
**CIVIL RIGHTS ISSUES OF
EURO-ETHNIC AMERICANS IN
THE UNITED STATES:
OPPORTUNITIES
AND CHALLENGES**

A Consultation Sponsored by the United States
Commission on Civil Rights, Chicago, Illinois
December 3, 1979

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is a temporary, independent, bipartisan agency established by Congress in 1957 and directed to:

- Investigate complaints alleging that citizens are being deprived of their right to vote by reason of their race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin, or by reason of fraudulent practices;
- Study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting discrimination or a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution because of race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin, or in the administration of justice;
- Appraise Federal laws and policies with respect to discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin, or in the administration of justice;
- Serve as a national clearinghouse for information in respect to discrimination or denial of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin;
- Submit reports, findings, and recommendations to the President and Congress.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Arthur A. Flemming, *Chairman*

Stephen Horn, *Vice Chairman*

Frankie M. Freeman

Manuel Ruiz, Jr.

Murray Saltzman

Louis Nuñez, *Staff Director*

**CIVIL RIGHTS ISSUES OF
EURO-ETHNIC AMERICANS IN
THE UNITED STATES:
OPPORTUNITIES
AND CHALLENGES**

A Consultation Sponsored by the United States
Commission on Civil Rights, Chicago, Illinois
December 3, 1979

Preface

The term "Euro-ethnic American" is of fairly recent coinage; it received national attention during the 1975 White House Conference on Neighborhood Revitalization. It has come to mean Americans from or descendants of persons from eastern and southern Europe. It is a working description rather than a precise definition.

The current interest in ethnicity is a resurgence of an issue that dates back to the earliest days of our heterogeneous society; like the tides, it has ebbed and flowed in national consciousness and attention. For a time, it was overshadowed by the "melting pot" theory of the dynamics of acculturation and assimilation. More recently, ethnicity has gained increased attention and academic respectability as social scientists have explored and examined the multiracial, multireligious, and multiethnic nature of American society. Just as poverty existed as a real force in the lives of millions of Americans before its "discovery" in the 1960s, so too ethnicity existed as a real force in the lives of millions of Americans before its recent "discovery" or resurgence.

For this consultation, as for others the Commission has sponsored, staff went into the field to interview leaders of agencies and organizations with concerns and programs in the subject matter. Staff also met with recognized authorities and appropriate Federal, State, and local public officials. A wide spectrum of viewpoints was solicited and heard. The final choice of subjects to be covered however, was the responsibility of the Commission.

Preparations for the consultation were under the direction of Herbert H. Wheelless, Community Relations Division, Office of Congressional and Public Affairs, with the assistance of David Grim, Isidro Lucus, Celeste Wiseblood, and Violeta Baluyut. In addition, contributions were made by Ki Taek Chun, Roy Johnson, Charles Rivera, Del Harrod, and Miu Eng. Support services were provided by Betty Stradford, Alfonso Garcia, Patricia Ellis, Barbara Hulin, Elsie Furnells, Ginger Williams, Loretta Ward, Mary Davis, and Deloris Miller. Administrative and management services were provided by Ruth Ford and Natalie Proctor.

In planning the consultation, the Commission acknowledges the assistance of Kenneth J. Kovach, director of the Cleveland Urban Museum Project of the Ohio Historical Society; John A. Kromkowski, president of the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs; and Irving M. Levine, Director of the Institute of Pluralism and Group Identity of the American Jewish Committee.

The consultation was under the overall supervision of Frederick Routh, Director of the Community Relations Division, and William T. White, Jr., Assistant Director of the Office of Congressional and Public Affairs.

Contents

First Session: An Overview	1
Statement of Irving M. Levine, Director, Institute on Pluralism and Group Identity, American Jewish Committee ..	2
Statement of Joan Aliberti, Educational Consultant	13
"Conceptual Considerations of Ethnicity," by Joan Aliberti	21
Statement of Kenneth J. Kovach, Director of the Cleveland Urban Museum Project of the Ohio Historical Society ..	41
"With Roots Entwined: Intergroup Relations in Urban Ethnic America," by Kenneth J. Kovach	51
Statement of John A. Kromkowski, President of the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs	76
"Conceptual Considerations of Ethnicity: Past, Present, and Future," by John A. Kromkowski	84
Discussion	105
Second Session: Housing and Ethnicity	127
Statement of Arthur J. Naparstek, Director, Washington Public Affairs Center, University of Southern California.	128
"Geographic Documentation" by Arthur J. Naparstek and Chester D. Haskell	136
Statement of Helena Z. Lopata, Professor of Sociology, Loyola University	159
"Euro-Ethnic Families and Housing in Urban America," by Helena Z. Lopata	165
Response of Peter Ujvagi	192
Response of David Guttman	198
Response of Richard Kolm	201
Discussion	208
Third Session: Education and Ethnicity	217
Statement of Francis X. Femminella, Professor of Sociology and Education, State University of New York	217
"Education and Ethnicity: Euro-Ethnics in Anglo-Ethnic Schools," by Francis X. Femminella	221
Response of James A. Banks	243

Response of Georgia T. Noble	257
Response of Thomas Vitullo-Martin	264
Discussion	279
Fourth Session: Social Services and Ethnicity	290
Statement of Marvin L. Rosenberg, Associate Professor of Social Planning, School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University	290
“Ethnicity and Social Services: Some Policy Perspectives,” by Marvin L. Rosenberg	297
Response of David E. Biegel	312
Response of William McReady	318
Response of Joseph Giordano	322
Discussion	328
Fifth Session: Ethnic Women	336
Statement of Kathleen McCourt, Assistant Professor of So- ciology, Loyola University	336
“Euro-Ethnic Women: Some Observations,” by Kathleen McCourt	342
Response of Galina Suziedelis	360
Response of Laura Scanlon	364
Response of Jan Peterson	366
Discussion	371
Sixth Session: Employment and Ethnicity	373
Statement of Daniel E. Leach, Vice Chairman, Equal Oppor- tunity Commission	374
Statement of Leonard F. Walentynowicz, Executive Director, Polish-American Congress	379
“Employment and Ethnicity,” by Leonard F. Walenty- nowicz	396
Statement of Freida S. Rozen, Instructor of Labor Studies, Pennsylvania State University	461
“Employment and Ethnicity,” by Freida S. Rozen	466
Response of Russell Barta	488
Response of Father Lydio Tomasi	492

Response of Esta Bigler	499
Discussion	504
Seventh Session: Communications Media and Ethnicity	509
Statement of Richard Gambino, Professor of Educational Philosophy, Queens College	510
“The Communications Media and Southern and Eastern European Ethnic Groups,” by Richard Gambino	515
Response of Christine Noschese	520
Response of Thaddeus L. Kowalski	523
Discussion	525
Eighth Session: Inter-governmental Relations and Ethnicity ...	530
Statement of Myron B. Kuropas, Supreme Vice President, Ukrainian National Association	531
“Intergovernmental Relations and Ethnicity,” by Myron B. Kuropas	539
Response of Marcia C. Kaptur	556
Response of Paul Ascioffa	560
Response of Nampeo McKenney	573
Discussion	576
Ninth Session: Wrap-Up Session	580
Statement of Edward A. Marciniak, President, Institute of Urban Life, Professor of Urban Studies, Loyola University	581
Statement of Father Geno Baroni, Assistant Secretary, Office of Neighborhoods, Voluntary Associations and Consumer Protection, Department of Housing and Urban Develop- ment	585

ERRATA

On page 459, insert the following after line 10:

Mr. Walentynowicz. But Title VII doesn't talk about affirmative action. Affirmative action is a bureaucratic creature. There's no law detailing affirmative action as we now know it.

CIVIL RIGHTS ISSUES OF EURO-ETHNIC AMERICANS IN THE UNITED STATES: OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

**A Consultation Sponsored by the United States
Commission on Civil Rights, Chicago, Illinois
December 3, 1979**

First Session: An Overview

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is sponsoring this consultation on civil rights issues of Euro-ethnic Americans in the United States: opportunities and challenges, as one of a series of consultations under its clearinghouse jurisdiction.

The purpose of this consultation, as with others in the series, is to enable the Commission to examine the civil rights issues of a number of minority groups in the United States.

The consultation format and setting provide the opportunity for the Commissioners to hear from and enter into dialogue with scholars and practitioners who are knowledgeable and experienced with the civil rights issues of a particular minority group.

Two recent Commission-sponsored consultations are illustrative: the April, 1979 consultation on *Religious Discrimination, a Neglected Issue*, and the May, 1979 consultation on *Civil Rights Issues of Asian and Pacific Americans, Myths and Realities*.

Staff planning for this consultation on Euro-ethnic Americans dates back to the late spring and early summer of 1979. It responds to the felt needs of eastern and southern European ethnic groups, because the agenda was developed in consultation and cooperation with their organizational leadership.

The Commission staff held a number of meetings in Washington and other meetings in New York, Cleveland, and Chicago to solicit the views of these leaders just as we have done in the past with other groups of leaders in planning previous consultations and conferences.

The first series of presentations on the agenda is designed to provide us with an overview of some of the issues in this area. I'm asking my colleague, the Vice Chairperson of the Commission, Dr. Horn, to preside during these presentations this morning.

The first panelist is Mr. Irving M. Levine. Mr. Levine received his Bachelor's degree from New York University and pursued further graduate work at the NYU Center for Human Relation Studies and the University of Wisconsin School of Social Work.

He has been active in the civil rights movement throughout his professional career, published numerous articles on intergroup relations and urban affairs, and served as narrator of the NBC documentary, "The Ethnic Factor."

In 1968 he organized and chaired a national consultation on ethnic America, and he has developed the Institute on Pluralism and Group Identity. As Director of that institute and Director of Program Planning for the American Jewish Committee, he has conducted a number of multiethnic programs and research based on the belief that elimination of group polarization is in the best interest of all ethnic minorities in the nation.

**STATEMENT OF IRVING M. LEVINE,
DIRECTOR, INSTITUTE ON PLURALISM
AND GROUP IDENTITY,
AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE,
NEW YORK, NEW YORK**

Thank you, Mr. Horn.

Let me just say a few words of appreciation of those who consider themselves a part of the white ethnic movement. We think this is an historic moment in the life of this nation, the United States Commission on Civil Rights.

Millions of Americans have felt for a long time that their needs have been relatively neglected, even as they admitted and accepted the fact that other groups have major priorities in this society of social justice and antidiscrimination.

And your recognition that there is a category called Euro-Americans is something we have worked for for many, many years; and the fact that you've assembled so distinguished a group of people here who are both experts and representatives of a variety of ethnic groups is a reflection on the carrying out of your duty correctly. I want to indicate our appreciation to this meeting.

In 1909 an educator wrote that a major task of education in American cities was to break up these immigrant groups or settlements to assimilate and amalgamate these people as part of our American rights and to implant in their children, so far as can be done, the Anglo-Saxon conceptions of righteousness, law and order, and popular government.

Sixty years later, the Congress of the United States passed the Ethnic Heritage Studies Act, giving official recognition to the heterogeneous composition of the nation and to the fact that, in a multiethnic society, a greater understanding of the contributions of one's own heritage and those of one's fellow citizen can contribute to a more harmonious, patriotic, and committed populace.

What brought about this ideological switch? Does the change in talk about American society reflect reality or just rhetoric? Do we really mean that the melting pot concept has been replaced, or have we just exchanged the slogan of "cultural pluralism" or what we're calling the "new pluralism" for earlier images without changing reality?

During the first quarter of this century there was considerable interest in ethnic groups. After all America had absorbed an incredibly large number of immigrants and the task of molding these disparate groups into one nation was a difficult one.

Many studies were done and many organizations formed to help ethnic groups in their translation to Americanness. On the surface, they seemed successful. People did learn English, become citizens, and adopt the Anglo-Saxon conception of righteousness.

The World Wars and the Depression that separated them, the economic boom following World War II, and the suburbanization stage of metropolitan development in the '50's all contributed to a greater emphasis on the forces that unified people with a lesser emphasis on ethnic differences and distinctiveness.

Intergroup relations concentrated on blacks as the largest leftout group and emphasized legal desegregation, first in the armed forces, then of public schools, public accommodations, employment, and housing.

The central intergroup issue was prejudice, and theorists concentrated on understanding those individual attitudes that resulted in discriminatory behavior.

But toward the late 1960's, two things happened that forced us to look at ourselves again as a multiethnic, not merely a black-white society.

Even as the Kerner Commission reported in 1968 that we were moving toward two societies, one black and one white, it was becoming clear that this was an oversimplification that among both white and nonwhite Americans there was still considerable diversity;

and while that report spoke eloquently and with necessary urgency about the needs of blacks, it masked the degree to which there were still important unmet needs among segments of the white population as well.

Social and economic needs and unresolved problems of ethnic group identity began to surface among Jews, Italians, Poles, Greeks, Ukrainians, and other groups, many of whom are from southern and eastern Europe. The first important influence of this new consciousness and expression was economics. In 1967, for the first time in 25 years, real economic purchasing for blue collar workers declined; and the onward and upward success stories for the children and grandchildren of early immigrants seemed to be coming to an end.

It no longer looked like the children could automatically go to college, with costs constantly rising. Nor did it seem that passing down an apprenticeship in the union to one's son was a sure thing.

At the same time that the economic squeeze began, another force fought what might be called an identity squeeze. The black movement, focus of considerable public attention, if not adequate programmatic response, appeared to switch from a central integrationist thrust to one based on black identity.

This approach, combining power and culture, is still generating controversy, but it did gain legitimacy among some leaders of American opinion; a my-own-group first strategy looked like one which had the potential to pay off.

From the viewpoint of white ethnic groups, these changes in economics and identity expression, coming together as they did, might have communicated this message: Here we were, taught by our parents and schools that in America we could make it, if we would only become real Americans and drop those elements that made us different.

But now we see we are not making it, and the people who look like they are making progress seem to be doing it by emphasizing their identity, not by denying it. Maybe that's the way we should go, too.

This response has been described as reactive, as me-too, and as essentially opportunistic and false. For some it may have been; but for many, especially the new generation of ethnic leaders, it was a real and genuine response.

It was in part a sense that the requirements for success in America seem to be an estrangement from family and history, that for all of its rhetoric about pluralism, America didn't mean for ethnicity to go beyond the boundaries of food, a few statues or parades honoring heroes, or colorful costumes and dances.

For many individuals from ethnic communities, this new feeling about the importance of ethnic background took the form of questions,

rather than certainties. What does my history mean to me? How tied do I want to be to my family and neighborhood? How much do I know about where my grandparents and parents come from, or why, and what they went through? What does it mean to be American? Is that some standardized image, and who set it up? How much am I, or have I become, just white? And probably most important, what do I want to be? How do I arrive at a blending of my personal individuality, my family, and cultural roots, and my Americanness?

Now this little description that I have given to you about, I think, the backdrop of what might be called the white ethnic movement or white ethnic resurgence, began long before 1968, but it culminated in that conference that your Chairman talked about, which I had the privilege of organizing and chairing, the Fordham Consultation on Ethnic America, which for the first time penetrated what had been really a rather, I would say, negativism, or, I would say, unconsciousness, about the nature of white diversity.

That conference was widely publicized; it stimulated conferences in some 21 cities in this country, and we began to talk about middle Americans, the silent Americans, white ethnics, et cetera.

What was really happening at that point was, as I said, not only a reaction to the black thrust, but a beginning of a real feeling of a surge of selfhood.

How deep it is? At this particular point there's great controversy about the future of American pluralism and the future of white ethnicity as an identity movement, but we're beginning to talk in terms of real figures and while the statistics are varied, and have been in some ways distorted by very inadequate Census figures, we know that when we talk about people who were first, second generation in this country, who are close to the immigrant experience or the migrant experience, and include Hispanics, we're talking about a hundred million people who are into the identity movement.

That is a very big figure; pretty close to half the population, you would say, are very, very close to their roots; and at least half of that group, it's an estimate, are white ethnics. So we're talking about a very sizeable population, without having precise figures, and some of my colleagues may do a better job than I on giving you figures.

I wanted to be in a position, if I could, to clarify some of the confusions about the whole concept of ethnicity, and it's going to be very difficult because everybody who studies the issue feels confused. But we are coming up with some working definitions, which I think ought to be in front of the Commission and ought to be in front of the American public.

When we talk about ethnic groups and ethnicity, we're talking about ethnicity meaning peoplehood, a sense of commonality of community

derived from networks of family relations which have, over a number of generations, been the carriers of common experiences.

Ethnicity, in short, means the culture of people and is thus critical for values, attitudes, perceptions, needs, mode of expression, behavior, and identity.

To say another thing about that, even with the vast numbers of people who become intermarried, and especially in the white ethnic community, there is large intermarriage, and there is fusion of different identities and different cultures, there are learnings. Children grow up with the leaning toward the family of one parent or the other, and while they often confuse their identity, that very confusion is what may be causing some difficulty; and there's a job in the educational and civic world to begin to help children deal with and grapple with this identity confusion.

But even where there are families that are of one ethnic group background, there are various shades of conscious identity. I think we had better be aware that the identity movement depends on geography; it depends on generation; it depends on organization and consciousness of organization; and if we look at the white ethnic movement if it is a movement, and I believe it has become one we will see that it is generated largely not by, as had been asserted earlier, just lower middle class whites who are seeking to rise, but just as in the black community, we began to see real black activism when blacks reach the middle class stage; you have the same thing happening in the white ethnic community.

You have an educated group of young professionals coming into the field, no longer feeling that there is a contradiction between the middle class and being ethnic. The fact that there are so many who are middle class and ethnic gives them cohorts in expressing their ethnicity with all of the new influence of the media and with all of the influence of perhaps a new generation of people coming over from overseas.

I think we've got to be aware that continuing immigration to this country, from all over the world, including Europe, even though the European immigration is smaller than it has been in the past, creates the kinds of needs to resettle and to reintegrate people from your homeland, from your background, which gives tasks to what you call people in the ethnic movement, but also rekindles feelings of early experiences of parents and grandparents and is a permanent fixture on the American scene.

And to underestimate the impact of immigration and the capacity for world events to turn new refugees into objects of great compassion would underestimate what you call the recycling of American history.

I think we're talking about a permanent state of American history which needs a permanent immigration ethic, and that ethic and the stance of liberality and immigration is mostly backed by the organized ethnic community; and they maintain a very strong and powerful force in making this country what it is in terms of the receiving of newcomers, and the number of newcomers coming to our shores, especially to urban centers, is creating a need for, I would say, a new form of application.

Let me say a few things about some of the issues – I want to just take a limited amount of time – that I believe the Civil Rights Commission has to be aware of.

One, we've got to break the black-white dichotomy. In my opinion, it has not done blacks as much good as blacks thought in 1968. The capacity to organize America into two races does give advantage at a certain point in history, but then begins to be a force for the polarization; and to the extent that one views the white community and its diversity, to that extent, can both whites and blacks create the kinds of coalitions across group lines that do not depend totally on race; and I think that we've come to that point of maturity now where we find that for black Americans and minority Americans, they can carry both race and ethnicity together.

As a Jew, I do recognize clearly how complicated it has been for the Jews to carry both ethnicity and religion together; but if you ask a Jew what he is, he would have to say, honestly, "I am an ethnic bounded by religious civilization; I've got to carry water on both shoulders."

And I'm suggesting that the same thing may have come true for black Americans and other minority Americans.

One of the major forces in American life, disputed as it may be, is ethnic succession; and if one is going to define the new ethnicity, the new pluralism, as against the Horace Callan cultural pluralism, one of the most distinguishing features is the manner in which groups are represented collectively and corporately.

I think you'll find that we're now talking about a new form of pluralism, a pluralism where it is now legitimate for groups to be represented collectively and commonly.

The great controversies in our society will be whether or not that has to be ensconced in law.

I happen to be a strong believer in individual rights with group prerogatives and group power to ensure those individual rights for members of a particular ethnic group.

I personally believe that we've gone too far in confusing, and I think the Civil Rights Commission has to look at this more clearly, the whole question of racial and ethnic categories and the law. They are really, I can only say, wild and dangerous in their lack of definition,

their lack of preciseness, and almost the scatterbrained way in which we have created categories which include some and exclude others with barely any evidence that one particular group has suffered a special discrimination.

The best way I can describe that is if you were an Argentinian of middle class background who emigrated originally from Italy and you emerge on the American scene, as a Spanish speaking personality, Affirmative Action might work for you.

If you're the son of a lower class hod carrier immigrating from Italy directly to the United States, it will not. I don't think we can live with those kinds of categories that are so undisciplined and ill-defined; and I think one of the major things that the United States Civil Rights Commission has to do is to investigate the standing of racial and ethnic categories and American law.

That is not to diminish the reality and the necessity for Affirmative Action and the fact that we might use race and ethnicity, as the Supreme Court has indicated, as one other factor in many other factors relating to pluralism.

But I think using it totally as the fact of and meshing ethnicity with race, as we have done, and very broad categories without really having a distinguishing understanding of how the two things work together, could be disastrous for those countries.

Only one judge, in Bakke, seemed to understand that there is a difference between race and ethnicity, even though ethnicity assumes race. I think we have to be clear of that. If we read the record of Bakke, judges have been using the terminology very loosely, and there's a need for the Civil Rights Commission to clear up some of the definitions.

On issues, I think we are merging rapidly with not just a black-white dichotomy, but an urban-suburban dichotomy, and it will break along race lines, and again you're going to find white ethnics in the suburbs, seemingly arrayed against black interests.

I believe that there has to be new investigation of these factors. It's very, very disturbing to see the growth in overt outbreaks of violence; that violence is generic in this society as we know, and it sometimes affects people on both sides of the race issue. But I do think that we may be facing new hardening of hostility, and that the Civil Rights Commission has to take a closer look at what I would call the intergroup climate that is beginning to develop in suburban communities.

I think we have underestimated how difficult it will be as people move in an age of scarcity and are subject to the question of sharing. And since we do have a new ethnicity, it is possible that there will be a

negative aspect to the new ethnicity as well as the positive celebratory approach to pluralism.

I think in that sense one has to be able to recognize that there are such things as racism, bigotry, discrimination, and legitimate group interest. And legitimate group interest for the long racial line sometimes, or long ethnic lines, sometimes looks like bigotry and discrimination but is not.

We have seen the recent struggle between blacks and Jews, the so-called trouble between blacks and Jews, where they have been asserting both bigotry and racism, but also legitimate group interest, and I think there is a need for the leadership of this country to help distinguish what is legitimate group interest, especially when so many white ethnic groups feel that they are not getting the aid that they should be getting from government, and others are getting it.

And I think that it clouds the issue if distinguished people in our society charge others with racism when all they are doing is really asserting group interest that is legitimate on their side as on the other side, and I think we have to really do something about that language.

I do believe that this society has been doing a pretty good job in the last few years on immigration. I think that it's rather interesting that we do maintain the most humane position in the world on immigration. I think there has to be a remodelization of what I call the immigration ethic, and in that sense, a unification of various ethnic groups around not only the expansion of immigration, but the protection of immigrants documented and undocumented.

And over here, I would say that the white ethnic groups have many undocumented immigrants. There is a fusion of interest here with undocumented Hispanics coming from the Caribbean Islands; and I think as we look for coalitions, as we look for issues that can mesh and merge groups, we will find that the immigration issue both legal and illegal is an issue that we can get some unity on this country.

There is an interest in the aging, in all groups in this society, and I recommend that we take a closer look at the cultural aspects of aging. There is a sharp differential among various groups in terms of how they age and their attitude towards health and death; the ethnic factor is an underestimated factor in the field of aging, and even in the discrimination against the aged, and in the receiving of services.

Different groups, based upon cultural factors, have better or worse access to services, and government often provides programs that are culturally insensitive; this is especially true with white ethnic groups. There are many, many programs that are insensitive, which means that certain people are automatically excluded from fair treatment in programs.

And I would say that one of the major policy areas of investigation is whether or not government programs in general are culturally sensitive not only to race, but also to ethnicity and to white ethnicity; and we will find, as we look at the data, that differentials are great enough to make adjustments and to give choice in picking up of government services.

I think there is a tremendous interest in this country in the American family and in the capacity for families to cope and to survive.

We believe that the family is a coping and surviving unit, and in fact the cultural differences and structural differences of the families are adaptations to that survival instinct.

This has been true in the reanalysis of the black family. I would say to you that it would be equally true if one looked at the unbelievable way in which immigrants who came here under very harsh conditions have survived and even prospered in this society.

Any government policy which interferes with the structure and the culture of the family ought to be looked at and severely censured. We find that over the years there are many, many policies that have led to family dissolution and, whereas some work has been done on race in this field, we ought to look more closely on cultural factors that incorporate race, but go beyond race, in terms of the hunt for family cohesion.

There is a confusion in this country about the issue of ethnic lobbying. Let me say to you, ethnic lobbying is as American as cherry pie, as legitimate as business lobbying, as legitimate as labor lobbying, as legitimate as any other lobbying.

I think, as a matter of fact, if one would look at the history of ethnic lobbying in this country, one would find that quite often it was the ethnic lobby that alerted the larger society to what might have been an inadequate and insensitive approach to foreign policy, overseas interest in the United States; and as we study ethnic lobbying, we find it has been not only a very adequate expression of both the interests of those people who are closest to the homeland but also, quite often, pathetic in pressing the United States into a position where it was more sympathetic on human rights and other issues, to people who were the cohorts of the group over here.

That goes for not only the foreign policy, ethnic lobbying, but also for domestic lobbying as well. I think we have got to legitimize the fact that this is an orchestration of many, many groups and that while they may be making demands that seem to be unreasonable to other groups, in the marketplace of ideas, they have as much right to assert the extremities of their ideas as any other group in the society; I think that one of the things that is likely happening is the tremendous push against so-called special interests will eventually push very hard

against the capacity of ethnic groups to legitimately lobby for themselves; I think there has to be some awareness on the part of the United States Civil Rights Commission that there is a mood against so-called special interest, and it may again diminish the capacity for people for free expression.

Let me say something about research. Millions of dollars are being spent in this country on research that does not have adequate questions around ethnicity.

If you take a look at Government agencies, you will see that there is no universal style of doing research that incorporates the breadth of American ethnicity. Sex is dealt with; race is dealt with; income is dealt with. The multiethnic factors are often neglected, giving us tremendous distortions in reality. I think this is an important area for the United States Civil Rights Commission to look into.

The Census – I would rather not talk about the Census. It's horrible. In its capacity to elicit the proper information as to the nature of American ethnicity, it just doesn't do the job. There are experts here who might go into greater detail on that.

The media – there is no question in my mind that strong civic pressures have got to be brought against the media's capacity to defame groups. We have come to a point where it's outright dangerous for the media to have a license to operate in public shaming and defaming large groups of Americans and having their children develop a self-image that is destructive to their personality development.

The kind of pressure, I would say, ought to be developed from voluntary sources; I'm not looking for censorship; I'm looking for strong, outrageous proclamations of, I would say, denunciations. It still goes on. It definitely has attacked a very vital development of the Polish and Italian community; we faced it as Jews and blacks and others at earlier stages. I think it still goes on and is a serious problem. It is not a minor problem, because it becomes a "ha-ha" problem and people laugh at it. It is a serious problem that has to be addressed by the United States Civil Rights Commission in one fashion or the other, and I think there are people who are ready to make real recommendations on that.

One last word on antidiscrimination. There are studies that indicated that white ethnics, while they have reached a middle class status and they have salaries commensurate with their position and equal to WASPS and others in the society, they do suffer extreme discrimination when it comes to the higher places in the society.

They're excluded not only from clubs; they're excluded from corporate suites, and increasingly, because of the mainstream nature of white ethnic society, this is leading to unequal treatment and the kind of unequal treatment that will create ethnic rage.

We have not really made it in that sense, and it doesn't look like we're going to be making it unless there's some help from official bodies taking a look at sections and patterns of exclusiveness and exclusion in this society.

They exist; they're powerful forces. They develop negative images in terms of the various white ethnic groups.

Let me just end up by saying something as an intergroup relations professional with 25 years of work in the civil rights and intergroup relations field.

I entered the white ethnic field in the same way that I entered the civil rights field. I saw injustice. I saw hate. I saw hostility. I saw intergroup turmoil taking place in this country.

I think this country still has not come to grips with its diversity, doesn't yet understand the nature of identity clearly, doesn't understand the fact that we are a country that is constantly into what you call a dialectic between particularism and universalism; and instead of a straight line towards assimilation, we have a culturalization with structural differences, and we will have it for a long time to come.

And the fact that one of the largest factors in creating new people in this country still is immigration and migration, means that new people will be coming here, clashing mostly in urban-suburban centers with older groups; one of the things that has to be assumed here is that the major work of the United States Civil Rights Commission has been phenomenal in behalf of nonwhite minorities, as it should be, and we commend you for that.

But these nonwhite minorities always live in areas, always live in areas except for the far South and perhaps the far West, where the ethnic patterns are of these eastern and southern European groups. So it's the rubbing up against the interests of eastern and southern European groups that the minority group pattern develop into so that there cannot be any effective dealing with minority groups unless there is an adequate response to white ethnicity and within the context of what I would call a new intergroup relations movement.

We have, I would say, enthusiasm for enforcement. As a member of the New York City Commission on Human Rights in charge of tension control in Queens and other places in the middle 1950's and part of the Community Relations Staff of the New York City Human Rights Commission, we had a tremendous amount of work in intergroup relations, not only in enforcement.

And we were deeply involved in the training of public officials, deeply involved with training of lay and civic leadership in intergroup relations, and deeply involved in constantly training ourselves to identify tension spots and to identify rising group interests among new groups all the time.

I think if you look at the bulk of human rights workers today, over the last 10 years, you will find that they are not only inadequately trained, but shamefully untrained in recognizing some of the white ethnic factors that I've been talking about.

Thank you very much.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Thank you very much, Mr. Levine.

Our next panelist is Joan Aliberti, who is a graduate of New England College, earned her Master's in administration, planning, and social policy from the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

She has had extensive experience in education at the grass roots level when she was director of an alternative school for troubled students at South Boston High School.

In the past 2 years she has been Educational Consultant for the Women's Research Program in the National Institute of Education. That is part of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Her responsibilities included the researching of critical issues relating to the educational and occupational needs of white ethnic women.

Ms. Aliberti.

STATEMENT OF JOAN ALBERTI, EDUCATIONAL CONSULTANT, WASHINGTON, D.C.

It's a distinct pleasure being here today. I would like to address some of these issues informally and then spend more time on questions and answers.

In writing this paper, I tried to focus on tangible issues. Issues regarding ethnicity, as you know, tend to be vague and difficult to hold onto, and because my background is in education and in political action, I'd like to focus on educational and occupational needs.

In looking at this issue, the thing that impresses me as being most serious is the role of women. While I don't want to focus all my paper on women - because I would suspect that the other panel members would be addressing the issue - I would like to point out where there is a distinction.

I think everyone would admit that there are problems of discrimination for all ethnic groups and for all members of ethnic groups, men and women. But for women it's particularly difficult.

I'd like to run through, very quickly, an outline of my paper and then go in more detail over some of the parts relating to education and occupations.

In my paper I started off talking about the immigrant experience, how various groups, the Irish, the Greeks, the Italians, the Jews, came here, in the 1800's and early 1900's, and about some of the problems that they had.

Then very quickly, I'd like to go into the issue of ethnicity in the 1950's, in the post World War II era when everyone was to be American and to carry the American flag and to be thought of as being Irish-American, French-American, and Italian-American was to be anti-American. So we didn't learn our second language; we didn't learn how to speak Italian or French. We were truly American.

In going into the 1950's, in the post Korean War period, and again, how we were very American.

Then in the 1960's, in the civil rights movement and how these things started to change, how blacks particularly helped white ethnics understand the whole idea of belonging and belonging to a particular group, community, was a good thing, not a negative thing.

And while people were moving out to the suburbs en masse to have their car, to have their little ranch or bi-level, there was a certain group of people in the cities, in Boston, in New York, and Chicago, that wanted to stay there because this is where they really experienced community in a very ideal sense.

And I'd like to focus on particularly the Italian-American family, maybe because it's what I'm most familiar with. But I think another reason is that the Italian-American family, more than other ethnic groups, is very insular; it's very inner directed, and while this is a real strength in ways, it's also a disadvantage when it comes to going on in our careers and in education.

And I'd also like to look at the ethnic community as a model community in taking ethnic communities around the country and learning from them and learning how we could build sort of an ideal community from these ethnic communities.

We have Gulf Oil building places like Reston and claiming that they are the ideal community. I tend to disagree. I think there's much more sharing of resources in ethnic neighborhoods than there is in Reston or Columbia in Maryland; and I think that as Federal officials we should look at this and look in terms of developing policy which would be productive and not counterproductive to individuals, particularly from ethnic origins - in the nontypical American community - I should say the Anglo community.

And I'd like to talk about - and I hesitated in writing this paper, being a woman and being a first, second-generation Italian and a first-generation feminist - I hesitated to really come down strong on women's issues, but I think that I would be terribly negligent if I didn't address the real problem of women in ethnic groups and the amount of sex discrimination that happens with all women, but happens even more in ethnic groups. It's often done among ethnics, in stereotyping women in the traditional roles and looking at Mama Celeste, looking at the Italian mother as only making meatballs and feeding her son and

ignoring the fact that she has daughters and then they are educated or want to be educated; and also what that does in terms of first- and second-generation Americans, particularly women, in terms of how they see themselves and the type of roles they are presently in, and how they see themselves in terms of the future.

Do they go on to a four-year college; and if they do go on to a four-year college, how far do they go? Do they go into the more traditional women's jobs, like nursing and teaching? Are they held back either by themselves or by the family in terms of getting a degree in medicine or becoming architects or becoming lawyers?

I think we would all have to admit that there are many more women going to law school and going to medical school, but my question is: Are they ethnic women and what about the women that are presently in their fifties and sixties and what types of advantages did they have if they had any?

I'd also like to look at the policy implications in the work place, and particularly in terms of working class communities and working class people. I'd like to look at the future trends, what's going to happen to the people that are presently in their thirties, forties, and fifties today, how are we grooming people in terms of occupational opportunities and educational opportunities, and how we're preparing people for our society in the 21st century.

And then I'd like to go into specific recommendations – to general recommendations and specific recommendations, focusing in on education and occupational opportunities.

As I said earlier, the immigrant experience began in the middle 1800's when people were flocking to America for equal opportunity, for freedom of speech. They were flocking to America because there were no opportunities or very few opportunities in Europe.

And they came to America; they came to the east coast; they came to Boston; they came to New York. Some traveled on to Chicago and Detroit. Some traveled further to the farmlands in Michigan and Wisconsin, and then there were real pioneers that went out to the west coast. They settled in, by and large, in California and all along the Barbary Coast.

And with the exception of the people that settled on the west coast, there was very little assimilation. There was very little integration. They were basically ostracized from the mainstream. They were thought of as being poor, which they were, and ignorant in the ways of America, but not ignorant people.

They were hard working and they really believed in the American dream. Some of them were disillusioned. Some of them still believed in the American dream in terms of not questioning the American way of

life. They taught their children to be very submissive and not to challenge institutions.

While this may be good in some situations, it also created a certain thing with ethnic groups and did not allow them to have a political base. And I think there's a very good similarity between ethnic groups and between the traditional minorities in terms of blacks and Hispanics.

They were also taught to accept the American way, buy the American dream, and not to challenge our institutions; and as a result, they had very little: they had a very small political base and they had very little opportunity.

In the post World War period, there's a lot that could be said about the immigrant experience, and I really don't want to focus on that right now.

I'd like to talk more in terms of contemporary America and how that immigrant experience provided some strength in terms of ethnic groups valuing certain things like family, work, community, and friends, and these are the things that have really kept people going, kept white ethnics going in a time when they had nothing else going.

After World War II, and probably because we were engaged in a world war and we became isolationists, we became also much more American, and we looked at the foreign powers as being foreign and we felt that in order to be really accepted, we couldn't really talk about our Italian heritage or our Polish heritage or our Greek heritage. We really had to accept the American way whether we believed in it or not.

I basically think that at the time most people did believe in it and really felt very strongly about it. You couldn't get any group of Americans more patriotic than traditional ethnic communities, and they still are patriotic.

An interesting thing happened after World War II. While we were accepting the American dream and moving out to the suburbs, we also started to look in terms of opportunities. The American dream said that if we really believed and worked hard, we would move up the social ladder, the economic ladder, the political ladder.

By and large, that didn't happen. With the exception of probably California in the west, where we had people like A. P. Giannini who started the Bank of America, which was then the Bank of Italy, we had very little assimilation. We had few opportunities. We had substantial prejudice toward immigrants.

And to counter that second-generation Americans became super patriots and super Americans. They didn't teach their children to speak their language, and they probably only passed on their culture in a very sub rosa way.

And it's probably not until the second generation that we see a big change in that, and that's probably why there's a real increase in the ethnic movement.

When one talks about white ethnics, typically it conjures up very negative descriptives. This is particularly true in the 1960's. After the 1950's when we were very American and very patriotic, certain things started to happen in the 1960's, the civil rights movement, and in the late 1960's the women's movement, had a certain impact on how we looked at white ethnic groups.

By and large, they were viewed as racists, as bigots, as hardhats, as probably stupid, ignorant people who just didn't understand the way, didn't see the way.

Well, this, I don't think, is true. I think typically the white ethnic groups stay in their cultural enclaves, some for economic reasons, most for cultural reasons – because they could really share resources that they could not previously do.

One of the things that happened at that time in the social unrest of the 1960's was the ethnic community that remained very stable, the Italian-American family, the Greek family, the Jewish family; they were still holding on to very strong European values about the family. And if you were going to do something, you didn't do anything that reflected poorly upon the family.

And I'd like to use the example of the Greeks, the Italians, and the Jews to present this. Unlike the Jews and the Greeks, the Italians were very inner directed, and if something had to be done – and this sounds reminiscent of the Godfather – if something had to be done, someone in the family could do it. If someone in the family could not do it, it was because it was impossible to do.

And this is a nice support system to grow up in, but what does that do in terms of careers for women and for men? If you sacrifice everything for the family, how does that affect your own individual developments?

Unlike the declining influence of the family in the larger society, the family, nuclear and extended, has remained generally intact in the ethnic community.

In a very real sense, ethnic neighborhoods represent an ideal community with the sharing of resources, goods, and services, in living and working in close proximity. The residents of these communities share more than bread and shelter. They share values, traditions, and a common culture.

As neighbors, they work, they play, and they learn together. Since their culture transcends the physical limits of the neighborhood, they have unlimited power and potential within the generational scheme of things and among ethnic groups.

I would like the Commissioners to look at ethnic groups as a very positive rather than a negative force in our community, and how we can look to ethnic enclaves, particularly in the cities, in Detroit, in Chicago, in Boston, and in New York, and ask ourselves how can we learn from these communities.

How could we take the real values that all Americans cherish, like family and friendship, and extend that into the broader Anglo community?

While these are the strengths of the ethnic community, the negative factors are also there.

The ethnic communities have become a stabilizing influence in the urban areas, and they have served as training grounds, particularly in relation to women.

While paradoxically they have served to perpetuate ethnic and sex stereotypes, particularly in the areas of education and work, they also serve to help the individual.

While cultural traditions may vary according to particular groups, regions and religious practices, those values which remain constant include family, work, and community.

In a close-knit ethnic community, these values have a strong interdependency. While an individual perceives that his or her role in the world of work is often shaped by family attitudes and expectations, similarly, education attainment – whether it be secondary or post-secondary – is clearly determined by the norms of the family and the community.

Therefore, in order to understand the educational and occupational needs in a pluralistic society, these should be examined in the context of a particular subculture.

This examination will provide a better understanding of the educational, occupational needs of individuals in a working class community. It will also illustrate how, through community activities, initially entered through family-centered concerns, one could develop skills – organizing, administration, et cetera – which could be transferable to leadership positions in community or in society in general.

I'm specifically talking about women and the changing roles of women in the ethnic community.

In many situations, ethnic communities and groups have not been successful politically and getting a power base, as I mentioned earlier. And the real exception is white ethnic women. They have been organizing – again, as I said, in the 1960's, this brought about a lot of organization.

For purposes of discussion, in this paper I zeroed in on the Italian-American family.

Clearly, it is impossible to divide the community, neighborhood, and peer group from the family in their impact on immigrant and second generation Italian-Americans.

The set of qualities that seems to distinguish Italian-Americans includes individuality, temperament, and ambition, all of which, however, are restricted by the culture and outlook of the family and neighborhood.

How these attitudes and traditions shaped one's future is evident in the lack of emphasis on formal education. According to Glazer and Moynihan, they stated, "One common American channel to success - education - was narrowed for Italian-Americans by the particular constitution and outlook of the family and neighborhood; accomplishment for the Italian son is felt by the parents to be meaningless unless it is directed to the gratification of the family, by maintaining closeness of the family and advancing the family's interest."

While education in an Italian-American community was never really strong for males, for females it was almost nonexistent. This is difficult in some situations to prove, because the data on ethnic groups is not very widespread, probably because we want to become so Americanized, we don't break down our data according to ethnic groups.

Since current statistics are not broken out along ethnic lines, it is increasingly difficult to determine the actual educational statistics of white ethnics as a group.

I have several general recommendations. Number one, there is a need to develop a strong and accurate statistical base so that we can point out that there really are differences between people that perceive themselves as non-ethnics, Anglos, whatever.

And there is also a real need to recognize white ethnics as a constituency and I think the fact that this meeting has occurred, I think, is a milestone. It would help the ethnics themselves to develop a stronger cultural identity and also people that don't identify themselves along the ethnic line to realize that there are real problems.

There is a need to remove both hidden and apparent economic, social, and political barriers which prevent white ethnics from achieving success while adopting and integrating the values of family, work, and community into the general American way of life.

In terms of employment, jobs must be redesigned to meet the particular educational and occupational needs of women - particularly of women who have had limited formal training and experience. As I mentioned very briefly, the community, the ethnic community, has provided a background where women could become activists and learn certain skills. These skills should be used and transferred into the marketplace for paid work.

New careers must be made available in nontraditional work; careers in sales, management, community organizing, and politics are additional areas of work in which previous homemaking and community skills could apply.

Blue-collar jobs which are typically dominated by white ethnic men and women should be redesigned to reduce dissatisfaction and provide workers with opportunities for self-fulfillment and self-actualization through work.

In this regard, the Civil Rights Commission could monitor other Government agencies responsible for the workers' safety; for example, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

In terms of financial aid and particularly in terms of education, since many white ethnics are from whiteworking class backgrounds, they should be recognized as a special-needs group so that they could qualify for special types of financial assistance available now only for the poor and not for the working poor.

This is particularly important for families needing financial assistance for college age children and for women interested in returning to college.

And in terms of education for older ethnic women, community colleges, particularly those based in the neighborhoods like the National Congress for Neighborhood Women, would provide an environment conducive to learning.

With financial assistance to these women, they could return to schools without having to worry about family responsibilities.

Four-year colleges and universities should not only design programs and courses specifically for women over 65 but create a tuition-free, open-enrollment policy for all general education courses and degree programs at the university level.

In addition, they should provide the support systems for older Americans and for people that have strong traditional cultural values, that they don't feel alienated from the prevailing Anglo environment. This is particularly true in Ivy League schools.

In addition, evening and community school programs should be available through local school systems for older Americans, older ethnic Americans and first-generation Americans.

What are the present parental attitudes toward educating daughters and how do parents view training for jobs and careers? These are questions which should be looked into.

The area of research is critical. The National Institute of Education, where I previously worked, sponsored a program on the educational and occupational needs of white ethnic women. The work has been done; it has not been published and it is not available to the public; and

at this point, it's not clear whether it will be available at all, and this is something that I think should be looked into.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. I might add, on that point, the Staff Director will follow up on that and see what is the status of that report.

MS. ALIBERTI. In terms of the future, in terms of the elderly, we are going to have an elderly population in the next two decades which will be first and second generation immigrants. If we do not train them and educate them now, what will the future be of these groups?

I think we have to do some real critical thinking in terms of the opportunities presently available and redesign our jobs for the future.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Thank you very much. Your paper, as well as the papers of all other panelists, will be published in full, and we appreciate your summarization of it.

[The complete paper follows]

CONCEPTUAL CONSIDERATIONS OF ETHNICITY: A VIEW OF EDUCATIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL NEEDS, PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

By Joan M. Aliberti*

The Immigrant Experience

During the past century this country has experienced a dramatic change in its economic, social and political systems. In part, this was due to the tremendous influx of the European immigrants who began entering the country in the mid-1850's. By the 1880's the fabric of this nation had so drastically changed that the political and social institutions would never be the same. Our cities, our schools, our churches, and our synagogues had been touched in a way which we had never known and perhaps would never see again.

For three-quarters of the population that hears itself so often hailed as "the American people" are the descendants of immigrants from Asia and Africa and, most of all, from the continent of Europe. They brought over with them their religions and folkways and their national foods, not least their national prejudices, which for a long time in the new country turned the cities of the Northeast and Midwest into adjoining compounds

* Educational Consultant for the Woman's Research Program, International Institute for Education, Washington, D.C.

of chauvinists, distrustful not only of immigrants from other nations everywhere but too often of their neighbors three or four blocks away.¹

For the European immigrant, America provided land which needed to be toiled. So strong and proud, they worked the land. They taught their children to accept the rules and the institutions even if these were alien to their European culture. They were in America and, if one worked and sacrificed, anything was possible.

Whatever the group, the immigrants brought with them a certain attitude toward life which was further shaped by their new environment. They had entered a country which had recently embarked on the Industrial Age; therefore, there were two essential needs: to fill quickly the critical labor shortage and to adapt immediately to the prevailing Anglo culture. The readiness in which they would comply would, to a certain degree, determine their immediate and long range success.

Thrown into a growing and dynamic nation, these immigrants sought to be integrated into an established society in the east, into the agrarian society in the midwest, and into the frontiers of the west; they had to work hard to not only survive, but also to be accepted. Clearly they did survive but with the possible exception of the west, particularly California, the immigrants failed to assimilate. In the years that followed, they developed strong ethnic enclaves in the teeming cities, on the coast, in New York City, in Boston, and in the new industrial centers in the mid-west around Chicago and Detroit, and in the farmland of Minnesota and Wisconsin. They settled, and for the next two generations remained as laborers, small business owners, and as farmers. In settling in these particular regions, they transferred more than their customs and folkways, they transferred their values, particularly as they related to family, work, friends, and community. It was for them, their lack of the proper education and skills which determined their lot, their class. Their attitude toward these issues varied according to several factors: time of arrival in this country and previous educational, occupational, and economic status (rural or urban) in their country of origin.

Often these factors determined where they would settle, the type of work they would do and the goals they would set for their children.

The Jews who emigrated from Poland and Russia around the turn of the century were neither farm laborers nor peasants, but peddlers, shopkeepers, and artisans with a more middle-class occupational tradition. They also differed from their fellow immigrants in their belief in education, partly for reasons related

¹ Alistair Cooke, *America* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1976), p. 273.

to this tradition. Although they worked initially as unskilled and semi-skilled laborers in America, they reacted differently to their environment than did the ethnic groups from peasant and farm labor origins. Superficially, the Jewish family resembled the Italian one, with a nuclear household surrounded by a large family circle. Because of the high value placed on education; however, the immigrants did not restrain their children from contact with the outside world.²

Whereas the Italian immigrant's view of the family was much more exclusionary. To reach beyond the confines of the family was seen as threatening to the survival of the unit. Consequently, their attitudes toward work and education were shaped much more by the limits and boundaries of the family experience. On the other hand,

. . .the Greeks prided themselves on individualism. And the Greek child was encouraged by both his family and his community to "make a name for himself". For Greeks, and for Jews too, this meant small business and the professions. As a result, Greek life, like Jewish life, has been characterized by American middle-class values.³

Ethnicity in the Post World War II Era

Having lived through two World Wars and a "Korean conflict", Americans were tired. Much had happened during this first half of the 20th century. To a large extent Americans had come of age. With the territorial expansion of the west in the 1880's, the industrialization of the cities in the northeast and midwest, and the internationalism in foreign affairs, the domestic and foreign policy of this nation would never again be the same nor would its people.

In this World War II era of American patriotism, ethnic traditions and values were under great scrutiny. Automobiles, increased wages, and access to better jobs made the house in the suburbs a goal even within reach of many of the white ethnics. During the "affluent" and somnolent years of the fifties (Parker, 1972), the melting pot theory was most dominant. With the exceptions of the ethnic enclaves still maintained in the urban areas, by and large America was on the move.

While upward mobility was basically an economic issue, it was also a social condition of the times. During this period, when the American dream was in full flower, the need to be socially accepted tended to make many first and second generation Americans more quick to deny his/her own heritage. Perhaps it was during this time that the fertile seeds of the social revolution of the 1960's were planted - because it was during the 1960's that the serene life of the previous decade

² Herbert J. Gans, *The Urban Villagers* (New York: The Free Press, 1962), p. 241.

³ *Divided Society: The Ethnic Experience in America*, ed. Colin Greer (New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1974), Introduction, p. 22

shattered. Yet ironically, this revolution brought new hope not only for blacks but also for white ethnics.

Contemporary America and the Changing Needs of White Ethnics

When one mentions white ethnics, several descriptors come to mind – hardhat, blue-collar, racist, bigot. This, unfortunately, was the image in the middle and late 60's, for those who did not fall into that category had successfully accepted the melting pot concept. But through the civil rights movement, this too had changed. What had brought this about is difficult to say but several factors seem to contribute. In the aftermath of the massive civil rights demonstrations, there was a heightened sense of one's heritage, a need to belong to a particular group or culture. In addition, middle class women began to question their roles and lack of status in society. These struggles eventually were felt in the ethnic community. The ethnic neighborhood, the last bastion of strength in the city, was changing.

These neighborhoods which previously were disdained by the middle class and examined by the intellectual elite, had begun to receive a higher status in our society. The working class and lower middle class which had fled to the suburbs in the 1950's and early 1960's were now beginning to take another look at the old homestead. The younger generation, having once rejected the working class environment and its offerings, had now begun to reexamine their cultural ties. While it is too early to adequately assess this phenomenon, the following sections of the paper will examine these cultural ties more closely.

Family and Community Stability in a Changing World

In a changing world where few things remain stable, the family has always been a microcosm of the ethnic town or neighborhood. While the constancy of the family unit may vary, depending on the particular ethnic group, generally it is constant. Unlike the declining influence of the family in the larger society, the family, nuclear and extended, has remained generally intact in the ethnic community. With the social unrest of the 1960's and 1970's there was some speculation that the values and the mores of the ethnic family would be challenged. By and large, this has not happened.

In a very real sense, ethnic neighborhoods represent the ideal community. With the sharing of resources, goods and services, and living and working in close proximity, the residents of these communities share more than bread and shelter; they share values, traditions

and a common language. As neighbors, they work, play and learn together. Since their culture transcends the physical limits of the neighborhood, they have unlimited power and potential within the generational scheme of things and among ethnic groups.

Influence of the Family in Determining Education and Careers

On the one hand, the ethnic neighborhoods have become a stabilizing influence in the urban areas and have served as training grounds in developing new vistas for women, while paradoxically they have served to perpetuate ethnic and sex role stereotypes, particularly in the areas of education and work. Therefore, this section shall explore how the family and community can serve to further, as well as hinder, the potential of the individual.

While cultural traditions may vary accordingly to particular groups, regions and religious practices, those values which remain constant include: family, work, and community. In the close-knit ethnic community these values have a strong interdependence. How an individual perceives his/her role in the world of work is often shaped by familial attitudes and expectations. Similarly, education attainment, whether it be secondary or post-secondary, is clearly determined by the norms of the family and the community. Therefore, in order to understand the educational and occupational needs in a pluralistic society, these should be examined in the context of a particular subculture. This examination will provide a better understanding of the educational and occupational needs of the individuals in a working class ethnic group. It will also illustrate how, through community activities (initially entered into through family-centered concerns), one would develop skills (organizing, administering, etc.) which would be transferable to leadership positions either in the community or in society in general. The question, therefore, arises: Having become more outer-directed, how does the individual (usually a woman) develop additional educational training for her newer work opportunities?

For purposes of discussion, this paper will explore some of the values and traditions in the Italian-American family. Clearly,

It is impossible to divide the community, neighborhood, peer group from the family in their impact on immigrant and second generation Italian-Americans. The set of qualities that seems to distinguish Italian-Americans includes individuality, temperament and ambition, all of which, however, are restricted by the culture and outlook of the family and neighborhood.⁴

⁴ Nathan Glazer and Daniel Patrick Moynihan, *Beyond The Melting Pot* (Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1970), p. 194.

How these attitudes and traditions shaped one's future is evident in the lack of emphasis on formal education. According to Glazer and Moynihan,

. . .one common American channel to success – education – was narrowed for American-Italians by the peculiar constitution and outlook of the family and neighborhood. . .accomplishment for the Italian son is felt by the parents to be meaningless unless it directly gratifies the family – for example, by maintaining the closeness of the family or advancing the family's interests through jobs and marriage.⁵

While education was never strong for the males, it was substantially more inferior for the females. Since current statistics are not broken out along ethnic lines, it is increasingly difficult to determine the actual educational statistics of white ethnics as a group. Nevertheless, there are some studies which would clearly indicate that education was not a priority, particularly for women. In researching women at the turn of the century, Betty Boyd Caroli found that:

the girls (Italian) reflected the effects of a system which encouraged them to cut schooling short. Thus, they did not show large numbers in the white-collar occupations. Both sons and daughters felt pressures to keep formal education at a minimum but families with white-collar ambitions expected girls to sacrifice in favor of their brothers.⁶

In a study in Syracuse, N.Y., where 400 families were interviewed “on the nature of their family relations and the childrearing patterns aimed at the transmissions of family values and behavior,”⁷ Colleen Johnson found that the “central importance of family has persisted among second and third generation Italian-Americans interviewed.”⁸ Nuclear in form, “sibling and other relatives continue to dominate the lives of Italian-Americans. In the family, individual interests were secondary to the family.”⁹ This is further supported in Glazer and Moynihan where the Italian American values family advancement, not self-advancement.

In another interesting study, Joseph Lopreato refers to a 1930 study in New York City conducted by Caroline Ware. She claims that the

⁵ *Ibid*, p. 197.

⁶ Thomas Kassner and Betty Boyd Caroli, “New Immigrant Women At Work: Italians and Jews in New York City 1880-1909,” *The Journal of Ethnic Studies* 5, 4, Winter (1978), 23.

⁷ Colleen L. Johnson, “The Maternal Role in the Contemporary Italian American Family,” Paper Presented at Canadian American Historical Society, Toronto, 1977, 2.

⁸ *Ibid*, p. 2.

⁹ *Ibid*, p. 3.

change in familial attitudes resulted in part from the "changing position of Italian women and girls."¹⁰ According to Lopreato:

The importance of the Italian patriarchal family is more fiction than fact. At the turn of the century, as now, women in Italy were quick to acknowledge their husband as the family head, but almost invariably had a strong hand in the important decisions of the family. Italian women have always been almost exclusively responsible for raising the children; attending to their children's religious education; preparing their children for marriage; articulating social relations with friends, kin and townsmen.¹¹

In light of these studies, one may draw some comparisons to family and community, particularly as related to women. In understanding the importance of the family, it is easier to also understand the role of women in the neighborhood. While women were offered fewer opportunities outside their environment, they learned to use their surroundings to further their ideas. Unfortunately, with the exception of Nancy Seifer and Kathleen McCourt's study on working class women, little or no research has been conducted on the role of women in ethnic communities. Nevertheless, one need only look at the leadership of organizations at this level to see that they are frequently female-dominated. Therefore, it is not at all surprising that leadership¹² in the community would be more controlled by the women, while educational and occupational opportunities in this same community would be limited for all, but nearly nonexistent for women. The family is the central interest.

In an informal study¹³ of organizers in Boston's North End, nearly all the women hesitated to emphasize their leadership qualities or positions in the community. When questioned as to why they were involved, they nearly all stated that the general welfare of this community was critical to maintaining the welfare of the family. Since needs (i.e., good health care facilities) often extended into the community, the women felt compelled to take an active role in its life. This was seen as more of a protective measure for the family rather than as leadership for the individual. Here, as in ethnic communities in the Chicago Southwest Side, women involved in any activities had serious conflicts.

¹⁰ Caroline Ware, *Greenwich Village* as quoted in Joseph Lopreato, *Italian Americans*, (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 58.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

¹² Many of the neighborhood-based organizations are either developed by and for women, or the organizational level of effort is controlled by the women. For example: National Congress of Neighborhood Women, Brooklyn, N.Y.

¹³ A small in-depth study on the changing roles of Italian-American women in the North End of Boston was conducted from April 1978-April 1979. The women were questioned in regard to their roles in the family and in the community as well as on their attitudes on leadership, women's movement, education and their goals.

The most prevalent anxiety for the women centers around the possibility that their activities may have some ill effects on their families. Many of the most active women are quite sensitive to, and even defensive about, such a possibility. They stress the fact that their activities do not interfere with meeting the demands of family and household. They emphasize that what they are doing they are doing for their families, and some recurrently state that they receive no money for their work.¹⁴

There are some interesting questions which should be explored. How do women interface family responsibilities and community activities? How have these community activities evolved? Do they eventually result in full-time positions? What is the next step for a community leader? Are there skills which are developed first in the family and then in the community which could be transferable to paid leadership positions? How do these activities relate to educational opportunities? Is there a need for additional education opportunities?

Community activities with their resultant responsibilities should focus on serious issues involving the role of women in the community. Therefore, researchers in academic and in government should begin to examine the benefits of this type of leadership. The policy implication in terms of work and education could be far-reaching. Vocational training, higher education as well as wider opportunities for work outside the community (if so desired) could result from the initial work begun at the neighborhood level. In addition, this work experience could provide the individual with particular skills that could be transferable to the larger society. Therefore, initial skill building could be an essential ingredient to help bridge the earnings gap between men and women in the marketplace.

Sex Stereotyping Within Ethnic Groups

White ethnic women, like other women, are often victims of sex stereotyping but the problem is more severe for them because they are adversely affected by the strong cultural bias which frequently gives preferential treatment to males.

In essence, white ethnic men often perpetuate the myths which help keep women in a secondary status within our society. This is commonly seen in the research and literature on ethnicity. Perhaps it is that the historical and contemporary writings rarely portray women in an active role, that the research of the 50's, 60's and 70's frequently places women in the traditional subordinate role as the homemaker and defender of the hearth.

¹⁴ Kathleen McCourt, *Working-Class Women and Grass-Roots Politics*, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977), p. 236.

Since the research is so scanty in regard to white ethnic women, it is difficult to say whether there is a cause and effect relationship between the manner in which ethnic women are portrayed in literature and in media, and the type of educational and occupational opportunities that they seek; but even among second and third generation ethnic women there is strong indication that their aspirations are not nearly as high as men. In traditional job placement, women are often channeled into secondary roles which typically fall into the service positions.

If there is a dearth of information in regard to educational opportunities for ethnic women, then the statistical data on employment is more severe. Since the stereotyped image of the ethnic woman as wife and mother prevails, there is little information regarding this woman as wage-earner. Therefore, data may only be extracted from information on women, with some implications made for the ethnic issue. Some ethnic women typically hold low-level service jobs while other college educated women hold the typical women's jobs.

Clearly, there is a dramatic increase in the wage-earner family. According to the Department of Labor's statistics, prepared by the Women's Bureau (See Chart I: *Most Women Work Because of Economic Need*), while some women work for social or psychological reasons, most are employed because the single wage-earner family will inadequately meet the needs of the family in this society.

A significant proportion of working mothers have husbands whose incomes are below the low-income or poverty level. In fact, among the 11.7 million working mothers with husbands present, 2.3 million had husbands whose 1975 incomes were below 7,000 dollars. Included were 595,000 whose husbands had incomes below 3,000 dollars; 671,000 whose husbands had incomes below 5,000 dollars; and about 1 million whose husbands had incomes between 5,000 dollars and 7,000 dollars.¹⁵

In regard to job opportunities, clearly sex stereotyping remains prevalent. Perhaps it is the traditional, often rigid, role expectation which places them in particularly defined jobs as either male or female. While this is changing in the larger society, for white ethnic women this generally remains a problem.

Of prime importance, then, in explaining the earnings differential is the concentration of women in relatively low-paying occupations and in lower status positions within even the higher paid major occupation groups.¹⁶


¹⁵ U.S. Department of Labor, *Working Mothers and Their Children*, compiled by Women's Bureau (Washington, D.C., 1977), p. 9.

¹⁶ U.S. Department of Labor, *The Earnings Gap Between Women and Men*, compiled by Women's Bureau (Washington, D.C., 1976), p. 2.

Chart I

Most Women Work Because of Economic Need

(Women in the Labor Force, by Marital Status, March 1977)




August 1978

Source: Prepared by the Women's Bureau, Office of the Secretary, from data published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

Chart II

Women Are Underrepresented as Managers and Skilled Craft Workers



August 1978

Source: Prepared by the Women's Bureau, Office of the Secretary, from 1977 annual averages data published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

In addition, within the female population, 41 percent work while employed mostly in service type jobs, "women's jobs" (Private household 97 percent, Clerical workers 79 percent, Retail sales workers 62 percent and service workers 62 percent). (See Chart II: *Women Are Underrepresented as Managers and Skilled Craft Workers*). While it is impossible to accurately determine how many are white ethnic as opposed to other groups, given past cultural history it may be assumed that many fall into these categories.

In the area of financial remuneration, women are again subordinate. In 1976, white women earned nearly half that of white men and almost 1/5 less than that of minority men. See Chart on *Fully Employed Women*. (Chart III)

The absolute dollar gap between men and women widens with increasing levels of educational attainment, except for 5 or more years of college. (See Table 1). The relative income or position of women (income of women as a percentage of that of men) (Column 4) reverses its downward trend with the completion of high school, and begins to rise with college attendance, reaching a maximum with postgraduate education. The extent to which man's income exceeds women's is reflected in the relative income differentials (Column 5) which reach a minimum with 5 or more years of college. The fact that the marginal return on the investments in education is greater for men than for women is confirmed by the data in Columns 6 and 7 of Table 1. Only among workers completing 5 years of college or more is the return from an additional educational investment greater for women.¹⁷

The implications of this for white ethnic women are staggering. For women, particularly of the first and second generation, had dramatically fewer educational opportunities than men and those who were college educated rarely had advanced degrees; thus, white ethnic women will continue to be severely disadvantaged in the economic marketplace.


Needs: Financial, Educational and Occupational

For white ethnics, the lack of recognition as a minority group or a special-needs constituency has made it impossible for their particular cultural needs to be addressed in educational programs and vocational training. In addition, for white ethnics of working class background, critical financial aid is often remote. Since they are generally above the established poverty level, the financial assistance which is readily available to the poor is rarely available to them. Interestingly enough, what usually keeps these families above the poverty line is the second

¹⁷ *Ibid*, p. 3.

Chart III

Fully Employed Women Continue To Earn Less Than Fully Employed Men of Either White or Minority* Races



August 1978

* Includes all races other than white.

Source: Prepared by the Women's Bureau, Office of the Secretary, U.S. Department of Labor, from data published by the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.

TABLE 1

**Comparison of Median Income of Year-Round, Full-Time Workers,
by Educational Attainment and Sex, 1974
(Persons 25 years of age and over)**

Years of school completed	Median income		Income gap in dollars (3)	Women's income as a percent of men's (4)	Percent men's income exceeded— women's (5)	Marginal dollar value of increased educational attainment	
	Women (1)	Men (2)				Women (6)	Men (7)
Elementary school							
Less than 8 years	\$ 5,022	\$ 7,912	\$2,890	63.5	57.5	—	—
8 years	5,606	9,891	4,285	56.7	76.4	\$ 584	\$1,979
High school							
1 to 3 years	5,919	11,225	5,306	52.7	89.6	313	1,334
4 years	7,150	12,642	5,492	56.6	76.8	1,231	1,417
College							
1 to 3 years	8,072	13,718	5,646	58.8	69.9	922	1,076
4 years	9,523	16,240	6,717	58.6	70.5	1,451	2,522
5 years or more	11,790	18,214	6,424	64.7	54.5	2,267	1,974

Notes: Column 3 = column 2 minus column 1.
 Column 4 = column 1 divided by column 2.
 Column 5 = column 2 minus column 1, divided by column 1.
 Columns 6 and 7 = absolute (median) dollar difference between successive years of school completed.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census: Current Population Reports, P-60, no. 101.

income of the wife and often additional assistance from the children of working age.

In the area of social science research, as was stated previously, there is little hard data concerning the educational and occupational needs of white ethnics, particularly women. With the exception of the research on working class women (Komarovsky 1964, McCourt 1977, Rainwater 1959, Rubin 1976 and Seifer 1973, 1976), ethnic women in both middle class and working class are ignored. Since ethnicity is rarely considered in most research studies, it is difficult to determine how ethnicity is a factor in the educational and occupational decision making process. This lack of sensitivity is further advanced by

research agencies in the government which make little effort to identify this group as one which, like other minorities, has specific needs.

For the most part, legislation is developed and programs are designed to meet the needs of a pluralistic rather than culturally diverse society. A good example of this is the Vocational Education Act, 1963 as amended. While this legislation benefits all in a general sense, it does not recognize white ethnics as a special-needs population. Consequently, particular areas of emphasis are designed to focus only on: the handicapped, the disadvantaged (economically and academically), those who are limited in speaking English, the bilingual population, as well as issues relating to sex equality and sex stereotyping. The only racial type recognized is the native American.

While the ethnicity issue is beginning to spark some interest within the confines of the government, the only program which substantively addresses the issue is the Ethnic Heritage Studies Act within the U.S. Office of Education.

During the fiscal year 1979-80 this program, which was funded for 2.3 million dollars, awarded 48 grants of not over 60,000 dollars each, with the average ranging from 47,000 to 50,000 dollars. These grants, which were either multi- or mono-ethnic, generally focused on training, dissemination or curriculum materials development. Since this program is designed to meet the needs of all ethnic groups, the level of effort for Euro-ethnics is minimal. Clearly, this is not enough.

In the area of educational research, the National Institute of Education conducted a national agenda setting conference to determine the research needs of white ethnic women in the areas of education and work. Although the conference was held in October of 1978, the proceedings and recommendations are not yet available to the public.

Policy Implications for the Work Place

Along with the social action of the '60's, the civil rights demonstrations and the women's movement, the lack of sufficient economic resources in the 70's make life in the ethnic community difficult. No longer isolated from the larger society, the residents had to make hard decisions about their lives. With the steep rise in living costs, skyrocketing tuition rates (for secondary and post-secondary education), and the decrease in earning power, it was necessary for women to return to work to assist the family.

Since an increasing number of women are presently working, there is a critical need to reassess the role of the female worker. Although it is difficult to determine how many of these women are white ethnic, it is clear that these women, particularly those with school age children,

will require more services – day care, vocational training, and better working hours (part-time and flex-time, job sharing). With little indication that these work trends will be reversed, better educated, more highly skilled, and more politically-savvy women will be entering and remaining in the job market.

In order to move toward closing the earnings gap, there is a need for continuing adult education, personal and vocational counseling (of employer and employee), and revision of job description (to make the women previously skilled in other areas qualifiable for some of the more nontraditional jobs).

Where Do We Go From Here? Future Trends

For many first and second generation Americans, their ethnic values and traditions have often created a serious source of inner conflict. Balancing between two distinct worlds, the individual must decide whether or not to accept the dominant culture of the American society or acknowledge and accept the traditional values passed on by his or her family and subculture. Whether cultural diversity will be part of the new American dream (which would accept and admire people for their differences) is largely dependent upon the social, economic, and political issues in the next two decades.

With the increase in educational and occupational opportunities for both women and men, and the decrease in population of younger generations, the next two decades will have a substantially different approach to work and leisure time activities. While the differences between first and second generation ethnic groups may fade, the diversity issue may continue for newer immigrant groups.

Ethnicity and the Elderly: Is There Any Room For Grandma?

In order to focus on the more critical needs of our aging population today and in the next two decades, it is necessary to divide the existing groups on issues relating to first and second generation Americans.

The first generation of Americans presently ranging in ages 46 to 60 will be, in the year 2000, 66 to 80 years old, while the second generation of Americans, presently ranging in age from 30 to 45, will be 50 to 65. With the advances in science, and the resultant decline of disease, older Americans living in the next 20 years will have a longer life expectancy. Yet, with more free time and with limited resources, the needs of the elderly in the next two decades will be more critical.¹⁸ As a nation, how will we be prepared?

¹⁸ Russell G. Davis and Gary M. Lewis, *Education and Employment*, (Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company, 1975), p. 77.

Clearly, this is an issue which many social scientists and policy makers must address. While there presently is some discussion and research on the needs of the aging in the coming decades, there has been little or no thought given to the large population of first and second generation Americans – the white ethnics. While this is a serious problem for all elderly people, if current trends continue the impact on women will be more severe. Since there are more single or widowed women than there are men, it is the woman who must face her later years alone. With the increased mobility and its resultant impact on the extended family, ethnic women may have more difficulties in adjusting to her new set of circumstances.

Traditionally, women have been offered fewer resources, fewer educational experiences, and fewer occupational opportunities. But for ethnic women who grew up in a male-dominated environment, the educational and professional opportunities were almost non-existent. If any opportunities were available, they generally went to the males in the household. Consequently, what would be the implications for *these* women in their later years?

First Generation:

In comparing first and second generation Americans, it is clear that the needs of the first generation are greater and substantially different, particularly for women presently in the age range 50-65. For these women their previous lack of opportunities in the areas of employment and education substantially increases their burdens later in life. Therefore, business, industry, and government must provide educational programs, employment training (or retraining), and financial assistance.

Second Generation:

In planning for second generation Americans, the needs of these women will be substantially different. Being younger, better educated, and more experienced in the professions, in the communities, and in the political arena, these women will be better prepared to take strong leadership positions in all aspects of society.

In addition to the various educational, financial, and occupational resources available to them (which were provided them by the first generation women), these women will have a greater need to channel their energies into more constructive and creative jobs and leisure time activities. Therefore, there will be a dramatic change in lifestyle.

As was stated previously, the next two decades will see a higher percentage of elderly than youth. Therefore, the political process (and control) would be directed by, and toward, this age group. As a result

of this new political force, more social service programs, more career opportunities and better educational advantages will probably follow.

General Recommendation

There is a lack of statistical data by which white ethnic groups could be identified clearly as a minority group, which would therefore entitle them to particular governmental programs in education, financial aid, and vocational training. Consequently, the Bureau of Labor Statistics (Department of Labor), the Bureau of Census (Commerce), and the Office of Civil Rights (HEW) should be advised to collect data on ethnic groups. This could be done on a self-identification basis.

Specific Recommendations

Employment:

Jobs must be redesigned to meet the particular educational and occupational needs of women who may have had limited formal training and experience, yet have comparable experience in the home and the community.

New careers must be made available in nontraditional work; careers in sales, management, community organizing and politics are additional areas of work in which previous homemaking and community skills could apply. Therefore, efforts must be made to accept previously gained skills in the marketplace. Are women qualifiable for the job?

Blue-collar jobs which are typically dominated by white ethnic men and women should be redesigned to "reduce dissatisfaction and provide workers more opportunities for self-fulfillment or actualization through work" (Davis and Lewis, 1975). In this regard, the Civil Rights Commission could monitor other government agencies responsible for the workers' safety and health, particularly the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

Financial Aid

Since many white ethnics are from working class backgrounds, they should be recognized as a special-needs group so that they qualify for the same type of financial assistance now available for the poor. This is particularly important for families needing financial assistance for college age children and for women interested in returning to college.

Education

For older ethnic women, community colleges (based in the neighborhoods) would provide an environment conducive to learning. With financial assistance these women could return to school without having to worry about family responsibilities. In addition, if the college is in the neighborhood, they would not be intimidated by an

alien environment. Therefore, the community-based college established by the National Congress of Neighborhood Women, Brooklyn, N.Y., should be replicated (with the strong support of government agencies and foundations) in other urban ethnic neighborhoods around the country.

Four-year colleges and universities should not only design programs and courses specifically for women over 62 but also should create a tuition-free open admissions policy for all general education courses and degree programs at the university level. In addition, they should provide the necessary support systems for older individuals, i.e., counseling and remedial education. (Free tuition is presently available to citizens of Maryland over 62 at the University of Maryland).

In addition to the evening and community school programs available through local school systems, older Americans should be encouraged to participate in the daytime high school curriculum offered through their local schools.

This interaction with regular high school students would provide an excellent forum for an exchange of ideas and experiences. If the current school enrollment decline continues, resources at the high school level would be plentiful; therefore, this policy would make a better utilization of such resources.

What are present parental attitudes toward educating daughters and how do parents view training for jobs or careers? The extent to which historical ethnic patterns still operate to channel girls into the exploiting, dead-end occupational roles, to which immigrant women have been subjected for generations, needs to be documented. Do factors like geographical location, kinship networks, employer stereotypes, and self-imposed definitions of "proper" workplace roles for women still significantly affect job choices? (Conference on the Educational and Occupational Needs of White Ethnic Women, October, 1978).

A study designed to survey attitudes in a representative sample of ethnic communities across the country should be followed by specially designed materials that dispel for parents the myths about limited work life expectancies for today's young women. Instead, the importance of school, the need to take courses in math and the sciences, and projections about future educational and job opportunities should be publicized (Conference on the Educational and Occupational Needs of White Ethnic Women, October, 1978).

Alternative higher educational programs that meet the academic, occupational, financial, or cultural needs of working-class women who decide to go back to school, whether at midcareer or to seek a job for the first time, should be more widely available. Special focus should be placed not only on training for new careers or job areas, but also on

helping women cope with their dual roles as workers and housewives (Conference on the Educational and Occupational Needs of White Ethnic Women, October, 1978).

The Office of Federal Civil Rights Evaluation in the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights should monitor the publication timetable of the above-mentioned project on the Educational and Occupational needs of white ethnic women. This would insure that a timely publication date would be established and met.

Future Recommendations

With the large second generation elderly population, government and industry must provide increased opportunities acknowledging cultural diversity within governmental and corporate structures - i.e., boards, committees and commissions.

Since the majority of the population will be older and more sophisticated, they will be more oriented toward political action. As a result, women will take leadership positions in government and politics. However, ethnic women, particularly from the working class background, are still slightly disadvantaged. Therefore, efforts must be made to assure that skills (which are currently being developed within their communities) be channeled into future leadership positions at state and national levels.

Bibliography

Books

- Allen, Frederick Lewis. *Only Yesterday*. New York: Harper and Row, 1931.
- Burns, Constance. *Boston An Urban Community: The Emerging Immigrants of Boston* (annotated reading list). Boston: Boston Public Library, 1977.
- Cooke, Alistair. *America*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1976.
- Cornelisen, Ann. *Women of the Shadows*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1976.
- Davis, Russell G., and Gary M. Lewis. *Education and Employment*. Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company, 1975.
- Gans, Herbert J. *The Urban Villagers*. New York: The Free Press, 1962.
- Glazer, Nathan and Daniel Patrick Moynihan. *Beyond the Melting Pot*. The M.I.T. Press, 1970, 2nd ed.
- Glazer, Nathan, and Irving Kristol, ed. *The American Commonwealth*. New York: Basic Books, 1976.
- Glazer, Nathan, and Daniel P. Moynihan. *Ethnicity*. Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1975.

- Greer, Colin, ed. *Divided Society: The Ethnic Experience in America*. New York: Basic Books, 1974.
- Howe, Irving. *The World of the Blue Collar Worker*. New York: Quadrangle Books, 1972.
- Feldstein, Stanley and Lawrence Costello, ed. *The Ordeal of Assimilation*. New York: Doubleday, 1974.
- Levenson, Andrew. *The Working-Class Majority*. New York: Penguin Books, Inc., 1974.
- Lopreato, Joseph. *Italian Americans*. New York: Random House, 1970.
- McCourt, Kathleen. *Working-Class Women and Grassroots Politics*. Bloomington: Indiana Free Press, 1977.
- Parker, Richard. *The Myth of the Middle Class*. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.
- Rainwater, Lee et al. *Workingman's Wife*. New York: Macfadden-Bartell, 1959.
- Rubin, Lillian Breslow. *Worlds of Rain*. New York: Basic Books, 1976.
- Ryan, Joseph A., ed. *White Ethnics: Life in Working-Class America*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.
- Seifer, Nancy. *Absent from the Majority*. New York: The American Jewish Institute, 1973.
- Seifer, Nancy. *Nobody Speaks for Me*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976.
- Sennett, Richard, and Jonathon Cobb. *Hidden Injuries of Class*. New York: Random House, 1972.
- Solomon, Barbara Miller. *Ancestors and Immigrants*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.
- Te Selle, Selle. *The Rediscovery of Ethnicity*. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
- Todesco, Paula. *Boston's First Neighborhood: The North End*. Boston: The Boston Public Library, 1976.
- Tomasi, Silvano M. and Madeline H. Engel. *The Italian Experience in the United States*. New York: Center for Migration Studies, 1977.
- Whyte, William Foster. *Street Corner Society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1943.
- Wolfbein, Seymour. *Work in American Society*. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1971.
- Papers and Government Reports*
- Johnson, Colleen. "The Maternal Role in the Contemporary Italian American Family," paper presented at the joint meeting of the American Italian Historical Association and the Canadian Historical Society, Toronto, Canada, October, 1977.
- Kessner, Thomas and Betty Boyd Caroli. "New Immigrant Women at Work: Italians and Jews in New York City 1880-1905." *The Journal of Ethnic Studies* Vol. 5, No. 4, Winter 1978.

- National Science Foundation. "Social Policy, Social Ethnics, and the Aging Society," edited by Bernice L. Newgarten and Robert J. Havighurst, 1976.
- U.S. Department of Labor. *The Earnings Gap Between Women and Men*. Compiled by the Women's Bureau, Washington, D.C., 1976.
- U.S. Department of Labor. *Working Mothers and Their Children*. Compiled by the Women's Bureau, Washington, D.C., 1977.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, NIE Conference on the Educational and Occupational Needs of White Ethnic Women, proceedings and papers, October 1978 (unpublished).

* * *

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Our third panelist this morning is Mr. Kenneth Kovach. He is the Director of the Cleveland Urban Museum Project of the Ohio Historical Society.

After he received his Bachelor of Divinity degree from St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary, he also secured a Bachelor's and Master's from Case Western Reserve University.

He pursued Doctoral studies in comparative ethnic relations. He has been an active consultant to the National Commission on Neighborhoods and to various Cleveland corporations and institutions. He is currently a consultant to the Greater Cleveland Project on School Desegregation.

Those of you who saw "The Deer Hunter" might be interested to know that Mr. Kovach was the musical consultant and dance coordinator of the vivid portrayal of ethnic culture in that Academy Award winning picture.

We're delighted to have you with us.

**STATEMENT OF KENNETH J. KOVACH, DIRECTOR,
CLEVELAND URBAN MUSEUM PROJECT,
THE OHIO HISTORICAL SOCIETY,
CLEVELAND, OHIO**

Thank you very much.

As the grandson of European immigrants, this consultation means a great deal to me. I'm a part of that generation that was supposed to have been purged of foreign traces in the melting pot. As you can tell, I don't have a foreign accent. I wear three-piece suits and use the suggested grooming products, but I know who I am with regards to my roots.

The scheduling of this consultation is absolutely right. I picked up the *Chicago Sun Times* yesterday, and the lead article, "The Dawning of the Decade of Hope," stated: "if the '70's were a grass roots decade,

the 1980's may well become the roots decade." It goes on to say, "Millions of Americans in the neighborhood movement are demanding participation in decision making. The thrust of the neighborhood movement suggests that people in their communities are simply renegotiating their relationship to government, at all levels, and are concerned more with decentralized delivery of services."

And on my own front doorstep in Cleveland on Sunday morning, *The Plain Dealer's* real estate section featured an article about "Community Pride, Little Warsaw Neighborhood Getting a Face Lift." It focused upon a community that has been identified with the Polish immigrants who settled there three generations ago and continues to be proud of its heritage.

So what we're talking about today is very, very appropriate and, in the words of Theodore Hesburgh, "We need some great statements about what America is about and what we can do about it." I believe that in the two days of this Consultation you'll hear some great statements about America!

This nation of the United States is the world's most challenging experiment in intergroup relations. In the process of building a nation with people from nations of the entire world, we have created a dynamic arena for interaction which is unparalleled in world history. We have taken a land mass of approximately three and a half million square miles and concentrated nearly two-thirds of our population not merely in urban but in 233 metropolitan communities. Approximately one-fourth of our population lives in the 12 largest metropolitan areas. About 220 counties hold over one half of the nation's population; the other half is scattered in over 2,800 essentially rural counties.

America is the nation in which the processes of urbanization, industrialization, and immigration commingled to create complex networks of people, goods, and services - what we call cities - which have undergone extensive structural alterations. This nation was predominantly an agricultural one until about the last half of the 19th century, and its democratic traditions were oriented toward the frontier and the farm - not the city. Today, the cities of this nation are the new frontiers; urban pioneers, among them Euro-ethnics, are attempting to discover methods for the effective governance of these cities. When our blossoming cities of the 19th century had added to their populations shiploads of immigrants, with their own customs, beliefs, laws and languages, the networks of relationships already established were challenged. The patterns of ethnic succession in cities have resulted in a series of group collisions that go beyond black-white confrontations that are familiar to most of us.

The process by which various ethnic groups emerge, rise, share power and prestige, and sometimes replace each other has not been

clearly examined or understood. The adjustment for the European immigrants and racial minorities to the urbanization of America has varied widely. The attempt to develop coalitions among white and non-white ethnics in the 1970's has its roots in that period from 1880 to 1930 when the concentration of millions of peoples and their cultures occurred. The degree of prejudice encountered, the education available, and the family values contributed to those individual experiences in the city. However, most black and white immigrants never moved beyond working class status. The big difference occurred among the immigrants' children and grandchildren, like myself, with many factors contributing to mobility.

The immigration of Euro-ethnics to specific areas of American cities followed distribution patterns based on the same combination of economic, demographic and cultural factors that influenced their distribution across North America.

Once in a city, immigrants did not scatter randomly around the urban landscape. Their ultimate destination was or became a particular ethnic neighborhood. Thus, the final result of immigrant distribution was the ethnic neighborhood, or as Anglo-Americans called it, the ethnic ghetto. The formation and location of the ethnic neighborhood followed certain laws. Rather than being the forced creation of a racist or nativist society, the immigrant ghetto grew logically out of special cultural needs of the southern and eastern European peoples and the particular economic structure they encountered in America. Furthermore, the immigrant neighborhood showed patterns and characteristics that belied the traditional image of the stagnant, homogeneous ghetto. The immigrant neighborhood was never that.

One is often amazed that the immigrants managed to survive their experiences in urban America. Perhaps the main reason for their ability to survive the hazards of life in the city was the extensive aid and support they received from their own people, their churches, and the numerous "self-help" organizations established to sustain the immigrants during the period of adjustment.

Immigrant associations certainly did anticipate the subsequent welfare agencies created by the government to help find jobs and homes. Some organizations offered employment insurance; most offered some form of death benefits. The Great Depression of the 1930's pressed these fraternal and religious associations into extraordinary service. By 1933 approximately one-third of the families in America lacked a means of support. The Depression forced many changes in our government's response to people in need. For example, the massive public housing programs of the New Deal era were initiated as a means of forestalling starvation and revolution among the

mass of unskilled first and second generation immigrant workers concentrated in the poorest sections of the larger American cities. These workers had no industrial job skills but constituted a major component of the construction industry.

Since construction was among the most labor-intensive industries and was the occupation with which the immigrants were most familiar, programs were created to employ the poor to demolish deteriorated housing and to build new housing for the lower income people in their own neighborhoods.

In clustering together in America's cities, the Euro-ethnic immigrants were doing what came naturally. The peoples of southern and eastern Europe had a very different sense of society and personal identity from those of northern and western Europe; and hence, from a lot of the Americans that were already here. Southern and eastern Europeans are "network" peoples. Their identity, security, self-control and stimulation are derived not just from their membership in a group, but in a group that they can see, touch, hear, smell, feel at all times.

The group provided mechanisms for social control and determined codes of personal behavior. . . In thus forming clusters, "ghettos", or ethnic neighborhoods, southern and eastern Europeans were attempting to recreate the network pattern of the village, something that, ironic as it may seem, was easy to do on the streets of urban America but hard to do on America's farms and open spaces.

A major wave of suburbanization in the United States was signaled in part by the 1940 Census which revealed that one out of seven urban dwellings was in need of major repair, one out of every seven urban dwellings had no running water or plumbing of any kind, and one out of every eight urban dwellings had no indoor bathing or toilet facilities. This was the first official Census to include a documentation of housing quality. Urban America was growing old and the signs of old age were overwhelming.

The suburban explosion of population from the central cities was rapidly followed by the dispersion of manufacturing industries from the core of the city to the suburbs in the late 1940's and 1950's. Major improvements to highway and street systems, often at the expense of central city neighborhoods, along with widespread automobile ownership by factory workers, set the stage for the urban exodus. A common contemporary pattern was established: white-collar, upper-middle income residents of suburbia traveling to their work places in the core of the city, and blue-collar lower-middle and lower income residents of the central city traveling out to the factories in the suburban fringe.

The basic conflict circumstance of the "black, poor, deteriorated, old, and substandard inner city versus the white, affluent, new, standard, and legally sanctified suburbia" contributed much to the discontent and the destructive central city rioting that we saw in the late 1960's.

The decade of the 1950's marked the massive relocation of middle and upper-income groups to the outer fringes of the metropolitan areas and the first movement toward the relocation of retail trade centers to the suburban fringe. This resulted in a vast extension of suburban areas in America.

The Federal Highway Act of 1956 established the inter-State system of roads with expressways through cities designed as links in the system. The expressways required enormous amounts of land, and their large-scale construction, particularly in the 1960's, destroyed vast areas of housing and ruthlessly eliminated the neighborhoods of working poor, both of Euro-ethnic immigrant and racial minority background.

The uprooting of Euro-ethnic peoples from established neighborhoods by Federal renewal programs, the concentration of the poor, both black and white, in areas of the central cities by federal public housing programs, and the overall sentiment that the city is evil and to be avoided created the context in which the long hot summers of 1966 and 1967 occurred; then our American cities experienced disorders in central city areas which resulted in the destruction of more neighborhoods.

Perhaps the central theme of American urban history in the post-World War II period was the polarization of metropolitan regions during the creation of the megalopolis. There was a tendency to divide those areas into white suburbs and black cities. The second related theme was the growth of huge black communities in the cities of the North and West and the social conditions these engendered.

The influx of southern blacks into northern cities led to rapid and extensive neighborhood changes and continual tensions on the peripheries of black and white settlements. The Kerner Commission report declared that there were several major reasons for the tensions. Among them were the changing nature of the American economy, racial discrimination, political opportunities, cultural factors, and the vital element of time. And the report went on to say:

Today, whites tend to exaggerate how well and how quickly they escaped from poverty, and contrast their experience with poverty-stricken Negroes. The fact is, among many of the southern and eastern Europeans who came to America in the last great wave of immigration, those who came already urbanized were the first to escape from poverty. The others who came to America from rural

backgrounds, as did the Negroes, are only now, after three generations, in the final stages of escaping from poverty. Until the last 10 years or so, most of these were employed in blue-collar jobs, and only a small proportion of their children were able or willing to attend college. In other words, only the third, and in many cases, only the fourth generation has been able to achieve the kind of middle-class income and status that allows it to send its children to college. Because of favorable economic and political conditions, these ethnic groups were able to escape from lower-class status to working class and lower-middle class status, but it has taken them three generations.

The report goes on to say that the escape from poverty by blacks has been blocked in part by the resistance of European ethnic groups. Blacks have been unable to enter into some unions and to move into some neighborhoods outside the ghetto because descendants of the European immigrants who control these unions and neighborhoods have not yet abandoned them for middle-class occupations and areas.

The history of the urbanization of America is really the history of Euro-ethnics – the immigrants, their children, grandchildren, and their organizations. Urbanism is said to reduce the likelihood that the conditions needed to bring active group life to neighborhoods will jointly occur. This general rule is dramatized by its exceptions.

Many urban neighborhoods do harbor active and intimate social groups. . . . They usually fit one or more of the following descriptions: being threatened from outside, being an ethnic or occupational enclave, or being populated by people with little physical mobility.

The pluralistic society in North America was created largely out of the free mingling of peoples through immigration, along with impressed slaves brought by traders. The development of neighborhoods by the network-building nature of the southern and eastern European immigrants provided the context in which primary and personal relationships emerged as sets of people who lived near one another and saw each other more frequently and more easily. Urbanization has placed large numbers of other people within easy reach of individuals and thereby provided more bases of association than the locality alone. Some social scientists call it a shift from a “neighboring of place” to a “neighboring of taste.”

Today it is easier for people to build networks of association while living perhaps in social worlds that are distinguished by class, occupation, or interest. These associations based on common interests and cultural similarities are important to the urban and suburban experiences of Euro-ethnic Americans and, perhaps, they are a key to understanding intergroup relations in the 1980's. If urbanism as a way

of life does create freedom from proximity, thereby allowing people within neighborhoods the opportunity to construct associational networks that extend beyond their neighborhood, then, indeed, the apparent urban-suburban dichotomy is questionable.

A noted humorist once defined neighborhood in the following way: "A neighborhood is where, when you get out of it, you get beat up." Well, that may not be the case anymore, but the perception of the solidarity of neighborhoods is still operative.

In the historical development of neighborhoods, the people who lived in close physical proximity in the city have been seen as a natural social group. Like the family, the neighborhood has commanded the intense loyalties of its residents and their intimate involvement with one another. Research in the United States and abroad shows that in the context of the suburbs, the neighborhood is now viewed as more cohesive than it is in the city. Whether involvement in the neighborhood is measured by visits with neighbors, concern for the local area, the proportion of local personal activities, or almost any other equivalent indicator, suburbanites score somewhat higher than city dwellers.

Some social scientists have followed the same individuals in their move from the city to the suburb; their studies have found that they tend to increase their neighboring after they move. What these studies have failed to take into consideration is the ethnic context of the new residence. Not many studies have addressed themselves to suburban ethnicity. We have looked at neighboring in the city, but the whole question of a neighboring in the suburbs is yet to be researched. I think there are numerous opportunities for social scientists and others to do research on suburban ethnicity.

The urban polarization, markedly evident in the central city rioting of the late 1960's, demonstrated that few members of racial minorities shared in the fruits of suburbanization since World War II. The 1970 Census showed that more people were living in the suburban fringes of metropolitan areas than in their central cities. A wave of scandals in the sixties revealed that there were problems with subsidized housing programs and that the FHA, for example, had relaxed too many standards; that speculators had moved in to buy run-down housing at cheap rates in the old Euro-ethnic neighborhoods of our central cities, made few repairs and then sold them to other low-income families under FHA subsidy programs.

We began to hear the revolt of the white lower middle class as the decade of the '60's ended. *New York* magazine reported,

They call my people the White Lower Middle Class these days. . . . Television has made an enormous impact on them, and

because of the nature of that medium – its preference for the politics of theatre, its seeming inability to ever explain what is happening behind the photographed image – much of their understanding of what happens is superficial. Most of them have only a passing acquaintance with blacks, and very few have any black friends. So they see black in terms of militants with Afros and shades, or crushed people on welfare. Television never bothers reporting about the black man who gets up in the morning, eats a fast breakfast, says goodbye to his wife and children and rushes out to work. That is not news. So the people who live in white working-class ghettos seldom meet blacks who are not threatening to burn down America or asking for help or receiving welfare or committing crimes. And in the past five or six years, with urban rioting on everyone's minds, they have provided themselves, (or been provided with) a confused, threatening stereotype of blacks that made it almost impossible to suggest any sort of black-white working-class coalition.

U.S. News and World Report identified "The Unhappy Americans: Who They Are, What They Want" in a feature article.

The nation's 40 million citizens whose forebears came from impoverished areas of Europe two or four generations ago show revived interest in ancestral culture. Some have differences to proclaim – as in New York City where 100,000 Italian-Americans thronged Columbus Circle last year to protest alleged slurs against them as a group in recent stories about organized crime. More militantly, a Jewish Defense League has sprung up to protect Jewish lives in racially troubled cities.

City, the Magazine of Urban Life and Environment, was one of the first publications to address itself to the fact that white ethnics, Euro-ethnics, were beginning to organize in the industrial cities of the Northeast around these economic, environmental, and other community issues. The question was: Is this a step toward or away from improved race relations?

The appearance of community organizations in white working-class communities has begun to capture the attention of the media. . . . The rediscovery of the white ethnics, however, has prompted some observers to ask whether this means that needy nonwhites will have new competition for scarce public resources; whether conservative pressures have compelled former friends of the civil rights movement to desert the cause; whether organizing white rather than multi-racial organizations is not divisive; and whether these efforts will not result in their being co-opted by racist demagogues.

The fate of the older industrial cities of our nation and the welfare of those minority people who inhabit them in growing numbers depend in no small part on the white ethnics who choose to remain in those

neighborhoods. These old neighborhoods may represent the last chance we have to prevent most of our major northern cities from becoming "reservations" for nonwhite minorities.

Descendants of eastern and southern European immigrants, the Euro-ethnics, can be found in all social-economic strata. Those who live in suburban communities may be economically mobile and socially less parochial than their friends and relatives who reside in the old neighborhoods, yet, they still are a prominent component of the blue-collar labor force as well as the modest white-collar workers. Psychologically and physically, the Euro-ethnic suburbanite remains in intimate contact with the central city and its problems – crime, urban decay, and racial tensions-problems which, in part, pushed them to the suburbs. Whether in cities or suburbs, many white ethnics share problems in common with their nonwhite neighbors and fellow workers. Clearly, there is a basis here for alliances with minority groups.

My distinguished colleague, Irving Levine, declared in a speech before the Annual Health and Welfare Institute in Cleveland in 1973, that we've got to come to some sort of consensus, which some people will call coalitional thinking.

We have the whole range of issues that are, in fact, coalition issues, but the way in which the organizations develop around these issues, and the way in which people perceive the possibility of negotiating progress will determine whether or not these issues will become coalition issues or will become conflict issues.

By the middle of this decade there was a significant rising up of neighborhood-based coalitions in communities across the United States. I think we have reached a point today where, if you start naming the different cities where community organizations have been established, consisting of Euro-ethnic Americans, as well as Afro-ethnic and Hispanic-ethnic, you would have a list that reads like an atlas of American cities.

Ever since the riots of the 1960's everyone has talked about the "urban crisis." Not only have older homes and neighborhoods been considered expendable, but entire cities and regions of the country have been written off by the private and public sectors during the 1970's debate on the "urban crisis." In the face of what some people would call the wholesale sellout by government, people have begun to speak to each other. Ever since 1972, right here in this city of Chicago, when 2,000 people came together and created National People's Action, this dialogue has increased and the discussion has involved a growing number of participants. Other national as well as regional forums have been established, by organizations such as the National

Association of Neighborhoods and the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, to bring together neighborhood leadership.

Thousands of working-class Americans of Euro-ethnic as well as Afro-ethnic and Hispanic-ethnic heritage are participating in coalitions within our cities and they have become indignant over what has been happening to their neighborhoods. They are being joined by their suburban brothers and sisters in direct action on critical issues.

The Buckeye Woodland Community Congress, a major community organization in Cleveland of which I was the founding President, leads the battle today in the nation under the provisions of the federal Community Reinvestment Act of 1978. We have challenged Ameri-Trust, one of the largest banks not only in the Midwest but in the United States on the issue that they have not been meeting the financial and credit needs of the community. If such a culturally and racially diverse group of senior citizens, blue-collar laborers, homemakers, white-collar office workers, merchants, and students can get together to prepare a case against one of the largest banks in the country, then I think we have got a real potential for the dynamic revitalization of our central city neighborhoods. Coalitions of concerned citizens really do work.

President Carter's Urban and Regional Policy Group issued its report in 1978 and the National Commission on Neighborhoods issued its report this year stating that where possible, neighborhood and community organizations and coalitions should be supported to carry out citizen participation functions, including planning and implementation of the participation process. I believe now is the time for the careful assessment of conflict resolution through increasing public participation in decision making. Major decisions about the distribution of goods and services result in complex public policy disputes. Increasing citizen participation in these decisions may uncover previously hidden conflicts that will require more time to resolve. However, if legitimate group interests are brought into the process at early stages, the decisions are likely to be the best decisions for the future of our Nation. I believe that policy makers must also acknowledge the persistence of ethnicity. There is no monolithic white community or black community. Instead, there is diversity within and among all communities which is expressed in this multiplicity of groupings of people.

In the context of neighborhoods in America's central cities, of the Midwest and Northeast particularly, coalition-building is a survival mechanism to ensure a safe environment in which to live. Just as the immigrants who came by the millions to our cities sought out 'safe space' where their families could grow, the residents of the central city

seek to make their neighborhoods as good a place as any other for human development.

And in the suburban communities of our country, there may well be a different model of neighborhood, perhaps deviant from the central city experiences; however, the networks there can be described as an entwining of roots which strengthens the base of intergroup relations in the community.

The history of the urbanization of America and the response of Euro-ethnic Americans to that process provide dramatic examples of conditions created by the public and private sectors which promoted the decay of our roots and sometimes prevented them from entwining. The result has been that our roots have withered as we competed for attention. Today, in many neighborhoods, both in the cities and the suburbs, the matter of maintaining one's heritage is not the question, but rather it is the matter of day-to-day physical existence, survival.

The challenge of the 1980's for intergroup relations in America is how we will effectively utilize the processes for citizen participation in decision making, both in the public and private sectors, and how we will define those mechanisms for participation already created by citizens. The conflicts which are identified by community groups of Euro-ethnics, Afro-ethnics, Hispanic-ethnics were not necessarily created by those groups. They represent unresolved issues in our society. Ethnicity as manifested by Euro-ethnic Americans is not an end in itself. It is a way of life. It is the American experience.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Thank you very much. That was a very well done summation.

[The complete paper follows]

WITH ROOTS ENTWINED: INTERGROUP RELATIONS IN URBAN ETHNIC AMERICA

By Kenneth Julius Kovach *

We need some great statements about what America is about and what we can do about it. Theodore M. Hesburgh

America—the United States thereof—is the world's most challenging experiment in intergroup relations.

In the process of building a Nation with people from the nations of the world, we have created a dynamic arena for interaction which is

* President of the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs

unparalleled in world history. We have taken a land mass of approximately 3,536,855 square miles and concentrated nearly two-thirds of our population not merely in urban but in 233 metropolitan communities. (1970 Census) Approximately one-fourth of our population lives in the twelve largest metropolitan areas. About 220 counties hold over one-half of the nation's population; the other half is scattered over 2,800 essentially rural counties.

America is the nation of the world in which the processes of urbanization, industrialization, and immigration commingled to create complex networks of people, goods, and services – called cities – which have undergone extensive alterations of their structure. This nation was predominantly an agricultural one until about the last half of the nineteenth century; and its democratic traditions were oriented toward the frontier and the farm – not toward the city. Today, the cities of this nation are the new frontiers and urban pioneers are attempting to discover methods for the effective governance of our cities. When our blossoming cities of the nineteenth century had added to their populations shiploads of immigrants, with their own customs, beliefs, laws, and languages, the networks of relationships already established were challenged. The patterns of ethnic succession in the cities have resulted in series of group collisions going beyond the white – black confrontations that are familiar to most Americans.

The process by which various ethnic groups emerge, rise, share power and prestige and sometimes replace each other is seen as evidence of the inexorable upward mobility that characterizes American life. However, there is nothing inevitable about what Robert Park and his students referred to as the “race relations cycle.” In the context of worldwide ethnic stratification, our system is unique in many ways.¹

This process has not been clearly examined or understood. The history of the United States has minimized the impact of groups other than the English colonists upon our free political institutions and our free enterprise. Until recently these accomplishments were attributed chiefly to Anglo-Saxon genius. Our textbooks have emphasized these themes and have encouraged Americans to accept such views as sacrosanct.

America grew from a colonial society into a modern industrial-urban nation not only because of its Anglo-Saxon enclaves. People of other backgrounds also contributed ideas, talents, and

¹ Daniel Elazer and Murray Friedman, *Moving Up – Ethnic Succession in America*. (New York : American Jewish Committee, 1976) p.11.

especially their labor to the building of America into the nation she had become.²

Extensive urbanization anywhere in the world is a post-eighteenth century phenomenon related to industrialization, the development of rapid transportation, and the use of fuel-burning machines. The great current of immigration in the nineteenth and early twentieth century increased the rapid and urgent urban change. Therefore the meaning and function of our cities for the people who now live and have lived in them cannot be caught by a census, survey, or poll at one particular moment in time. Each city is the sum of its history.

During the "Old Immigration" period in American history from 1830-1880, the points of origin of immigrants were predominantly northern and western Europe. The numbers expanded greatly, peaking at 400,000 immigrants per year in the 1870's. This increase was primarily due to the demand for labor in America's expanding industrialization and the building of transportation systems such as the canals and railroads.

The Euro-ethnic immigration initially began at the end of the seventeenth century. During this "Colonial" period, the composition of immigrants was approximately 50 percent English, 10 percent German, and the remainder Dutch, Irish, and Scottish. The early, lighter immigration period from 1783-1830 had an average of 10,000 persons per year who were predominantly English and German.

The "New Immigration" during the period 1880-1924 caused the most extensive changes in the composition of the major urban areas in America. The immigrants came predominantly from southern and eastern Europe. Their numbers continued to expand with peaks in 1907 and 1913 of one million immigrants during each of those years. More than 25 million immigrants came to the shores of America from 1880-1930. The Euro-ethnic impact upon this nation is not to be underestimated.

The Middle Atlantic region housed more newcomers than any other section. New York City continued to be the nation's premier port for immigration and the city's population swelled. In 1930, 75 percent of the New Yorkers consisted of foreigners and their children. Italians and east European Jews predominated but enclaves of almost every other ethnic group, ranging from Arabs to Yugoslavs, lived there. . . . The Slavs in particular found that the Pennsylvania mines provided the best-paying, unskilled jobs and many of them went to the Pittsburgh area. Buffalo, a port on the Great Lakes and connected to New York City via railroad as well as by the Hudson River and the Erie Canal, received many

² Leonard Dinnerstein, Roger L. Nichols, David M. Reimers, *Natives and Strangers - Ethnic Groups and the Building of America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979) Preface.

Poles and Italians. It also served as one of the gateways to the Midwest, where Chicago attracted just about everyone. . . .³

Other Midwestern cities also attracted migrants from Europe and the American South. Detroit, Cleveland, and Milwaukee proved particularly attractive to Slavs from the Austro-Hungarian empire. Cleveland's prosperity rested on its Lake Erie location and on its iron and steel foundries, blast furnaces, and rolling mills. In 1906 it was estimated that one of every five Cleveland inhabitants was German or Jewish, and one of every six of Slavic background. Detroit, the nation's most important point of entry for both English - and French - speaking Canadians, also claimed a polyglot population. . . . The South was less hospitable to the new immigrants than it had been to the old, but foreign-born workers and their enclaves appeared throughout that region.⁴

The examination of how American cities grew over a period of 100 years reveals the following:

In 1850, among the larger cities in the United States were New York (696,115), Baltimore (169,054), Boston (136,881), Philadelphia (121,376), New Orleans (116,375), and Cincinnati (115,435).

In 1900, the largest cities included New York (3,437,202), Chicago (1,698,575), Philadelphia (1,293,697), St. Louis (575,238), Boston (560,892), Baltimore (508,957), Cleveland (381,768), Buffalo (352,387), San Francisco (342,782), Cincinnati (325,902).

In 1950, they included New York (7,891,957), Chicago (3,620,962), Philadelphia (2,071,605), Los Angeles (1,970,358), Detroit (1,849,568), Baltimore (949,708), Cleveland (914,808), St. Louis (856,796), Washington, D.C. (802,178), Boston (801,444), San Francisco (775,357).

Data from the 1970 Official Census indicates that the process of urbanization, that is, the growth of metropolitan urban areas is slowing. No longer are they growing faster than nonmetropolitan parts of the Nation.

In 1974 over two-thirds of the population lived in standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA's) which are comprised of counties with cities of 50,000 or more inhabitants together with neighboring counties that are closely associated with them by daily commuting ties. Between 1970 and 1974, the population of SMSA's increased 3.8 percent; the metropolitan population increased 5.0 percent. The largest metropolitan areas with more than 3 million people, seven have shown little or no growth since 1970. Only the Washington, D.C. SMSA has grown significantly during this period.

The central cities of metropolitan areas have lost population since 1970. The 1980 Official Census should reveal additional decreases. This loss is accounted for entirely by declines in the white population.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 127.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 127-129.

The population of blacks and other racial minorities has decreased in nonmetropolitan areas since 1970. The increase among blacks, and other racial minorities in central cities has been 1.9 percent per year since 1970, a lower annual increase than in the 1960's. At the same time, the population of racial minorities living in the balance of SMSA's outside central cities - mostly suburban areas - grew 6 percent per year from 1970 to 1974 (an annual gain greater than in the 1960's). Only 26 percent of the metropolitan population of racial minorities lived outside central cities compared with 62 percent of the white population.

The older central cities of America have been described as becoming "Black, Brown, and Broke." However the move to the suburbs by some of the white population has not meant the abandonment of the neighborhood bases established by the early Euro-ethnics in the city. While these Americans can be found in various socio-economic strata in our society, a large number of southern and eastern European heritage are blue collar workers. They continue to be the backbone of the labor force in most of our northern industrial cities, mining towns, and manufacturing centers. They still reside in older neighborhoods or have relocated in predominantly blue collar suburbs or those mixed with white collar mid-managerial or supervisory workers. The needs, frustrations, and concerns of this metropolitan population are varied and urgent. While they share many problems with their nonwhite neighbors, they compete with them for jobs, living space, and educational opportunities. This competition has produced mutual fear and suspicion. It has created intergroup conflicts which have precluded recognition of common objectives and cooperative efforts to eliminate those problems which affect the urban environment, housing both white and nonwhite neighbors.

At the beginning of this decade, leadership of the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs in Washington, D.C. declared,

Past attempts to bridge the differences that separate the American working class and the blacks have failed. It is our belief that no progress will be made toward this end until the American ethnics develop the leadership and community structures which will enable them to effectively articulate their demands and influence decisions which are vital to the well-being of their communities. If their alienation and powerlessness is to be reduced, responsive community organizations which are under their direction must be developed. Only after they gain the capacity to affect the outcome of decisions relevant to their community, will they think about revising their problem solving agenda and consider coalitions with neighboring black groups and organizations.

It would be overly optimistic to anticipate their forming coalitions with their minority-group neighbors soon after they

develop indigenous community structures. However, these structures and new leaders, in the short run, can produce opportunities for cooperation and provide the organizational means to cooperate effectively with other urban groups. They are a prerequisite over the long run to genuine multi-racial coalitions for peaceful changes in urban America.⁵

The process of adjustment for the immigrants and racial minorities in the urbanization of America varied widely. The attempts to develop coalitions among white and nonwhite ethnics in the 1970's has an historical perspective in the period from 1880-1930 when the concentration of millions of peoples and hundreds of cultures occurred. The degree of prejudice encountered, the education available, and the family values contributed to the individual experiences. However, most blacks and white immigrants never moved beyond working class status. The big difference occurred among the immigrants' children and grandchildren, with many factors contributing to mobility. For blacks, progress was especially slow.

During the rapid pace of U.S. industrialization in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, positions for the unskilled existed in every section of the nation. After World War I, when immigration declined, blacks found greater opportunities. The common experience of Euro-ethnic immigrants and blacks during that intense industrialization process was low wages for long hours in deplorable surroundings. At the beginning of the twentieth century, the average work week was 59 hours and the average weekly wages – including skilled as well as unskilled labor – were less than ten dollars per week; it was an 84-hour week in the steel industries and a 10-hour day at seven and a half cents per hour in the textile industries. More than 1.5 million children under age 16 were working 13 hours per day. In 1900, the United States was the foremost industrial country of the world.

The working conditions in the factories and mines stimulated the development of labor unions, but because of the over-abundance of labor, discrimination, employer opposition, and public and governmental indifference or hostility, unions were not very successful until after the First World War. Members of almost all immigrant nationalities and some of the blacks participated in union activities at one time or another, but their experiences were not uniform. Unions usually excluded blacks or else segregated them into separate locals. Employers in every part of the country used both immigrants and blacks as strike breakers.

Also, thousands of immigrants and blacks in the South were victimized by one of the most oppressive systems of labor imaginable –

⁵ Anon., Proposal Statement from the Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, n.p., n.d., p. 3.

peonage – which was a form of involuntary servitude. Peonage existed in almost every state of the nation but was concentrated in the cotton belt, railroad construction camps, the sawmills, and the mines of the South. The 1900 Census showed over 620,000 foreign-born inhabitants in the South; in 1910 the figure declined to half a million due to the abominable treatment of workers received in the South as well as misrepresentation by labor agents and entrepreneurs.

Labor unrest peaked shortly before World War I, expressing itself in widespread and bloody strikes, marches and the beginning of legislative improvements. However, these steps toward social improvement were quenched by the War and the need for national unity it demanded; a booming economic prosperity followed which delayed further social developments for many years. The labor unrest of immigrant-laborers, large-scale union strikes and labor's support of the Socialist Party (particularly in the election of 1912), resulted in efforts to restrict immigration and ultimately to pull up the gang plank to stop the flow of immigrants from southern and eastern Europe. During and after the War, nearly a half million southern blacks migrated to the north along with Appalachian whites from their homes.

A number of forces were shaping America's large cities:

- (1) a Nativist protest of rural Protestant America against the South-European immigrant, the Jew, and the Catholic Church – all of which were identified with the city; (2) an aristocratic reaction against leveling; (3) a deep concern over the threat to democratic ideals posed by expansive capitalism, which rapidly growing cities so conveniently could represent; and (4) a recognition of very serious and very real problems – political corruption, disease, and degradation – that were a part of the rise of the city.⁶

In a number of the large cities of the East and Midwest, the foreign-born of southern and eastern Europe and their children outnumbered Americans of older northern and western European stock. "Ignorant foreign riff-raff" were being held responsible for the problems of urban life. The abuses perpetrated against immigrants did not go unnoticed. During the early years of the twentieth century, muckraking journalists wrote about the worst evils and along with reformers of the times attempted to improve the conditions of working class Americans through legislation. The Euro-ethnic immigrants were successfully cut off from their homelands with the ending of immigration. Quota laws were first established in 1921. The execution of Sacco and Vanzetti (two foreign-born anarchists) was symptomatic of the times; their crime was being both foreign-born and anarchists. Public sentiment

⁶ Charles N. Glaab, *The American City – A Documentary History* (Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, Inc., 1963) p. 265.

was sharply hostile to lower-class workers and especially ethnic laborers.

The prosperity following World War I turned almost everyone's attention to a search for new meaning in the nation. "Back to God!" crusades, prohibition, flag-pole sitters, "flappers" and dance crazes marked a decade that moved our nation toward the Great Depression of the 1930's – precipitated by the Crash of 1929. There were serious setbacks to the cause of organized labor and to social reform movements. It was a period of "Boom" and "Bust."

W.R. Hopkins, City Manager of Cleveland, Ohio, stated in a 1924 address to the Ohio State Conference of City Planning:

The cheap, mass-produced automobile. . . has revolutionized the problems of American cities. . . we are now compelled to recognize the fact that any city worthy of the name must immediately take care of a territory at least ten to twelve miles out from its center and a territory which inevitably tends to spread further and further out.⁷

The first accounts of an auto-oriented shopping center, "Country Club Plaza" in a territory near Kansas City, signaled the first wave of massive suburbanization in America. Emphasis was placed on the development of land at the perimeter of the city. Any improvements to older central city areas that were not of absolute functional necessity were almost totally ignored. The automobile opened new access to potential homesites independent of the limited transit corridors; for the first time, suburban living became possible for the lower managerial and skilled workers. (The second wave of suburbanization followed the end of World War II.)

Already there was evidence of strong pressures from new suburban home owners for security against undesirable change and from the lower classes. Zoning laws were established as legal controls both of questionable people and disharmonious commercial and industrial land usage.

With greatly reduced immigration and the reduced demand for in-city housing resulting from the flight of the middle class to the suburbs, central city housing conditions went from bad to worse and vast areas of physical deterioration emerged. But the black migration to the central city, an internal migration, continued, resulting in the racially segregated black ghetto slums (like Harlem, New York City).⁸

⁷ Laurence C. Gerckens, *American City Planning Since 1900 A.D.* (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1978), Module "D" p.3.

⁸ *Ibid.*, Module "D", p. 4.

The immigration of Euro-ethnics to specific areas of the cities followed distribution patterns based on the same combination of economic, demographic, and cultural factors that influenced their distribution across North America.

Once in a city, immigrants did not scatter randomly around the urban landscape. Their ultimate destination was (or became) a particular ethnic neighborhood. Thus, the final result of immigrant distribution was the ethnic neighborhood or, as Anglo-Americans called it, "the ethnic ghetto." The formation and location of the ethnic neighborhood followed certain laws. Rather than being the forced creation of a racist or nativist society, the immigrant ghetto grew logically out of the special cultural needs of southern and eastern European peoples and the particular economic structure that they encountered in America. Furthermore, the immigrant neighborhood showed patterns and characteristics that belied the traditional image of the stagnant, homogeneous ghetto. The immigrant neighborhood was never that.⁹

One is often amazed that the immigrants managed to survive their experiences in urban America. Perhaps the main reason for their ability to survive the hazards of life in the city was the extensive aid and support they received from their own people, their churches, and the numerous "self-help" organizations established to sustain the immigrants during the period of adjustment. Most of the immigrants wanted to express their traditional culture and transmit it to their children while adapting to life in the new country.

Immigrant associations anticipated the subsequent welfare agencies created by the government to help find jobs and homes as well as to obtain transportation to other cities. Some organizations offered unemployment insurance; most offered some form of death benefits. The Great Depression of the 1930's pressed these fraternal and religious associations into extraordinary service. By 1933, approximately one-third of the families in America lacked a means of support. The Depression forced many changes in the government's response to people in need. The concept of federally-funded slum clearance was one that fit neatly into the needs of the nation in its effort to recover from an American economy which lay prostrate. Had the need for public housing not served as an important element in the economic recovery, it is doubtful that the humanitarian purposes served could have motivated action to produce public housing. Low income employed of Euro-ethnic heritage were among the residents of public housing. Most of those families were upwardly mobile, economically,

⁹ Caroline Golab, *Immigrant Destinations* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1977) p. 111-112.

during the Depression and World War II years; and the stigma attached to contemporary public housing was not operational.

The massive public housing programs of the New Deal era were initiated as a means of forestalling starvation and revolution among the mass of unskilled first and second generation immigrant workers concentrated in the poorest sections of the larger American cities. These workers had no industrial job skills but constituted a major component of the construction industry.

The immigrants who were least assimilated and least capable of surviving economic adversity were the targets of programs aimed at creating jobs to prevent family disaster and to reawaken their faith in the "Great American Dream." Since construction was among the most labor-intensive industries and was the occupation with which the immigrants were most familiar; programs were created to employ the poor to demolish deteriorated housing and to build new housing for the lower income people in their own neighborhoods.

An important by-product of the slum clearance projects of the 1930's was the first major step toward desegregation in American housing. This came about as a result of federal government policies prohibiting racial segregation in housing projects receiving support from the federal government.¹⁰

In clustering tightly together in America's cities, the immigrants of southern and eastern Europe were doing what came naturally. . . . The peoples of southern and eastern Europe had a very different sense of society and personal identity from those of northern and western Europe - and hence from the bulk of Americans. Southern and eastern Europeans were "network" peoples. Their identity, security, self-control, and stimulation derived not just from their membership in a group but in a group that they could see, hear, touch, and smell at all times. They could not function without the constant presence of the group because a person became an individual only by belonging to and interacting within a group. The group provided mechanisms for social control and determined codes of personal behavior. . . . In thus forming clusters, "ghettos," or ethnic neighborhoods, southern and eastern Europeans were attempting to recreate the network pattern of the village, something that, ironic as it may seem, was easy to do on the streets of urban America but hard to do on America's farms and open spaces.¹¹

The questions of ethnic succession in urban America were already being raised before the Depression years. In *The Newcomers*, Oscar Handlin addresses the residential movement in the late 1800's by those people of the "old immigration" (from northern and western Europe)

¹⁰ Gerckens, Module "F", p.5.

¹¹ Golab, p. 122.

from New York's Lower East Side to sections of Greenwich Village, and the East Side of Manhattan as a result of the "new immigration" (from southern and eastern Europe.) Moving up in America often means moving out.

In this exchange, the displaced groups often take with them the intangible as well as tangible. Things that give a community its unique flavor, such as ethnic restaurants, stores, special gathering places and even the name and prestige of particular school. In turn, the newer groups bring their own distinctive characteristics and institutions with them into the area. Just as neighborhoods have been changed, so too has the ethnic composition of industry and business been altered as newcomers began to penetrate the economic structures."¹²

The second wave of suburbanization was encouraged by the 1940 Census data which revealed that one out of seven urban dwellings was in need of major repair, one out of every seven urban dwellings had no running water or plumbing of any kind and that one out of every eight urban dwellings had no indoor bathing or toilet facilities. This was the first official Census to include a documentation of housing quality. Urban America was growing old and the signs of old age were overwhelming.

Before World War II, almost all housing in the United States was produced one house on one lot at a time by contractors with small operations, who were primarily hand craftsmen. Between 1942 and 1945, mass housing developments with as many as 5,000 dwelling units were created almost overnight in the suburbs.

Experience at this scale of operations, gained by the American construction industry under the impetus of this war housing program, set the stage for the application of this scale and its techniques to the provision of housing units by private enterprise at the end of the war to meet the 7,000,000 housing unit demand and to provide the mass of housing needed by the returning GI's.¹³

The suburban explosion of population from the central cities was rapidly followed by the dispersion of manufacturing industries from the core of the city to the suburbs in the late 1940's and 1950's. Major improvements to highway and street systems - often at the expense of central city neighborhoods - along with widespread automobile ownership by factory workers and subsidized development of trucking fleets for freight service, set the stage for the urban exodus. A common contemporary pattern was established: "white-collar upper-middle income residents of suburbia traveling to their work places in the core

¹² Elazar and Friedman, p. 9-10.

¹³ Gerckens, Module "G", p.5.

of the city, and blue-collar lower-middle and lower income residents of the central city traveling to the factories in the suburban fringe.”¹⁴

The basic conflict circumstance of “black-poor-deteriorated-old and sub-standard inner city” versus the “white-affluent-new-standard and legally sanctified suburbia” contributed much to the discontent and destructive central city rioting of the late 1960’s. The Urban Renewal program – sometimes called the “Negro Removal” program – was created by the U.S. Housing Act of 1949. It resulted in the demolition of thousands of existing homes in the neighborhoods of original settlement by southern and eastern European immigrants; many of those homes were occupied by the fathers and mothers of the American-born second generation Euro-ethnics who had moved into the new suburban areas. This program further intensified the competition for low income housing in the city.

The year 1950 was one of prosperity, of a continued housing boom in suburbia and of general optimism; the decade of the 1950’s marked the beginning of the Korean War (some called it a police action) and the Civil Rights Movement. Popular opinions still held to the notions of the inherent sinfulness of city life and the need for ruralizing urban areas.

There developed a massive relocation of the middle and upper-middle income groups to the outer fringes of the metropolitan areas and the first movement toward the relocation of retail trade centers to the suburban fringe. This movement of people, goods, and services out of the central city resulted in a vast extension of suburban areas in America.

A new housing act was created in 1954 which amended that of 1949. A so-called “workable” program for clearance – rehabilitation – conservation specified the need for a comprehensive plan by a community before federal financial aid for redevelopment could be received. This program also emphasized neighborhood analysis and citizen participation; attention was given toward efforts to improve the status of inner-city residents.

The Federal Highway Act of 1956 established the Interstate System of roads with expressways through cities designed as links in the system. The federal government had supported highway construction since 1916 although no funds for this purpose were granted to cities until 1944. The expressways required enormous amounts of land, and their large-scale construction, particularly in the 1960’s, destroyed vast areas of housing and ruthlessly eliminated the neighborhoods of working poor – both of immigrant and racial minority background. In 1956, the new act provided for a 42,500 mile, 60 billion dollar road

¹⁴ Ibid., p.9.

network with a profound impact on the patterns of urban development which was not considered when the act was passed. The program was advocated primarily as a national defense measure; the highways would permit quick movement in case of atomic war. In our preparations for such war, we not only lost more troops from the city but we created new battle grounds at home. The neighborhoods suffered from the policies of segregation and discrimination and were the sites of continued animosity between the races again, as in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The Exploding Metropolis was published by the editors of *Fortune* magazine in 1958. This work revealed to the everyday citizen what had been occurring since 1950, popularized and stimulated discussion of urban sprawl, and raised some serious questions concerning the value of suburbanization and the future of the older portions of the city. Jane Jacobs contributed a chapter to this book which served as a preview of the "blitz"¹⁵ she was to release on American city planners in the early 60's.¹⁶

The urban revolution of the 1960's resulted from recognition of the fact that "a nation cannot operate within an agrarian framework of social values while using the city for its advantages. . ."¹⁷

Jane Jacobs' book focused on an overriding principal need for the development of an individually satisfying urban life: "the need for a most intricate and close-grained diversity of primary uses that give each other mutual support, both economically and socially."¹⁸

In 1965, the United States Congress created the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It was the most comprehensive extension of federal housing and urban development since the U.S. Housing Act of 1949. A new dimension of Urban Renewal was created in 1966: the Model Cities Program. Its goal was "to build not just housing units, but neighborhoods, not just to construct schools, but to educate children, not just to raise income, but to create beauty and end the poisoning of our environment."¹⁹

What the Federal Government had begun to destroy after World War II with one program, they were attempting to create with a new program in 1966: neighborhoods. For many planners and developers in the late 1940's and the 1950's, the "back-to-the-village" solutions to the sins of the American city prevailed. In 1948 the agrarian-romantic bases were codified in the document *Planning the Neighborhood* published by the Public Health Association. In this work, the

¹⁵ Jane Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (New York: Random House, 1961).

¹⁶ Gerckens, Module "H", p. 23.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, Module "I", p. 4.

¹⁸ Jacobs, *op.cit.*

¹⁹ President Lyndon B. Johnson, The Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966.

neighborhood unit was combined with certain anti-urban ingredients – totally unsupported by empirical proofs of their social, economic, or functional relevance – and proposed as the minimum standards for development in America.

This document, published by an interest association and not by a federal agency, sanctified the detached single-family owner-occupied dwelling unit bases. . .and established the 7-15 du/hectare (3-5 du/acre) “desired maximum single-family density pattern” of contemporary suburbia in spite of proof that this new “standard” had no basis whatsoever in objective fact relative to the protection and/or promotion of the public health, safety, or morals, being “preferred as it will attain privacy. . .and a sense of openness. . .”²⁰

If southern and eastern European immigrants are best described as “network” peoples, what a conflict of cultural values this created. With the heritage of families being close-knit villagers for more than a millenium and having established neighborhoods embodying the unseen social and emotional networks of culture, the sons and daughters of these immigrants were being “Americanized” in yet another way. In terms of intra-Euro-ethnic group relations, the values of the northern and western European “old” and established immigrants were imposed upon the “new” immigrants from southern and eastern Europe; they had never lived on isolated or separately enclosed farms. Such a concept embodied in the Neighborhood Unit Principle had no meaning in their social system. Yet it found its way into FHA and VA national mortgage loan requirements for housing as minimum national standards, “and by means of these standards they entered the value bases for much of the local zoning and subdivision control ordinances executed by city planners in the late 1940’s and the 1950’s.”²¹

The Model Cities Program, as with all new programs, encountered serious problems. The natural suspicion of the citizens in the target areas who have either been left out of other programs or pushed around by them, led to questions about the real intent of any governmental action in their behalf. The notion of artificially creating neighborhoods on Urban Renewal land was strange to those of immigrant background. Attempts to prepare the residents of these areas and equip them to organize and participate according to the Federal guidelines were, for the most part, unsuccessful.

The uprooting of Euro-ethnic peoples from established neighborhoods by Federal renewal programs, concentration of the poor – both black and white – in areas of the central cities, by Federal public

²⁰ Gerckens, Module “G”, p. 10.

²¹ Ibid.

housing programs, and overall sentiment that the city is evil and to be avoided created the context in which the "long hot summers" of 1966 and 1967. America's cities were experiencing disorders in their central areas which resulted in the destruction of more neighborhoods.

A report of the National Commission on Urban Problems pointed out: "The people of the slums are the symptoms of the urban problems, not the cause. They are virtually imprisoned in slums by the white suburban noose around the inner city, a noose that says "negroes and poor people not wanted."²²

Perhaps the central theme of American urban history in the post-World War II period was the polarization of metropolitan regions during the creation of the megalopolis; there was a tendency to divide them into white suburbs and black cities. A second related theme was the growth of huge black communities in the cities of the North and West and the social conditions these engendered.

The influx of southern blacks into northern cities led to rapid and extensive neighborhood changes and continual tensions on the peripheries of black and white settlements. The Kerner Commission report declared that there were several major reasons for the tensions; among them: the changing nature of the American economic, racial discrimination, political opportunities, cultural factors, and the vital element of time. "Today, whites tend to exaggerate how well and how quickly they escaped from poverty, and contrast their experience with poverty-stricken Negroes. The fact is, among many of the southern and eastern Europeans who came to America in the last great wave of immigration, those who came already urbanized were the first to escape from poverty. The others who came to America from rural backgrounds, as Negroes did, are only now, after three generations, in the final stages of escaping from poverty. Until the last 10 years or so, most of these were employed in blue-collar jobs, and only a small proportion of their children were able or willing to attend college. In other words, only the third, and in many cases, only the fourth generation has been able to achieve the kind of middle-class income and status that allows it to send its children to college. Because of favorable economic and political conditions, these ethnic groups were able to escape from lower-class status to working class and lower-middle class status, but it has taken them three generations.

"Negroes have been concentrated in the city for only two generations, and they have been there under much less favorable conditions. Moreover, their escape from poverty has been blocked in part by the resistance of the European ethnic groups; they have been unable to enter some unions and to move into some neighborhoods outside the

²² National Commission on Urban Problems, *Building the American City* (1968) p. 1.

ghetto because descendants of the European immigrants who control these unions and neighborhoods have not yet abandoned them for middle-class occupations and areas.”²³

The 40-year flight to the suburbs has taken on the nature of a flight from scourge. The contrast in attitudes towards cities between the European “Old World” and American “New World” might be explained in part by the existence of a European urban culture that had been well rooted long before the industrial revolution had impacted upon it. The words “city,” “civility,” and “civilization” shared a common root. The European traditions of standing ground against the contaminations of industrialization and meeting social problems by reform, not flight, never gained root in an America whose cities were being created almost overnight – a sharp contrast to the slower development of Europe in antiquity.

America was a society on the move. For more than a century, the city’s elite had been terrified by the continuous flood of foreigners who threatened their foundations for society. How could a lasting pride in place exist in a country constantly washed by massive waves of unwelcome strangers? Most of the buildings in our cities were built for speculation, not duration. The continued expansion of the American city to encompass metropolitan regions resulted in a reduced impetus to central city reconstruction. “By 1973, it was estimated that there were over 9,000,000 housing units in American central cities that were vacant, but rehabilitatable, most in government ownership due to tax or mortgage loan default, making government the largest slum landlord in the nation.”²⁴

The history of the urbanization of America is the history of Euro-ethnics - the immigrants, their children, grandchildren, and their groupings. Urbanism is said to reduce the likelihood that the conditions needed to bring active group life to neighborhoods will jointly occur. This general rule is dramatized by its exceptions. “Many urban neighborhoods do harbor active and intimate social groups. . . . They usually fit one or more of the following descriptions: being threatened from outside, being an ethnic or occupational enclave or being populated by people with little physical mobility.”²⁵

The pluralistic society in North America was created largely out of the free mingling of peoples through immigration, and with impressed black slaves brought by traders. The development of neighborhoods by the “network-building” nature of the southern and eastern European immigrants provided the context in which primary and

²³ “Comparing the Immigrant and Negro Experience,” *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*, Chapter 9, p. 278-282.

²⁴ Gerckens, Module “J”, p. 21.

²⁵ Claude S. Fischer, *The Urban Experience* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1976) p. 119.

personal relationships emerged as the sets of people who lived near one another and therefore saw each other more frequently and more easily. Urbanization has placed large numbers of other people within easy reach of individuals and thereby provided more bases of association than the locality alone. Some social scientists call it a shift from a "neighboring of place" to a "neighboring of taste."²⁶

Today it is easier for people in cities to build "networks" of association while living in social worlds that are distinguished by class, occupation, or interest. These associations based on common interests and cultural similarities are important to the urban and suburban experiences of Euro-ethnic Americans and, perhaps, a key to understanding intergroup relations in the 1980's. If urbanism does create "freedom from proximity" thereby allowing people within neighborhoods the opportunity to construct associational "networks" that extend beyond the neighborhood, then, indeed, the apparent urban-suburban dichotomy for Euro-ethnics is questionable.

"A neighborhood is where, when you get out of it, you get beat up."²⁷

In the historical development of neighborhoods, the people who lived in close physical proximity in the city have been seen as a natural social group. Like the family, the neighborhood commanded the intense loyalties of its residents and their intimate involvement with one another. Isolation from the neighborhood portends an individual's alienation and the destruction of the neighborhood threatens social disorganization. In the context of the suburbs, the neighborhood is now viewed as more cohesive than it is in the city. "Research in the United States and abroad is virtually unanimous on this point. Whether involvement in the neighborhood is measured by visits with neighbors, concern for the local area, the proportion of local personal activities, or almost any equivalent indicator, suburbanites score somewhat higher than city dwellers."²⁸

Some social scientists have followed the same individuals from city to suburb; their studies have found that they tend to increase their neighboring after the move. What these studies have failed to take into consideration is the ethnic context of the new residence. The popular vision of suburbia in the 1950's was that ethnic differences were dissolved in the "melting pot." Not many studies have focused upon suburban ethnicity but the few notable ones – on the Jews – have found that "Jewish suburbanites continued to identify themselves as Jews and, more importantly, that their intimate social relationships

²⁶ Ibid., p. 123.

²⁷ Murray Kempton quotation from *The Toastmaster's Treasure Chest* (New York: Harper and Row, 1979) no. 1287, p. 148.

²⁸ Fischer, p. 219.

were almost exclusively with other Jews, even when they resided in overwhelmingly gentile communities.”²⁹

These cases can be generalized to Euro-ethnic nonJewish (predominantly Catholic and Orthodox Christians) families who moved to suburbia in the 1950's and 1960's. The persistence of ethnicity partly depends upon the presence of significant numbers in the group in the suburban areas; those who can travel long distances to maintain associational networks do so, but those who are relatively immobile (e.g. due to physical or financial problems) are often isolated in their suburban houses. The elderly provide a case in point.

Social scientists attempting to examine city-suburban differences have concluded that until further studies are completed it is difficult to ascertain whether those differences (if they exist at all) are a result of the residence in or move to suburbia. The ethnicity of suburban neighborhoods and their networks of association with city neighborhoods – historically and under contemporary conditions – should demonstrate that suburban residents are members of predominantly Euro-ethnic stock, that there are economic corridors in the suburbs which differentiate ethnics of northern and western European origin from those of southern and eastern European origin, and that their impact upon urban social and political life is a reactivation of cultural pluralism as a defensive move.

The urban polarization markedly evident in the central city rioting of the late 1960's demonstrated that few members of racial minorities shared in the fruits of suburbanization since World War II. The Census of 1970 showed that more people were living in the suburban fringes of metropolitan areas than in their central cities. By 1972, the U.S. Interstate Highway System was slated for completion. More city neighborhoods became “ripe for the bulldozer.” The Model Cities Program was being terminated by the Nixon administration. A wave of scandals was revealed in federally subsidized housing programs; the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) relaxed too many standards when it became active in inner city housing following the riots of the late 1960's. Speculators moved in to buy run-down housing at cheap rates, made few repairs, then sold them to low-income families under FHA subsidy programs.

We began to hear of the “revolt of the white lower middle class” as the decade of the 1960's ended. *New York* magazine reported: “They call my people the White Lower Middle Class these days. . . . Television has made an enormous impact on them, and because of the nature of that medium - its preference for the politics of theatre, its seeming inability to ever explain what is happening behind the

²⁹ Ibid., p. 222.

photographed image – much of their understanding of what happens is superficial. Most of them have only a passing acquaintance with blacks, and very few have any black friends. So they see blacks in terms of militants with Afros and shades, or crushed people on welfare. Television never bothers reporting about the black man who gets up in the morning, eats a fast breakfast, says goodbye to his wife and children, and rushes out to work. That is not news. So the people who live in working-class white ghettos seldom meet blacks who are not threatening to burn down America or asking for help or receiving welfare or committing crime. And in the past five or six years, with urban rioting on everyone's minds, they have provided themselves, (or been provided with) a confused, threatening stereotype of blacks that has made it almost impossible to suggest any sort of black-white working-class coalition."³⁰

Social scientists were busy explaining the causes of white "blacklash." *Ebony* magazine focused upon "The White Problem in America." Other reports labeled white rioters as "misguided bigots." *The Nation* declared that the working poor – both white and black – are in trouble. "Only in the past few months has the plight of the 20 million American working poor begun to attract attention. Heirs of the Industrial Revolution, they have become its neglected offspring; desperate pockets of workers earning more than welfare but less than what their own government says is a moderate income. They are bitter and bankrupt and almost totally without voice."³¹

U.S. News and World Report identified "The Unhappy Americans: Who They Are, What They Want" in a feature article. "The nation's 40 million citizens whose forebears came from impoverished areas of Europe two to four generations ago show revived interest in ancestral culture. Some have grievances to proclaim – as in New York City where 100,000 Italian-Americans thronged Columbus Circle last year to protest alleged slurs against them as a group in recent stories about organized crime.

More militantly, a Jewish Defense League has sprung up to "protect Jewish lives" in racially troubled cities – and those living abroad, too."³²

America magazine reported that experts disagreed on how city people make sure that city services are provided and how schools actually teach children. " 'Power to the People' is a slogan that admits of various meanings. . . . For many urbanologists, it means the decentralization of governmental structures, the political and fiscal

³⁰ Pete Hamill, "The Revolt of the White Lower Middle Class," *New York Magazine* (New York, April 14, 1969).

³¹ Dennis Duggan, "Still Forgotten: The Working Poor," *The Nation*, (June 9, 1969).

³² "The Unhappy Americans," *U.S. News and World Report* (April 19, 1971) p. 90-96.

empowering of ordinary citizens in the neighborhoods where they live.”

One of the major sources of the salience of ethnic groups in American life in this decade is the rise of a “communal society.” The importance of multiple community issues alongside economic problems has forced the Euro-ethnic American into voicing his/her frustration, anger, and sense of helplessness. “What we have witnessed in the past thirty years. . . is the politicization of the society in a way no one had entirely anticipated;. . . in effect, there is probably more participation in political life today than in previous periods. And yet, in consequence of this, more and more groups act as veto powers and check each other’s purposes.”³³

During this past decade in American society, we have a revolution of rising expectations. Previously, citizenship was defined by political rights – the full right to vote and hold office; today we define it by social rights – to have a job, adequate health care now and when we are old, and a decent standard of living. Equality has been re-defined in terms of these entitlements. Finally, the old authority structures are being challenged and their bases are becoming eroded.

City – the Magazine of Urban Life and Environment – was one of the first publications to address the fact that white ethnics were beginning to organize in the industrial cities of the Northeast around economic, environmental, and other community issues. Was this a step toward, or away from, improved race relations?

The appearance of community organizations in white working-class communities has begun to capture the attention of the media. Some mainstream institutions have provided modest grants to support these organizational activities. The rediscovery of the white ethnics, however, has prompted some observers to ask whether this means that needy nonwhites will have new competition for scarce public resources; whether conservative pressures have compelled former friends of the civil rights movement to desert the cause; whether organizing white rather than multi-racial organizations is not divisive; and whether these efforts will not result in their being co-opted by racist demagogues.³⁴

The fate of the older industrial cities in this nation and the welfare of the minority peoples who inhabit them in growing numbers depend in no small part on the white ethnics who chose to remain in their neighborhoods. These old neighborhoods may represent the last chance we have to prevent most of our major northern cities from becoming “reservations” for nonwhite minorities.

³³ Thomas M. Gannon, “Plato, Aristotle and Neighborhood Government,” *America* (March 20, 1971).

³⁴ Daniel Bell, “Ethnicity and Social Change” in *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975) p. 145.

Descendants of eastern and southern European immigrants can be found in all socio-economic strata. Those who live in the suburban communities may be more economically mobile and socially less parochial than their relatives and friends who still reside in the old neighborhoods, yet they are still a prominent component of the blue-collar labor force as well as the modest white-collar workers. Psychologically and physically the Euro-ethnic suburbanite remains in intimate contact with the central city and its problems – crime, urban decay, and racial tensions – problems which, in part, pushed them to the suburbs. Whether in cities or suburbs, many white ethnics share problems in common with their nonwhite neighbors and fellow workers. Clearly there is a basis for alliances with minority groups.

The black poor and working-class whites in the center city, meanwhile, remain on a collision course for they are compelled to compete for the same meager services, living space, and jobs. . . . Until the white ethnics, through heightened group identity, generate new leaders and develop new organizational props, the preconditions for coalition activities will not materialize in their communities.³⁵

Irving Levine, Director of the National Project on Ethnic America, declared in a speech before the Annual Health and Welfare Institute in Cleveland, Ohio on March 8, 1973:

As a social worker, someone that has been involved in national and local intergroup relations, a veteran of civil rights warfare, I would say that we all came through the 50's and 60's believing we had a moral cause, which we did, and that cause of social justice ought to work just because we were right. Well, they never have and they never will. To be right is not enough. To be strategic, to be practical, to be aware of the politics of the situation and to gather 51 percent of the majority at least is the only way to make things happen, and even then it is very, very difficult. . . . We've got to come to some sort of consensus which some people will call coalitional thinking. . . . We have the whole range of issues that are, in fact, coalition issues, but the way in which the organizations develop around these issues, and the way in which people perceive the possibility of negotiating progress will determine whether or not these will become coalition issues or conflict issues.³⁶

By the middle of this decade, there was a significant rising up of neighborhood based coalitions in communities across the United States. We have reached a point today where if you start naming the different cities where community organizations have been established,

³⁵ Richard J. Krickus, "The White Ethnics: Who are they and where are they going?", *City* (Washington, D.C., May/June 1971).

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 18-19.

you have a list that reads like an atlas of American cities: Chicago, Cleveland, Providence, Oakland, Boston, Milwaukee, Rockford, Cincinnati, Utica, Seattle, Wilmington, Indianapolis, Los Angeles, St. Louis, Saginaw, New York, Waterloo, Philadelphia, East St. Louis, Lincoln, Hartford, Duluth, Brooklyn, Dallas, Pontiac, Prince Georges County, Charlotte, New Haven, Somerville, Bronx, Dorchester, Covington, and Denver; more cities are joining this list each year.

Ever since the riots of the 1960's, everyone has talked about the "urban crisis". . .Not only have older homes and neighborhoods been considered expendable but entire cities and regions of the country have been written off by the private and public sectors during the 1970's debate on the "urban crisis." In the face of this wholesale sellout by government and particularly the banking industry, the people of this country have begun speaking to each other. Ever since the First National Conference in 1972, when 2,000 people came to Chicago and created National People's Action, this dialogue has increased and the discussion has involved a growing number of participants. As the debate has grown, so have the issues. . .This development of issues, and the ability to organize at both the local and national levels, is undoubtedly the most significant aspect of community organizing in the 1970's. Building from a block club through a community organization through a city-wide coalition through a statewide alliance to a national movement, has contributed tremendously to the power base from which community people are able to address whatever issue needs to be addressed.³⁷

The thousands of working class Americans of Euro-ethnic as well as Afro-ethnic and Hispanic-ethnic heritage that participate in the coalitions within our cities have become indignant over the way in which dollars flow from the pockets of consumers to the coffers of business and industry, and perhaps more importantly, to the federal government's treasury. The state of the neighborhoods, which is the state of our Nation as we begin the decade of the 1980's, is the result of deliberate policies by the Federal Government and the private sector. Coalitions of citizens from across the country must confront the reality that no one is going to represent their interests but they themselves.

President Carter's Urban and Regional Policy Group issued a report in March, 1978. "A New Partnership to Conserve America's Communities - A National Urban Policy" proclaimed: "The cities' tangible significance is matched by their historical and symbolic importance in American culture. For millions of individuals the city has symbolized choice, hope, and opportunity. It is where generations of foreign

³⁷ Irving Levine, "Nationality and Minority Groups: Confrontation or Cooperation?" statement from the recorded proceedings of the Health and Welfare Institute of the Federation for Community Planning, Cleveland, Ohio, March 8, 1973.

immigrants and native American men and women have sought to better their own lives and secure a brighter future for their children.

“But today some cities are finding it increasingly difficult to fulfill their historical roles. Cities are often unable to afford the services their citizens need. Pollution, poor public school systems, fear of crime, congestion, high taxes, physical decay, and the need for space drive people and industry away from many cities, eroding their fiscal resources and increasing the problem of unemployment. . . . We must direct aid to cities in distress. Their needs and the needs of many of their residents are immediate and compelling. . . . Efficiency requires that urban policy be based primarily on saving the cities and neighborhoods that we already have rather than building new ones. Efficiency requires that the Federal Government consider the possible impact of all its actions on cities, so that indirect effects from unrelated Federal efforts do not inadvertently make urban problems worse. Most importantly, we must recognize that urban problems cannot be solved by the Federal Government alone. A successful urban policy must incorporate a philosophy of partnership among the Federal Government, State and local governments, private businesses, neighborhood groups, voluntary organizations, and urban residents.”³⁸

The National Commission on Neighborhoods – a specially appointed Presidential commission – issued its final report this year based upon one year of extensive research and analysis. The Commission’s Task Force on Governance, Citizen Involvement, and Neighborhood Empowerment made the following recommendations to Congress concerning federally mandated citizen participation: (1) “Where neighborhood groups exist, these groups should be given priority to select representatives for citizen advisory boards, task forces, rather than allowing the representatives to be appointed.” (2) “Where possible, neighborhood and community organizations and coalitions should be funded to carry out citizen participation functions including the planning and implementation of the participation process. . . and the evaluation and monitoring of programs that directly impact upon the community.” (3) “The National Commission on Neighborhoods recognizes that in many neighborhoods advocacy organizing continues to be the only means through which disenfranchised neighborhood residents can develop the leadership and power necessary to control their future. . . it is recommended that because leadership development by skilled organizers is central to the issue advocacy process, continued independent training of organizers and leadership should be supported in order to harness the grassroots networks,

³⁸ *Neighborhoods First: From the '70s into the '80s*. (Chicago: National Training and Information Center, 1977) p. 3-4.

voluntary associations and other human resources in neighborhoods.”³⁹

The 1980 Census will result in the redrawing of the lines through which America defines itself politically. The Census stakes are high for the future of the central cities and particularly those in the industrialized Midwest and Northeast. There has been a wholesale reshuffling of the most populous states since World War II.

Much of the terminology of reapportionment, including terms as vital for the 1980's as “compact” and “contiguous” districts is as old as the republic, but its application has been the subject of wide interpretation. . . . The overall objective is to halt the modern day gerrymandering through which even districts of equal population can be sliced to partisan advantage. Of major concern are districts dominated by one group, like blacks or minority group members. When such groups live in highly identifiable areas, the classic gerrymander is to put the core into one district, but then bring the tip of three or four other districts in around it, so that their numbers are far too small to have an impact on the other districts. Stopping that kind of reapportionment is what's at stake in the 1980 elections.⁴⁰

Now is the time for careful assessment of conflict resolution through the increasing public participation in decision-making. Major decisions about the distribution of goods and services – and in the case of reapportionment, political power – result in complex public policy disputes. The Government continues to pursue broad national objectives which involve and, often, impinge on many interests and groups. Increasing citizen participation in these decisions may uncover previously hidden conflicts that will require more time to resolve. However, if legitimate self-interests of groups are brought into the process at early stages, the decisions are likely to be not only more acceptable but the “right” decisions for the future of our Nation. The “new pluralism” or “new ethnicity” – as it has been called – involves the concept of “legitimate self-interest.” Who defines legitimacy and how are conflicting interests reconciled? “Ground rules” have already been formulated by those neighborhood-based coalitions in existence across the United States. The intensification of tensions among groups – whether they are between Euro-ethnic and Afro-ethnic, or Afro-ethnic and Hispanic-ethnic – is caused by the social definitions of conflicts. How much is there of the self-fulfilling prophecy in American intergroup relations; are groups acting as they are “expected” to act according to the prevailing norms of our society? If we

³⁹ “Recommendations of the Task Force on Governance, Citizen Involvement and Neighborhood Empowerment”, National Commission on Neighborhoods (Washington, D.C., January 24, 1979).

⁴⁰ Rex Hardesty, “Politics in the 1980's: The Census Redraws the Lines” *The AFL-CIO American Federalist* (Washington, D.C., November, 1979) p. 13, 15.

could change those expectations and offer new definitions of group "self-interest" and group conflict, the polarization may dissolve into pluralism.

Policy makers must acknowledge the persistence of ethnicity. There is no monolithic white community or black community. Instead, there is diversity within and among all communities which is expressed in the multiplicity of groupings of peoples; these groupings are linked both formally and informally in our society by associational networks which transcend physical boundaries. Especially for the Euro-ethnic American, these boundaries transcend time; heritage of antiquity in Europe has been translated to the urban, industrial America with integrity of content. The entwining of "roots" in our Nation makes coalition-building more than a possibility; it is a necessity.

In the context of neighborhoods in America's central cities, of the Midwest and Northeast particularly, coalition-building is a survival mechanism to ensure a safe environment in which to live. Just as the immigrants who came by the millions to our cities sought out "safe space" where their families could grow, the residents of the central city seek to make their neighborhoods as good a place as any other for human development. Perhaps, the community coalitions of the 1970's have, in part at least, attempted to replicate the experience of the extended family unit and have established a community of concern not based upon blood relations but upon shared social, economic, and political experiences. An original imprint of ethnicity may well be the "network" nature of the Euro-ethnic American roots.

And in the suburban communities of our country, there may well be a different model of neighborhood, perhaps deviant from the central city experiences, however, the "networks" there can be described as an entwining of roots which strengthens the base of intergroup relations in the community. Citizen participation in the affairs of suburban communities appears to be greater than in the central city communities; this may well be the result of stronger feelings about self-interests and a greater openness in which to express them.

The history of the urbanization of America and the responses of Euro-ethnic Americans to that process provide dramatic examples of conditions created by the public and private sectors which promoted the decay of our roots or sometimes prevented them from entwining. The result has been that our roots have withered as we competed for attention. Today, in many neighborhoods - both in the cities and the suburbs - the matter of maintaining one's heritage is not at question but rather the matter of day-to-day physical existence.

The challenge of the 1980's for intergroup relations in America is how we will effectively utilize the processes for citizen participation in decisionmaking - both in the public and private sectors - and how we

will define the mechanisms for participation already created by citizens. The conflicts which are identified by community groups were not necessarily created by these groups; they represent unresolved issues in our society. Ethnicity as manifested by Euro-ethnic Americans is not an end in itself. It is a way of life. It is the American experience.

A special note of gratitude and appreciation to Barbara Forster and Paula Kalamaras for their indispensable assistance in preparing this paper.

* * *

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN.

Our last panelist this morning is Dr. John A. Kromkowski, who is President of the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs.

He has been a member of the College faculty since 1962 before assuming his recent post, received his Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctoral degrees from the University of Notre Dame in South Bend, Indiana.

He served as the Director of the Human Resources Economic Development of the City of South Bend, and the National Chairman of the Ethnic, Racial, Native American Advisory Committee to the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration.

And he was formerly a Board member of the South Bend-Fort Wayne Human Rights Commission.

Glad to have you with us. If you would summarize your paper in the next half hour, we would appreciate it.

**STATEMENT OF JOHN A. KROMKOWSKI, PRESIDENT,
NATIONAL CENTER FOR
URBAN ETHNIC AFFAIRS,
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

Thank you very much.

I have some preliminary comments that I want to make about the character of this convening, and then move into the summary of my paper.

First of all, the naming of this consultation on ethnicity in America, in some respects is a wildly compromising modifier. We are willing to work under this label, but I think you have noticed already in the three previous presentations that Euro-ethnic is hardly a specific category. What does this mean in terms of the fact that ethnicity is something that moves across the entire cultural spectrum of the American experience?

It's particularly important that this certain dimension, a neglected and ignored dimension of the ethnic factor in America, get a hearing.

But my concern and the concern of many people who were involved in the discussions and planning, prior to this convening, is that the focus on Euro-ethnic things in no way be understood as a sign of our exclusionary or exclusive interest in a particular dimension of ethnicity in America, but that rather this is an occasion where the Euro-ethnic dimension can in fact find ways of building coalitions with other groups that are part of the American multi-ethnic experience.

This raises the question that we had struggled with for a very, very short time during the Bicentennial, when the Bicentennial Administration called groups to Washington to, in fact, identify a so-called "minority agenda" for the Bicentennial.

When one begins to count Euro-ethnics, Afro-ethnics or black ethnics, Hispanic-ethnics, Native Americans and Asian-Pacific Islanders, one is no longer talking about a minority agenda in America; we are talking about a majority agenda, and we are, in fact, pointing to the reality that, in a variety of ways, with various permutations, everyone participates in an ethnos, and even more that the character of every ethnos is that it is a reality that is in flux, that changes, that we discover through the analysis of human experiences.

A second preliminary point is on the question of why various specific Euro-ethnic groups are not part of the consultation as participants with a specific ethnic claim or specific ethnic agenda.

The focus on overarching issues, rather than specific ethnics, it seems to me, was an important one, but I'm afraid that part of the language of this consultation, of this invitation to participate, was frightfully condescending. It suggested that, in fact, if this consultation wasn't done at the highest academic level, then some sort of uncontrollable mob might disrupt discussion and not engage in constructive dialogue.

And what I've said in my paper is that the various dimensions of group cooperation and coalition building is, in point of fact, the reality of the situation, and further, that when we deal with particularly narrow stereotypes and we play on the fears of people, in this field, we should not unwittingly generate behavior that causes divisiveness, and that causes dissension, and causes us to, in fact, maintain the character of a divided people. What I think I've demonstrated in my paper is that the Bicentennial Racial Ethnic Coalition was a moment in public time when in fact, through a large-scale process, groups of varying ethnic groups, various ethnic persuasions, various political persuasions, were able to form and to fashion an agenda for liberty and justice for all in America, that I hope will become a challenge that the U.S. Civil Rights Commission picks up from this consultation, because it seems to me that the agenda for the 1980's is something that still must be written.

I know that the participants who were part of the BERC Consultation are people who are hopeful, are the same people who today are looking for access within the agencies of the National Government, looking for the initiation of a process at this consultation that proclaims that America is in fact able to write a liberty and justice agenda for the 1980's.

The process of building this agenda, it seems to me, can only begin when we've established certain basic frameworks of analysis and understanding.

For over a decade, the founder of the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, Monsignor Geno Baroni, has moved through the nation, and in a variety of public forums and speeches, has regularly quoted Dubos, Bidney, and Nesbit, and has added his own vision to the question of what is it that makes America a particularly unique and challenging situation.

And he has often quoted Rene Dubos in his article "Baghdad on the Hudson", where, in fact, he invites us to recognize that tolerance of diversity is a pre-eminent American need and virtue, because tolerance of diversity, while it has drawbacks, nonetheless creates the social tensions which we need to, in fact, exert on the process of changing attitudes and laws, because without this sort of tension we are unable to give equal rights to all citizens, irrespective of religion, race, age, sex and ethnicity.

And Baroni goes on to quote Bidney on the vitality of "Cultural diversity and heterogeneity" that counteract and challenge a culture to in fact not fall into a state of death and disorder.

And he quotes Nesbit on the question of how a national process leading towards increasing penetration into the private sector, by the Government, leads to a breakdown of freedom and moral order.

These three theoreticians and a host of others that have already been cited today by Irving Levine, Ken Kovach and Joan Aliberti have already begun the process of laying an ethical, a social science, a public policy framework for analysis.

What I think we have to recognize today is that the analysis of the ethnic factor must be combined with the analysis of the neighborhood fact, that is - and here I want to pick up on Kovach's analysis - that in fact we have begun to recognize that the neighborhood factor is the neglected dimension of urban life.

The strategies for neighborhood revitalization, the coalition process that Kovach already spoke about, are significant dimensions. But there are two other dimensions or strains. One is concerned with the process of moral re-establishment, moral discovery, moral principles. The other dimension is the process of governance which grows out of the argument and analysis concerning American Federalism and the

movement toward centralization and the critique of centralization and the question of how does one effectively decentralize.

Well, what are the policy strategies and programs of a neighborhood and culturally pluralistic urban policy? Should we begin by pointing out what are the disincentives and disinvestment attitudes in policies and programs that have got us to where we are today?

I think that we need to, in fact, ask the Civil Rights Commission to help us in the articulation. And when I say "us", I mean all of the American population that is seeking liberty and justice for all. Help us to find a way of expressing a new way, a new idea, a new focus; help us to redefine ourselves as a culturally pluralistic people; help us to begin to recognize in public forums that people have the emotional and economic investments in neighborhoods, and that if neighborhoods continue to die, then cities continue to die; and if cities continue to die, then people's spirits begin to die, because it's only the city that can in fact aggregate and dis-aggregate people in ways that allow for the flourishing of the human spirit.

It's the city that's the cradle of the type of civilization that we have, and that seems to be the only possibility as we move into an energy-scarce age. In fact, the sprawl will become increasingly impossible. The advantages of human concentration, the advantages of cultural diversity, and the advantages of citizen participation can only be established if we have insightful leadership for a new urban, culturally pluralistic policy in America.

We have failed for a long time to call attention to the culturally pluralistic dimensions of our past, because we felt that calling attention to this would simply produce unpatriotic divisiveness and disorder. The history of prejudice, persecution, bigotry, and alienation parallels the history of America's ethnic groups. It is an unpleasant feature of our past.

But, recently we have begun, through a number of disciplines – historical, social science, phenomenology of religion, a variety of approaches – have begun to see that in fact ethnic consciousness, racial consciousness, is in fact something that is here, will not fade away, will not be washed away, will not be utterly transformed.

There is no metastasis that is possible. We are involved in a very profound cultural reality that, because it is real, ought to be legitimated, i.e., made an official part of public policy.

The National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs has been working in this area for the past 10 years; 10 years of community development; 10 years of community organization; 10 years of the development of consciousness about the urban factor; 10 years during which the question of the working class agenda became somewhat legitimate in America.

It's not too long ago that everyone was middle class in America, and the middle class symbol was, in many respects, our unwillingness to come to grips with the character of stratification in America.

The range of issues that Irving Levine brought out in his paper, are still with us today, and they have been with us during this same 10 years that the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs has been organizing and developing public policy.

We could point to particular studies, particular situations, but I'm afraid the argument could be dismissed as anecdotal. My paper traces a moment in public time, a moment when a massive organization of racial, ethnic, native American people proclaimed to the nation, as it began its second century, that liberty and justice for all was a possibility, was in fact something that was articulated in terms of a reformulated public policy.

And how did BERC do it? It raised the question under three modes. First of all: What is the role, the importance, of heritage in America?

Second: What is the role of festival and celebration in America?

And third: What are the horizons for America as we move into the third decade of the Republic?

I shan't retrace that history in summary, but it is very, very important to see the BERC history as a moment when the following recommendations for public policy emerged.

Before I add those, let me finally suggest a capsulizing framework for what I understand to be public policy, and the public policy formation process. In 1976 Father Theodore Hesburgh made these observations when the New Direction initiative was announced. His interest was in international affairs and a new direction for foreign policy. He said we ought to have a long-range policy for total human development which transcends the economic, but is very important to the economic, when even transcends the political, because it's more important than the crisis of the moment, which is really focused on the fact that America as a nation promised hope, promised dignity, and promised freedom for people.

So I'm talking about public policy in terms of transcending the typical categories, but this approach relates, that is, the thrust of this approach relates to very, very specific initiatives and reforms of public policy.

Recently a group of national organizations that are supportive of the multiethnic approach to what I would see as the neighborhood agenda, and what I think they would see as the neighborhood agenda as well – and what I am suggesting to you is perhaps a way of getting at the civil rights agenda for the 1980's – outlined a series of questions that face urban American and ethnic America.

Housing. There is need to develop a coherent housing policy. What is the Civil Rights Commission going to do and say about the bankruptcy of housing policy in America, specifically on assisted housing, on housing counseling, on displacement and home ownership?

A second area: How do we build the capacity of neighborhood groups to handle the question of governance? Is the Civil Rights Commission going to move with hundreds of thousands of people in neighborhoods around this country to in fact ensure the massive funding of the Neighborhood Self Help Fund or initiatives that help us develop livable cities, that allow us to in fact celebrate and to define and discover our heritage?

What is the Civil Rights Commission going to do with hundreds of thousands of people on the energy issue? Is the civil rights agenda for the 1980's the energy policy for America for the 1980's?

What about the various regulatory functions that move money and people without sense of place, style, well-being? What is the Civil Rights Commission and the hundreds of neighborhood ethnic organizations throughout the country going to do about the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act and the question of geographic discrimination and the question of how we reinvest public and private money into the process of reestablishing, revitalizing, and maintaining urban neighborhoods?

What are we going to do about economic development, about small business, and about the community organization as the developer of wholesome entrepreneurial activities?

What are we going to do about manpower policy? Is, in fact, CETA training a manpower pool for the 1980's? Is the civil rights agenda for the 1980's the economic empowerment agenda for people of America?

Are civil rights hollow shells without economic rights? I think so. To separate them is to do a disservice. To isolate them is to, in fact, live in a dream world.

What about the questions of community participation? Are ethnic people involved? Are the structures of participation appropriate?

What about multi-cultural education? Are we in fact educating for the 1980's, for the cultural pluralistic character of America?

What about the delivery of social services and census information? Do we have any realistic base of information about the character of mobility, except in 10 year spurts and in macro aggregations? Do we have accurate tracking mechanisms that allow us to do housing and economic revitalization?

Do we know with any sort of reliability the magnitude and intensity of ethnic affiliation? Do we understand the dynamics of the perdurable character of ethnic symbols within the consciousness of people?

I would say that these issues should prompt the U.S. Civil Rights Commission to examine the post-World War II experience of urban design and development.

Let's go back. Let's explore where we have, in fact, come. Let's begin tracing in a rather full and systematic way the items that Ken Kovach raised in his paper.

I would also like to see the establishment of U.S Civil Rights Commission hearings on the report of the National Neighborhood Commission. I think this could begin a national dialogue that could replicate the BEREC experience that is in the body of my paper.

BEREC-type forums could discuss the development of legislative and executive action that would redirect our horizons in favor of the national multi-ethnic neighborhood policy.

The National Neighborhood Commission identified legislative and executive actions leading toward neighborhood reinvestment through policy, strategies and programs for neighborhood revitalization.

However, Federal agencies and departments, including the Department of Commerce, Housing and Urban Development, Health, Education, Welfare, and now the Department of Education, and special agencies like the Small Business Administration, ACTION, Community Services Administration, and Minority Business Enterprise.

They must be prompted by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission to develop policies strategies, and programs for neighborhood revitalization; for housing, for neighborhood marketplace revitalization, for economic development, for the stabilization of communities through a redesign of human service programs.

The good efforts of many of the agencies need to be identified; and convergent issues at the neighborhood level and bridge issues at the jurisdictional level have to be articulated. The Neighborhood Commission has put this agenda into print.

What I'm saying, and I think Euro-ethnic people and perhaps all ethnic people are saying, is that the neighborhood movement and the ethnic movement are coming closer and closer together in practice in America, and we are looking to the Civil Rights Commission to, in fact, regain the stature that it once had in America, when it spoke to the content of civil rights in the context that was appropriate for the 1950's and the 1960's.

During the 1970's, the question of what is the context of achieving liberty and justice for all has in fact shifted to the neighborhood focus. I'm saying that the National Neighborhood Commission has examined these things, but what must be addressed is the question of visibility of its findings and the question of linking them with a commission of your stature. This linkage not only enlivens and legitimates our agenda of

liberty and justice for all, but may establish a whole new set of groundings for your new call to the nation for the reestablishment of what I've said in a number of ways in my paper, what runs through the entire BERC statements: the legitimation of diversity in American life and the preservation and development of ethnic and community arts which provide the means for the expression and benefit of diverse communities.

The rationale for this kind of policy was argued by BERC when it said, we are "far from. . . a melting pot; we are a nation whose diverse and singular blend of cultural expressions yields a different flavor with every tasting."

BERC also addressed neighborhood restoration. We argue that the nation must begin to see that people live in communities, and communities mean belonging. They're made up of a people with common purposes and relationships that include ethnic and cultural ties.

I think we have to begin to see that, when we're looking at cultural activity and festivals, this activity is part of a cultural impulse that invigorates the entire American spirit. A sense of celebration is the closest we come to a classical sense of leisure that allows us to, in fact, play, so that the best of our human impulses can be articulated.

At bottom, we urge the U.S. Civil Rights Commission to recognize that we are the most heterogeneous people living in a democratic society. We must reaffirm that we are committed to liberty and justice for all. We must proclaim that we desire a public policy which vigorously pursues this American dream.

The BERC experience proclaims that the recognition of cultural pluralism is a founding idea which will lead us to become a wiser and more mature citizenry capable of loving and respecting and working together, in a truly democratic nation.

We exhort the U.S. Civil Rights Commission to mobilize a national coalition directed towards forming and fashioning public initiatives and directed towards surfacing this agenda in city and county governments, in legislative and executive offices of our states, in Congress, and perhaps most importantly, in the halls of the domestic counselors of various Federal agencies and in the White House, to lead us into the third century.

The history of BERC that I presented in my paper was presented because I think it can be read as a parable of the realm which ends with a stunningly American question: Are we a courageous people seeking liberty and justice for all?

[The complete paper follows]

CONCEPTUAL CONSIDERATIONS OF ETHNICITY: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

By Dr. John A. Kromkowski*

The Founder of The National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs (NCUEA), Msgr. Geno Baroni, has for nearly a decade called our attention to the insights of Dubos, Bidney, and Nesbit, and added his own vision to the analysis of the American society.

Rene Dubos, in "Bagdad on the Hudson," reminds us that we need not fear diversity if we educate ourselves for tolerance:

Although the persistence of human diversity has many drawbacks, it also has beneficial consequences. It creates social tensions which lead to a strenuous quest for attitudes and laws designed to give equal rights to all citizens irrespective of religion and race, of age and sex. Human diversity makes tolerance more than a virtue: It makes tolerance a requirement for survival.

The anthropologist David Bidney says, "Cultural diversity and heterogeneity counteract the tendency to cultural entropy." Entropy is the general trend of the universe toward death and disorder.

We must somehow learn to live with our diversity and to recognize that our strength and unity will be bound in the legitimization of our ethnic and cultural pluralism.

If we learn to live together and struggle for liberty and justice for all in our third century, then we must become aware of the intercultural imperative of American Life. Indeed, we already live in a world that is an "intercultural village."

Robert Nisbet points out that the family, the neighborhood, the community, the schools, and voluntary associations once used to carry a great deal of the load in building morality. Now they don't, because of the tremendous politicization of our social order. We have transferred so much responsibility to the Central Government, and authority now stems from the involvement of so many State and Federal bureaucracies in peoples' lives, that these basic communities are drying up. The danger arises that more and more people will turn to the Government as the source of community. This will bring us close to totalitarianism, to statism. Nisbet warns that if this state of mind is allowed to grow, the United States could go the way of such once-great powers as Greece and Rome, in which the erosion of the

* President, The National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, Washington, D.C.

old institutions led to the creation of the absolute state. Msgr. Baroni argued the following case in 1976 and since then, as Assistant Secretary of HUD, has championed the notion that we need to devolve more power to the neighborhood communities and to encourage the organization of voluntary self-help groups among the families, churches, and community groups in our neighborhoods.

In 1979 many scholars, policy analysts, and others agree that the neighborhood is a neglected unit of American urban life. Today residents in cities all over the country are organizing to improve their neighborhoods. Strategies for neighborhood revitalization have many variations and evolve from different ideological perspectives. However, one theme runs throughout every strategy: the desire to assist people to become more involved in the process of governance and thus share in the control of their neighborhoods and their lives. To date, two major streams of thought have influenced this movement.

The first includes those proponents of neighborhood government who return to the principles of Jeffersonian democracy and the conceptual notions put forth by Mumford and Jacobs. They define the problem in human and moral terms and argue that because family and community life suffer, people do not cope well with the diversity and pressures of the city. They assume that people will live better if they have options for control and that the way to achieve this is by a return to smaller units of government.

The second stream consists of those proponents of American Federalism who also decry the trend toward centralization and bigness. However, they define the problem within the context of the good government and reform movements of the early twentieth century and build on the theoretical framework of contemporary public administration. Their approach is functional and structural with emphasis on identifying the tasks which can best be carried out by small service areas in order to achieve greater efficiency, effectiveness and productivity.

What are the policies, strategies, and programs of a neighborhood urban policy? Should we begin by pointing out the disincentives and disinvestment attitudes of policies and programs that have led to public and private urban disinvestment? Our programs and policies have served to discourage personal as well as public and private institutional re-investment strategies in our urban neighborhoods.

Is there a new way, or a new idea, or a new focus that will help us to redefine ourselves as a culturally pluralistic people? There is no such policy, because we have failed to recognize that people live in neighborhoods, not cities. Their emotional and economic investments are in the neighborhood. If neighborhoods continue to die, then cities will die. If we are to develop domestic policy that reflects the reality

of our ethnic and racial diversity, then we must begin to develop a national urban policy for neighborhoods.

There is a paucity of Federal legislation which legitimizes the neighborhood as a legal authority. A major problem in writing legislation has been in defining the appropriate role of the Federal Government. To some degree, this failure is caused by the bankruptcy of our national approach to ethnic diversity.

For a long time, consciousness of a pluralistic dimension of our past had been suppressed for fear that calling attention to cultural and ethnic diversity would produce an unpatriotic divisiveness and disorder. The history of prejudice, persecution, bigotry, and alienation, which parallels the history of America's ethnic groups, is an unpleasant feature of our past. Recently, however, historians have produced and appear to be producing at an ever accelerating rate, a body of sophisticated literature about American immigration and immigrants. Social scientists are likewise very active in their inquiries into anthropological, geographical, demographic, sociological, economic, and political aspects of ethnic communities and patterns of behavior. The humanities and the arts have likewise found a fertile ground for growth in ethnic and racial materials. This emergence of ethnic consciousness should be legitimized (i.e. made an official part of public policy) through efforts supported by the National Government.

The National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs argues that our experience in multi-ethnic cooperation through community based organizations, often in partnership with government and the private sector, offers a fruitful new horizon for the eternal aspiration of America - liberty and justice for all. While a catalogue of our success could be presented as evidence, an argument of that sort could be dismissed as anecdotal. Consequently, The National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs (NCUEA) prefers to focus its case on a unique moment in the history of the urban ethnic movement in America - the emergence and experience of the Bicentennial Ethnic Racial Coalition. The vision of the Bicentennial Ethnic Racial Coalition (BERC) may help us understand the relationship between the emergence of neighborhood consciousness and ethnic and racial consciousness. The BERC story may help us to transcend conventional interest group activity and public policy formation.

Though the efforts of Bicentennial Ethnic Racial Coalition to impact on the directions of Bicentennial suffered a host of rebuffs from the ARBA Advisory committee and ARBA Board, it nonetheless represents a moment in the public articulation of the BERC idea; i.e., a reinterpretation of the American experience which unashamedly promotes the importance of cultural ethnic diversity and the primacy of neighborhood institutions.

Workshops of June 1974 BERC Conference

An understanding of the approach taken by the BERC group can be gained by reviewing the basic assumptions made by participants and conference planners. Workshops were held at the June 1974 BERC meeting for each of the three thematic areas of Bicentennial planning: Heritage, Festival and Horizons.

In the area of heritage and education, workshop emphasis was on the ethnic experience in American education and the ethnic and racial contributions to the building of America. The statement distributed to the workshops in Heritage and Education read:

History has been made unpopular by persons who would use it to teach a specific lesson. Ethnic and racial Americans must understand their past before they can chart a useful future. This means that they must avoid narrowness while at the same time emphasizing the richness that the ethnic and racial groups have contributed to the American pluralistic experience. This experience of "otherness," which has been a hallmark of the American experiment, must not be feared or shunned, but must be accepted in terms of its contributory role in America's heritage.

In the area of Festival and the Arts, the workshop groups focused on the need to legitimize the cultural diversity of American life by preserving and developing ethnic and community arts, music and folkways, and by providing a means of expression for the benefit of diverse communities. The basic statement of philosophy distributed to the Festival and Arts workshop said:

Far from being a cultural melting pot, we are a nation whose diverse and singular blend of cultural expressions yields a different flavor with every tasting. It is a fact of our society that the channels for cultural expression and appreciation, of the diverse groups of which we are comprised, are not well developed. Our culture is our essence made visible. Whether it is manifested in the mundane or the profound, it adds inspiration, satisfaction, and pleasure to our lives. The extent to which our citizens are limited from a full experience of their right to cultural expression is the extent to which we condemn ourselves to a bland and homogenized national existence.

The Horizon area workshop focused on *economic and social revitalization of neighborhoods*. Discussions were held concerning neighborhood restoration and preservation, economic growth and stabilization, and the permanent duty to serve basic human needs of all citizens. The topic statement distributed to the workshops, focusing on economic and social revitalization of neighborhoods said:

Because people's behavior is affected primarily through the surroundings where most of their experiences occur, we believe

that economic and social revitalization of racial and ethnic neighborhoods is one of the key means of bridging the existing gap between the two nations which make up this country - that of the rich and that of the poor.

In each of these three workshops, participants from the more than 21 different ethnic groups were allowed to contribute their own ideas about appropriate agendas for action by BERC. Each of the three workshops independently produced the recommendation that a fully representative advisory body be established to assist ARBA in policy and program development. It was also recommended that this advisory body assist in funding and legislative consultation and review, and that it be provided with the means to serve as an outreach network for ethnic and racial groups throughout the country.

The BERC initiative quickened the development of a unique political perspective. This perspective establishes a set of criteria from which an interesting and provocative view of the American domestic policy emerges. At the bottom, the history of BERC prompts the generation of policy studies and program recommendations which set out to remedy the malaise in the civic culture of America, which provoked the convening of BERC.

The BERC consultations initiated a national dialogue with ARBA in 1974. Through ARBA is no longer a functioning agency, the concerns first articulated by the BERC demand continued discussions because they address serious contradictions which fester in American polity. The history of BERC can be read as both a call to reflection and a call to action.

While the issues raised in this paper speak to the arena of public needs of all Americans, they are particularly salient for low and moderate income Americans of various ethnic and racial traditions. The civil rights horizon for the 80's should become cognizant of the multi-ethnic neighborhood approach to claims of justice and equity articulated by the Bicentennial Ethnic Racial Coalition. These issues reflect the content of the American vision of civil rights. However, the growing bankruptcy of the Civil Rights Commission derives from the isolation of the content of your advocacy from the context of the American reality as it is lived in neighborhoods. Even your most ardent supporters are beginning to share the perception of your work as irrelevant to the context which surrounds the content of your advocacy for justice. Two basic elements of the American context are ethnic diversity and a nonideological or common sense appreciation for fairness. Liberty and justice for all is alive in America. Attempts to mute diversity are fated to cause charges of exclusion and/or neglect, while attempts to highlight diversity are fated to cause claims of special status and/or exaggerated importance. Yet diversity must not

be denied. The recognition of multiform cultural expression and heritage and the perdurable fact of multi-ethnic diversity are proposed to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights as the ground from which it can establish the civil rights agenda for the 1980's.

The BERC perspective argues that the contradictions in the American polity are profound, but it also proclaims that the reservoir of goodwill and talent existent in our country is an awesome force. Reflecting on the BERC story and its attendant challenges, parallels the reflection and action proposed by Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, President of the University of Notre Dame, who made the following observation about new directions for public policy.

We ought to have a long range policy on total human development, which transcends the economic, but is very important to the economic, which even transcends the political, because it's more important than the crisis of the moment, which is really focused on the fact that America as a nation promised hope, promised dignity, and promised freedom for people.

Though Father Hesburgh was speaking primarily about new directions in international policy, the thrust and truth of his position apply as well to domestic policy.

The BERC perspective argues that the domestic policy of the past three decades has not appreciably contributed to the total human development of America. In fact, our cities are threatened with fiscal and moral bankruptcy. Most tragically, the American polity has nearly ceased fulfilling its unique capacity to enliven the human spirit. In fact, our domestic policies appear to have stifled our hopes for dignity and freedom for people. Moreover, these policies have deformed the American people by cultivating public attitudes of pessimism, antiurbanism, and privatism. This malaise will not be remedied simply. What must be done can only begin by transcending the paradigms which guide our domestic policy.

The BERC consultations transcended these paradigms by insisting that the diverse cultural dimensions of human existence could be viewed as the ground from which a wholesome civic life could be formed and fashioned. BERC argued that we must transcend our current understanding of domestic realities by reorienting our understanding of the American city; i.e., the social form of existence which predominates in America. While cities obviously have an economic function, they, like all human forms of association, are not simply economic entities. Cities are clusters of human communities. Domestic policy has ignored and neglected human communities, i.e., the spiritual substance which constitute cities. Domestic policy should remind us that human communities are "little worlds of meaning" informed by

shared experiences of order, filled with human traditions which people experience not simply as accidents or convenient diversions, but as the very substance of their human essence. The human communities of cities are neighborhoods which can offer the possibility of human development in fellowship, friendship, and cultural experiences.

The BERC perspective argues that the failure of our urban policy can be traced to our lack of attention to urban neighborhoods and the rich variety of ethnic and religious substances which sustain these communities. Over the last three decades, we have squandered our cultural and religious resources. Many healthy neighborhoods have been destroyed by the heartless, monocultural or mass-cultural orientations of government action and inaction. Unfortunately, new public policy imperatives, arising from this critique, are not easily translated into recipes for action. Nonetheless, many leaders and groups have begun to raise our sensitivity to human rights as an important dimension of world politics. The BERC perspective proposes a parallel thrust in domestic politics. From the BERC perspective, the many worlds in American society – the urban/rural poor, the suburban/exurban rich, the culturally dispossessed, rootless, heritageless people of all economic statuses – expose a national domestic scandal; a crisis in our civic culture. BERC asks: If American citizens hardly know themselves and each other, how can we learn to treat each other as brothers and sisters of a world-wide human family? The BERC perspective of our domestic crisis and scandal provides a challenge to persons engaged in policy studies. The challenge is to develop a civic, neighborhood, and human development agenda, which is grounded in the multi-cultural fullness of the American reality.

Few persons involved in policy studies have recognized that the American reality includes the perdurable diversity of its ethnic, cultural, and religious composition. The BERC perspective proclaims that we will not understand the urban crisis until we understand the ethnic, religious, and cultural diversity of the American people. The BERC consultations revealed that public policy initiatives are influenced by rigid economic categories, embodied in interest groups, which assume a fallacious national self-image; i.e., they ignore cultural, religious, and ethnic diversity. The BERC perspective argues that the melting pot notion and/or ideologies of narrow selectivity are inadequate frameworks for dealing with diversity and have in fact produced a scandalous civic crisis. The BERC thesis suggests an imperative: We must redefine ourselves; we are a pluralistic people. The BERC idea affirmed that Americans are the most ethnically, racially, religiously, and regionally diverse nation in the world, which is governed through processes of free political competition. Rather

than perceiving diversity as an impediment to human development, BEREC claimed that we must learn to recognize that the extent to which our citizens are limited from a full experience to their right to civic expression is the extent to which we condemn ourselves to a bland and homogenized national existence. BEREC avoided narrowness and divisive ethnocentrism, while it emphasized the richness that regional, cultural, and religious groups have contributed to the American experience.

The BEREC perspective expects us to recognize that our urban areas are diverse clusters of religious, cultural, ethnic, and multi-ethnic human communities. New urban policy directions grounded in the BEREC perspective begin with the fact that urban neighborhoods have, over the past five years, become the source of a new community sector force in American politics. Urban neighborhood leaders are devising new urban strategies for rehabilitation, preservation, economic development, cultural enhancement, education, and crime prevention. Though these community sector groups display a wide range of ideological orientations, one theme unites their efforts. They desire to assist people to become more involved in the decisions which affect their lives and the existence of their neighborhoods. The extent to which these recent eruptions of neighborhood activity are both infused with the spirit of community pluralism and supported by public and private policies will, in large measure, determine the extent to which we achieve liberty and justice for all in America. The future of America, a nation "which promised hope, promised dignity, and promised freedom for people" will depend on the ability of private and public sectors to appropriate a wholesome understanding of diverse communities and to appreciate the need for pluralism of approaches to human development. Neighborhood leaders and national policy-makers must begin to share their insights. The leaders of public, private, and community sectors must fashion sets of civic strategies which include the expanded cultural and civic agenda proposed by BEREC. Persons engaged in policy studies can play a catalyzing and developmental role in formulating initiatives which are consonant with the BEREC agenda for America.

The question which confronts us today, in some respects, parallels the question which confronted the American Founders during the period after the Declaration of Independence and prior to the founding of our Constitution. The question put simply is this: Are we a courageous people, able to form and fashion new mechanisms of governance and new policy directions within the framework of our Constitution, which recognizes that we are an urban people, in need of an accountable and responsive public order, in need of a vision of our urban reality, which celebrates our cultural diversity, and in need of a

civil theology which weaves various traditions into a cloth of many colors, textures, and designs? Perhaps the BERC experiment is the loom on which we can create a new Jacob's robe, which will warm our hearts and minds, so that we might live as united people with liberty and justice for all. These are the pieces of the BERC dream. The BERC constituency has experienced the various faces of alienation and poverty in America. The BERC experience is the ground from which this restatement of the BERC mission issues. As we move into the 1980's it is appropriate to reflect on the causes of the poverty and alienation that have debilitated America, and begin anew our work of breaking the cycle which constrains the full development of liberty and justice in America. Poverty, which is a lack of the ability to sustain basic human needs, is related to a complex combination of spiritual failings encased in economic, social, and cultural factors, which, while they vary from one area of our nation to another in their intensity and magnitude, they, nonetheless, encumber, retard, or paralyze the human development of individuals, families, and communities. More specifically, these impediments to human development include selfishness, economic dependence, inappropriate education, narrow public policy, and a blindness to the culturally pluralistic character of American society.

The BERC ideals affirm the basic human rights of all persons to decent material living conditions, to the availability of opportunities for humanly fulfilling work, to ownership of property, to a share in the control of decision-making, which affects limited resources, and the articulation of the human spirit in diverse cultures of the American people. Our cultural resources are manifestations of our nation's spiritual richness. Our cultural vitality is found in various traditions which maintain their integrity, while they interact with each other and support each other. BERC believes that all citizens have the responsibility to utilize their resources and power to protect, support, and promote essential human rights.

Another face of poverty surfaces through oppressive institutions – public, private, religious, governmental entities – which exercise practices and policies that have a debilitating impact on the lives of individuals, families, and communities. Changing oppressive institutions involves breaking down barriers and current control patterns which produce unjust policies and practices. Change may be needed because:

- A. Specific policies or practices are oppressive.
- B. Policies or practices are not relevant to human needs.
- C. Admirable policies are poorly implemented, or not implemented.

D. Admirable policies are implemented in such a manner that fundamental causes or problems are unchanged or even reinforced.

Change can be initiated in various ways: at the policy-making level of the institution or at other points below that level. It is quite possible that the process of changing oppressive institutional practices may require a reformation of the problem. The BERC experience has, in fact, urged the reformulation of our domestic policies. The BERC experience has created a significant change of awareness and an attendant new hope among both the oppressed and powerful.

The BERC's perception of our malaise prompts support for a national commitment to allocation and educational processes designed to change oppressive attitudes and their institutional forms. BERC affirms a mission to modify policies and practices which have prevented people from reaching full spiritual, psychological, social, and physical development. BERC affirms a mission to modify those social, cultural, economic and political structures and systems which do not provide the environment which enables the basic human needs of individuals, families, and particularly racial, ethnic, and Native American communities to do their own work and decision making; i.e., to become people helping; people helping themselves.

In fact, the powerlessness BERC constituents have experienced is the chief obstacle to the realization of a dignified and hopeful life. Powerlessness is the lack of choice and control in the fulfillment of one's basic physical, psychological, social, economic, political, and cultural needs. Powerlessness is the inability of identifiable cultural groups, within this nation, to form coalitions which will significantly contribute to the development of liberty and justice. Powerlessness may be derived from a lack of education skills, a lack of political clout, a lack of money, or from the presence of oppressive institutionalized attitudes such as bigotry, alienation, polarization and centralization. Monocultural homogenization has produced forces that work against self-esteem and self-development. In order to participate in a democratic society, each individual or group has a God-given and civil right to share in the decision-making process and the shaping of society and its institutions.

Powerlessness, therefore, extends to those who, while in a position to meet their basic needs, experience the inability to modify systems and institutions which adversely affect the fate of others, ironically and perhaps tragically - systems and institutions in which we are all involved.

Given these faces of poverty, BERC affirms its mission and proclaims the "centrality" of its mission to the nation, when it argues

that in the 1980's American domestic policy must defend the rights of alienated millions to a life worth living – a life of dignity and hope.

While BEREC recognizes that rural poverty continues to plague our nation, and efforts must be made to minimize oppressive rural conditions, the stunning reality of urban poverty in all of its various forms prompted BEREC to articulate a vision and research-action agenda for American domestic policy.

BEREC argues that our understanding of the city must be reoriented. Cities need not be viewed as demonic concentrations engendered by selfish desire. Cities are placed where people reside. Too often we have ignored this obvious fact and concentrated our concerns upon the historic economic role played by cities. Recently cities have begun to see this folly. Cities have begun to examine their role in light of the 1970's, with the attendant communication and transportation facilities which allow- for decentralization. Decentralization involves business firms and people. Both the economic role and the residential role played by a city are fundamental. Ultimately, one must ask whether this latter role can be played if a city, any city, loses a significant portion of its standard housing stock. If it can't, will the city be able to perform the former role?

All older American cities are faced with decay in its housing stock. More importantly, this decay is spreading in ever wider circles. It can be stopped. But to stop it demands a positive, forceful housing program. It demands a housing program that is given equal priority with the economic development programs of the city. Moreover, we must reorient our perception of the city by rediscovering an ancient ideal and unashamedly proclaiming that the city is the cradle of our traditions and or civilization.

The American Revolution, which gave birth to our country, was fashioned and fought in the cities and towns from Boston to New Orleans. The great American experiment – liberty and justice for all – was first experienced by millions of Americans who came to the cities, and there developed the rich mixture of human spirit which characterizes the form and style of a fully human life – an urban civilization. Only cities offer the possibility for the continuation of this full human life, through the enhancement of urban fellowship and social development. Only the city can aggregate the fiscal and human resources which enable persons to enjoy their life and work in a framework of civic amenities: well tended lakes and rivers, green areas and parks, distinguished buildings, great universities, libraries and museums, outstanding restaurants, fine music, exciting shops, theater, fountains, art in the streets, opportunities for participatory recreation and spectator sports, signs of the past, historic squares and healthy neighborhoods with diverse traditions, styles and tones of life, and

finally the governance of these realities through public institutions, i.e., accountable and responsive governments which are carefully attuned to the variety of communities and wholly dedicated to the importance of enhancing these civic amenities and the full flowering of the human spirit in all communities.

The fact remains, however, that over the decades and even today, we have callously abandoned our cities and have thoroughly espoused a Candide-like posture of pessimism, anti-urban privatism, and self-centered familialism. Our National urban policy has not only threatened our cities with fiscal bankruptcy, but more tragically, our cities have nearly ceased fulfilling their special and unique capacity to enliven the human spirit. Our cities are not producing the civilizing influences of work, education, art, music, and fellowship that of necessity must be located and developed in urban settings. These problems are often discussed, and much research has been directed towards eliminating the *urban crisis*. Perhaps the failure and frustration of these efforts can be traced to their lack of focus on the ancient distinction between *urbs* and *civitas*, two words, which while they are both translated city, they were not synonymous for the ancients, nor are they synonymous today. *Urbs* was the place of assembly, the dwelling-place, a sanctuary of the *civitas*. *Civitas* was the religious and political association of families and tribes – the people bound together in civic association. These ancient distinctions are important today, because urban research and urban policy are bankrupt because of their lack of attention to the *civitas* – their lack of attention to *civic* renewal and *civic* development. By focusing on *urban* concerns, the physical items, to the exclusion of *civic* concerns, our national urban policy has nearly destroyed *the civitas* – the various levels of human community which make urban life possible.

Our national urban policy has ignored and neglected a basic dimension of community life. The *civitas* has been forgotten and nearly has been eclipsed. Of course, we cannot deny that cities have external physical aspects which need attention. However, serious consequences, perhaps fatal results, derive from urban strategies that fail to recognize that a city possesses, in fact, is primarily a “little world of meaning” that is illuminated with meaning by human beings, who continuously create this “little world of meaning” through religious and secular symbols, shared experiences, traditions; and further that this “little world of meaning” is not merely an accident or a convenience, but that it is the locus of fundamental experiences which establish our humanity. In sum, our urban policy must be rethought and refashioned into a *civic* policy – a policy which in broadest outline is cognizant of our *civic* life and supportive of the preeminent features of *civic* life which have been thoughtlessly squandered – our rich

variety of religious and cultural associations which have been the sustaining structures of our urban neighborhoods.

The fondest of family and community traditions of diverse populations, have been nurtured and protected in our urban neighborhoods. The urban neighborhoods have produced civility, order, and stability. They were sustained by delicate networks of interpersonal, family, cultural, economic, religious, and political relationships. In fact, a good measure of a healthy city is the health and vitality of its various neighborhoods.

The BERC rationale for this position was simply stated, but it must be examined more carefully. The referent points of the city for most residents can be classified at two levels; city-wide affiliations and the neighborhood living experiences. The great institutions of the cities, with which most people identify, are usually of great scale; stadia, concert halls, museums, universities, and exposition halls. The function and meaning of these large scale institutions are well known; they are shaped to a large degree by mass media, and frequently the product of specialized studies which have attempted to relate form to function.

The more human scale institutional referent points of the neighborhood are churches, schools, political or fraternal clubs, labor halls, unique ethnic commercial facilities, community centers, and the neighborhood organizations. These human scale institutions still await their chroniclers, and more importantly, need the support of governmental policy and the support of foundations and religious groups. There is a remarkable paucity of knowledge and low level understanding of these vital institutions. At a time when we desperately need to grasp the dynamics of neighborhood, this reality is the subject of much rhetorical but little scholarly exercise. Neighborhoods are usually defined by demographic indicators such as: race and ethnicity, age spectra, income and educational levels, and standard econometric and bureaucratic variables. These indicators are used to describe and measure the health of urban life. Are such measurements clearly conclusive and sufficient?

The cultural dimensions of urban life, which hold large numbers in the embattled neighborhoods who are economically able to leave, have yet to be seriously examined. A most useful way to begin to understand and enhance urban neighborhood culture is through an analysis of the evolution of its institutional life, followed by the development and support of its institutional life and the networks of relationships which constitute its organic culture. This activity constitutes a new mission area – a new arena of research and action.

BERC constituents complained that many healthy neighborhoods have been destroyed – mostly by government action or inaction. In a steady procession of good intentioned, but basically faulted programs,

initiated by national urban strategies compounded by faulty local initiatives and planning, many city neighborhoods and all that they have meant for our country and our people have tragically passed from the scene. If this process continues, our greatest American cities will collapse. However, a new civic policy can arrest this breakdown and may provide models for neighborhood revitalization and the creation of new neighborhoods.

The majority of public programs that have shaped our cities, particularly the older industrial areas of the Northeast, Mid-Atlantic and Mid-West regions, were created and implemented during the postwar II period. There has been serious absence of research on the historical meaning of this crucial period during which the ethnic, racial, and social class composition of our cities was transformed. There have been numerous specialized studies, but none of a comprehensive and analytic nature seeking to determine the function of scale in urban planning and development.

The cities during the postwar period were provided with the largest number of Federal programs specifically targeted at particular problems, urban renewal, the housing programs, particularly FHA, community renewal planning, "The War on Poverty," Model Cities, and the highly targeted education, social services, and health programs that proliferated during this period. Since 1968, a new approach has begun to replace the old, namely, "The New Federalism," representing a bloc grant rather than funding by specific category. Both general revenue sharing and the Housing and Community Development Act represent the devolution of federal resources and authority to the states and localities. Our current policy includes a mix of categorical and bloc grant approaches meant to stabilize and revitalize the cities. Future policies are uncertain, and, at this point, will be determined on a basis of inadequate knowledge and analysis.

Statistical studies are plentiful, as are policy analyses of the various programs which emphasize the legislative process. Advocacy studies, frequently based on useful data, are also plentiful but overly rhetorical, usually constituting an attack on the public and private urban "establishment." There are a few case studies that begin to deal with the issue of human scale, the neighborhoods. Ironically our knowledge of the neighborhood, a level of urban life which most directly experiences the consequences of policies and programs, is very limited.

BERC challenges policy researchers to combine the field experiences of neighborhood bodies with the disciplines of economics, planning, and political science to undertake a project which will aggregate and systematically analyze policy outcomes from the human scale perspective. The project should proceed to collect and to analyze the literature, not only the scholarly studies concerned with economic

and social indicators and legislative histories, but also Government and privately funded evaluations of Federal programs, with emphasis on local actions in selected cities, including documents of the planning departments and the authorizing statutes, and testimonies of the city councils. Finally, oral histories of political, planning, private sector, and neighborhood leaders should be taken as an original body of data. Though these data may be simply anecdotal, if not soon tapped, will be lost forever, and no existential framework for testing hard data will be available. The result should be the analysis of urban policy and program outcomes from the neighborhood perspective which should provide new insight into the salience of human scale as a factor for future urban planning and civic development.

BERC was not blind to the fiscal crisis of urban areas. The economic bind facing cities is mounting daily and this compounds residential and human scale problems. The middle class of all races and ethnic groups are being forced to flee the city. The tax base is eroding, jobs are disappearing, mass transportation is a farce. There is no adequate housing policy or program, health costs are mounting, education standards are decreasing. In sum, the quality of life in America is deteriorating. Revenue sharing is woefully underfunded and is often being used at the whim of political persons without insight into the problems.

Recently, a coalition of national organizations, supportive of the neighborhood approach to a civil rights agenda for the 80's, outlined a series of concerns which face urban America:

A. Housing -

There is a need for the development of a new coherent housing policy, or the cardinal principles of such a policy which benefits people in neighborhoods and which, among other things, addresses the following:

- assisted housing;
- housing counseling;
- displacement;
- home ownership.

B. Capacity Building/Direct Funding -

The insurance, continuation, and development of new sources of capacity building monies, for community organizations, is a top priority for everyone. Data is needed on where money now exists and for what programs. There is debate around centralizing capacity building monies versus decentralization among agencies. There is virtual unanimity on the need for availability of direct funding to community organizations and the use of national coalitions as training and technical assistance providers. Support is needed for reauthorization at increased levels of the Neighbor-

hood Self-Help Fund (120 million for three years), and for Livable Cities (120 million for three years).

C. Energy -

Most people see energy and energy conservation as an emerging issue that cuts across class lines. If the windfall profits tax passes, then the administration will be looking to agencies for programs to spend the funds. Energy and neighborhood economy - many people see energy programs on the local level as a boost to the local neighborhood economy. Conceivably, appropriate energy technology could be the basis for cottage industry and small business, strengthening the neighborhood economy.

D. Regulatory Functions -

Several people spoke of the need to deregulate obstacles to social and economic justice in some areas and to increase regulation in others. All areas need analysis, in terms of which require regulatory changes and which legislative action. Some of the areas discussed included:

- Home Mortgage Disclosure Act;
- geographic discrimination;
- targeting;
- Community Reinvestment Act.

E. Economic Development/Employment -

Although there was general agreement as to the importance of economic development and its implications for employment, it was generally agreed that Federal dollars need to catalyze as well as subsidize these efforts. Among the areas of economic development discussed were:

- small businesses;
- CBO as developer;
- CETA;
- CDBG/UDAG.

F. Community/Citizen Participation -

Almost inherent in a neighborhood agenda is the institutionalization of not only citizen participation, but also citizen control in decision making and programming.

G. Education -

The creation of the Department of Education focuses the need for a major effort in support of multicultural and multiethnic education, including support for non exclusionary private schools and for alternative schools. Multilingual, multicultural education was seen as an ongoing need to overcome barriers to learning by building confidence through a positive self-image.

H. Service Delivery -

This topic related generally to the rearrangement of Federal dollars to insure a better mix, vis a vis service delivery in all areas and specifically to the availability of Title XX funds to neighborhood organizations, so that services would be provided and controlled locally. There was some discussion around the lack of definition regarding the delivery of human services in neighborhoods and the need for a clearer agenda in this area.

I. Census -

The census and the census undercount and the exclusion of important ethnic information were mentioned largely in terms of the broad based community education needed and the use of neighborhood residents as enumerators.

These issues prompt us to propose that the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights examine the post World War II experience of urban design and its impact on economic development in a sample of cities, to determine if the perception of ethnicity and social class were factors which contributed to our economic malaise. Our interest is to determine the ethnic and class variables that are truly relevant to design; why some products of the development process were suitable in functional terms, and why others were not. This project could result in a new body of knowledge which might be the basis of a major addition to our understanding of the urban economic strategies.

There are numerous examples of residential and commercial development: Projects mounted in neighborhoods of specific ethnic and social class identity. These projects have undoubtedly influenced the new image of the neighborhoods in which they were built. Future developments are expected. Such an analysis becomes ever more urgent because of the growing awareness of the relevance of ethnic and class variables as economic development factors, and their relationship to preserving and revitalizing the neighborhoods of our older industrial cities. This information is needed to support a new movement of reinvestment in certain areas.

The primary focus on any decentralization strategy must be the city, for without a workable strategy of neighborhood decentralization on the local level, the best efforts of other governmental units will be fruitless. A two-phase neighborhood decentralization mode could begin a process of combining political and administrative decentralization, in a fashion that permits and encourages citizen participation. It would have to recognize that each city is different and no one can prescribe a generic model. Nor can one prescribe the mechanics of developing linkages between neighborhoods, and city and regional governmental units. Such a model should be considered a limited approach toward meeting selected needs on a neighborhood level. Dr. Arthur Naparstek, a BEREC participant and member of the National

Neighborhood Commission, has noted that there is a paucity of Federal legislation which legitimizes the neighborhood as a legal authority. He argues that prior to writing new legislation, we must assess the appropriate role of the Federal Government within three major areas of concern:

- 1) The structure of financial resources available to cities;
- 2) The orientation and impact of Federal programs, agencies and regulatory bodies on cities;
- 3) The provision of technical assistance to various actors in cities.

Subsequent to these clarifications, a neighborhood policy needs to be enacted to test models and approaches to:

- 1) Restructuring the procedures of governance through a mix of centralization and decentralization of services.
- 2) Restructuring financial systems with emphasis on subsidy and incentive programs for neighborhood life.
- 3) Molding federal funds and programs to local conditions; i.e., political culture, age, size, region, etc.
- 4) Providing oversight over relevant Federal regulatory bodies from the perspective of the neighborhood impacts of their decisions.
- 5) Rearranging human and educational service delivery systems in ways which increase utilization and decrease ethnic and racial tension and polarization.

The establishment of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights hearings on the report of the National Neighborhood Commission could begin a national dialogue through BERC-type forums, which could discuss the development of legislative and executive action, that would redirect our horizons in favor of a national multi-ethnic neighborhood policy. The National Neighborhood Commission identified legislative and executive action leading toward neighborhood reinvestment, through policies, strategies, and programs for neighborhood revitalization. However, Federal agencies and departments, including the Departments of Commerce, Housing and Urban Development, Health, Education and Welfare, and special agencies such as the Small Business Administration, ACTION, the Community Services Administration, and the Office of Minority Business Enterprise, must be prompted by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to develop policies, strategies, and programs for neighborhood revitalization, housing, neighborhood market place revitalization, economic development, and the stabilization of communities, through serving basic human needs. The good efforts of every one of these Federal agencies and departments are needed to identify the *convergent* issues at the neighborhood level and *bridge* issues between their jurisdictions. The

National Neighborhood Commission documents the existence of a broad racial and ethnic constituency for neighborhood revitalization.

Neighborhood decentralization policies, in themselves, are no urban panacea, but the neighborhood perspective must be studied in light of the increasing concern for community which is a political orientation. The public policy challenge at all levels is to devise a political process which can support appropriate policies and administrative decentralization efforts.

This is why it was so important for BERC, a constituency which celebrates the uniqueness and diversity of local communities, to call constantly for Federal recognition of their claim to be part of the political process of resource allocation. Because BERC emerged during the Bicentennial, its agenda and rhetoric reminds us that the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights and our Constitution should be the "glue" that brings unity out of our racial, ethnic, and regional diversity. Nor should we forget that in the Bicentennial year, BERC developed a new vision of the American dream that brings us together; not in an untenable "melting pot" tradition, but in a spirit of "participatory pluralism", that would begin a renewal of political development which values cultural justice and cultural democracy in a neighborhood setting.

In the best spirit of a new "tradition", BERC claimed that we must understand the intercultural imperative of American life, particularly at the neighborhood level, where increased self-governance will bring more people together to shape and share the burdens of social change. The BERC impulse warrants the recommendation of legislative and executive action to redirect the funding priorities of institutions which have not heretofore been perceived as important mechanisms of urban policy, but which could promote cultural justice, which in turn could enhance community development by facilitating respect and trusting relationships. The National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities and Public Broadcasting Corporation should:

1. Legitimize the cultural diversity of American life.
2. Preserve and develop ethnic and community arts, music, and folkways.
3. Provide a means of expression for the benefit of, and to the benefit of, diverse communities.

The rationale of this policy change was proposed by BERC:

Far from being a cultural melting pot, we are a nation whose diverse and singular blend of cultural expressions yields a different flavor with every tasting. It is a fact of our society that the channels for cultural expression and appreciation of the diverse groups of which we are comprised are not well developed. Our

culture is our essence made visible. Whether it is manifested in the modest work of amateurs, or the profound insight and craft of the artist, it adds inspiration, satisfaction, and pleasure to our lives.

The extent to which our citizens are limited from a full experience to their right to cultural expression is the extent to which we condemn ourselves to a bland and homogenized national existence.

The BERC impulse implied a well orchestrated legislative and executive initiative toward redirecting the funding priorities of the Department of Commerce, the Department of Interior, the Social Security Administration, the Community Service Administration, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development and ACTION toward public policies which support:

1. Neighborhood restoration.
2. Neighborhood preservation through economic development, particularly through Community Development Corporations and support for small businesses and the expansion of ownership opportunity.
3. Neighborhood stabilization through the delivery of basic human needs.

The following rationale of this policy was proposed by BERC:

People's behavior is affected primarily through the surroundings where most of their experiences occur. We believe that economic and social revitalization of urban neighborhoods is one of the key means of bridging the now existing gap between the two nations which make up this country - that of the rich and that of the poor. A neighborhood association can be a mechanism for developing communities. Community means belonging; it is made up of people with common purposes, common needs and interests. One is bound to a community by a host of relationships, including ethnic or cultural ties. In our urban centers, community can mean the neighborhood - a series of closer economic, social, and political relationships. Our concern is, that neighborhood communities become an integral part of the public policy because they are an essential element of the American Experience.

The BERC impulse suggested legislative and executive action to redirect the funding priorities of the Office of Education and the National Institute of Education toward funding programs designed to include the ethnic, racial, and native American contributions to the building of America. The following rationale of this policy was articulated by BERC:

Racial, ethnic and native Americans must understand their past before they can chart a useful future. In fact, the development of productive skills, which relate to our economic growth, may be enhanced by culturally pluralistic education. We all must avoid

narrowness and divisive ethnocentrism, while we emphasize the richness that racial, ethnic, and native American groups have contributed to the American experience. "Otherness", which has been the hallmark of the American pluralistic experiment, must not be feared or shunned, but must be accepted in terms of its contributory role in America's heritage.

Finally, the BERC impulse implied legislative and executive action to redirect our national priorities toward the development of a housing Civic Development policy which echoes the USCC Statement on Housing which:

1. Affirms and advances the realization of the national housing policy of "a decent home and suitable living environment for all American families."
2. Provides a variety of programmatic tools and sufficient resources to meet the housing needs of low and moderate income families, including the continued participation of non-profit, community based housing corporations.
3. Focuses programs and resources on the special following: low-income people, rural Americans, the elderly, farmworkers, Native Americans and the handicapped.
4. Adopts our housing delivery system to meet the economic realities of inflation, recession, and unemployment.
5. Recognizes the central role of the neighborhood in the survival of viable urban areas, by encouraging rehabilitation and reinvestment in central cities.
6. Encourages land use policies that provide for adequate planning and effective controls on unreasonable and wasteful development and speculation.
7. Encourages a monetary policy and credit allocation system that provides a sustained supply of affordable credit for housing production.
8. Encourages the integral participation of housing consumers and tenants in decisions regarding housing at local, regional, and National levels.
9. Encourage equal housing opportunity, within a framework of cultural pluralism, through voluntary compliance and, where necessary, legal remedies.

At bottom, we urge the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to recognize that we are the most heterogeneous people living in a democratic society. We must reaffirm that we are committed to justice and liberty for all. We must proclaim that we desire a public policy which vigorously pursues this American dream.

The BERC experience proclaims that the recognition of cultural pluralism as a founding idea will lead us to become a wiser and more

mature citizenry, more capable of loving and respecting and working together with others in a truly democratic nation. We exhort the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to mobilize a national coalition, directed towards forming and fashioning public initiatives directed towards surfacing our agenda in the city and county governments, in the legislative and executive offices of our states, in Congress, and perhaps most importantly, within the halls of the domestic counselors in various Federal Agencies, and in the White House to lead us into the Third Century.

The history of BEREC can be read as a parable of the realm which ends with the stunningly American question:

Are we a courageous people seeking liberty and justice for all?

DISCUSSION

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Thank you very much.

I think, for the benefit of the audience, and perhaps I should have mentioned this earlier, that when our panelist mentioned BEREC, he was not talking about Edmund Burke, B-u-r-k-e, although there might be an occasional analogy; he was talking about BEREC, B-E-R-C, the Bicentennial Ethnic Racial Coalition, just to make it clear.

It is clear to the reader of your paper, but perhaps not to the audience.

CHAIRMAN FLEMING. I would like to address a question to all panel members. There has been, in the discussion so far, and I'm sure this will be true throughout the consultation, a good deal of emphasis on the neighborhood concept.

There has also been a good deal of emphasis on diversity and cultural pluralism, and I'd like to ask the members of the panel if they feel, at times, there is a conflict between the neighborhood, as we see it operating in this country, and diversity and cultural pluralism; whether they feel that at times the neighborhood does operate in such a way as to prevent diversity, to prevent cultural pluralism, and if that is the case, what can be done, should be done, to offset the practices of that conflict.

I hope all of the members of the panel feel free to get into a discussion of that.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Well, why don't we start with Mr. Levine and work our way around?

MR. LEVINE. Those of us who study ethnicity know that there's a yin and a yang in ethnicity.

CHAIRMAN FLEMING. A what?

MR. LEVINE. A yin and a yang. It's an ethnic thing. The heights of human civilization and creativity grow out of one's attachment to

one's group; the capacity to universalize that attachment in a concrete way.

Also the heights of hate, murder, rage, discrimination and ethnocentrism also emerge.

The problem is, we haven't wanted to admit the complexity of this issue on one side or the other.

And we also have not done our job in this country in defining what we mean by integration. There are numerical ways of talking about integration, but there are also philosophical ways that may be more helpful, and that is that integration is a process—a little bit of separatism, a little bit of mixing, a little bit of the process of coming together and the process of pulling apart.

The fact that we only make legitimate one aspect of integration—and that is mixing—means that we are fooling ourselves and have an incomplete picture of the process of how people develop togetherness. They develop it in both ways.

I can always say to you, by law, we're seeking integrated neighborhoods. By practice, there are the elements of separatism, not based upon necessarily violation of the law, although there are many violations of the law, but based upon choice of people's living patterns.

Now, can we live in a society where we recognize that we will have highly integrated neighborhoods as a goal and as an ideal, and at the same time, we will have the kinds of movements that we've had constantly in urban and suburban America, the coming and going, within the context of antidiscrimination law?

That is our reality. I would say to you that if we do not accept that reality, we will have an imbalance of what I would call a positive approach to antidiscrimination. When I say an imbalance, I speak from 25 years of civil rights history, my only activity of having helped pass many civil rights bills.

The imbalance means that we will not be in a position to nourish and to deal with those people who are in fact still in a stage of their history where they must have a mobilization of cohorts that come from their own ethnic group.

By that I'm saying that nonwhite minorities have made the greatest progress in this country when they recognize that, based upon their ethnicity, they can organize. We're also saying, based upon their ethnicity, they have the natural systems, the support systems, the networks; and if they are cut off from them by some ideal vision of the world of numerical mixing, on a percentage basis, we will destroy some of the impulse for progress which is based upon a steep grounding in one's own group.

Now, that is a complex idea, I know that, and it's difficult to deal with public policy in that arena, but I would say that it's not

impossible, and we've got to have programs that deal both with anti-discrimination and, I would say, cultural diversity and maintenance of culture at the same time.

I think some of us can demonstrate how policies like that could be developed.

MR. KROMKOWSKI. If I could very briefly add to that, perhaps just another angle or parallel. The fact of ethnicity is in fact a dimension of human consciousness that can be manipulated by fear or by hope, and the degree to which the political process of persuasion uses fear language will in fact heighten the kind of divisiveness that you're very, very concerned about. At least that's one of the thrusts of your questions, in my hearing of it.

The language of hope and the translation of the language of hope is a much more subtle and complicated process, but our experience in neighborhoods throughout the country is that there is a reservoir of good will and common sense appreciation of fairness, that is still alive in the minds and hearts of Americans.

The translation of that welling of good will and the articulation of language that uses the nuances of ethnic symbols and multiethnic symbols to that end is very, very subtle and difficult. And finally, the process of translation into public policy is even more complicated, but doable, because unless we take that route, there's nowhere else to go, except to continue to exacerbate tensions between groups.

And if we've already reached levels of polarization in America today, let's remember that the dimensions of ethnic stuff, consciousness, are very, very close to religious dimensions.

Remember, St. Paul used ethnos as one of the dimensions of religious spirit that Christianity is supposed to transcend, and his phenomenology of what is the experience of the givenness of people that he was working with.

The madness of religious fervor and rage that's going on in the Middle East today is some sign of how one can, in fact, manipulate ethnic religious symbols for massive hatred; and it's a givenness. It won't go away.

So finding the appropriate subtlety and translation is a central agenda, and one that I hope your question addresses out of hope rather than fear.

MR. KOVACH. Probably I should respond by saying "I'm glad you asked that question!" I have here a photocopy of a letter to the editor of *The Cleveland Press* which was printed under the headline: "Parma Called Tribute to Ethnic Achievement".

Now, Parma is one of those post-World War II suburbs that I talked about. It is the home of southern and eastern Europeans, the sons and

daughters of immigrants who moved from the south side and the west side of Cleveland. It was their realization of the "American Dream".

And this letter, I think directly relates to the questions about the civil rights of individuals, the civil rights of groups, and to what extent are group self-interests legitimate. The author of the letter obviously feels very strongly about the matter.

In reference to Barbara Weiss' "November 4th story", as a Parma resident, I resent the headline "Parma is Called Symbol of Racial Hostility".

To those who have a background of being subsidized by government doles and give-away programs from generation to generation, it may appear as a symbol of hostility; actually, Parma should be referred to as a symbol of ethnic achievement.

Parma, to a great extent, is comprised of first generation ethnics, whose parents came to this country around the turn of the century with just the clothes on their backs and perhaps a few pennies in their pockets. The majority had little formal education, perhaps 4 years at most.

After their arrival, they rolled up their sleeves and started to achieve. They took the most meager jobs and saved and planned for a future. Saving pennies, nickles and dimes, made their dreams come true. They were not interested in the location of the welfare office or where there was a government give-away program. When times got tough, to them it meant that it was time to roll your sleeves higher or take the shirt off, if necessary, and expend more energy and more guts and not turn to crime.

These added efforts resulted in the creation of communities wherein they built churches, schools, and businesses and sustained them with these savings of pennies, nickels and dimes that they sweated for. They had a dream, a dream to buy their own homes and to educate their children. I believe you can find letters like this in newspapers around the country from citizens of that basic sentiment.

In my paper I addressed the fact that we have looked at the city as the center of all ills in our society, and we've done such a good job in communicating the message that everybody who is able wants to escape from the city, whether they're black or white. The city of Parma is now before a Federal District Court Judge in Cleveland on a housing discrimination charge because they were not permitting public housing. This has brought forth a large amount of testimony from Cleveland area scholars on ethnicity. People are saying "Well, don't we have a right to a community like that? It's a good healthy, community."

Whether the "neighborhood" concept, where it encompasses culturally homogeneous groups of people, creates conflict needs to be well researched. I think there are some good examples where the "neighborhood" concept does embody cultural diversity. It depends, though, on the physical condition of the neighborhood. If you're living in a poor neighborhood and suffering, struggling for survival, then cultural diversity is often understood to mean that the people who are "different" are the cause of your problems. When you're in a nice suburban neighborhood, the differences are not threatening. We've got neighborhoods of diverse people in the Greater Cleveland Area and the sharing of cultures enriches the quality of life.

I think we need some new research in this area. There are good examples of both, and I don't think that we can look at the neighborhood concept only in terms of conflict. As a social scientist, I would like to do some more work on that subject.

MS. ALIBERTI. I would ask if you would repeat the question.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. I indicated that throughout the discussion this morning there has been a good deal of emphasis on the neighborhood concept, and I simply asked the members of the panel – and I also took note of the fact that there's been a good deal of emphasis on the desirability of diversity and the desirability of cultural pluralism and so on – and I simply asked whether or not there was a conflict between the neighborhood concept and the objective of cultural pluralism and the objective of diversity; and if so, what would be the positive approach to dealing with situations of that type?

MS. ALIBERTI. My response to that is yes and no. That sounds like a political response, but from my experiences as a practitioner and also doing research on neighborhoods in terms of the changing roles of women, what I see, the neighborhood is providing a very positive statement in our American society. And as I said earlier, the neighborhood provides a community in its very ideal sense.

I mean, we share all our resources; we share our schools, although, that's debatable now with the conflicts they're having in busing.

And I think that society in general can learn and adopt some of the things that are very positive in an ethnic neighborhood and adapt it to a broader society.

I think it does have drawbacks, also. I think it creates an insular attitude on the part of the people that are living there, particularly in terms of educational and occupational achievement, because there's a conflict.

People that I've talked to say they really feel conflicted in going on in education or going out of the community. There is peer pressure on young people and housewives; they feel pressure as being regarded as different.

One of the reasons that I was recommending that community colleges have neighborhood base colleges is that you would cut down on some of the alienation that particularly women might have when they first go back into higher education.

I think that this is something—and I agree with Ken— that has to have further research; having some sort of balance and keeping the real values of the ethnic community, the family and the sense of work, et cetera, and spreading that to a larger population, bringing the larger population into the ethnic community. And it's just a matter of reciprocal things.

MR. KOVACH. May I just add this note, that I personally do not have and I don't think anybody else really has a romanticized view of the neighborhood. In those neighborhoods across the United States, where there are mechanisms for the expression of diversity, it's working, and people are celebrating cultural pluralism, and as John said, people are dealing with the issues. But where there are no mechanisms, there is misunderstanding and that's where there are problems.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Any further questions, Commissioner Freeman?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. One of my concerns has been, as I read these papers, is that there seems to be an assumption that all ethnics have freedom of choice.

And to the extent that the minorities, the racial minorities, are not even defined as ethnics by some in certain places, to the extent that they are not, they are the victims of discrimination and the denial of some basic constitutional rights. And to that extent, they cannot even participate in a decision as to whether they would be a part of a community, part of a neighborhood.

And I would like to know if each of you could speak to the impact of even, as you say, the discrimination laws of the past, in 1964; the fact that it was necessary, even as late as 1964, to have a law against discrimination.

Now that, as far as black people are concerned, is something that is an experience that the Euro-ethnics have not had.

I'd like to know if you could speak to this.

MR. LEVINE. Commissioner Freeman, it's wrong to say that the Euro-ethnics did not have problems being discriminated against. They were, but never to the same degree that blacks were. But to have a blanket statement like that I think—

MS. FREEMAN. I'm saying as perceived; this is what I'm saying.

MR. LEVINE. No, there was actual discrimination against Italians, against Jews, against Poles, real discrimination against Irish—"No Irish Need Apply."

We really have to set the historical record straight on that. There has never been the kind of systematic discrimination against white ethnics as there has been against blacks, meaning that there is a great difference, which the Government public policy and even institutional policy has to deal with; the nature of being black as against perhaps being everything else.

The confusion, I must say, is when we begin to deal with Hispanics and Aleutian Islanders and Guamanians and Samoans and everything else. You're beginning then to deal with ethnic categories that have only recently been developed as special categories of discrimination.

Those categories, as discriminated against as they may be, may in fact turn out to have been equal in discrimination to say early Italian, anti-Italian discrimination.

We don't know these things yet. We have to be clear and sharp about the fact that there is such a thing as ethnic succession in this country that developed differentially in different regions of the country, with different discriminatory patterns, depending upon who you were.

As a matter of fact, Jews and Italians were seen as races. The designation of Jews and Italian was separate races, among other groups. So I think it's important at this point, when we've come to this kind of maturity, to set the record straight.

That does not mean that if you take the white ethnic American you do not have patterns of racism, but you also have some very interesting patterns of, what I would say, an acceptance of fairness and fair play.

The National Urban League did a study on who accepts or does not accept antidiscrimination; and the white ethnics in America rank much higher than the WASPS, much higher. On every social welfare indicator, the white ethnics are the most progressive group next to the blacks and Hispanics.

So we're not talking about a large population group of screeching reactionaries. We're talking about people who are, as has been described here, locally oriented, neighborhood oriented, who do see changes in their life and their family and their neighborhoods, based upon migration patterns of other groups, which they see as perhaps dangerous, disastrous, what have you. That does lead to bigotry, discrimination, and prejudice; there's no question about it.

The solving of these problems, then, cannot be done in terms of fiat. I mean, we have had fiat for the last few years, and fiat was necessary in certain places, but as we get into an understanding of the complexity of these problems, we may get to a system where we're much more involved in conflict resolution and what I would call ethnic bargaining.

In a Parma area, I'd like to see housing go up for minority groups, but I think there is a process of bargaining that must take place with local people in the face of nonethnic discrimination. If they're clearly discriminating on the law, they're wrong. But if there's a marginal situation, where it is not clear that it's bold-face discrimination, there ought to be a community process which would allow for what I call ethnic bargaining.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Any other comments from members of the panel?

MR. KROMKOWSKI. Yes, I'd like to respond to that question in two ways.

One, I'm going to be very frank about how important it is to follow through on getting the record straight. I think we all have to do our homework in this area, and I think, in fact, the question that comes from the Commission underscores the importance of continuing this kind of formation, because let me say, also, very, very frankly, the implication of your question is exactly one of the core areas that exacerbates conflict between people. Why? Because if you tell me I don't have a pain, and even though I've got one that's very, very slight, it's going to hurt a lot more.

One of the regular dimensions of our analysis is that there's no doubt that black Americans have had a broken back because of oppressive, racist language and social science which has become encased in institutions, and consciousness of many Americans.

But if you don't understand that working-class European people have had a sore shoulder and perhaps a broken toe, and you say, "You don't have any pain" to people of that sort, you're putting back the movement of liberty and justice for all in ways that will never be redeemed.

MR. KOVACH. In my paper, I referred to a development over the past decade in American society that I would call a revolution of rising expectations. Previously, citizenship was defined by political rights: the full right to vote and to hold office. Now I think we've moved to citizenship defined by social rights, that is, the right to have a job, adequate health care now as well as when we're old, and a decent standard of living.

I think equality has been redefined in terms of these entitlements. I've been to many sessions of what I call the blood-letting—"My group suffered more than your group" type. And if you think it's only between white and black, then you should attend some ethnic meetings where the Serbs and the Hungarians and the Poles start talking about how badly they were treated. If you put them all together, you could have a "bleeding" session that is unending.

But we're way beyond that, and I think we need to move forward. We're all part of American society and really creating a whole arena of social rights. Maybe because blacks have not even had those basic civil rights, and we move from political rights into social rights, everybody is expecting too much. We all feel we're entitled to so many things, and these rising expectations cause frustration and anxiety. We need to be careful about the kind of language we use in talking with groups. As I indicated, if we use labels and make sweeping generalizations, we start putting those barriers up.

The bleeding sessions, if they must be held, should be held to get it all out on the table. I thought the Bicentennial really brought us up-to-date through the past 200 years in an adequate way. But obviously, we haven't really fully explored the level of human suffering experienced by every group that's come to this country.

So maybe the Civil Rights Commission really needs to do that first, and then, once that is accomplished, look at the kind of question that you raise about the freedom of choice today as we approach the 1980's with a changing economy and a different set of social expectations.

MS. ALIBERTI. I'd like to make some brief comments, because I think the issue has been very adequately covered by the other panels. I think I have to agree with Irving that there was massive discrimination with the early immigrants, and, to a certain extent, it's happening with immigrants right now.

And because it's not as apparent right now, we tend to sort of ignore people who come from ethnic backgrounds, because they're white and we say what type of problems do they have. It's like looking at a kid and saying "You're just a kid; you know, you don't have any problems."

There are serious problems; and if the choice issue is addressed, there are serious problems in terms, again, of educational and occupational issues. I was talking to a friend only last week, who teaches at one of the Ivy League schools, and he said that they pride themselves by accepting a lot of working class students. He said they're very bright students, and they've always succeeded and done very well.

But he said that after they get accepted, they don't do anything. They don't define any kind of support systems. And what happens with these kinds is that they feel extremely conflicted, because here are these parents that have really sacrificed their whole life to put them there. They're very proud of the fact that their son or daughter is going to this institution.

Yet they also feel that they're losing their son or daughter to sort of the prevailing establishment in the institution, and the student realizes and the parents realize this, and it creates very serious problems.

Yet, these same students are the students who are such serious problems because they really value the family experience. And I suppose what I'm trying to say is that unless we recognize it as a problem and as a real issue, then we won't be able to deal with it and we will have generations of kids and middle-aged people and older people denying their heritage and denying their backgrounds and being not so complete people.

And they'll deny it, because this is the only way that they will achieve success by American standards.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Commissioner Freeman? Commissioner Ruiz?

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Yes. I agree with Mr. Kovach that it's about time that this type of a hearing be held, so that we can let our hair down on issues that have been on the periphery without direct confrontation. I think it's going to be an interesting hearing.

I was interested in his report on ethnic coalitions being formed throughout the country as a survival mechanism.

I would like to read, in part, a letter from a local Illinois activist, which I received in California. It is dated October 9, 1964, to Mr. Manuel Ruiz, 704 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, California.

Dear Mr. Ruiz:

I want to talk politics with you. I fully support the Immigration Bill proposed by Congressman Ed Derwinsky of Illinois which seeks to reunite families now separated by immigration restrictions.

The Democratic Bill discriminates against Italians, Greeks, Poles and Yugoslavs, but the Republican Bill will allow more of them to come to America.

We are all immigrants or of immigrant stock originally. We wish to continue and improve the immigration system under which our forefathers came to America.

Now, here is a voice from Illinois, 16 years ago, reaching across the the continent for a coalition with an Hispanic-American. I'm a Mexican-American.

The time had not yet arrived.

Perhaps as a Commissioner, in 1979, I will be able to respond to some of the issues here by assisting in the making of policy as envisioned by Mr. John Kromkowski. Issues raised by the National Neighborhood Commission could be a good point of reference for articulation in the 1980's by the Commission.

If we appreciate the fact that white ethnics have also been hurt and subject to discriminatory practices, I think this would tend to fuse the

interests of the various races, because they have something in common. This is also true of the black, Asian or Pacific Islander, on the basis of coalition, particularly as persons of all races become decision makers within our political system, which is rapidly changing from an ethnic point of view with respect to educated persons and intellectuals. And we are here on that basis.

I think this is going to be a very excellent meeting, Mr. Chairman.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Thank you very much. Commissioner Saltzman?

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. In looking through some of these papers you submitted to us in the morning session, I feel somewhat conflicted, because you succeeded in raising issues which apparently have no immediate possible resolution.

You point in your presentations to polarities: Cultural pluralism, versus the creation of a national purpose that forms a cohesive nation. Is not facility in speaking English necessary to a cohesive nation? Perhaps bilingual education is a resolution, by promoting cultural pluralism while also promoting a common language. But is bilingual education succeeding? Are we able to serve both these purposes?

Mr. Levine suggested that English remains a significant vehicle for access to economic opportunity. How can minority language groups succeed in America without English?

There is another thought that is raised in my mind. There seem to me to be other forces at work that enhance the desire of ethnic communities to reinforce their ethnic identity. In the 1970's we are experiencing the breakdown of families, the breakdown of social constraints and disciplines, shared values and the mounting influence of peers over family. You indicated ethnic identity is such a positive benefit in counteracting these negative forces working against family cohesiveness.

And I think these negative forces have tended to intensify the search for self-identity through an ethnic cohesiveness. However, I'm not sure that ethnic culture is adequate today to overcome the confluence of the forces at work against a strong ethnic identification.

You mention the ethnic celebrations, Mr. Kromkowski. I think Mr. Levine pointed to the possibility that that celebration is a very superficial veneer when we celebrate merely foods and dress, perhaps, and nothing really authentic to the historic roots and culture of that ethnic community.

Baltimore, where I now live has a summer-long celebration where different ethnic groups present their ethnic heritage to the community at large on different weekends. Attending some of those, I find they're really very superficial. A few of the native foods, and then everything

else is hot dogs and hamburgers, but no real communication of authentic values emerges from the distinct ethnic culture.

Finally, how do we communicate and share, when within the ethnic community a drastic dilution of authentic identity with a loss of ethnic values has taken place?

Thus, how validly may we look to the neighborhood and the ethnic community within it as a positive force for maintaining the benefits derived from strong ethnic identification, when that strength may have been so weakened already?

MR. LEVINE. Commissioner Saltzman, a lot of it depends on how we invest. We have a program here in Chicago which I'm proud to say the American Jewish Committee has invested a lot of money in. It's the Institute on Pluralism and Group Identities, Midwest Office.

And my colleague, David Roth, is here. He runs five major coalitions in education, mental health, foreign policy, immigration, et cetera. Every one of those coalitions was based originally on a white ethnic coming together. Half of those coalitions are now being led by blacks and Hispanics.

There is an emerging methodology and social technology, if I can use those lousy words, and they are lousy to describe these humanistic things, that we are beginning to learn.

On the west coast we have sponsored an extensive study on ethno-therapy, on how you recoup one's group identity in the most intensive way we know how. It was started by Dr. Price Cob who was a major black psychiatrist and carried on by Dr. Judith Weidsdenklein, a Jewish psychologist. It's leading to, in my opinion, a revolutionary approach to what is Jewish identity, how is it created, and where does it go.

Now, we're just at the beginning stage of the acceptance of our diversity. We ought not to ask for too much yet, except the fact that the Government be at least a benign partner, you know, in not interfering. That's been the problem. The problem has been the Government has been interfering.

We'd like it to be a little more aggressive in a positive kind of overlay to allow these hundred blossoms to flower. We're frightened that sometimes the Government wants to move in and squash some this diversity and variety, because it doesn't fit the particular moment in history that decides how it will administer its business.

That's one of the problems. You mentioned bilingualism. Somebody just reminded me that the Foreign Language Association just came out with a report. I think you've seen it reported. We're the most abysmal nation in the world in the mastery of foreign languages. If one will take the last 25 years of our foreign policy and take a look at the massive

failures, I don't think I would get too much of an argument to say it has been miserably culturally insensitive to others.

We train people to be imperialists, literally psychological imperialists, and they lose for us. They lose all over the world. We have the most magnificent multiethnic capacity in this society. We send blacks to Denmark; that's what we used to do.

Now, something is the matter with our thinking, and I think if you take a look at the emergence of the multiethnic society and the positiveness that's been presented and will be presented in the next two days, sure there are fears; sure there are ambivalences. That's the whole story.

Where do we lean? Well, we lean toward the positive end of this thing, or we conjure up fears that did not even take place. My God, the fear that we had 10 years ago of the so-called Black Revolt. First of all, where is it, and whom did it do any harm to? I would say, the social conscience of this country was transformed to a degree – not enough – by the so called Black Ethnic Revolt. That's what it was.

We're too fearful about these things, because we have very little confidence in our own society.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Any other reactions?

MR. KROMKOWSKI. Comment one—the neighborhood focus is not a panacea, but it is one dimension of the work. The question of festivals being more than food, fun, and famous people is emerging. We're becoming much more sensitive to that reality today.

In fact, there are some culturally perverted dimensions that are even more insidious than the superficiality you point to.

Groups have stopped indigenous cultural development to get ready for the festival, so that they can put some money together; so they start making sausages all year, and they forget the language classes and moral development.

Now, we're remedying that in a couple of ways; one, by calling this fact to the attention of groups, if they don't already know it. NCUEA has two video tapes, film presentations that in fact explore this dimension, and we'd be happy to share those with you.

Our NEH Project with Virginia Cassiano, Bill Wattman and Olivia Cadaval just completed this film and it will be for national distribution. Another film, *Festivals are More than Food and Fun* is very, very sensitive to the superficiality issue.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Any comments over here?

MS. ALBERTI. Yes, I don't think that the festivals and celebrations are superficial. I think, to a degree they may be, but I think that they do represent attitudes and feelings of strong family pride and strong ethnic identity; and probably the reason why they're becoming so popular now is for the first time ethnic people feel that they don't

have to hide who they are and where they came from, and they're interested in celebrating in a very public way.

That, in addition to the fact that people who don't identify as ethnic like the celebration because they feel that there's something lacking in their own life, in their own identity.

MR. KOVACH. To follow up on a more mundane note, I think there's a great popularization of ethnicity. Today you can go shopping at the supermarket and get frozen lasagna, blintzes, pirogi, and a variety of other ethnic foods all prepared and ready to heat and eat!

I think of America as the great ethnic smorgasbord. That the foods are being shared is only a beginning. It has always been a very important part of the European tradition.

I agree that if the celebration only focuses on food, then we are at a superficial level. Also, many of those festivals are run by political organizations, and some politicians still don't know what ethnicity is all about. They call upon their own people year after year to do these festivals without understanding their potential.

If the organizers of festivals would say, "Let's go beyond superficiality; let's do festivals that get us really at the roots of culture", then we'll see a difference. And there are those festivals, I think what John has talked about is a good example.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Before I get to my own questions, let me ask Mr. Nunez, do you have any questions?

STAFF DIRECTOR NUNEZ. Yes, one question to Irving and Mr. Kromkowski.

You know, I spoke before your group seven years ago, and I indicated that I did not see any major conflict between the cultural pluralism movement and the civil rights movement.

But, Mr. Kromkowski, you indicated that our agenda for the 1980's perhaps could be to get behind a program to strengthen the role of the neighborhoods, and I go back to what the Civil Rights Commission is. It is a Civil Rights Commission, and on the idea of strengthening neighborhoods as a value in our society, I could probably agree with you. But how does that connect with the issue of discrimination in our society, given the context of this Commission? This is not the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The issue of strengthening the cities, creating an urban renaissance, is a useful concept in our society, and I think any thinking person would endorse those concepts.

But within the context of the Civil Rights Commission, how do you see the agenda of urban or Euro-ethnic America focusing on the issues of civil rights?

Mr. Levine and Mr. Kromkowski?

MR. LEVINE. I do see a relationship to the preservation of neighborhoods that are decent and the capacity of minorities to live in a decent neighborhood.

One of the greatest problems with neighborhoods is that when there is light—call it life light if you will—what you have is neighborhoods that are reduced in terms of their capacity to deal even with the incoming population.

So you have a problem, really, of even the transfer of economic development, social development, all of the developmental ideas that come from what we're talking about; these natural networks and helping systems that come from ethnicity.

I happen to believe that an integrated neighborhood can achieve those same goals, and there are many, many integrated neighborhoods in this country. I grew up in a black, Jewish neighborhood 40 years ago, and there were disparities between the blacks and the Jews.

So it's the networks that have broken down today. They were not as badly in disrepair as they are today. Let's just say that there were networks, churches, and boys clubs. I was the President of the Brownsville Boys Club, a club of 2,000 boys, and we provided immense service to blacks and Jews. That was the nature of the neighborhood.

What I'm saying is that we have models of more naturally formed integrated neighborhoods that have existed for a long time.

What we intend to do in the practice of antidiscrimination is, as I said before, single-minded, and the implementation of antidiscrimination against the possibility of breaking down these networks. I would say to study the way in which antidiscrimination is implemented, so that one would maintain whatever strengths there should be in the neighborhood, so even neighborhoods that are willing or even unwilling to receive others and have to receive others will have the strengths so that others can benefit by it.

Absolutely essential, in my way of thinking, as neighborhoods change, and even when neighborhoods do not change but are either forced or willingly integrated, if we break down those networks, which we have been doing, by the way, unconsciously, by a certain kind of post antidiscrimination action, we're not doing anybody any good.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. You raise a very interesting point, I think, in terms of the counterproductivity in the long run of some Federal actions as opposed to an examination of success stories at the grass roots —

MR. LEVINE. Absolutely.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. —Where people have worked within a network of an existing neighborhood—

MR. LEVINE. Absolutely. I am saying that--

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. --To get others admitted to that neighborhood.

MR. LEVINE. --There are other ways to enforce anti-discrimination. And those better ways ought to be the ways that the United States Civil Rights Commission --

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. All right. I have to move along to some additional questions, if I might.

Mr. Nunez, did you have any other questions?

Mr. White, did you have any question you wished to ask?

ASSISTANT STAFF DIRECTOR WHITE. Let me make an observation. I happen to have grown up in a city in which we had this diversity that Irving Levine speaks of, and Kovach knew from Cleveland.

And I went to school with students whose name ranged from Sam Vecchio to Lucian Nardi to Ray Kominowski, and I recall that when I was working and going to school, most of the fellow workers happened to be representatives of those ethnic groups as well as blacks.

The only point I want to make here, is that there were very few, if any, Anglos, or Caucasians -- WASPS, and I simply wanted to relate to what John Kromkowski said; that while perhaps Ray Kallinowski was not hitting it in the head, is co-wondering and I was aware of that.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Very good. What I'd like to do is pursue, in the remaining minutes, with each of the panelists, some of the questions that I elicited from their testimony and that I am unclear about. And I would like to see if we can secure a succinct answer, because I have a lot of ground to cover, and I would appreciate that.

Mr. Levine, you made reference to the undocumented worker issue and claimed that there could be unity, I assumed, in focusing on that issue from the various ethnic groups, which would include various racial groups, as I understood your testimony.

I wonder if you could succinctly tell me, what did you mean by that? It was not clear.

MR. LEVINE. I was sitting in Chicago and I remember the sweep of the Immigration Service in rounding up Polish charwomen, and I was thinking of those kinds of sweeps that take place against Hispanics in this country, and I know that the ire of the Polish community and the other ethnics was unbelievable in this community, that such a thing should happen.

What I'm saying is that fair treatment, due process, constitutionalism, human rights, even for aliens, are things that many of the ethnic groups would back; and in this case, since the principal group seen in this society as having the undocumented migrant issue is Hispanics,

this is a good place where you would have some coalitions that would related to the needs of Hispanics.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. When you noted that many Government policies have led to family dissolution, you didn't name them. Are you talking about the Aid to Dependent Children policy, et cetera?

MR. LEVINE. I would say that Government policy, in general, is culturally insensitive, does not realize that my mother is not going to pick up the food stamps because it's just not done in my family, but she has as much need for that aid as somebody who's picking up the food stamps.

And I'd like to see policies which give people the right to pick up Government services in a culturally sensitive and choice way. So we're talking about options that people have, based upon the religious-cultural-ethnic-racial life styles. And one of the biggest problems of this society was the mislabeling of the black family. Look at the consequences we've had from not understanding the interior workings of the black family.

Public policy is so out of whack with what the reality of the black family is, that in trying to do the black family some good, we've often done it harm.

I would say that if you looked at the Jewish family, the Italian family and others, if you're going to have a population planning program, a lot of Jews will say, "Include us out". We are the smallest minority in terms of fertility, we're not reproducing ourselves, and what we want is help from you as Government to allow our husbands and wives to have more children if they want to have more children, without the unbelievable burden of parenthood today.

That's what I mean by cultural and ethnic sensitivity.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Okay.

Ms. Aliberti, you mentioned this problem of the original origin of the immigrant to fill very critical labor shortages in our society. A lot of people have said, well, that opportunity doesn't exist anymore, the chance that people had to work their way up. Yet, in a way it must exist, when you think of the undocumented workers who are estimated to range between one and 12 million and who are not limited to Hispanics, it just was mentioned that they could be Polish people in Chicago, East Europeans, Canadians, et cetera, in Detroit, so forth.

I wonder, have you given much thought to the degree to which undocumented workers are able to find jobs in our society? And yet, we still have substantial unemployment for domestic American citizens, both white ethnics and minority youths in particular. And to what degree, as you look at the historical past does the opportunity still exist to work one's way up from fairly low-level, unskilled jobs in society?

MS. ALIBERTI. Well, I think when the immigrants in the 1800's and the 1900's came here, they were welcomed here because there was a need because of industrialization ' to fill these jobs.

Now that we have become much more mechanized, there is less of a need, but there is still a group of people here that are filling those jobs. They're not the early immigrants because they've gone on to other things; more often than not into skilled labor.

I think this is a problem that's going to continue as long as we have a high rate of immigrants coming into this country, whether they're sort of the traditional white ethnics or the Hispanics, or whatever group they are.

There's always going to be a group that is perceived as unskilled and will be filling a particular need.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Well, I just find it rather ironic that millions of people can come to this country and do find work and are undocumented workers. And in a sense, that's what immigration waves in the 19th century and early part of the 20th century also found, and yet we have high unemployment among many domestics.

Now, some would say it's the wage rate structure; Americans won't do that type of work, et cetera, et cetera. And yet, people who are very conscientious, hard workers, are taking those jobs in restaurants, car washes, gasoline stations, homes, et cetera, et cetera, and in a sense getting a piece of the action.

You see this with the documented workers, the refugees, if you will, coming in from East Asia who are working industriously this way.

On page 3 of your paper, you mention that the Italian immigrant's view of the family was much more exclusionary. Is that really a matter so much of national origin as religion, and I wonder if you could comment on that with regard to other immigrant groups who have come to this country, in terms of their view of the family?

MS. ALIBERTI. Well, I think what I was trying to say, in terms of the Italian-Americans, is that they were not terribly concerned. They were concerned about the community in that it created a threat to the family, but their family unit was very tight.

I think Jewish families and Greek families have a very tight family unit, but not to the extent that the Italians do.

And what I was trying to say here is because it was such a rigid, family-oriented culture, they wouldn't go, if they had particular needs, to educational institutions to have those needs met. And they wouldn't push their children into particular occupations.

They have gone into occupations—for example, women, when they were educated, went into the traditional jobs in teaching, et cetera, because it didn't infringe on the family and bringing up the children; that was their role in life.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. You raised another point on Page 22 which several other witnesses have also commented on.

You state, "The lack of sensitivity" of the Federal Government "is further advanced by research agencies in the Government which make little effort to identify this group as one which, like other minorities, has specific needs."

We've heard comments on the very poor nature of the Census in identifying ethnic groups so you could use these data as a basis for public policy. In a nutshell, I'm curious what the panelists are advocating.

Are you advocating a more detailed codification of ethnicity? There could be a hundred categories, I would think, here, and I'd like to know just what are we searching for?

MS. ALIBERTI. Well, one of the problems that I saw, when I was putting together the Conference on the Educational and Occupational Needs of White Ethnic Women, was that almost all the research that research agencies like NIE and other research institutes were doing, were never thinking in terms of looking at the cultural factors which would determine why a person would get an education or not get an education.

They were looking at racial factors very often and factors regarding sex, but they wouldn't look in terms of the cultural background and the traditions and things of that nature.

And I'm suggesting that unless we are sensitive to that, you're not going to get a very accurate picture. What Irv said about, you know, people going on food stamps, getting food stamps, or medical care facilities for working-class people, or going to college for working-class women, or getting financial aid for college students in working-class areas--unless you're sensitive to those issues, then you'll never qualify for any of these programs.

The Vocational Education Act doesn't look at cultural diversity at all, and as a result it looks at handicapped; it looks at a whole lot of different areas, but it doesn't look in terms of cultural diversity in developing vocational education programs.

That's a critical issue that has to be addressed.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Mr. Kovach?

MR. KOVACH. We're talking about the 1980 Census and obviously there is going to be some reapportionment. We're going to redraw the lines by which we define ourselves politically, and you know the old gerrymandering that goes on. There is a lot of concern being expressed by Euro-ethnic Americans as well as others that those who live in the central cities are going to be affected by the 1980 Census with regard to their political power and their voice in decision making. The Census on one hand gives us certain information, like the quality of our

housing, but on the other hand, in each decade it's also divided us up and often against each other.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Let me suggest to the members of the panel, if you have some thoughts on what the Federal Government ought to be doing in specific types of census questions, I would appreciate each of you filing them with the Staff Director so they could become a part of the record.

We're a little pushed for time now to pursue this.

MR. LEVINE. Yes. May I make one general suggestion?

The entire area of racial and ethnic categories and the status in law is one that terribly needs study, and I would suggest that this is one of the major areas of concern that the United States Civil Rights Commission should take up.

How are those categories defined, what is their origin in history, and what is the prognosis for the way in which these categories are going to be used?

I couldn't think of anything more useful you might do.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. I think it is a good suggestion. As you know, we pursued the Spanish under-count situation in the 1970 Census. Some change was made as a result of that.

Let me just say, on Page 23 of your testimony, Miss Aliberti, I'm asking the Staff Director to ask the Office of Education for a breakdown of the grants that have been made under the Ethnic Heritage Study Act, so that we could know to what type of groups these grants have gone and how much money have been involved in that. I think that's important.

MS. ALIBERTI. I think the fact that you will be looking into that would be very important.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. I would like to merely make a comment on your suggestion, which came out in your oral summary, that there be a sort of neighborhood community college.

As an educator, you make a good point in perhaps an initial transition step, but I often wonder if you would be only talking to each other as people in the neighborhood, and if people have no outside views, whether they will really advance too much in breaking down some of their parochial or insular ideas.

MS. ALIBERTI. I think you're absolutely right. I think that this will fill a particular need, and maybe it's a transitional step, and for some women or men it might be the only step they want or need.

But I don't think it's the only thing that should be done. I think it's just one of the areas, and after a 2-year degree program, like the National Congress of Neighborhood Women in Brooklyn, after that type of program, they might want to go into a regular 4-year college, or university or go for advanced degrees.

I think, I stand corrected if that isn't true, I think many of them have done that.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Mr. Kovach, my colleagues covered your testimony, I think, very well. I just have two remaining questions, Mr. Kromkowski.

I noticed on Page 2, you state, "In 1979 many scholars, policy analysts, and others agree that the neighborhood is a neglected unit of American urban life," and of course that's been a theme many of you have stressed this morning.

When you look at how the media covers what occurs in a neighborhood, I think we all understand that they cover conflict. The media seldom seeks to gain an understanding of what really goes on in a neighborhood.

But certainly, when we use that inflammatory work "busing", I would think that runs counter to the concept of neighborhood, in the sense of removing individuals from a particular neighborhood to go to school in another neighborhood; and I wonder, if that is so, how does that really aid in trying to build the coalition you were seeking?

In other words, if you're moving people out of the neighborhood, generating this type of hostility, is that counterproductive to coalition-building?

MR. KROMKOWSKI. Are you pushing me on the question of direct response to the strategy of busing?

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. That's right

MR. KROMKOWSKI. It seems to me that one of the dimensions that is sorely neglected in this area is the whole role of private, nonexclusionary schools.

They have in fact been a neglected factor in the research about what the educational situation is in many of the older industrial areas in the Northwest and the Midwest.

The question about whether or not the best use of resources is in fact gained by moving people from neighborhoods to schools is a question that we don't know a good deal about.

I think, by and large, the students must be educated for life in the entire city. What the best strategy is for allowing that to happen, and maintaining quality education and a variety of programs, it seems to me, is much more important than the miracle juggling that has been the activity of the Courts and not the activity that is central to the process of bringing children into a society that they must not only be productive in, but that they must be culturally sensitive to.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Well, I think one could argue it probably either way, depending on what happens. One could say, that the way you build a coalition is to get people out of the neighborhood who are

involved with people from other neighborhoods, where they share common interests.

Certainly, the education of children is one such common interest.

MR. KROMKOWSKI. Well, one of the problems of answering the question in terms of a national agenda, is that the situations within which you make prudential judgments about what activity is more efficacious move one to the point of recognizing the *sui generis* features of cities i.e., less strongly important particularities.

If you don't have a private school system in place, then you might as well move children around so that they can become educated somewhere. If you have a private situation that is in place, then you've got another arrangement within which you make your decisions.

Alternate schools, magnet schools, a variety of programs that are interesting, a kind of mix with the engagement of the private sector, in terms of the development of jobs; that seem to me is an entirely different question.

I mean are high schools utterly important for the 1980's or is the question of alternate education within institutions, within cooperatives, within neighborhood rehabilitation corporations, within the humanities that are neighborhood based—I think that the agenda for the 1980's has to explore a variety of alternatives within the urban context.

But to simply talk about busing as one of the dimensions without probing more deeply is—leads us to the kind of guilt that's simply saying neighborhood revitalization is urban panacea.

Cities are made of neighborhoods, but they're also cities, and people do in fact have to become educated, and how that happens varies from place to place. A simple answer about busing moves us to the point where discussion is utterly irrelevant; i.e., misses the trees which constitute the forest.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Well, one obvious strategy when you're talking about what can the public schools that represent the broader public of the city do, is to locate schools on borderline areas between neighborhoods to provide a vehicle for integration. But when you look at many cities around the country, that is not what has been done.

They have lost the opportunity, often consciously, to do that and simply planted the school in the middle of the so-called ethnic area, which has led to much of the tension when you are trying to overcome governmental segregation.

MR. LEVINE. But you can also say that there's a value in having a neighborhood school as well as a more cosmopolitan school at the same time.

The idea is that you might have both kinds of schools at the same time, and let me suggest something for the United States Commission—that you give more attention, in the future, to the climate of intergroup

relations in the classroom that exist as a result of desegregation, however that desegregation takes place.

As somebody who has helped write three desegregation plans, which all included extensive busing, I have seen every one of them turn into resegregation. I have become a new skeptic about my activities and everybody else's activities, especially when at this particular point in history, if we look in the actual classroom and in the school, we see a deterioration in the integration idea; we see racial and ethnic violence in the schools; we see hostility growing.

We do not see a sense of honesty on our own part in taking a look at the results of what is really supposed to be a very good idea. Now, let the shoe fit. Where the idea works, wonderful; but where it is not working and is creating more intensive problems than we even had before, we ought to be able to document that as well as documenting successes.

I've studied the United States Commission on Civil Rights reports and I hail you for finding all the desegregation successes. I think you have an equal responsibility to take a look at what's happening in some schools where it's not working and come up with some remedial measures as well.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. May I say, usually most of the Commissioners feel we only find the failures and we very seldom stress the successes, so I'm glad you perceive it as stressing the successes.

We will be holding a major hearing on desegregation this summer and hopefully we can get at some of the points you are talking about, which we realize are very real concerns in terms of: You can have desegregation in the schools and segregation—or between schools and segregation within the schools; and we acknowledge that.

Let me just say in summary, it seems to me, one of the issues that we have only hinted at once or twice this morning and have not directly addressed, is the whole economic class issue which cuts across ethnicity, race, et cetera, and the gulf of differences which that causes in terms of upward mobility opportunities.

MR. LEVINE. I can only say that inflation unemployment is not good for us.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. That's correct; that's correct.

Second Session: Housing and Ethnicity

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Commissioner Freeman.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This session this afternoon we will have two presenters and a reacting panel.

Arthur Naparstek is the Director of the University of Southern California's Washington Public Affairs Center and a Professor of Public Administration. Recently he served as a Commissioner on the National Commission on Neighborhoods and a Task Panel Member of the President's Commission on Mental Health. He has also served on the White House Domestic Council since 1970, has written extensively and testified often before Congress on urban policy, and holds Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctoral degrees in the field of social welfare. Mr. Naparstek.

**STATEMENT OF ARTHUR J. NAPARSTEK
DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON PUBLIC AFFAIRS CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA**

Madame Chair, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, thank you very much for inviting me to your consultation. I'm pleased to be here.

I'd like for my remarks to be seen within the context of neighborhoods. I will be discussing housing within the context of geographic discrimination.

To begin with, I'd like to start on a personal note. Several years ago, I had the opportunity to bring my now 9-year-old son back to New York City where I grew up, on the Lower East Side of New York.

My parents came to this country in the early 1930's from Poland. I grew up in a neighborhood of the Lower East Side of New York that was characterized by multiracial, ethnic communities. It had what we now call, in sociological jargon, organizational and cultural networks. What they were were synagogues, churches, ethnic clubs, paternal organizations.

Those networks, or mediating institutions, those institutions that connected individuals and families to the megastructures, those big structures, the public school system, the general hospital, et cetera, played such an important role in my life on the Lower East Side of New York in providing support for individual and family life.

It was a neighborhood in many ways that had problems, but one of its major strengths was that authority came from within the neighborhood. It was not imposed from outside.

As kids, we would get in trouble with the police for playing what we called then stickball on the street with a broomstick and a pink old ball. We'd hit somebody over the head, we'd break a window, et cetera.

If the police mistreated us, they were shamed because they were part of those networks. If we mistreated the police, my father was shamed because he was part of the same network, and a great deal of trouble.

The neighborhood I took my boy back to was alive 30 years ago with a sense of belonging, tradition, and roots. It has since been replaced by architecturally grim and administratively monolithic public housing projects. A new type of slum was created, one with little hope of culture and community, one in which gangs, violence and alienation abound, a direct result of the 1948 Public Housing Act – not by the 1937-38 Housing Act, which was good housing and had respect for individual and family life and neighborhoods.

The second neighborhood I visited was where my father had his cleaning store, and that was in the South Bronx. You've all read and seen on TV what's happened to the South Bronx.

I remember the South Bronx in the 1940's and '50's of Italian, Jewish, black, Irish neighborhoods. Today the South Bronx is a wasteland; it is a wasteland. Abandoned housing abounds. Two years ago it was reported there were 60 fires a night there in the abandoned housing.

Secretary Harris, in touring the South Bronx three years ago with President Carter, said, "Did this come from President Nixon's administration?" No, it did not.

It started in the '40's. It was the worst form of racial steering by the public officials of New York City, steering close to one million Puerto Ricans in two neighborhoods of New York, Spanish East Harlem and the South Bronx, without providing the adequate supports.

It was the kind of arrogant planning, urban planning, of Robert Moses, in terms of separating the South Bronx from the rest of the city by building highways and tearing down those organizational and cultural support systems, mediating structures, churches and synagogues, et cetera the worst form of racial steering.

The third neighborhood of my youth – Brooklyn Heights. My extended family lived there. Again, multi-ethnic, multi-racial in the '40's and '50's, beautiful brownstone houses. I go back there now and we would need \$300,000 to buy a house, \$300,000.

My family was totally pushed out of that neighborhood as were many of the other people there. The shame of that is that many of the people who lived there were elderly, and it came to the point where if they owned the housing their property taxes were greater than their initial mortgages; and because many of them were on a fixed income, the neighborhood as we call it – and I'll deal with it in my written statement – was gentrified and people were displaced.

Those are the three neighborhoods. In many ways, I see those three neighborhoods as neighborhoods that are duplicated throughout the entire United States.

I see it in Baltimore; I see it happening in Lower Fels Point, Upper Fels Point of Baltimore; we see it in Washington in terms of

gentrification and displacement of people in Washington, D.C., and we see it in this city as well.

One of the lessons, I think, is that people lost control in each one of those neighborhoods. They lost control both of the macroforces and the microforces, social and economic forces that impacted on them, and that is a negative thing.

The issue came up this morning in terms of how do you mesh the issues of ethnicity, class, and race. I found, by looking at it within the neighborhood context, you do develop – you have the options and the potential of developing – a public policy which gives conceptual handles on the issues of ethnicity, class and race, looking at it through neighborhoods.

A second experience, very briefly, is working with Mayor Hatcher in Gary, Indiana, a mayor whom I consider to be one of the finest in the country. He's entering now his fourth term. A city that had great potential.

But I go back there now and it looks bombed out. It looks like a wasteland, yet Mayor Hatcher I believe to be one of the best mayors in the United States.

Why? Many mistakes were made. We saw things in macrostrategies. We defined problems as macroproblems, the war on poverty, for example. We assumed that poverty in Gary was the same as poverty in Cincinnati, Cleveland, Toledo, wherever; New York. We did not deal with the differences, both within a region as well as within the city. We did not look at the neighborhoods.

For example, we spent millions of dollars on model cities in Gary, Indiana, but we did it in an area that was being redlined, right after your Civil Rights Commission in 1968 came up with the issues of redlining. We still went ahead and did it. We did not deal with those disincentives that are structured into the system that create negative preconditions and make it impossible for anything to work, redlining being one of them.

Several years ago, with my colleague from Chicago, Gale Cincotta, we wrote that we did not look at the "systemic origins of urban decline". We have not recognized them. We have not looked at the preconditions for change.

Instead of perceiving that the deterioration of our cities is rooted in certain institutionalized policies, attitudes and practices, the tendency has been often to respond to symptoms. Structured into the system in most cities are processes which lead to discrimination and inequity. We don't look at those and we don't deal with those head-on.

"The former is directed towards race", and in many instances toward ethnicity, and the latter toward the physical properties of the neighborhood.

One discriminates against individuals; the other discriminates against entire communities, and I have found, when these are operating, we can expect tensions to increase between the races and between ethnic groups and the decline of this city to accelerate.

So, in spite of billions of dollars spent since 1938-39, we have not looked at those preconditions that are necessary for the effective expenditure of that money.

I feel in many ways, with the number of colleagues in this room and on the panel, that I've been part of a new movement that does bring this together, and it's the neighborhood movement.

And I feel in many ways the neighborhood movement has looked at the issues of discrimination that affect racial and ethnic groups. A key one is around geographical discrimination, and I will discuss some of the aspects of geographic discrimination.

The U.S. Civil Rights Commission has done very good work in legitimizing this issue, in terms of redlining, home mortgages, redlining related to home mortgages, as well as redlining related to insurance. I note that in my paper in terms of your Advisory Commissions in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota and Wisconsin, Advisory Committees to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission in terms of the work you've done on insurance redlining; I congratulate you. More needs to be done, however.

Forms of geographic discrimination, redlining, are based on concepts of risk. Lenders and insurance companies invest the funds at their disposal in hope of future returns.

However, the key issue here is it is not an objective judgment. It is not a straight economic judgment, as I'm sure you know. It's very, very subjective, very, very subjective.

I wondered about that. Why is it so subjective? And I went up to our good library at HUD to find out and I traced back to the early papers, back to '34 and '35, to get some sense as to how all this subjectivity entered into the transaction of lending money.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board was established in 1933 to regulate savings and loans. It was established precisely for the purpose of providing for the credit needs and thrift needs of inner city residents, to help them.

However, what also occurred in 1933 and 1934 were a number of other theories about neighborhoods based on several myths. Let me explain that.

There were three myths that we were able to identify. One is that older neighborhoods, either through natural forces or the competition of the marketplace, invariably decline and move toward blight as they filter into the hands of poorer residents, a bias against older neighborhoods.

Second, racial change is a precursor of decline, a bias against racial change.

Third, mixed land uses or the introduction of commercial or industrial uses into residential areas indicates and contributes to decline.

These three myths all stem from the same root and can be treated under a single discussion.

These myths grew out of ideas developed in the 1920's and '30's about the nature of people and investment. The human ecology model developed at the University of Chicago viewed neighborhoods as being subject to invasion and attack – those words were used – by racial and ethnic groups, with the group most suitable to a particular environment finally winning that ground as demonstrated through universally applied laws of nature.

The point that was raised earlier this morning in terms of people's identity is that we have been so acculturated – I think it was the point from the Commissioner from Baltimore – so acculturated to give up our identity, because by giving up our identity, we were reducing risk.

Racial and ethnic changes were seen as critical factors in this decline, giving the work of the early housing people in this country a very racist, anti-ethnic, anti-lower-income group bend, and that's where the issues of ethnicity, race and class came together.

These theories were not the idle speculation of ivory tower academics; some who developed the theories had indirect and direct roles in establishing Federal policy toward neighborhoods in the '30's. Indirectly, their ideas were accepted as gospel by a generation of bankers, insurance men, real estate appraisers, public officials and others.

Directly, their work formed the core of the policies of the Federal Housing Administration, created in 1934 to deal with the problems of housing in urban America.

One such theorist was commissioned to write a number of documents and papers for the FHA and another was, for a time, in charge of writing and implementing the underwriters, the FHA underwriters and real estate appraisal standards.

I reviewed those several weeks ago in preparation for this testimony. The first Federal Housing Administration manual was published in 1934, and I put this forth to suggest that, yes, these issues are no longer in the Underwriters' Manual, but the attitudes are still there, and let me talk about what some of those attitudes were that were established in 1934.

Some of the risk categories established included things like visual appeal of the property, livability of the property, conformity of the property to the neighborhood, the degree of protection of the

neighborhood against inharmonious land use, the physical and social attractiveness of the neighborhood, and the relative marketability of the neighborhood.

These risk categories explicitly state the bias toward conformity and homogeneity of property, use, and residents. Tremendous emphasis is placed on new developments, with a clear prejudice against older, established neighborhoods being present. Older areas are seen as clearly less desirable.

If you look in more precise terms at the various sections, you see other factors that were thought to contribute to neighborhood decline: declining population, both in terms of numbers and desirability; a lack of protective covenants – can you believe that? – a lack of appropriate zoning; inharmonious racial and nationality groups, stated very clearly; appeal of the neighborhood; the stability of the neighborhood; and degree of protection from adverse influences.

And in fact—in fact, in their work, they rank ordered various ethnic groups, based on impressionistic information about adverse effects on neighborhood communication by one wealthy real estate broker.

The ranking reads in descending order from those with the best to those with the worst impact. Listen to this: English, German, Scotch, Irish, Scandinavians were the best. North Italians were second. Bohemians and Czechs were third; Poles were fourth; Lithuanians fifth; Greeks sixth; Russian, Jews, lower class – in parentheses – were seventh; South Italians were eighth; Negroes nine; and Mexicans tenth.

I can go on with this kind of horror story, so that the point being that in many ways those attitudes are still with us. We see, in terms of the manuals and the letters, the pervasiveness of the prevailing notions about what risk was, how it was affected by different factors, and how to assess it for use in determining when a loan application should be approved.

I saw it in this city in 1970 when we did a study looking at redlining, and we took one zip code, 60622, which is West Division Street, made up of at that time Italian, Polish, Puerto Rican, and black neighborhoods. We found that of \$33 million on deposit at the local savings and loan, only \$90,000 had been returned to the neighborhood in terms of loans.

And when talking to the bankers and others and, in fact, the city officials, they had a perceived sense of risk that was not all that different from Babcock and Hoyt of 40 years ago or so.

FHA, a Federal agency, was explicitly involved in making subjective judgments that had real and direct results, decisions whether or not to accept loan applications, and I might add I saw that happen in the South Bronx in the 1950's.

The judgments were based on certain myths about the real estate market and neighborhoods and demonstrated openly racist, anti-ethnic, anti-lower-income biases, and do you know what happens? The blacks blame the whites and the whites blame the blacks, but before the whites begin blaming the blacks, they're blaming each other. The Poles are blaming the Italians and the Italians are blaming somebody else.

And in Los Angeles you find it in terms of Asians, Chicanos, blacks and whites, and it gets very, very difficult to deal with; and until we were able to have a data base that shows, hey, it wasn't the blacks, it wasn't the Hispanics, it wasn't the Latinos, it wasn't the ethnics, it was the banks, then we could get a coalition going.

There are other forms of geographic discrimination that I'd like to take a few moments and talk about and show how some of these attitudes are still with us in terms of the FHA Underwriters' Manual.

City government discriminates geographically in a variety of ways. We find, for example, that most cities follow resource allocation among neighborhoods, distributing money and other resources according to some pattern designed to meet city objectives.

In my city of Washington, D.C., I live in Northwest Washington, right on the Maryland line – it's called Chevy Chase, D.C. – we get garbage pickup twice a week in our neighborhood. We do not need garbage pickup twice a week in our neighborhood. We probably need it once a week. There are other neighborhoods of our city that need garbage pickup three or four times a week.

If something should happen, God forbid, a policeman will arrive within three minutes. In other neighborhoods a policeman may never arrive.

These are various forms of discrimination in terms of city services.

What happened, as I recall, in the South Bronx when I worked in my father's cleaning store as a boy of 13 or 14 was that in neighborhoods that are perceived as going down the tubes, city officials become somewhat corrupt.

All of a sudden the Fire Inspector came by and wanted a handout. The Housing Inspector came by and wanted a handout, wanted a bribe. If you didn't give them, they would close up. The Health Inspector, the same kind of thing.

People lose a degree of accountability because the mechanisms that provide for accountability are destroyed. City services begin to decline.

I think one of the real policy issues in city government is, should city services be based on equity which means sameness, all neighborhoods being treated the same – I'm sorry – should city services be based on the notion of equality, which means sameness, or should they be based

on the notions of equity, which means fairness? I think it should be based in terms of equity.

Garbage pickup – big, big issue, as I indicated. Residents of older neighborhoods are generally older people who are more dependent on public services. In our work in Newark, New Jersey, several years ago, we found that to be true, yet, again, what happens is the city services continue to decline, and those who have the option will move out; those who do not have the option are forced into living a life of quiet desperation, or sometimes not so quiet.

Another form of geographic discrimination, which is again a soft issue, but involves the use of human services, is public health and human services generally, mental health as well.

We have just – my colleague– whom you will be hearing from tomorrow – David Biegel and I have been carrying out a two-city study in Baltimore and Milwaukee, looking at mental health services to ethnic, working-class populations.

One of several of our general conclusions is that, one, we live in a system, a human service system, that does not respect pluralism. There is an assumption as you heard this morning that everybody is going to deal with crisis in the same kind of way.

Our human service delivery system is monocultural, yet we know that blacks from the South will deal differently with crisis than blacks with second, third generation in the North, who will deal differently than Jews, who will deal differently than Italians.

Different people have different needs and they will meet their needs in different ways. Yet we find our policies, the Community Mental Health Act of 1963, the Title 20 amendments of the Social Security Act, \$3 billion of human service money, and many of our Title 19 in terms of health care.

We find that they are structured in such a way that it becomes very, very difficult for those people who are in the most degree of trouble to make the use of that money. It's all trickled down either from the Federal level to the neighborhood, or from the State level, through the city and then to the neighborhood, and very, very little of it gets to the neighborhood. There are several other issues that need to be dealt with in terms of geographic discrimination.

We have gone into, without being explicit, a notion of triage. Triage comes out of World War I, as you may know.

We look at those neighborhoods that have the best chance of survival and we ignore those that are in the most trouble. That may make sense in terms of economic necessity, but it ignores attendant human tragedies.

HUD itself has been a culprit through the work of a good colleague, Tony Downs and others, who have typed certain kinds of neighbor-

hoods, and we have not looked at the human dimensions of those neighborhoods. They've defined neighborhoods in a very generic sense and tried to put some kind of unified perspective on it, but we have not looked at the people who live in those neighborhoods.

Neighborhoods should not be defined in many ways by people outside it. That's a complicated issue, and perhaps in the questions and answers I can get more into that.

The whole issue of gentrification displacement is a major, major problem. Let me just make one point in terms of the deep personalization that exists in Washington bureaucracies right now toward the people we're supposed to be serving.

I was on an elevator at HUD and I heard very good people at HUD talking like this. If you take a 235 program and link it to Section 8 and tie it to Section 202 and link it to 312, you'll have a dynamite neighborhood revitalization program going.

Never once did they talk about people. So what do they do? They parachute a 312 program in the South End of Boston and it becomes gentrified, and you kick and you displace most of the people there.

That's what I'm talking about. Same kind of thing is happening with Title 20 and some of these other programs.

Real quick, my recommendations, and there are about six pages of them, really fall into three general areas: administrative and regulatory; many of them will not need new legislation, although I urge the Commission to urge the Congress to outlaw geographic discrimination, to strengthen the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, to strengthen the Community Re-Investment Act, et cetera.

The second area is around the whole notion of capacity building for partnerships, for partnerships with parity, where each of the partners has some degree of power; the third set of recommendations is around empowerment of community groups.

And I'd be very happy to go into those at another time. Thank you for your patience.

[The complete paper follows]

GEOGRAPHIC DISCRIMINATION

By Arthur J. Naparstek and Chester D. Haskell *

After many years of struggle, the people of America's neighborhoods have begun to succeed in making decision makers at all levels of government aware of the importance of the neighborhood focus in

* University of Southern California, Washington Public Affairs Center

urban policy. While such recognition has led to numerous actions that have helped people in neighborhoods, there is still a great deal wrong with the way our public and private policies deal with the people who make up the neighborhoods of our cities.

Almost 4 years ago, Naparstek and Cincotta wrote of the failure of urban policies and programs. One reason for this failure, they argued, was the tendency to see problems on a grand scale, ignoring the varying needs of different urban neighborhoods.¹ The second reason was

. . . that the systemic origins of urban decline have not been clearly recognized. The requisite preconditions for effective change have not been met. Instead of perceiving that the deterioration of our cities is rooted in certain institutionalized policies, attitudes and practices, the tendency has often been to respond to symptoms. For structured into the system in most cities are processes which lead to "discrimination and inequity. The former is directed towards race, the latter towards the physical properties of the neighborhood. One discriminates against individuals; the other discriminates against entire communities. When either of these is operating, we can expect tensions between the races to increase, and the decline of the city to accelerate."²

Despite the changes of the past 4 years, there is little to alter their assessment.

This does not mean that progress has not been made. Hardly.

The neighborhood movement has focused on many forms of discrimination affecting racial and ethnic groups. The common theme of this focus has been discrimination on the basis of location - geographic discrimination. This paper will discuss some significant aspects of geographic discrimination, centering on attitudes and perceptions about race, ethnicity, and neighborhoods and will end with specific policy recommendations.

Much of the effort of the past 4 years has gone toward attempting to eliminate one of the most blatant aspects of geographical discrimination, namely redlining. The work of a broad coalition of neighborhood organizations resulted in passage of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, as well as similar legislation on State and local levels. Using this type of tool, neighborhood residents have begun to work with government officials and private lending institutions to start providing the mortgage and rehabilitation credit that is essential to the health of any neighborhood. These antiredlining efforts continue (and need strengthening) as is extensively documented in numerous sources.

¹ Arthur J. Naparstek and Gale Cincotta, *Urban Disinvestment: New Implications for Community Organization, Research and Public Policy*. (National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs and National Training and Information Center, 1976) p.8.

² *Ibid.*

(See, for example, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Bibliography on Redlining and the Report to the President and Congress of the National Commission on Neighborhoods.) The arbitrary refusal of lenders to invest in mortgage and rehabilitation loans on the basis of neighborhood characteristics is now illegal. Considerable work remains to be done, but the principle of the illegality of such discrimination is established.

Similarly, a related redlining practice – insurance redlining – has come to be recognized as another form of geographic discrimination. As the report of the Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin Advisory Committees to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Insurance Redlining: Fact Not Fiction*, notes:

The problem of insurance unavailability is not one which randomly affects isolated individuals but rather strikes at residents of older urban communities. Insurance unavailability threatens the viability of entire communities.³

Insurance, like adequate credit, is essential to any community. Yet, the Advisory Committees' report continues:

Residents and those in business within the urban centers of major metropolitan areas have been experiencing increasing difficulty in obtaining adequate insurance since the urban unrest of the 1960's. When insurance is available to inner city residents at all, it frequently provides only limited protection at unfairly discriminatory rates. The withdrawal of insurance companies from inner cities subsequent to the urban upheavals of the 1960's has given rise to the charge that the insurance industry *discriminates on the basis of geographical location*. Such geographic discrimination is called "redlining."⁴

Again, such discrimination is increasingly well documented and has given rise to several actions and policies designed to bring about change. (See Chapters 5 and 6 of the Advisory Committees' report as well as the National Commission on Neighborhoods report.)

These forms of geographic discrimination – redlining – are based on concepts of *risk*. Lenders and insurance companies invest the funds at their disposal in hope of future returns. Obviously a degree of risk is involved with any investment, given that there are limits to what we can predict about the future. Such institutions naturally seek to reduce the amount of risk involved in any investment, be it the chance that a borrower will not be able to repay a loan or that an insurance company will have to pay out more funds in claims than it received in premiums.

³ Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio and Wisconsin Advisory Committees to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights *Insurance Redlining: Fact Not Fiction* (1979) p.1.

⁴ *Ibid.* (emphasis added, p.4.)

However, precisely because our ability to peer into the future is limited, the assessment of risk involved in an investment decision requires a *judgment* about the nature and degree of chance involved. Redlining exists in its many forms because lenders, insurance companies, and others have come to believe that the *location* of a potential borrower or insuree is a central determinant of risk. In other words, redlining assumes location is more important than individual characteristics.

Because location – geography – is and has been an important factor in the assessment of risk, the process by which such assessments are made is also important. Further, as will be shown below, judgments about the risk characteristics of particular locations are largely based on *subjective* information. The attitudes and perceptions of those making such judgments are thus critical. Lenders, assessors, appraisers, and underwriters try to predict the future on the basis of limited subjective information. In the process they discriminate against individual members of racial and ethnic groups and help to create the self-fulfilling prophecies of neighborhood decline and disinvestment. They are aided, abetted, and encouraged in this damaging process by planners, service deliverers, and policy makers in the public sector.

Such attitudes and decision making processes are hardly new. As the Neighborhood Reinvestment Task Force of the National Commission on Neighborhoods has shown, this approach to the assessment of risk is based on a series of myths about the possibilities and limitations of revitalizing older neighborhoods in our cities.⁵ Three of these myths are:

1. Older neighborhoods, either through “natural forces” or the competition of the market place, invariably decline and move toward blight as they filter into the hands of poorer residents;
2. Racial change is a precursor of decline; and
3. Mixed land uses or the introduction of commercial or industrial uses into residential areas indicate and contribute to decline. These three myths all stem from the same root and can be treated under a single discussion.⁶

These myths grew out of ideas developed in the 1920's and '30's about the nature of people and investment. The human ecology model developed at the University of Chicago viewed neighborhoods as being subject to invasion and attack by racial and ethnic groups, with the group most suitable to a particular environment finally winning

⁵ National Commission on Neighborhoods, People, Building Neighborhoods. *Final Report to the President and the Congress of the United States*. (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979) pp. 68-80.

⁶ *Ibid*, p. 68

that ground as demonstrated through universally applied laws of nature.⁷

As the Neighborhood Reinvestment Task Force further notes:

Neighborhoods have been identified as going through natural life cycles. They grow to a point of success, and then as the technology of the society develops and favors different locations, there is invasion and succession by lower class people. There are temporary plateaus of stability when the area is occupied by a homogeneous population or land use, analagous to a single species of plant taking over its most beneficial location. When the homogeneity is interrupted by the "invasion" of a different type of land use, property or class of persons, this starts the downward cycle.⁸

Such attitudes were transferred to the world of real estate by Homer Hoyt, a professor at the University of Chicago, and Frederick Babcock. Together, they posited the theory that the age of a neighborhood is related to the income of resident groups, and as a community gets older, the income level of the residents declines. Racial and ethnic changes were also seen as critical factors in this decline, giving their work a very racist, anti-ethnic, anti-lower-income group bent.

These theories were not the idle speculation of ivory tower academics, however. Hoyt and Babcock had central direct and indirect roles in the establishment of Federal policy toward neighborhoods in the 1930's. Indirectly, their ideas were accepted as gospel by a generation of bankers, insurance men, real estate appraisers, public officials, and others. Directly, their work formed the core of the policies of the Federal Housing Administration, created in 1934 to deal with the problems of housing in urban America. Hoyt was commissioned to write several documents and papers for the FHA and Babcock was, for a time, in charge of writing and implementing the FHA's underwriting and real estate appraisal standards. It is instructive to examine the particulars of the results of their FHA work.

The Federal Housing Administration Manual was first published in 1934. Volume VII of that manual was (and is) an Underwriting Manual that explicitly describes the standards and procedures to be followed in the assessment of property values necessary for underwriting FHA guaranteed mortgages and loans. The Underwriting Manual defines several elements of risk which must be considered in assessing loans. The most important of these are "local real estate market

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Ibid.*

reactions and the *attitudes* of borrowers to observable immediate or foreseeable future conditions.”⁹ Central to assessing these conditions are real estate elements, defined as those “which relate to the property and its location.”¹⁰ Some of the risk categories established include:

- visual appeal of the property.
- livability of the property.
- conformity of the property to the neighborhood.
- the degree of protection of the neighborhood against “inharmounious land use”.
- the physical and social attractiveness of the neighborhood; and
- the relative marketability of the neighborhood.¹¹

These risk categories explicitly state the bias toward conformity and homogeneity of property, use, *and* residents. Tremendous emphasis is placed on new developments, with a clear prejudice against older, established neighborhoods being present. Older areas are seen as clearly less desirable.

Similarly, a great deal of attention is paid to predicting the cycle of decline of neighborhoods, with an eye to limiting the amount of risk involved in any investment. Section 71317.4 discusses the major factors contributing to neighborhood decline. These include:

- declining population (both in terms of numbers and “desirability”);
- “a decline, or danger of decline, or desirability of the neighborhood as a place of residence through introduction of commercial, industrial. . . or inharmounious uses of any kind”;
- a lack of appropriate protective covenants; and
- a lack of appropriate zoning.¹²

Again and again the importance of conformity, both in terms of use and residence population, is stressed.

The 1934 Manual is even more specific. In it, underwriters are enjoined to form opinions as to the prospects of particular neighborhoods during the ensuing 20 years, with special attention being paid to conformity, “inharmounious racial and nationality groups,” the “appeal of the neighborhoods,” the “stability of the neighborhood,” and the degree of “protection from adverse influences.”¹³

The 1935 Manual goes on further to define important “adverse influences,” “the infiltration of inharmounious racial or nationality

⁹ Federal Housing Administration, *Manual*, Vol. III, Section 70203.1.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Section 70204.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, Section 70218

¹² *Ibid.*, Section 71317.4.

¹³ Federal Housing Administration, *Manual 1934*, p. 158.

groups; infiltration of business or commercial development or use; the presence of smoke, odors, fog, etc. . . .”¹⁴ (The 1934 edition refers to the “ingress of undesirable racial and nationality groups.”)¹⁵ Here is clearly seen the human ecology concept of “infiltration” of competing groups. Further, it is instructive to note that groups of people are described as adverse influences in the same sentence with mixed use and physical pollution.

In 1936 and 1937, Babcock was Chief Underwriter and in this capacity issued numerous policy letters to field underwriting offices designed to interpret FHA Manual directives or to answer questions raised as to their implementation. The content of these letters, which had the force of regulatory law, is instructive. Babcock cautioned against mixing income classes, explaining that this was a primary cause of neighborhood decline.

. . . suitable locations for small (lower priced) houses will, in general, be *segregated* (emphasis added) to some degree from residential areas providing housing for persons in higher income brackets. To a certain degree, the Federal Housing Administration should hold itself responsible to protect higher priced areas from encroachments resulting from the construction of low cost housing in the same area.¹⁶

Citing the importance of neighborhood stability as a criterion for loans and insurance, he reiterated the adverse influence of the “presence of incompatible racial and social groups in areas surrounding a neighborhood.”¹⁷ Further, he emphasized the need for stability in a revealing discussion of suitable standardized rejection phrases to be used in explaining FHA decisions about turning down applications. For example, a suggested reject phrase for an application in a neighborhood perceived as declining was:

The location of this property is not sufficiently protected against change in social and financial class of neighborhood occupancy.¹⁸

Letter #414 (May 8, 1937) specifically justifies discrimination through the use of protective covenants. “It is entirely satisfactory for you (the field underwriters) to approve a restriction limiting use or occupancy to a specific race or nationality. . . .”¹⁹

In essence, these manuals and letters demonstrate the pervasiveness of the prevailing notions about what risk was, how it was affected by

¹⁴ Federal Housing Administration, *Manual 1935*. Sections 309-314.

¹⁵ Federal Housing Administration, (1934), *op. cit.*, Paragraph 310.

¹⁶ Federal Housing Administration, Underwriters Letter #118, May 21, 1936, p.5.

¹⁷ Letter #129, October 7, 1936.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ Letter #414, May 8, 1937.

different factors, and how to assess it for use in determining which loan application should be approved. Over and over again, the importance of the assessment process is stressed, with elaborate forms being constructed to gather information about a piece of property and its location. Yet for all this seeming objectivity, the forms are subjective to the point of being ephemeral. Point scales are utilized to assess the condition of a particular property or neighborhood with little judgment as to how to award points. This is especially true for such criteria as appeal of the neighborhood and existence of alleged "adverse influences." The importance of the attitudes and perceptions of the persons filling out the forms are obvious. The entire process is based on criteria that are non-quantifiable and non-objective.

How, then, was an evaluator to make any judgments? One way was for him to talk with local officials, such as the Chief of Police, members of the Chamber of Commerce and other "locally informed persons." These discussions, together with the evaluator's personal observations, formed virtually all of the data base for the evaluation process.

In essence, the FHA, a Federal agency, was explicitly involved in making subjective judgments that had real and direct results, i.e., decisions whether or not to accept loan applications. The judgments were based on certain myths about the real estate market and neighborhoods and demonstrated openly racist, anti-ethnic, anti-lower-income biases. What made things worse is that these standards were not restricted to the government alone but were representative of the real estate credit industry as a whole.

The Federal Housing Administration has mended its ways (although in some cases not until quite recently) especially since such blatant racial discrimination is against the law. However, it would be a mistake to assume that all aspects of geographic discrimination (like racial discrimination) have been eliminated from public and private policies. This paper will now turn to some examples of such continued geographic discrimination. These take many forms and operate on many levels. Of special and continued importance is the attitude of individuals and the perception of what constitutes risk.

Attitudes and perceptions about neighborhoods held by individuals are central to the assessment of risk and the subsequent decisions about loans and insurance. Such attitudes and perceptions affect neighborhoods in other ways that relate to forms of geographic discrimination.

The first of these is also directly connected to the formation of the attitudes and perceptions of lenders and insurance companies. As noted above, the process by which these people form opinions about the credit worthiness or risk factors of a neighborhood is a very subjective occurrence. Commonly, such individuals base a great deal

of weight on the opinions and attitudes of public officials. For example, we encountered one case where a banker asked a police lieutenant about a particular neighborhood. The police officer's response was that the neighborhood was experiencing difficulties and was "going downhill." The police officer did not base his opinion on objective information of any sort, but rather on his feelings about the neighborhood. The implications are obvious. What if the police officer had just had a difficult night, or was feeling ill, or had a grievance against a particular individual? The possible influence such extraneous factors could have on this interpretation of neighborhood viability is tremendous.

This is not an isolated incident. In fact, police officers and other "locally informed persons" are still often consulted by those who seek a judgment on a neighborhood. The FHA Underwriters Manual continues to list these individuals as the type of person an appraiser or assessor should talk with in trying to determine the risk involved in a particular neighborhood.

Such a process is geographically discriminatory in two ways. First, the question is asked – and responded to – in terms of the neighborhood as a unified entity. Instead of asking for specific information about specific applicants for credit or insurance, the assessor asks about the general health or appeal of the neighborhood as a whole. Second, the question and the response are both couched in subjective terms, a method guaranteed to bring personal values, attitudes and perceptions into play at the expense of objective information. Thus, a banker may make a decision on a loan based on biased data that in fact probably has little to do with the credit worthiness of the individual applicant.

City governments also discriminate geographically in other ways. Most governments follow strategies of resource allocation among neighborhoods, distributing moneys and other resources according to some pattern designed to meet city objectives. Again, however, these decisions are often made by a small number of elected and appointed officials. The criteria for defining needs are predicated on a complex convergence of administrative, political, financial, and social needs that may have little to do with the reality of individual needs in a particular community. The neighborhoods are again viewed as unified units *and* decisions are often influenced, to a great degree, by the perception and attitudes of that small group of officials.

The fact that in many cities the input from the people of neighborhoods is limited, at best, further exacerbates the problem. Public officials charged with running an entire city often are unaware of the particular and unique needs of the residents of a different neighborhood. Enmeshed in their bureaucracies, they often know little

about the real needs and concerns of residents, yet make critical decisions based on limited and filtered information.

Another example of city employee attitudes is as prosaic as the handling of trash cans by garbagemen. In one city an indicator of the health of a neighborhood was the condition of trash cans. Neighborhoods perceived as "good" had relatively undamaged cans, most of which were properly replaced by garbagemen after collection. In another neighborhood, garbagemen were clearly less concerned, being more careless, making more noise, not taking the extra step to pick up something, and finally creasing and denting the cans themselves. Damaged trash cans mean ill fitting or missing tops and thus more trash and garbage in the streets and more access to dogs, cats, and rats. Such a simple matter is a very visible sign of neighborhood deterioration, which, if left unchecked, compounds itself.

Finally, there is great variation in the degree and quality of service delivery to different neighborhoods. Here again, it is often a case of the rich getting richer and the poor poorer.

Residents of older areas, who actually require stepped up fire, police, and sanitation services because of such factors as the high number of vacant properties in their communities, often do not even receive these or other services on a basis equal to that of healthier communities. The cities' failure to provide services to these communities in return for taxes paid evokes a wide gamut of complaints: accumulated garbage and trash; rats, other pests, and odors; unrepaired roads and streetlights; decrepit and overcrowded schools; crime; fire hazards; and poor library, sewage, water, health, day care, recreation, and other services.

Most importantly, the decisions about which resources go to which neighborhoods again are made using large amounts of subjective data in a process that is easily influenced by the particular opinions of human beings. Neighborhoods are labeled due to imputed income and personal characteristics or residents based on their nationality or race. If a city official believes Poles are inherently unintelligent or conform to some other form of stereotyping, that belief is going to impact the kind of public services he provides to a Polish neighborhood in his city.

Another form of geographic discrimination involving public officials relates to providers of professional services, such as public health and mental health services. Naparstek, Biegel, *et al.* have done considerable work showing the impact of mental health professionals on a neighborhood and the influence of their understanding and attitudes about neighborhoods and their residents.

Starting from the assumption that ethnicity is an important variable affecting attitudes towards, and usage of, mental health services, they

demonstrate the underutilization of professional mental health services by urban working class populations.²⁰

Further, they argue, the neighborhood is central to the question of providing community mental health services.

Neighborhood attachment is a positive resource that can and should be used as a basis for community mental health services. People need to feel that daily life is being conducted at a manageable scale. In the urban setting this occurs largely within the neighborhood. It is the neighborhood that permits a strong social fabric and the mediating institutions that de Toqueville hailed as the social milieu within which American democracy thrives. The neighborhood has been used as a locus for service for some community mental health centers but as little more. There are many strengths and helping resources in communities (friends, neighbors, family, clergy, schools, etc.). Professional services should be designed to strengthen, support, build upon and augment these resources.²¹

This assumption is also shared by the President's Commission on Mental Health.

In spite of the recognized importance of community supports, even those that work well are too often ignored by human service agencies. Moreover, many professionals are not aware of, or comfortable with, certain elements of community support systems.²²

In recognition of the importance of community support systems, the Commission, as its first recommendation, proposed that

A major effort be developed in the area of personal and community supports which will: (a) recognize and strengthen the natural networks to which people belong and on which they depend; (b) identify the potential social support that formal institutions within communities can provide; (c) improve the linkages between community support networks and formal mental health services; and (d) initiate research to increase our knowledge of informal and formal community support systems and networks.²³

Naparstek and Biegel focus their attention on the need to relate professional services to existing and potential networks of community helpers that are part of the fabric of most neighborhoods. Still, as they

²⁰ See Naparstek, Biegel, *et al.*, "The Community Mental Health Empowerment Model: Assumptions Underlying the Model/Review of the Literature" An unpublished monograph of the Neighborhood and Family Services Project of the University of Southern California's Washington Public Affairs Center.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

²² President's Commission on Mental Health, *Report to the President*, Vol. I, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978, p. 15.

²³ *Ibid.*

note, there are tremendous obstacles to linking these groups. As Biegel puts it,

These obstacles reflect both biases and attitudinal and value differences between professional and community helpers as well as a narrow view of community needs often held by both professional and community helpers due to their focus or "targeting" on specific population groups or services.

Human service professionals often feel that they have all the answers, expertise, and skill necessary to help people in need and community residents can provide little assistance since they are not professionally trained.²⁴

Community helpers are many times intimidated by professionals and uncomfortable around them. This makes mutual trust harder to achieve. In summary, community helpers and professionals often have difficulty working together. They talk different languages. The professional talks of community needs; the community helper talks of needs of individual residents. Community helpers do not have access to "data" as do professionals and thus their only way of discussing community-wide needs is on an intuitive and gut-level basis. Professionals find it difficult to respond and lack of communication results. Differences in education and training and class and ethnic background oftentimes further make community helpers and professionals uncomfortable with each other.

Professionals tend to "aggregate" needs of individuals and to speak about "at risk" population groups and underserved areas using statistical data, surveys, and needs assessment studies. Community helpers speak about *individuals*.

Given these conditions, Naparstek and Biegel call for increased sensitivity to the varying needs of people in neighborhoods.

We live in a pluralistic society. Various groups of people approach problems, face crises, and seek help in different ways due to class, race, ethnic, and geographic factors. Social class and ethnicity, specifically, are very important variables affecting attitudes towards, and use of, mental health services. Yet, class and ethnic differences are often ignored by the mental health service delivery system. Mental health services should be tailored to account for class and ethnic differences.²⁵

Finally, they conclude that the attitudes of professional mental health workers do have a significant impact on the way they provide services to neighborhood residents. If these attitudes are positive, the

²⁴ David Biegel, *Neighborhood Support Systems: People Helping Themselves*. A speech delivered to the Pittsburgh Conference on Neighborhood Support Systems, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; June 13, 1979.

²⁵ David Biegel and Arthur Naparstek, 'Organizing for Mental Health: An Empowerment Model,' an article prepared for *The Journal of Alternative Human Services*; p. 10.

potential exists for forming flexible networks of professionals and community helpers to serve disparate resident needs. However, if the attitudes are negative or some of the many possible obstacles stand in the path of such linkages, residents will not be provided with either the quality or quantity of services they deserve. Individuals will be discriminated against in the delivery of services largely because of the neighborhood they live in and the view outsiders have of that neighborhood.

A different example of geographic discrimination by government officials is the practice of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service of conducting "sweeps" through Mexican-American neighborhoods in cities like Los Angeles. These operations are designed to capture alleged "illegal aliens" by random law enforcement activities in selected neighborhoods. However, the only criterion for choosing a particular neighborhood is the nationality or ethnic background of many of its residents, even though there may be no evidence to suspect any of the individuals sought are in fact in that particular community. Residents of such neighborhoods are having their civil rights violated simply because of their ethnic heritage.

A less obvious, but more insidious, kind of geographic discrimination has been fostered by certain experts on urban government and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development itself. In 1975, HUD published an influential study entitled *The Dynamics of Neighborhood Change*. Principally authored by Anthony Downs, then of Real Estate Research Corporation of Chicago, this report, in the finest tradition of Hoyt and Babcock, chronicled the "process of decay" of neighborhoods. Neighborhoods were described as passing through five stages: "healthy," "incipient decline," "clearly declining," "accelerated decline," and "abandoned."²⁶

The report focuses on racial change (or, rather, *perceived* racial change) as an important factor which may accelerate the process of decline. A "healthy" neighborhood is described as having a population in the "moderate to upper income levels" that is ethnically homogeneous.²⁷ The "incipient decline" stage is viewed as critical since past that point Downs' model says that recovery without massive intervention is very difficult.²⁸ "Aging housing stock" and the "influx of middle income minorities" are seen as two characteristic events which move a neighborhood into this stage.²⁹

²⁶ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research. *The Dynamics of Neighborhood Decline*, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 11-19.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

As a neighborhood grows older (and thus supposedly declines in desirability and value), more and more minority individuals move in, thereby generating increased white flight until the neighborhood can no longer support itself. The spiral of decline continues downward until rock bottom is reached and the neighborhood is dead.

As Bradford and others have pointed out, this report has several major defects, not the least of which is that only neighborhoods which had in fact declined to the point of abandonment were examined. No economically sound communities were included in the report.³⁰

This, however, is only the beginning of the difficulty. Not only can the analysis be faulted, but the report itself is problematic. First, the report gives undue weight to the economics of the real estate market and pays little attention to the human dimensions of neighborhoods. Second, by describing neighborhoods in a generic sense, the report continues the tradition of viewing neighborhoods in unified terms. The differences among neighborhoods and – more importantly – the differences among the residents of any given neighborhood speak to a stereotyping and standardization which can only be harmful. The academic proclivity toward generalization feeds the attitudes of lenders and government officials who tend to think that neighborhoods can be understood in general terms. Third, the labeling of specific neighborhoods by hundreds of planners, real estate people, government officials, and lenders has often helped create or support self-fulfilled prophecies. If a planner looks at a particular neighborhood and decides it is “clearly declining,” he then has a reason to justify putting resources elsewhere. This kind of insensitivity leads to informal classification of neighborhoods where the existence of a “cycle of decline” is taken as a given, a fact of life that all neighborhoods must pass through. In this sense, the report has fostered an attitude about neighborhoods that is almost causative in its effects.

The Neighborhood Reinvestment Task Force of the National Commission on Neighborhoods went to some length to refute the traditional assumptions that underlie this type of report.³¹ Instead of reiterating its findings, this paper will now explore the relationship between this view of neighborhoods and the implicit or explicit strategies of *triage* that have been applied to them.

Triage is a medical term used in emergency conditions. Cases are divided into three categories: those who will survive without immediate attention; those who will die with or without attention; and those cases in the middle who have a chance. The strategic assumption is that with limited resources one should focus one's attentions on the middle group where those resources will have the greatest impact.

³⁰ National Commission on Neighborhoods, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 70-76.

One important result of the 1975 HUD report was an increase in the use of triage as a justification for public policy decisions in urban affairs. The assumption is made that some neighborhoods are basically healthy and thus need minimal attention, some are doomed to death ("abandonment") and therefore are not worth putting resources into, and those in the middle ("incipient decline") are where the influx of resources may do some good. This may make sense in economic or real estate terms, but it certainly ignores the human beings who live in each of those neighborhoods. Do we write off people the way we write off buildings?

In fact, triage strategies are quite common vis-a-vis neighborhoods. The significance of this process in terms of geographic discrimination is obvious. Once a neighborhood is labeled, the self-fulfilling prophecies of disinvestment take control. The "declining" neighborhood receives fewer resources, a lower level of services, and less investment, and then decline does, in fact, occur. The people charged with supporting people in neighborhoods are often one of the major factors in destroying them.

This also leads to the process sometimes known as "gentrification." In today's real estate market, inner city neighborhoods are seen as valuable for some of their *physical* characteristics. Situated close to the downtown business area, such neighborhoods are attractive in terms of reduced transportation costs and time. The poor quality of much suburban housing construction, together with a renewed interest in preserving older buildings, has brought about an increase in the desirability of older neighborhoods in some cities. No longer is old seen as bad. Finally, the skyrocketing costs of all housing has made many inner city neighborhoods very attractive in economic terms. Thus, we have the phenomenon seen in many cities where middle and upper income whites are buying up older inner city homes and proceeding with extensive renovations and improvements prior to moving in.

Many people see this rise in the value of inner city real estate as being a very healthy sign. Municipal tax bases are raised as speculator-fueled property values rise. Service delivery costs are reduced as buildings that may have once housed 10 to 15 lower-income individuals are now occupied by two middle-to-upper-income individuals. The neighborhood looks cleaner and the new owners infuse money into their new homes.

The human costs of this change, however, are tremendous. Lower income individuals, who have the fewest financial and political resources, are displaced from their homes and neighborhood, thereby losing an affordable place to live and the support of the community of which they were a part. These people are forced to search for other

housing that is usually more expensive and may even be in other jurisdictions.

Gentrification and displacement focus on neighborhoods as buildings in a particular geographic place. The notion of neighborhoods as having a vital human component is ignored, the result being that many neighborhoods are "saved" through their own destruction. The buildings are renovated, but the people are discarded. This is geographic discrimination at its worst, reflecting as it does that historic American propensity to value property rights over individual rights.

If a neighborhood is seen only as a geographic area, the theories of Hoyt and Babcock, the cycles of decline, and the risk assessment techniques of the early FHA all make sense. However, if a neighborhood is seen as being composed of human beings, such approaches are insensitive at best and inhumane at worst.

Furthermore, this is not only a matter of race. Minority neighborhoods are being gentrified, but so, too, are middle and lower income ethnic neighborhoods. In this sense, gentrification and displacement are income and class related phenomena which focus on the individual's ability to pay. Displaced individuals are being discriminated against on the basis of their income and the area in which they live. Once real estate speculation takes hold in a neighborhood, residents have little power to stem its tide. Soon their property taxes will rise as a result of the general increase in market values. If they are "lucky" and own their home, they will be forced to sell and move, getting what profits they can. If they rent, they will simply be moved. In either case, their neighborhood will cease to exist.

To this point in this paper we have explored a number of forms of geographic discrimination, focusing largely on the attitudes of significant actors in the urban drama and the impersonal forces of the economic market place which these attitudes feed. We will now make a number of recommendations which can alleviate or prevent such discrimination. These recommendations fall into three major categories: specific legislative and programmatic changes; an argument for increased sensitivity and understanding of the dynamics of neighborhood life on the part of those who impact on that life; and the need for capacity building empowerment of neighborhoods.

A. The first category of recommendations are the same as those made by the National Commission on Neighborhoods' Task Force on Reinvestment.³² They include:

1. The U.S. Congress should outlaw geographic discrimination against neighborhoods.

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 26-35.

2. Financial institutions are to be prohibited from denying a loan or discriminating in setting the terms or conditions of a loan on the basis of the age or location of the property. Loans covered by this legislation should include—multi-family rental unit loans, small business loans, and other community development loans, as well as home loans and home improvement loans.
3. Non-discriminatory underwriting and appraisal standards that would serve as a standard to lenders would be required by regulatory authorities.
4. Lenders found to have a poor lending performance in low and moderate income and/or minority communities would be required to develop aggressive affirmative lending policies, with minimum standards set by law.
5. Regulatory analysis of compliance would rest most heavily on the examination of a given institution's lending pattern and community complaints.
6. Strong sanctions and penalties, including the use of fines, cease and desist orders, and denial of regulatory privileges would be levied on non-complying institutions.
7. The charters of financial institutions should be reviewed regularly and charter renewal should be based to some extent on compliance with this and other non-discriminatory laws and regulations.
8. Legislation should be enacted that would make the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act permanent. Additional provisions for HMDA would be required, including:
9. The HMDA regulations (Regulation C of the Federal Reserve Board) should be changed to require lenders to report data on a loan-by-loan basis.
10. HMDA regulations should be changed to require all the loan data presently collected under the California state regulations, with the inclusion of default and disclosure data.
11. The HMDA regulations should be changed to include data on deposits for institutions which are depository institutions.
12. The HMDA regulations should be changed to provide for a form of portfolio disclosure.
13. The HMDA should be amended to include mortgage bankers.
14. The HMDA should be amended to include the Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA), the Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA), the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (FHLMC), all state, county, and municipally created secondary mortgage entities as well as life insurance companies and pension funds.

15. The HMDA regulations should be changed to require central processing and tabulation of the HMDA data.
16. The Federal Reserve Board, as the lead agency in complementing HMDA, should develop materials to assist lenders in collecting and producing HMDA data.
17. The National Commission on Neighborhoods recommends that the Community Reinvestment Act be strengthened and closely monitored. Changes in the CRA Reinvestment Act must be strengthened and closely monitored. Changes in the CRA regulations must be adopted to assure its impact. Lenders must not only be encouraged to increase lending levels in low and moderate income neighborhoods, but must also be directed by the regulatory authorities, where necessary, to devise policies and programs that will carry out the intent. Examiners must be trained to assess the impact of each institution's advertising and marketing strategy, their ability to counsel applicants, and other mechanisms for reinvestment as outlined in the reinvestment chapter.
18. Commercial banks should be required to invest a federally mandated percentage of their assets, on a non-discriminatory basis, in home mortgages, with emphasis on their role in mortgage lending for existing multi-family apartment buildings.
19. The Commission recommends to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and to Congress that any further regulatory or legislative privileges granted savings and loan associations should be disallowed if a potential negative impact on credit availability in neighborhoods and on lenders' responsiveness to local credit needs can be shown.
20. The availability of insurance coverage is a major problem in low and moderate income neighborhoods. Discriminatory practices must be stopped and the administration of FAIR Plan coverage must be improved considerably.
21. The Fair Housing Act must be amended to specifically state that insurance falls under the purview of the legislation, thereby providing the Justice Department clear authority to investigate and impose sanctions on the discriminatory practices of insurance companies.
22. Legislation should be enacted that would require any state that wishes to participate in the FAIR Plan to:
 - a. have passed state legislation prohibiting insurance redlining
 - b. develop procedures by January 1980 by re-evaluating existing FAIR Plan policy holders within the state with the objective of returning to the private market those policy

holders who have been unfairly and arbitrarily relegated to the FAIR Plan.

23. Legislation should be enacted that would create a financial incentive for cities to use at least 15 percent of their CDBG funds to rehabilitate housing to exclusively benefit the existing low and moderate income and minority residents of redlined communities. Cities would be reimbursed dollar-for-dollar up to an amount equal to 50 percent of their total CDBG allocation.
24. Legislation should be enacted that would require that Section 312 low-interest rehabilitation loans be restricted in use to benefit solely low and moderate income and minority residents of neighborhoods experiencing gentrification; at least 30 percent of these funds should be used for multi-family rehabilitation (over 6 units) and Congress should appropriate additional funds to assure increased uses for multi-family rehab; strict income restrictions should be imposed and monitoring procedures established.
25. Legislation should be enacted that would require that 75 percent of the HUD 235 program be used for rehabilitation of existing housing for the benefit of existing low and moderate income and minority residents of disinvested communities, and low and moderate income residents of neighborhoods experiencing gentrification.
26. The Federal Housing Administration must direct its priorities so that they support the housing needs of low and moderate income neighborhoods and don't contribute to the dual housing market.
27. The Commission recommends that FHA's primary focus is to assist the home ownership of low and moderate income people. Therefore, FHA should be available throughout a given metropolitan area.
28. Mandatory pre-purchase (including credit and expense counseling) and default counseling should be provided to aid FHA applicants and mortgagors.
29. Repair and sell programs for all acquired HUD properties should be instituted.
30. All FHA mortgages will be tracked on a census tract basis so that if a given community shows an extreme dependence upon FHA lending, HUD would call upon the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the Comptroller of the Currency to investigate the lack of conventional credit in a given community.

31. The delinquency notice procedures should be restructured so that area offices and approved HUD counseling agencies can contact the delinquent mortgagor in the first or second month of default.
 32. FHA should provide a home inspection and certification prior to all closings and provide a one-year home warranty program for all FHA insured loans.
 33. HUD should develop a targeting strategy of assignment, counseling, and rehabilitation for neighborhoods experiencing the greatest concentration of defaults, foreclosures, and abandonments.
- B. A second set of recommendations involved the attitudes and perceptions of those making decisions that affect the lives of neighborhood residents. Generally, new ways of helping these individuals and organizations to better understand the dynamic interaction of people in the neighborhood setting must be explored. Such sensitizing should take many different forms. Some possible directions are:
- training and education programs funded through such legislation as the Intergovernmental Personnel Act. These programs would be designed to have lenders, appraisers, assessors, insurance company representatives, government officials, and others interact with neighborhood residents in a variety of settings and neighborhoods.
 - the facilitation of problem-solving partnerships where residents, public officials and private sector businesspeople could work together as equal partners in community based problem-solving programs.
34. Educational programs and planning procedures should be instituted to bring neighborhood groups and the private sector together to assess community needs and resources. Agreement should be sought on the following: indicators of economic distress; evaluation of resources; range of alternative strategies; and on the role to be played in economic development and reinvestment programs by various public and private agencies and individuals.
 35. The private sector should be urged to study and implement economic strategies which have been successful in other neighborhoods throughout the country. The economic empowerment and involvement of minority businesses should be an essential part of this effort.
 36. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should provide direct funding on a demonstration basis to neighborhood organizations for the purpose of developing neighbor-

hood human services systems. These neighborhood systems, modeled after the Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS) projects, would serve to integrate human services activities on a local level through improved partnerships between local residents, neighborhood organizations, private service providers, and governments at the federal, state, and local levels. This demonstration effort, to be targeted on low income neighborhoods, could be organized and funded under Section 1110 and 1115 of the Social Security Act, which authorizes the Secretary of HEW to fund research projects and to waive certain statutory and administrative requirements for Social Security Act programs such as Title XX.

Following completion of this demonstration program, legislation should be adopted to provide a 2 percent set-aside of Title XX funds for use in developing neighborhood human service systems. These funds would be allocated directly to neighborhood organizations at the discretion of the Secretary of HEW, who would be responsible for monitoring and evaluating the neighborhood systems. No state or local match would be required under this set-aside program.

37. Training and technical assistance funds already authorized by legislation such as Title XX, the Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, and the Community Mental Health Amendments should be redirected to promote improved linkages between professional service providers and neighborhood helping networks. The Title XX training program should be broadened by eliminating the restriction which allows training to be provided only for the staffs of state Title XX agencies and Title XX service providers. The elimination of this restriction would permit Title XX training funds to be used to assist neighborhood organizations in developing new human services partnerships in their communities.
38. National organizations such as the League of Cities, the Conference of Mayors, the International City Managers Association, the National Association of Counties and the National Governors Conference should:
 - a. Officially recognize the critical importance of a neighborhood based strategy to urban development;
 - b. Develop and implement effective information and training programs for their members in conjunction with local and national organizations that have had extensive experience in acting as intermediary groups between government programs and neighborhoods. They should directly involve experienced

neighborhood-based staff and leaders in the development and implementation of such training programs.

39. In order to effectively utilize federal programs to build neighborhood-competent governments, Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) staff should be responsible for coordination, monitoring, and evaluation of all training and technical assistance funding conducted under provisions of the Joint Funding Simplification Act. Joint funding agreements have tremendous potential for increasing the impact of training and technical assistance funds and programs at the local level. A mechanism must be established to coordinate such efforts. Further, a clearinghouse which can inform relevant Federal funding sources of the direction and status of other agencies and programs must also be developed. Such a mechanism would go a long way to insure the more effective targeting and mutual support for federally funded capacity building and technical assistance effort.
 - a. Funding of the IPA program should be increased to \$25 million in FY 70-80. Of this amount, at least \$8 million should be discretionary to be utilized for national demonstration grants;
 - b. IPA directives should be altered by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission or his designee (Director of the Bureau of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs) to emphasize training proposals which directly relate to neighborhood revitalization and the creative support of neighborhood-based partnerships.
 - c. To require no matching amounts of total program costs and to permit funding of training and technical assistance programs which involve citizens and public officials together.
 - d. Nonprofit organizations and especially community organizations should be eligible for assistance from IPA directed at improving the general management systems of community organizations. This change would permit community organizations and like groups to build their internal systems so as to enable them to better play partnership roles with local government.
- C. The third set of recommendations is perhaps the most important. Neighborhood residents have learned that they cannot rely simply on changes in legislation or rules or training programs and neighborhood consciousness-raising. They know, instead, that the most effective way to eliminate geographic discrimination is through the empowerment of the neighborhoods and their residents.

Empowerment means many different things. On one level it may mean increasing the effectiveness of mandated citizen participation in federally funded programs. Citizen participation is usually little more than a sham, but could provide one means of making certain that the interests of neighborhood residents are protected.

On a second level, empowerment means the building of the capacity of neighborhood residents and their organizations to deal with a wide range of problems. Capacity building may mean helping a neighborhood organization get the management and accounting skills necessary for receipt of Federal or local grants and contract moneys. It may mean the development of the ability to coordinate and organize a human service delivery network. It may mean providing the assistance necessary to organize on behalf of the community. It may mean developing the political muscle needed for dealing with the power structure of the city. Or it may mean gaining the research capacity required to make a case or back the stance of the neighborhood residents in a fight with developers or local government.

Such capacity building can be provided in many ways. The important point is that it does not come naturally, but instead needs the financial and organizational support of local government, the entire range of funding sources, and all concerned citizens.

Finally, empowerment means just that: making sure the neighborhood residents have the power necessary to protect and promote their interests, however they may define them. The neighborhood must be able to fight back when threatened. History shows us that the successful neighborhoods are not those that have relied on the largess and good will of government and the private sector. Rather, successful neighborhoods are powerful in every sense of the word. Their residents are sufficient in dealing with the problems that face them. They are capable of coping with the world around them.

Such sufficiency is not merely the by-product of a government program. Rather, sufficiency is the key to individuals and groups being able to control their own destinies. Geographic discrimination in its many forms saps and undermines that sufficiency. To fight such discrimination a wide range of strategies and tactics must be employed. Still, in the end, the important thing is the strength of the neighborhood and its people. Geographic discrimination can be overcome only by changing the programs and the laws, changing the attitudes and perceptions of those who practice such discrimination, and by making certain the people of the neighborhood have the power to control their own lives.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Thank you very much.

Our next presenter is Dr. Helena Lopata. Since 1969 Helena Lopata has been a Professor of Sociology at the Loyola University of Chicago and for the past 7 years has been the Director of that University's Center for the Comparative Study of Social Roles.

She has also served for more than a decade on the National Council on Family Relations. She has worked for the City of Chicago, on the Mayor's Council on Senior Citizens, Senior Citizens and the Handicapped, and the Mayor's Council on Manpower and Economic Development.

She holds undergraduate, graduate and doctoral degrees in sociology and has authored many articles and books on social roles in the ethnic experience in an urban setting. Dr. Lopata.

**STATEMENT OF HELENA LOPATA,
PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY, LOYOLA UNIVERSITY, CHICAGO,
ILLINOIS**

Thank you.

I come from Poland, and we can't avoid hearing about it, and I was doing a study of widows, women who had been widowed in the City of Chicago, and I decided it might be very interesting to see the view of the world from the vantage point of somebody who didn't know English, who had spent a considerable amount of time in Chicago.

So I went to an old people's meeting and got in contact with some older-widows who are Polish. One, in particular, was very eager for me to come and talk to her, so I did. As I walked into the room she handed me a letter written in English from the city saying that they were going to evict her from her home because she had somebody living in the basement. This was against the law, and she had never responded to any of their correspondence.

She had called the City Housing Office several times but each time somebody answered in English, and of course she does not understand English, and therefore could not answer, and they did not understand Polish. This is the reason she neglected to answer any of the letters that she had been receiving.

The office agreed, in their conversations with me, that they will send a Polish-speaking person to this woman's home and try to work it out. I hung up the phone and I said, "Well, don't forget the Government is trying to help maintain neighborhoods."

"The Government - the Government took my husband and killed him; the Government took my son and I don't know where his grave

is; the Government took me to labor; and the Government is now taking my home.”

She’s talking about four different governments. She’s talking about the Polish Government; her husband was in the army. She’s talking about the Russians who took her son, and the Germans who took her to a labor camp, and the Americans who are taking her home away.

But this is exactly her attitude, and that of many other people who feel that the Government, rather than protecting them, has the function of taking from them.

It was a very interesting interview. She lives in an old Polish neighborhood with Puerto Ricans, and she has a relationship going with the kids. They play at 3:00 p.m. every day the same game. The kids come by and finish drinking their Cokes and then throw them over the fence into her yard; and I thought “Oh, that poor woman.”

No, they have a relationship going. Those kids and she know very well what they are doing. They are relating – they are the only persons, except for the lady in the basement, that she responds to, or interacts with. Those kids appear to know that they’re helping her, giving her something to do in life, and as strange as it seems, it’s really a positive relationship. That is the extent of the social isolation of some the urban ethnics.

Since I cannot read my paper here, and it is on record, I would like to focus on the consequences of the American way of life and policies upon the European immigrants and their families.

I would like to read a quotation from the New York State Housing Commission, 1920. “It is economically unprofitable now; it has been economically impossible for many years past to provide a large part of the population of this state with decent homes according to American standards of living.”

This was written by the New York State Housing Commission in 1920; and I think that the comment illustrates a major problem. American society, although it did want workers at the turn of the century and before the quota system was imposed – wanted many workers, but somehow it did not want to deal with the problems these workers brought with them and the resultant problems from their settlement here.

Americans found themselves in a double bind situation in which the society did not have the resources, did not often have the desire to help solve the problems of the immigrants, hoping that they would somehow just go away; although they obviously did not do so for a long period of time.

The people who landed here at the turn into the 20th century came with not only different cultures, but also without any familiarity with an urban industrial style of life, although they settled in cities. Danuta

Mostwin, who studied my generation of refugees from Poland, points out that the new post-World War II immigration did not have the same kinds of problems, sort of like the Cuban immigration. They were educated, they dispersed and they were able to move into the mainstream of American society.

The people who came here prior to World War I came from poor areas of most of the countries; many of them were even landless peasants. They came for one of two reasons: either because of extreme poverty or because of prejudice and discrimination. The political and religious migrant did not want to go back to their original country, as for example true of the Russian Jews – some of those who came to America, like many Poles and many Italians, were really migrant laborers rather than immigrants. This distinction, made by Golab in *Immigrant Destinations* will help us understand the circumstances of life created in some ethnic communities. In other words, these people, young men, came in order to earn wages, save them, and go back to Poland, to Italy and so on.

There was a very strong tendency among most Poles not to plan on staying in America. They did not initially bring their families; they did not settle. They lived in boarding houses and in lodging houses of those people from the same country who came as families and maintained these houses.

Migrant workers who came here were really not interested in using the resources of the society being built around them. Many of them did not try to learn the language.

In the case of the Poles, many finally settled here permanently. Almost as many Poles went back to Poland as came here and stayed, but the ones who stayed gradually did build up a complex community.

An interesting comment was made this morning about the differences between the Italians and the Poles and Jews because the Italians were definitely family-oriented and did not build as complex a social system. The Poles, who have a very strong internal status competition, developed many lines of interplay between the family and the community and created a tremendously complex social structure.

In the meantime, the people who came here as migrant laborers took whatever jobs they could find, and, as you know, the kinds of jobs they took were very ethnically related.

For example, the Italians did not take jobs in mines or steel mills because they considered themselves physically incapable of withstanding that kind of work. The Slavs, the Poles took that kind of job. When they came, they settled not only in a different ethnic community from other groups but also in different occupations and industries. They wanted to live near where they worked, and developed a mutual interdependence between their living and their working.

But the point is that they worked at whatever job they could get within the ethnic milieu. They had to have somebody translating to the owner of the factory and the owner of the coal mine. They originally settled in heavily-male-dominated communities until, over time, they decided to bring their families, or, like the Greeks, went back, found a wife, brought her over here and her two brothers and so on. And so the ethnic communities started to develop.

This immigration influx was greeted by a strong and increasing amount of negative feeling by native Americans until the quota system was imposed on it; this prejudice and discrimination is so well documented. I do not need to add my documentation on it.

As if you recall, there were a number of studies commissioned by the American Government in 1911, to determine what was the "mentality", the health, the economics, the crime of the immigrants. A whole series of studies, reprinted in 1971, reinforced the picture of the immigrant as problem ridden. This is a very interesting collection – sometimes better, sometimes worse – of research on the different aspects of life in American ethnic communities.

In the meantime, although the problems of settlement included overcrowding and very poor health – Daniels has a whole documentation of the health problems – the community started to arise out of this.

One of the interesting aspects of the ethnic community growth is that most of the Poles, most of the Italians, who came to America in the height of immigration did not have a feeling of being Poles or Italians because they came from small villages; they came from areas which were locally oriented. However, since they tended to settle near other people with the same or similar language, they gradually developed an ethnic feeling. The ethnic community was a gradual development; it was not at first based on a national culture, but on a folk culture, a village subculture, and then gradually built into an ethnic system.

The problems of the immigrants were simultaneously the sources of the growth of the community in a very interesting way. For example, let us look at Thrasher's study of 1,313 gangs in Chicago. Many of these gangs were Polish, of the age and sex distribution of that population.

These gangs were anti-social, criminal, and often violent, and yet the members of these more than a thousand gangs of all nationalities in Chicago became middle-aged non-criminal adults.

The criminality rate among Polish adults is relatively low. Interestingly, what there is of it is a completely different criminality from that of the Italians, it is very individualistic.

Anyway, the first and second generation immigrants went through many problems of health, dietary deficiencies, poverty and so on. One

of the characteristics of ethnic communities is the fact that they have ties to another country. I think we very frequently forget that there is such a thing as a home country with which the ethnic group can identify, more or less, depending on the period of historical time, as in the case of Poland or Israel. Thus, the influence on the community comes not just from American society but from another nation.

Thomas and Znaniecki – I happen to be Znaniecki's daughter, and this is one reason I've got so much interest in Polonia – pointed out in the case of the *Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (they studied only the peasant, by the way) that some of the policies of the American society helped contribute to family problems. For example, American society treated each person as an individual in a marriage and gave women rights that they were completely unaccustomed to. Both Breckenridge and Thomas and Znaniecki pointed out that the American democratic policies helped contribute to the marriage problems of Europeans. For example, the consciousness that she could have her husband arrested anytime she wishes on charges of non-support, cruelty, disorderly conduct or adultery was for the woman an entirely new experience. Thomas and Znaniecki concluded: "No wonder that she's tempted to use her newly acquired power whenever she quarrels with her husband, and her women friends and acquaintances, moved by sex solidarity, frequently stimulate her to take legal action."

A rather biased statement, but in those years, reflective of the non-egalitarian culture.

In other words, even democratic policies of this society provided tools parents could use against their children and husbands and wives could use against each other in family conflict.

However, the immigrant generation for the most part did not have a high criminality rate, nor a high divorce rate. This means that there was enough glue holding the communities together and holding the families together, in spite of all this very visible conflict, so that they did stay together and they did help each other work and live in this very foreign culture and society.

The question, of course, is how harmful an effect did the kind of conflict and deprivation experienced because of immigration and the circumstances of life in America produce on the family, on the person? What are the long-range consequences and what are the long-range pains? Many of America's ethnic people have gone through many difficult years.

In summary, the problems faced by European ethnics in America stem from three sources: their background limitations; the unwillingness and possibly the inability of the dominant society to help them through the relocation; and their life constraints, including the

consequences of living in urban, lower-class ethnic communities and ghettos.

Their background limitations stem not only from their not being socialized and educated in the dominant American culture, but also from the low educational and rural composition of the immigrant stream.

More educated, urbanized, and industrialized immigrants face fewer problems of adjustment in this society.

Americans were overwhelmed by the immigrants at the turn of the century and did not help solve their problems, allowing victimization, exploitation, housing and neighborhood deterioration, inferior schooling for both adults and children, and the spiraling of multiple difficulties.

The price of this neglect and the health and welfare damaging existence in the centers of our cities is difficult to estimate. It was paid in many ways throughout the course of the first generation's and usually into the second generation's lives directly and in repercussions. Many of the ethnics, of the first and second generations, maybe longer, simply do not take advantage of the existing resources of the community because they had been socialized to be passive, to be fearful of organizational systems outside of themselves, and, therefore, afraid to use even those things which are available. In addition, the class and dominant group barriers made many resources unavailable.

The widowhood study proved to me dramatically how the effects of socializing women to regard themselves as unable to voluntarily engage in society and unable to individualistically utilize societal resources are isolating and life-constricting.

The same problems are true of other immigrant and lower class people. Most lower class people were not taught to utilize the resources of the society in an adequate way. The study of the widows, particularly of the ethnic widows in Chicago, convinced me that there is a gap between the kind of society that we have created and the way we have socialized all but upper and upper middle class people.

Thus, the basic issue is a class issue. To the extent that our new immigrants are from the same classes, the lower classes of Puerto Rico or Mexico, without the educational advantages of many of the Cubans and refugees after World War II – to that extent, we will be facing the same problems. It is not just the prejudice and discrimination on the part of American society against these groups, but also the inability of the people who come in under circumstances similar to those of the European masses to use the resources of the society which create life constraints.

It is this gap between the resources and the abilities of the individuals, increased by a social system which cuts off those segments

of the population which are not labeled as successful from the resources, which does not provide connecting links between them and the resources which needs to be filled.

Thank you.

[The complete paper follows]

EURO-ETHNIC FAMILIES AND HOUSING IN URBAN AMERICA

By Helen Znaniecka Lopata*

It is economically unprofitable now, it has been economically impossible for many years past, to provide a large part of the population of this state with decent homes according to American standards of living. (New York State Reconstruction Commission, 1920, as quoted by Jackson, 1976:127).

The state in the above quotation is New York and the year was 1920, but many of the current problems of European immigrants and their families stem from the inability of American society to absorb so many new entrants in the years before and immediately after the heavy migration. This paper examines some of the problems of those immigrants who are still alive and of their children which arise from the circumstances of their settlement in this country. Many of the consequences of these problems are hidden in a variety of events, attitudes, self-doubts, expectations, but many are evident in morbidity and mortality statistics. Most circumstances or consequences are not "the fault" of American society, since they originated in the class structure, poverty, educational inadequacy, cultural divergence from American culture, etc., of the home countries. This society could do nothing about these characteristics of the immigrants. It invited, encouraged, facilitated the immigration of a variety of peoples who were quite different from those already settled and already building a rapidly urbanizing and industrializing society. Its Statue of Liberty proclaimed that it welcomed such peoples. The only civil rights issues concerning them were that America really did not want them as they came, their "strange" ways, their lack of knowledge of American culture, and unwillingness to shed their own cultures immediately. America really did not have the resources to help them settle, nor could it prevent or ameliorate their painful problems in personal, family, and community disorganization. It did not have the attitudes needed to welcome them as fellow human beings. These failures, or at

* Professor of Sociology, Loyola University, Chicago.

least inadequacies of the society in its relations to the European immigrants, were, of course, multiplied, without any ways of accounting for the final product, when it comes to people forced to come here from Africa, or drawn here by the American need for cheap labor from other continents. The problems of the European immigrants in the years of the great waves of movement discussed here are simply examples of problems faced by anyone who came to this country without adequate knowledge or skills for living in the world it created, who faced prejudice and discrimination, and who, in spite of all the disadvantages, built a life and a society which have yet to be matched elsewhere, in the home country or in other new countries.

Background

John Kennedy (1964) reminded us that we are *A Nation of Immigrants* and Pope John Paul II pointed out during his last visit to the United States that cities like Chicago drew their populations from many different countries. The largest waves of immigration took place in the decades around the turn of the twentieth century and their volume, as well as the cultural divergence of its populations as compared to those of the dominant Americans, threatened the society sufficiently to create strong, hostile reaction and restrictive action. Although needing unskilled workers in its newly developed or expanded cottage industries, factories, steel mills, coal mines, transportation lines and construction sites, America was not psychologically nor politically geared to assist them in finding decent housing and jobs, of avoiding exploitation in all of its forms, and in facing prejudice and discrimination. As the number of immigrants increased, negative attitudes gained momentum which were assisted in a report by the United States War Department stating that

24.9 percent of the men of the draft army examined by the department's agencies did not know enough English to read a newspaper or to write letters home (Thompson, 1920/1971:62).

Woofter (1942:691-692) documents the extent of these negative attitudes of established Americans toward the new immigrants:

The danger of the foreigner to us and our institutions was urged in the popular press as a reason for further and more drastic restrictions (beyond the literacy test). The Nordic cult asserted that the Northern European races formed a group which was biologically superior to all others. It followed that all other races were inferior and should be denied admission to this country since no amount of Americanization could change their germ plasma. Bad heredity presented an insurmountable barrier to their assimilation.

The very theory of inbred racial differences and of the inferiority of Eastern and Southern Europeans supported the growing wish to restrict immigration and the idea of country of origin. Forgetting that they too were greeted by prejudice when first landing in the United States, the Scottish and German "old settlers" worried about *The Mentality of the Arriving Immigrant* (Mullan, 1917; see also Cross, 1973: 4). However, the problems of the immigrants and their families stemmed from a number of other circumstances beyond prejudice, discrimination, and the unwillingness or inability of American society to provide adequate resources to the millions of people entering its land by invitation, at their own initiative, or by force.

Immigration and Settlement

Most Europeans, in all kinds of communities, had heard about America, its need for workers, and the availability of land and jobs by the 1880's. Letters from earlier immigrants, advertisements or announcements in villages, active recruitment by agents of employers or steamship companies reached them, drawing mainly young rural men into migration chains (Lopata, 1976a; Thomas and Znaniecki, 1918-1920; Thompson, 1974). The migrant chains varied by place of origin, composition, manner of entry, and location of first and final settlement. Italians were assisted by the padroni system which matched them with work - "requiring the hiring of laborers in quantity to perform tasks of short or limited duration" (Golab, 1977:508), but they avoided coal mines or steel mills because they considered themselves as not physically strong enough for such work (Golab, 1977). Poles and Slavs took such jobs because other occupations were already monopolized by different groups and because they were willing to undertake any work which brought income. Their purpose for being in America was to save as much money as possible so that they could return to Poland when it regained its political independence; they also planned to buy land or more property (Lopata, 1954, 1976a, 1976b; 1977a; 1977b forthcoming). Such people were actually migrant workers rather than immigrants. They had a different orientation than did such people as the Eastern European Jews, who came in family units to settle in America, hoping for less prejudice and discrimination than they had experienced in countries of former settlement, planning never to return. Migrant workers moved around the United States rather freely whenever they heard of new work opportunities or when cutbacks in the fluctuating new industries deprived them of the job they previously held. They lived cheaply, usually in boarding or lodging homes, and brought over only those family members who could hold jobs and plan similar life styles.

The pull of American opportunity and the push of poverty, persecution, and foreign oppression operated as immigration factors not only on national levels, but also locally in influencing who came from where and where they went in America after being processed at entry ports. Golab (1977) details all the circumstances determining *Immigrant Destinations*, showing how Philadelphia drew some types of European immigrants, while others crowded into Boston, New York, Chicago, or smaller communities of the North and the East or Midwest. The main influences on the original location of a particular individual or family were the presence of relatives or others known to share the same culture and the availability of a job and of housing within walking distance to that job (Golab, 1977; Thompson, 1974). Most of the immigrants came from rural areas and subsistence level agriculture but settled in cities or industrial towns.

“The ethnic neighborhood boarding and lodging houses, basements, shacks, and tent camps were very common arrangements in areas where work opportunities had expanded faster than housing supplies” (Golab, 1977: 165). These boarding and lodging houses were run by members of the same ethnic group, often of the same extended family, as were the lodgers, because the lodgers who were of any origin other than British could not function in English-speaking neighborhoods. These houses provided acceptable income for the women who ran them and sleeping and eating facilities for the men who had left their own families behind in Europe or who had not as yet married and had families. However, the women who ran these lodging facilities were often overworked and tired. Often the facilities were inadequate for the number of people they tried to accommodate (Breckinridge, 1921/1971; Jackson 1976).

The areas the immigrants lived and worked in were often slums, near slums, or ghettos (Wirth, 1928). Zorbaugh (1929:141) points out in his description of the slum section of *The Gold Coast and the Slum* that

. . .this does not mean that the immigrant necessarily seeks the slum, or that he makes a slum of the area in which he lives. But in the slum he finds quarters he can afford and relatively little opposition to his coming. Moreover, as the colony grows the immigrant finds in it a social world. In the colony he finds his fellow-countrymen who understand his habits and standards and share his life experience and viewpoints. In the colony he has status, plays a role in a group.

The communities of immigrants tend to be highly overcrowded and unsanitary for various reasons (Davis, 1921). “The classic explanation for the concentration of the foreign-born in the city is that immigrants initially tend to locate in ethnic colonies near the center of the city” (Community Renewal Program, 1963). The pattern of central location

of migrant groups is, by the way, typical of America rather than being inevitable for the rest of the world. In this country, new migrant groups tend to settle within the first zone of the city, called by Burgess the Central Business District: "The inner zone is essentially an area of retail trade, light manufacturing, and commercialized recreation" or else in the second "zone of transition"(Gist and Fava, 1964: 108).

The unsanitary aspects of life in slums and other immigrant neighborhoods are due not only to overcrowding, but to inadequate water, toilets, heat and electricity, a lack of maintenance by landlords, neglect by city services, and general deterioration (Jackson, 1976). Gitlin and Hollander (1970) document the many problems facing residents in old areas of Chicago in this decade in their *Uptown: Poor Whites in Chicago*, and Jackson (1976) traces the history of the failure of most attempts at decent low cost housing in Manhattan. Reports of the inadequacy of all sorts of facilities, ranging from garbage, snow, or abandoned home removal, medical care and crime prevention, to schooling in poor neighborhoods, are legend. Most cities do not invest their money in housing the poor.

Immigrants contribute to their own health and family problems through their lack of knowledge of urban facilities resources and diets (Davis, 1921/1971; Breckenridge, 1921/1971; Daniels, 1920/1971). Davis (1921/1971: 76) summarizes the situation of newcomers in his *Immigrant Health and the Community* : "race prejudice, language barriers, strange customs, and manner have all had their share in this unnatural shutting away of our foreign-born Americans in the dreary districts of our cities". He found three types of tenement development:

- 1) The large old houses, once occupied by the better-to-do element of our cities, which have been more or less remodeled to meet new demands (rooms split, hallways constructed, central toilets and washing facilities introduced on each floor); 2) the tenements which have been built especially for the immigrant; 3) the houses erected by industry for their employees (77). (1921/1971)

Davis found infant and adult morbidity and mortality high in such districts, in contrast to middle class areas. Fallows (1969) also found variations in death rates in different cities. For example, the foreign-born Irish of New York had double the death rate (and Boston, triple) of the Irish living in Philadelphia.

The facts that housing was cheap in immigrant neighborhoods and that workers could walk to work rather than pay for transportation did not necessarily mean that other living costs were proportionately low. Lodgers had to pay a premium for being dependent on household managers to buy and prepare meals, while the mothers of boarding homes often saved only leftovers for their own children (Breckenridge, 1921/1971). Families were ignorant of budgeting; housewives

did not know how to plan expenditures and went into debt by buying on installment plans or purchasing spontaneously and unwisely (see also Rainwater, Coleman and Handel's *Working Man's Wife*, 1959).

The housewife is handicapped by the kinds of places at which she must buy, because of language, custom and time limitations, as well as the grade of articles available (Breckenridge, 1921/1971:117).

All purchases for the home had to be conducted in stores in which the language of the immigrant was understood. Most communities did little to teach the newcomer about diets, nutrition, and the composition of foods in America. Many immigrants had been accustomed to growing their own food and preparing most goods for their own consumption; the modern urban scene confused them and restricted their resources. Their limited amount of formal schooling and lack of training in the American way of life restricted their learning abilities. Most immigrants came at an age after compulsory education was legally required and most adults from Europe underused adult education. Thus, many were unable to read or write English, a major disadvantage in finding and keeping a job, housing, and goods needed for family maintenance. Unaccustomed to the use of formal schooling as a major means of upward mobility in the class-bound societies of their origin, many immigrant parents saw little value in keeping their children in school consistently throughout the year or after the legal age limit. Family needs came first, and children were kept home to help in crisis situations or to earn extra money (Wood, 1959; Thompson, 1920/1971). American society was really not interested in the children of its immigrant groups, so that schools in their neighborhoods were often inferior and little was done to enforce school attendance or child labor laws. "Factory classes" set up by employers were often sporadic and of poor quality (Thompson, 1920/1971). Private ethnic schools often focused on the native language and discipline, its teachers unable to prepare the students for life in urban America. The end result is that most of the immigrants and many of their children became the "urban villagers" described by Gans (1962), not really utilizing the vast resources for life in American cities (Lopata, 1979).

Building an Ethnic Community

Each new immigrant group must go through the process of "invasion" or "colonization" of an existing urban area, unless, of course, a town is created entirely for it (Gist and Fava, 1964; Thompson, 1974). " 'Colonization' refers to the invasion of an area from the outside, 'spread' is characterized by short distance dispersal"

(Thompson, 1974: 38). New migrants to an established area are not usually greeted with cooperation and acceptance by established residents, especially if they are "foreign" and their presence threatens property values, social status, and the protective attitudes of parents wishing their children to be exposed to their own culture only. In fact, first families of a new ethnic or racial group moving into a territory are usually met with hostility and even violence (Sennett, 1973). The same response is repeated, sometimes with escalating strength, as relatives and friends join the newcomers. Gradually, however, a new immigrant group can increase in size sufficiently to "take over", in succession, the neighborhood, establishing its own institutions, such as churches, schools, shops and personal services. Former residents move out, in panic or gradually as circumstances change and their degree of discomfort in the presence and domination of the new group increases, leaving behind only those members who cannot afford to move or who are stationary for other reasons. The community becomes stabilized as a Little Italy, Polonia, or Germantown, as more and more families of that ethnic group are formed or brought over to join the single men. Capital investment in buildings increases, a sense of community identity develops, and institutional complexity makes life within its boundaries possible (Breton, 1964; Lopata, 1969, 1976b; Gordon, 1964). Poles who had entered America with a group identity limited to the village, the "okolica" or area within which their personal reputation was known, or the region of their folk culture, found that neighbors not sharing such connections still spoke a similar language and shared customs (Thomas and Znaniecki, 1918-1920, Lopata, 1976b, 1976c; Wrobel, 1979; Znaniecki, 1952). Of course, not all their neighbors were of the same national culture society, but there were enough of them to create an ethnic community.

Although there is much disagreement among social scientists as to the basic characteristics of an ethnic community, or an ethnic group, the immigrants and their descendants developed in America ethnic community organizations and sub-cultures each distinct from each other, different from those of the society at large but also different from those of the national culture and folk societies from which they migrated (Lopata, 1976b, 1976c; Znaniecki, 1952; Gordon, 1964). By combining the characteristics of such communities developed by several authors, mainly Breton (1964), Etzioni (1958), Gordon (1964), Kramer (1970) and Ware (1937), I have defined an ethnic community as consisting of:

1. A group of people, rather than a demographic collectivity, in that they share a culture and web of relations;
2. Sharing an ethnic culture distinctive from the dominant culture, independently developed and limited to this community only,

based on a national culture or parts of it of a society living elsewhere, thus evolved as a marginal product combining two or more cultures, as modified by adaptation to a new environment and changing over times;

3. Identifying with this culture and with each other through various forms of solidarity;
4. Living in a society dominated by a different national culture or several different cultures;
5. Relatively concentrated in residentially distinctive communities, although not necessarily in a single location or set of locations, some members even scattered outside of community centers;
6. Containing a network of organizations and informal social relations of varying degrees of institutional completeness so that members *can* , but do not necessarily need to, limit their significant and important interactions to its confines. (Lopata, 1976: 6)

As Daniels (1920/1971) clarifies the type of "slum" which Zorbaugh (1929) describes is really not an ethnic community, in spite of ethnic "colonies". It resembles much of Wirth's (1958) *Ghetto* in its social structure. A slum, according to Daniels (1920/1971: 161), "is not a normal neighborhood at all, least of all an immigrant neighborhood. It has no organized unity; rather, it is a human conglomeration of which the outward shell may have a neighborhood look but in which real neighborhood substance and organization are lacking." I (Lopata, 1954, 1976a, 1976b, 1976c) found in a study of Polonia, The Polish American Community, a complex network of social groups and families, held together not only by similarities of cultural background, but also by circumstances of current life and an active internal status competition within neighborhood, urban, regional, and even national compatriot circles. The networks survived for years, in spite of indices of family and personal disorganization which Thomas and Znaniecki (1918-1920) concentrated upon in their analysis of *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*. Immigrants to America and their American born descendants experienced a great deal of disorganization of their cultural foundations, identities, interpersonal, and secondary relations as a result of the migration, settlement, Americanization processes, yet the ethnic community and its interpersonal relations performed as a cushioning service, absorbing some of the shock. Within its boundaries people labeled as "foreigners", "Polacks", "Wops", "Frogs", "Hunkies" by outsiders could establish their personal identities, actively seek social status for themselves and their families, and experience a relatively normal round of daily and long range activities throughout the life course.

Community Problems, Family and Personal Disorganization

Observers of the American scene hoping for a rapid "melting pot" effect on immigrants frequently lacked any understanding of the processes involved in a person's changing the whole foundation of life from one society and culture into another. Immigrants brought with their baggage all their views of the world, definitions of themselves and others, habits of doing and thinking which were totally different from those of dominant Americans. They were unable to reproduce the social system to which they had belonged in the old country and, thus, they had to build a type of community in America unless they were willing to adopt the dominant culture individually and rapidly. Most immigrants did not need to go through a complete metamorphosis and worked out their adjustment to America individually.

Thomas and Znaniecki (1918-1920), who looked at *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, were pessimistic as to the future of people who had migrated here. They documented many instances of personal and family disorganization and predicted increasing problems for the community. Their main thesis was that people socialized into small communities with strong social controls applied instantly, after any deviation from the norms, toward "hedonism" and personal disorganization in the urban centers of America. One of the reasons for family disorganization, which they saw as inevitable, in addition to the anonymity and the weakness of social control in cities, was the character of American laws (Thomas and Znaniecki, 1918-1920; Breckenridge, 1921/1971). These laws gave public schools, juvenile courts, and related institutions the right to control the behavior of parents to the point that children could be taken away from parents who put them to work for pay or physically punished them. Several social scientists studying the immigrants' situation in America noted that the laws and policies of this society also interacted in husbands' and wives' relationships (Thomas and Znaniecki, 1918-1920; Breckenridge, 1921/1971). In the countries from which most immigrants came

marriage gave the husband the right to determine where the domicile should be, the right to "reasonably discipline" the wife and children, the right to claim her services and to appropriate her earnings and those of the children, the right to take any personal property (except "paraphernalia" and "pin money") she might have in full ownership, the right to manage any land she might be entitled to, and the right to enjoy the custody of the children, regardless of fidelity or conduct (Breckenridge, 1921/1971: 47-48).

Bochanan (1963) claims that the rights to sharing a domicile and its maintenance, sexual access, economic gains by the wife and *in genetricem* affiliation of the children of the union to the male line are universal to patriarchal societies, of which European and American societies are descendants. In the cases of families which came from European countries since the late 1800's, the norms of relations between husband and wife, or between parent and child, into which the men were socialized, were not the same as legally sanctioned in America. The Immigrant's Protective League's record in Chicago, as well as documentation in other parts of America, indicates that many a woman found the behavior of her husband, especially in relation to physical punishment or financial support, sufficiently deviant to be subject to criminal action in United States courts. Thomas and Znaniecki (1918-1920:1750-1751) summarized what they considered to be the negative consequences of the American civil rights law and the relations between husbands and wives:

The consciousness that she can have her husband arrested any time she wishes on charges of non-support, disorderly conduct or adultery is for the woman an entirely new experience. Though under the old system she had in fact a part in the management of common affairs almost equal to that of the man, yet in cases of explicit disagreement the man had the formal right of coercing her, whereas she could only work by suggestion and persuasion, or appeal to the large family. Now not only can she refuse to be coerced, since the only actual instruments of coercion which the man has left after the disorganization of the large family - use of physical strength and withholding the means of subsistence - are prohibited by law, but she can actually coerce the man into doing what she wants by using any act of violence, drunkenness or economic negligence of his as pretext for a warrant. No wonder that she is tempted to use her newly acquired power whenever she quarrels with her husband, and her women friends and acquaintances, moved by sex solidarity, frequently stimulate her to take legal action.

The American family system created problems in the relations between parent and child among the immigrants, not only from Europe, but from other parts of the world. Familistic systems granted the father, and even the mother in his absence, the right to control the children's behavior and to any economic goods they obtained through their labor on the family farm or while they lived in the family home. Family, rather than individual economic welfare or status, was the expected focus of concern of all family members. The American focus on the independence of young people after they obtained sufficient schooling, especially when they procreated, goes against this norm of obligation to the family's orientation, that is, the family into which one

is born. Although most American families bear the cost of housing, feeding, doctoring or schooling of their young, immigrant families tend to expect a return payment much earlier and in much more concrete terms than do modern American families.

The expectation by many immigrant parents that their children would contribute all effort to the family welfare, combined with the custom of physical punishment for transgression, resulted in inter-generational conflict as well as in the alienation of the youth. Young girls, but especially young boys, left the overcrowded and tension-filled home to spend all school and work-free hours in the streets or other peer group locations (see Adams, 1910; Whytes, 1943; Suttles, 1968; Thrasher, 1927). Ethnically homogeneous or symbolically identified gangs developed on the streets in immigrant neighborhoods in Boston, Chicago, and other centers. Involved in antisocial behavior, including crime, these gangs also fought each other for territorial and reputational rights. Thrasher (1927: 194) studied 1,313 such gangs in Chicago and found that

The majority of gangs in Chicago are of Polish stock, but this may be due to the fact that there are in the city 150,000 more persons of Polish extraction than any other nationality except the Germans. (10) The gang in Chicago is largely, though not entirely, a phenomenon of the immigrant community of the poorer type. (191) A few of the members of these gangs are foreign born, but most of them are children of parents, one or both of whom are foreign-born immigrants. (191-192) Chicago has the character of a vast cultural frontier – a common meeting place for the divergent and antagonistic peoples of the earth. Traditional animosities are often carried over into gangs and color many of their conflicts in Chicago.

Suttles (1968) found similar gangs contributing to *The Social Order of the Slum* as late as 1968. The involvement of sons in gang activities contributed to conflict with their parents, in a vicious-circle fashion. Thomas and Znaniecki (1918-1920) reported parents in the Polish American community using the American court system in an effort to force their children into cooperation with the family. At the same time, welfare and legal agencies reported frequent cases of what were called “child neglect” and “child abuse” by immigrant parents who were either following the “old country” norms of socialization of the young or who were totally frustrated by their inability to control their children without community cooperation (Breckenridge, 1921/1971; Daniels, 1920/1971; Thomas and Znaniecki (1918-1920).

The criminal behavior of foreign-stock youth did not escape the attention of American society which used this fact as an added proof that an immigration quota system was a wise decision. The criminolo-

gist Taft, (1936: 726-730) felt obligated to remind society that "the foreign born as a whole are committed to penal institutions for felonies in proportion far below their normal ratio." The main reason the second generation youth of the new immigration groups had such high rates of juvenile delinquency, according to Taft, was because of the presence within this group of so many males in the "criminally significant" ages between fifteen and twenty-four. This was particularly true of Polish Americans in cities like Chicago.

One of the groups of immigrants who formed a tight ethnic community without high rates of externally visible conflict between spouses and generations was that of the Jews, although there was a strong division within the community between those who came from Germany and the largest segment which came from Russian-occupied Poland and Russia. This particular group was able, with the assistance of prejudice from the outside, to transmit its values to the second generation and to concentrate on the use of higher education for occupational and financial success in the adopted country. However, even the more disorganized immigrant groups were able to experience some social mobility, and even geographical movement out of the central city areas to its outskirts and, in some cases, to the suburbs. The families which stayed in America rather than return to the home country used their savings to buy homes after helping families left behind in Europe who had been devastated by World War I. Hamtramck, an enclave of Detroit, became a community of Polish families in neat row houses, whose children moved out in a northern or northeastern corridor. The Czechs and Bohemians, who dominated Berwyn outside of Chicago, moved further out, while their Polish counterparts followed Milwaukee Avenue to the northeastern suburbs (Wood, 1955; Radzialowski, 1974). The East-Enders of Boston, who formed a close Italian community prior to urban renewal, were somewhat scattered by that action, but still tended to reform a secondary and even tertiary residence (Gans, 1962). However, most of the second generation Euro-ethnics suffered many consequences of having been born to immigrant parents and having grown up in the slum of at least one ethnic neighborhood. Many were not mobile, having entered the occupational structure pretty much at the same level as were their fathers (Hutchinson, 1956; Duncan and Duncan, 1968). Their lives had been within these segregated communities in most of the major cities and thus they were not equipped to succeed in the broader society (Liberson, 1958, 1963).

Most studies of ethnic stratification in American society show the newer immigrant groups at the lowest rungs of the social status hierarchy (see Anderson, 1962; Greeley, 1974 and numerous other publications). Even geographical mobility is not necessarily an

indicator of social mobility since people have often been forced out of their neighborhoods by urban renewal (Rossi and Dentler, 1961; Suttles, 1968). Gitlin and Hollander (1970:331) entitled one of their sections of *Uptown: Poor Whites in Chicago* "Urban Renewal Means Poor People Removal". Gans (1964) dramatized the problems of East-End Italian-Americans in Boston when their community was broken apart by that city's urban policies. Even if re-settlement is necessitated by the group's prejudice against the newcomers moving into their neighborhood, rather than by urban renewal policies, it is difficult for an ethnic group to stay together in a secondary settlement. Older people tend to stay in the original neighborhood since their main investment is in the home which offers insufficient resale value to enable the purchase of another home elsewhere. They gradually become surrounded by members of new groups of a different cultural background than were their former neighbors which contributes to their social isolation (see Lopata, 1977).

The third generation of European-based Americans tends to disperse throughout the metropolitan regions, seldom concentrating in any area so that they are hard to locate for research purposes (Greeley, 1974). They appear not to have any special problems with their housing and community relations different from those of people of other backgrounds. Being classified as "white" and lacking distinctive physical characteristics which would carry a prejudice-drawing identity with them, they tend to blend in with the descendants of older immigrant groups.

Euro-Ethnics in Chicago

The analysis of family life among the European ethnics in America can be illustrated by a careful look at the population of Chicago, one of the most ethnic cities of this country. Chicago expanded dramatically after the turn into the twentieth century, both in its industrial base and population. Immigrants were pulled here from other parts of America and even directly from Europe to fill the jobs in the steel mills, slaughterhouses, construction, transportation, and numerous other industries (see Table 1). As late as 1960, 65 percent of its population was of foreign stock, that is of foreign birth or of native birth to foreign-born or mixed parentage. The median years of schooling, of just over eighth grade as late as 1940, does not really reflect the background of its population since so much of the schooling was obtained in foreign countries or inferior schools in the urban ghetto (Wirth, 1928). The population aged over the years, but the 1970 figures show a drop in the median age because so many of the whites moved out of the city as the proportion of blacks and Hispanic peoples increased. The new migrants to the city are young, as had been the

European immigrants before them. The white foreign-born are the most apt to be in the eldest age group of 65 and over.

Chicago's Irish males were concentrated in construction, transportation communication, and utilities as late as 1970 (*Chicago's Irish Population*, 1976:27). The Italians and Poles were overrepresented in the manufacture of durable and nondurable goods (40 percent and 47 percent respectively) (*Chicago's Italian Population*, 1976:28-31; *Chicago's Polish Population*, 1976; 31-34). Earlier settlers such as the Germans were more apt to be in wholesale and retail trade, finances, and the professions (*Chicago's German Population*, 1976: 28-33).

The foreign-stock Irish showed a much higher finishing rate of all four groups in the city and suburbs and of the population as a whole, at each level, grade school, high school, and college (See Table 2). Suburbanites had more education than did the urbanites, but the newest immigrant groups, that is, the Poles and the Italians, still suffer educational disadvantages. This is especially true of those members of the two ethnic groups who have remained in the city rather than moving to the suburbs. The figures reflect national statistics, as presented in Table 3. We see here that the older ethnics, that is, those aged 35 or more in 1969, who identified with any of the ethnic groups listed in a special census, are very apt to have not gone beyond high school; many of the Italians and Poles never even finished grade school. The newest migrants, those identified as Spanish speaking, are, not surprisingly, the least educated. The Russians aged 25 to 34, most of whom are of Jewish religious background, have a phenomenal 16+ median years of completed schooling. It is interesting to note two things about the Poles: one, that they obviously did not move in the direction the Russians did as far as schooling is concerned; and two, that they have "discovered" the value of higher education since the young Polish-Americans are now only second in achievement to the Russians, while the older members of this ethnic group were among the lowest achievers.

Returning now to the Chicago area Euro-ethnics, in the four major groups of Polish, German, Italian and Irish, we see that the Poles have a very high owner occupancy rate in the city and both they and the Italians are somewhat higher than the other groups in the percentage of ownership of their residences in the suburbs (see Table 4). Table 5 shows the dollar value of the homes owned by these groups in 1970. There does not appear to be a great deal of difference among the groups, except for a few concentrations and the tendency of the suburban homes to be in higher dollar brackets than are the urban homes. The last stated fact, of course, is not surprising. On the other hand, there is considerable difference in the amount of rent paid by the different groups for their non-owner occupied dwellings (see Table 6).

TABLE 1**The Composition of Chicago's Population by Selected Characteristics in Selected Years**

	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970
Nativity and race characteristics							
% White native born (total)	62.2	66.0	67.6	71.9	71.4		89.0
% White native born of native parents			27.9			64.1	70.0
% White native Born of foreign or mixed parents			39.6			23.3	19.0
Foreign stock			65.0			35.4	
% White foreign born	35.7	29.8	25.3	19.8	14.5	12.1	11.0
% Negro	2.0	4.1	6.9	8.2	13.6	22.9	32.7
% Other races	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.5	0.7	1.7
Median age			28.9	32.1		32.9	29.6
% 65 years and over			4.0	5.8		9.8	Fem: 4.4 Male: 6.2
Median schooling for population 25 years and over				8.5	10.0	10.0	11.2
Median income						\$6,738	\$10,242

* Sources: Unfortunately, the different sources do not organize the information comparably. Louis Wirth and Eleanor H. Bernert (eds), *Local Community Fact Book of Chicago*. Chicago: U. of C. Press, 1949; Evelyn M. Kitagawa and Karl E. Taeuber (eds), *Local Community Fact Book, Chicago Metropolitan Area, 1960*, Chicago Community Inventory, U. of C Press, 1963; Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission -1960-61 *Suburban Factbook*, Chicago, Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission revised with Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission *Suburban Factbook, 1973*, Chicago, 2nd Printing, August, 1973.

TABLE 2

Educational Attainment of Polish, German, Italian, Irish,* and Total Population Aged 25 and Over, Chicago and Suburbs, 1970

Level Finished	Chicago					Suburbs				
	Polish	German	Italian	Irish	Total	Polish	German	Italian	Irish	Total
Grade all	77	83	70	90	82	85	89	79	93	91
Male	80	84	71	90	82	88	91	79	93	91
Female	74	82	69	91	82	82	86	79	94	92
High School all	30	35	31	52	44	42	45	46	67	62
Male	35	37	30	49	45	48	46	47	71	62
Female	26	34	32	55	43	35	43	45	65	61
College all	5	6	3	8	8	8	8	6	19	14
Male	7	9	5	8	10	13	12	9	27	19
Female	3	4	2	9	6	3	5	2	19	10

* Foreign-stock, including foreign-born and native-born of foreign-born or mixed parentage.

Source: City of Chicago, Department of Development and Planning: *Chicago's Polish Population: Selected Statistics*, November 1976 (German, Irish, and Italian separate).

The Poles are especially apt to be living in very low rent apartments or houses, a pattern related to their unwillingness to spend money on items which do not have permanent value. Thus, they tend to spend little on themselves, saving money either to help relatives back in Poland or in anticipation of buying property here (Abel, 1929; Lopata, 1976b, 1976 c; Thomas and Znaniecki, 1918-1920; Obydinski, 1978; Ozog, 1942). Their home ownership rate is thus high, not only in the Chicago area, but throughout the United States (see, also Wood, 1955).

The Irish tend to have been the most recent movers to their present residence, both in the city and in the suburbs (see Table 7). Otherwise, the ethnics in the city are long-time residents with almost a third of the Germans and 25 percent of the Poles having lived in the same dwelling since 1949 or even earlier. Because of the changing nature of Chicago's population and housing patterns, we can assume that these people are the remnants of their ethnic communities in the old sections of the city. This supposition is borne out by detailed maps of the distributions of families of different ethnic origin in Chicago's Community Renewal Program, *An Atlas of Chicago's People, Jobs and Homes*, which, unfortunately, cannot be reproduced here.

TABLE 3**Highest Grade of School Completed by Persons 25 Years Old and Over, by Ethnic Origin**

Origin	Total (thou- sands)	Percent distribution by years of school completed							Median school years com- pleted
		Total	Elementary		High school		College		
			0 to 7 years	8 years	1 to 3 years	4 years	1 to 3 years	4 years or more	
Total, 25 years old and over	106,284	100.0	13.8	13.4	17.6	33.9	10.3	11.0	12.2
25 to 34 years old	23,884	100.0	4.5	4.8	17.4	43.5	14.7	15.2	12.5
English	2,301	100.0	4.3	4.6	15.5	41.2	16.8	17.6	12.6
German	2,848	100.0	1.6	4.1	14.8	47.4	14.6	17.5	12.6
Irish	1,670	100.0	2.6	3.7	18.8	45.1	15.9	13.9	12.6
Italian	902	100.0	5.3	3.3	16.3	50.4	12.7	11.9	12.5
Polish	503	100.0	1.3	3.0	10.6	53.8	15.1	16.2	12.7
Russian	209	100.0	0.7	0.7	3.7	24.7	17.7	52.5	16+
Spanish	1,239	100.0	19.2	10.0	23.5	32.2	9.8	5.3	11.7
Other	11,625	100.0	3.6	4.4	17.5	43.3	15.6	15.6	12.6
Not reported	2,585	100.0	6.2	7.2	20.3	43.6	10.9	11.8	12.4
35 years and over	82,400	100.0	16.5	15.9	17.6	31.1	9.1	9.8	12.0
English	9,698	100.0	11.9	13.7	17.8	31.7	11.1	13.6	12.2
German	9,977	100.0	10.6	22.0	16.1	34.2	8.6	8.5	12.0
Irish	6,960	100.0	14.3	16.3	18.8	32.9	8.4	9.3	12.0
Italian	3,780	100.0	23.5	17.7	20.0	27.6	5.2	5.9	10.3
Polish	2,266	100.0	18.5	19.0	19.2	30.9	5.2	7.2	10.9
Russian	1,375	100.0	10.8	12.1	11.9	35.1	11.7	18.4	12.4
Spanish	2,576	100.0	43.0	14.4	14.9	17.5	5.7	4.5	8.5
Other	37,661	100.0	16.5	14.3	17.8	31.1	9.9	10.4	12.0
Not reported	8,106	100.0	20.4	17.3	17.6	30.0	7.4	7.4	11.1

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census: *Population Characteristics*, P-20, 221, April 30, 1971, *Characteristics of the Population by Ethnic Origin*, November 1969.

TABLE 4**Occupancy Status of Polish,* German, Italian, Irish, and Total Households, Chicago and Suburbs, 1970**

	Chicago					Suburbs				
	Polish	German	Italian	Irish	Total	Polish	German	Italian	Irish	Total
Owner DCC	62	49	55	35	35	85	79	84	79	72
Rent for cash	36	50	43	64	64	14	19	15	20	27
No cash rent	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	0	1

* Foreign-stock, including foreign-born and native-born of foreign-born or mixed parentage.

Source: City of Chicago, Department of Development and Planning: *Chicago's Polish Population: Selected Statistics*, November 1976 (German, Irish, and Italian separate).

The final piece of evidence as to the housing characteristics of these four ethnic groups in metropolitan Chicago concerns household size (see Table 8). Between a third and a fifth of the German, Irish, and Polish people in the city itself are living alone, being mainly widows, with some widowers, of an elderly age. These are the people still in their old homes in the old neighborhoods now dominated by a different group. A study of Polonia's or the Polish American community widows who fell into a sample of current or former beneficiaries of social security found many of these women quite alienated from their new neighbors and dependent upon one child, usually a daughter, for most of their support (Lopata, 1977). Their children have dispersed into the suburbs and elsewhere, but one offspring tends to keep in contact. Their friends, who were mainly neighbors, met outside of the home during the round of daily activities, are dead or moved away; the church has changed; the old voluntary associations in which Poles tend to be very active have changed headquarters; and they are relatively isolated (see also Bild and Havighurst, 1976). The other ethnics tend to live in two-person households, with the spouse, and not too many have more than one additional person at home, usually an unmarried offspring (Wrobel, 1979; Wojniusz, 1977; Radzialowski, 1974; Lopata, forthcoming).

TABLE 5**Home Value of Polish,* German, Italian, Irish, and Total Households, Chicago and Suburbs, 1970**

Home Value in \$	Chicago					Suburbs				
	Polish	German	Italian	Irish	Total	Polish	German	Italian	Irish	Total
—15,000	17	13	15	18	16	14	13	7	9	13
15,000—19,999	26	24	20	26	27	17	20	13	14	19
20,000—24,999	27	29	28	33	27	19	21	27	20	20
25,000—34,999	26	30	27	19	22	27	26	32	32	26
35,000—49,999	4	3	8	3	6	15	13	14	14	14
50,000+	1	1	2	1	1	8	7	6	11	8

* Foreign-stock, including foreign-born and native-born of foreign-born or mixed parentage.

Source: City of Chicago, Department of Development and Planning: *Chicago's Polish Population: Selected Statistics*, November 1976 (German, Irish, and Italian separate).

Many of the elderly ethnics and most Chicago ethnics are elderly and rather restricted in their activities. A Chicago Need Assessment Survey, sponsored by the Mayor's Office for Senior Citizens in 1973, found many of the British, German, Italian, Polish, and Russian Chicagoans, that is, people born in those countries now living in the city to "never" engage in many activities outside of the home with other people, such as going to movies, plays, concerts, or meetings of clubs and church organizations, or playing cards (see Table 9). p2 These comments apply particularly to the Italians and much less to those who were born in Russia. It is surprising to see such a wide range of activities and, since most of the elderly had not achieved

TABLE 6**Gross Monthly Rent for Polish,* German, Italian, Irish, and Total Households Paying Cash Rent, Chicago and Suburbs, 1970**

Gross Rent in \$	Chicago					Suburbs				
	Polish	German	Italian	Irish	Total	Polish	German	Italian	Irish	Total
1-79	28	14	13	14	13	16	4	5	8	7
80-99	20	15	20	14	16	10	8	11	3	9
100-119	17	24	20	20	20	15	12	8	11	12
120-149	17	26	24	22	28	18	24	26	19	21
150-199	11	14	19	23	17	26	34	32	38	33
200	6	6	4	8	7	15	17	17	22	17

* Foreign-stock, including foreign-born and native-born of foreign-born or mixed parentage.

Source: City of Chicago, Department of Development and Planning: *Chicago's Polish Population: Selected Statistics*, November 1976 (German, Irish, and Italian separate).

much schooling, the differences cannot be attributed to that variable. One reason why some elderly ethnics of Chicago do not engage in more activities outside of the home is that they are afraid of being hurt or victimized in their neighborhood (see Table 10). On the other hand, three-quarters of those born in Eastern Europe and 81 percent of other foreign-born Chicagoans find their neighborhoods to be safe. It is thus possible that the lifelong or recent withering of personal resources, through death and mobility, health or financial constraints, accounts for the infrequency with which Chicago ethnic people utilize the city's resources for social contact.

TABLE 7**Year Moved into Housing Unit, Polish, German, Italian, Irish, and Total Populations, Chicago and Suburbs, 1970**

Year moved	Polish	German	Italian	Irish	Total	Polish	German	Italian	Irish	Total
1965-70	27	28	37	41	55	32	34	28	45	52
1960-64	17	17	20	18	17	23	17	23	19	19
1950-59	31	23	27	23	15	30	27	32	23	18
1949 or earlier or always	25	31	16	18	13	15	22	7	13	11

* Foreign-stock, including foreign-born and native-born of foreign-born or mixed parentage.

Source: City of Chicago, Department of Development and Planning: *Chicago's Polish Population: Selected Statistics*, November 1976 (German, Irish, and Italian separate).

Summary

The problems faced by European ethnics in America stem from three sources: their background limitations; the unwillingness and possible inability of the dominant society to help them through the relocation; and their life constraints as well as consequences of living in urban lower-class ethnic communities and ghettos. Their background limitations stemmed not only from their not being socialized and educated in the dominant American culture, but also from the low educational and rural composition of the immigrant stream. More educated, urbanized, and industrialized immigrants faced fewer problems of adjustment in this society. Americans were overwhelmed by the immigrants at the turn of the century and did not help solve their problems, allowing victimization, exploitation, housing and neighborhood deterioration, inferior schooling for both adults and children, and

TABLE 8**Household Size and Overcrowding of Polish, German, Italian, Irish, and Total Population, Chicago and Suburbs, 1970**

No. of persons in household										
	Polish	German	Italian	Irish	Total	Polish	German	Italian	Irish	Total
1	21	33	17	29	25	10	20	9	17	12
2	36	38	34	28	29	28	39	30	28	27
3	18	14	15	14	16	21	16	17	15	18
4	15	8	17	11	12	19	11	19	14	18
5	6	4	9	5	8	11	7	14	11	12
6	3	1	5	5	4	7	4	7	6	6
7	2	1	1	3	3	3	2	3	4	3
8	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	1	4	2
9 or more	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	1
Households more than one person per room	5	1	5	8	10	5	2	6	6	7

* Foreign-stock, including foreign-born and native-born of foreign-born or mixed parentage.

Source: City of Chicago, Department of Development and Planning: *Chicago's Polish Population: Selected Statistics*, November 1976 (German, Irish, and Italian separate).

the spiraling of multiple difficulties. The price of this neglect and health and welfare damaging existence in the centers of our cities is difficult to estimate. It was in many ways throughout the life course of the first generation, and usually into the second; its repercussions are still reflected in a lack of ability to take advantage of opportunities, lack of self confidence, and in a myriad of other constraints. The question is, what can be done for new waves of immigrants to prevent

TABLE 9

Percentage of Respondents "Never" Engaging in Selected Activities, by Race and Place of Birth, Chicago Needs Assessment Survey, 1973*

Place of birth and race	N	Reads newspapers	Reads magazines & books	Goes to movies, plays, concerts	Goes to clubs, church meetings	Goes for a walk	Plays cards with others	Works around the house	Work on a hobby	Watch T.V.
U.S. born, white	520	16.9	5.2	55.4	59.0	21.2	47.3	35.6	43.1	3.1
U.S. born, black	186	20.1	19.1	73.7	50.0	31.4	69.6	45.4	61.9	6.7
British Isles (includes Ireland)	27	22.2	3.7	74.1	63.0	22.2	70.4	51.9	66.7	7.4
Germany	34	17.6	17.6	61.8	52.9	14.7	58.8	14.7	29.4	5.9
Italy	32	59.4	37.5	84.4	71.9	15.6	71.9	9.4	53.1	9.4
Poland	50	30.0	10.0	64.0	54.0	20.0	60.0	36.0	40.0	2.0
Russia	27	25.9	11.1	48.1	37.0	00.0	66.7	29.6	51.9	7.4
Total	876									

* Chicago Mayor's Office for Senior Citizens, Chicago Needs Assessment Survey, 1973, unpublished. Tabulations prepared by Clarence L. Fewer.

TABLE 10**Chicago Needs Assessment Survey Respondents Judgment of Safety of Neighborhood of Residence, by Place of Birth***

Safety?	Native born U.S.	Eastern European born	Other foreign born	Total	
				%	N
Yes	64.8	74.6	80.7	68.1	673
No	17.2	12.8	5.5	15.0	149
Part of time	15.4	9.8	11.3	14.2	140
Don't know	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.7	27
	742	106	141	100.0	989
	75.0	10.7	14.2		

Chi Square = 19.39254 with 6 degrees of freedom (p. .01)

* Chicago Mayor's Office for Senior Citizens, Chicago Needs Assessment Survey, 1973, unpublished. Tabulations prepared by Clarence L. Fewer.

some of the damage to them and to insure their rights to life with dignity in the United States?

REFERENCES

- Abel, Theodore. "Sundeland: A Study of Changes in the Group-Life of Poles in a New England Farming Community." In Edmund De S. Brunner (ed.) *Immigrant Farmers and Their Children*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1929: 213-243.
- Addams, Jane. *The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1910.

- Anderson, Elin L. "Ethnic Stratification in the Community." In Milton L. Barron (ed.) *American Minorities*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.
- Bild, Bernice R. and Robert J. Havighurst. "Senior Citizens in Great Cities: The Case of Chicago." *The Gerontologist* 16, 1, Part II (February, 1976): 1-88.
- Breckinridge, Sophonisba. *New Homes for Old*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1921. Republished under William Bernard (ed.), *Americanization Studies*. Montclair, New Jersey: Patterson Smith, 1971.
- Breton, Raymond. "Institutional Completeness of Ethnic Communities and the Personal Relations of Immigrants." *American Journal of Sociology* 70 (September, 1964): 193-205.
- Community Renewal Program. *An Atlas of Chicago's People, Jobs and Homes*. Chicago, June, 1963.
- Cross, Robert D. "How Historians Have Looked at Immigrants to the United States." *International Migration Review* 7, No. 1 (Spring, 1973): 4-22
- Daniels, John. *America via the Neighborhood*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1920. Republished under William S. Bernard (ed.), *American Studies*. Montclair, New Jersey: Patterson Smith, 1971.
- Duncan, Beverly and Otis Dudley Duncan. "Minorities and the Process of Stratification." *American Sociological Review* 33, No. 3 (June, 1968): 356-364.
- Etzioni, Amitai. "The Ghetto." *Social Forces* 37, No. 3 (March, 1959): 258-263.
- Fallows, Marjorie. *Irish Americans: Identity and Association*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1979.
- Fast, Howard. *The Immigrants*. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1977.
- Gans, Herbert. *The Urban Villagers: Group and Class in the Life of Italian-Americans*. New York: The Free Press, 1962.
- Gist, Noel and Sylvia Fleis Fava. *Urban Society*. 5th ed. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1964.
- Gitlin, Todd and Nanci Hollander. *Uptown: Poor Whites in Chicago*. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Golab, Caroline. *Immigrant Destinations*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1977.
- Gordon, Milton M. *Assimilation in American Life*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Greeley, Andrew M. *Ethnicity in the United States*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974.
- Handlin, Oscar. *The Uprooted*. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1951.
- Hutchinson, Edward. *Immigrants and their Children, 1850-1950*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1956.

- Jackson, Anthony. *A Place Called Home: A History of Low-Cost Housing In Manhattan*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1976.
- Kennedy, John F. *A Nation of Immigrants*. New York: Popular Library, 1964.
- Kramer, Judith. *The American Minority Community*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1970.
- Liebersohn, Stanley. "Ethnic Groups and the Practice of Medicine." *American Sociological Review* 23, No. 5 (October, 1958): 542-549.
- Liebersohn, Stanley. *Ethnic Patterns in American Cities*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1963. Press, 1965.
- Liebersohn, Stanley. "Life Styles of Elderly Urbanites: Chicago of the 1970's." *The Gerontologist* 5, No. 1 Part 1 (February, 1975): 35-41.
- Liebersohn, Stanley. 'Polish Immigration to the United States of America: Problems of Estimation and Parameters.' *The Polish Review* 21, No. 4 (1976a): 85-108.
- Liebersohn, Stanley. *Polish Americans: Status, Competition in an Ethnic Community*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1976b.
- Liebersohn, Stanley. "The Polish American Family." In Charles H. Mindel and Robert H. Habenstein (eds.), *Ethnic Families in America*. New York: Elsevier, 1976c.
- Lopata, Helena Z. "The Function of Voluntary Associations in an Ethnic Community: Polonia." University of Chicago, Ph.D. dissertation and later published in Ernest Burgess and Donald Bogue (eds.), *Contributions to Urban Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago
- Lopata, Helena Z. "Funkcja Stowarzyszen Dobrowolnych w Polonijnej Wspolnocie Etnicznej." *Studia Polonijne* (Lublin, Poland) 2, (1977a): 83-112.
- Lopata, Helena Z. "Widowhood in Polonia." *Polish American Studies* 34, No. 2 (Autumn, 1977b): 7-25.
- Lopata, Helena Z. *Women as Widows: Support Systems*. New York: Elsevier-North Holland, 1979.
- Lopata, Helena Z. "Polish American Families." In H. Kubiak and T. Gromada (eds.), *Synthesis of the Past and Contemporary Changes of Polonia in the U.S.A.*, forthcoming.
- Mullan, Eugene. *The Mentality of the Arriving Immigrant*. New York: Arno Press, 1917.
- Musick, John. "Ethnicity and the Economic Squeeze." Paper. The University of Michigan School of Social Work, April, 1971.
- Obidinski, Eugene. "Polish American Social Standing: Status and Stereotypes." In Frank Mocha (ed.), *Poles in America: Bicentennial Essays*. Stevens Points, Wisconsin: Morzalia Publishing Company, 1978.

- Ozog, Julius John. "A Study in Polish Home Ownership in Chicago." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Chicago, Department of Sociology, 1942.
- Radzialowski, Thaddeus. "The View from a Polish Ghetto." *Ethnicity* 1, No. 2 (July, 1974): 125-150.
- Rainwater, Lee, Richard Coleman, and Gerald Handel. *Workingman's Wife*. New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1959.
- Rossi, Peter and R. Dentler. *The Politics of Urban Renewal: The Chicago Findings*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1961.
- Sennett, Richard. "The Brutality of Modern Families." In Helena Z. Lopata (ed.), *Marriages and Families*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1973b.
- Sennett, Richard. *Families Against the City: Middle Class Homes of Industrial Chicago 1872-1890*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- Suttles, Gerald. *The Social Order of the Slum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Taft, Donald. "Nationality and Crime." *American Journal of Sociology* 1-4 (August, 1936): 724-736.
- Thomas, W. I. and Florian Znaniecki. *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1918-20.
- Thompson, Brian. "Newcomers in the City: Factors Influencing Initial Settlement and Ethnic Community Growth Patterns." In David W. Hartman (ed.), *Immigrants and Migrants: The Detroit Ethnic Experience*. Detroit: Wayne State University Journal of University Studies, 10, No. 2,3,4, (Fall 1974): 30-50.
- Thompson, Frank V. *Schooling of the Irish*. New York: Harper and Row, 1920. Republished under William Bernard (ed.), *American Studies*. Montclair, New Jersey: Patterson Smith, 1971.
- Thrasher, Frederick M. *The Gang: The Study of 1,313 Gangs in Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927.
- Ware, Caroline. "Foreign Language Press." In Edwin R. A. Seligman and Alvin Johnson (eds.), *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* 5: 378-382.
- Whyte, William Foote. *Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- Wirth, Louis. *The Ghetto*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928.
- Wojniusz, Helen K. "Ethnicity and other Variables in the Analysis of Polish American Women." *Polish American Studies* 5, 34, No. 2 (Autumn, 1977): 26-37.
- Wood, Arthur Evans. *Hamtramck: Then and Now*. New York: Bookman Associates, 1955.
- Znaniecki, Florian. *Modern Nationalities*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1952.

Wrobel, Paul. *Our Way: Family, Parish and Neighborhood in a Polish American Community*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1979.

Zorbaugh, Harvey Warren. *The Gold Coast and the Slum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.

* * *

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Thank you.

We will now turn to the responding panel – the responding and reacting panel.

The first panelist is Peter Ujvagi, who served as a Commissioner on the National Neighborhood Commission until it concluded its work in April of this year. In that capacity, he chaired the Commission Task Force on Governments, Citizen Involvement, and Neighborhood Empowerment and directed the work that led to the publishing of a Commission book about the nation's community and neighborhood organizations.

He also serves as an officer with the Birmingham Neighborhood Commission and the River East Economic Revitalization Corporation in Toledo, Ohio.

RESPONSE OF PETER UJVAGI

Thank you very much. I'd like to make a couple of comments or share a couple of thoughts and then proceed to my remarks or reactions to the two panel papers.

The first one is that one of the first times that I've heard about this consultation of the Civil Rights Commission, I – at the time I heard about it – had an opportunity to look over some papers and some materials on how this consultation was going to take place.

And one of the comments that was made in those papers really struck me, and I think it is appropriate today, in terms of where we start dealing with the issue of ethnicity and whether the ethnic dimension is one that the Civil Rights Commission needs to look at in terms of discrimination.

And that was, as Dr. Kromkowski commented a bit earlier today, a discussion of the fact that in recognition of the potential impact that this consultation might have on the credibility and reputation of the Commission, planning had been conducted in what was called a high level of sensitivity for this two-day event.

It is essential that this consultation be conducted in an academic atmosphere and setting and involve participants with impeccable reputations for scholarship and character. This would elevate it above

inter-group politics which otherwise could cause chaotic planning and a less successful consultation.

Well, after having read that, I was sort of struck with the invitation to participate because I can assure you that, if you ask any of my college professors about my impeccable reputation for scholarship, I would be in deep, deep trouble; and I would rather not comment about my impeccable reputation in terms of my own character.

But I would say that that might be a good start for the Civil Rights Commission in terms of a perception of what we ethnics are. I can assure you that we are not necessarily unwashed, that we don't always cause revolutions, and that it doesn't always result in unmanageable intergroup politics and conflict.

And I think that what most of my comments today will be focused on are the perception of what ethnicity is, the perception of who ethnics are, and the perception of our role in society and in the community; I think that that might be a very good place for us to all start.

The second thought that I had sitting here today was that the first time I participated in a national ethnic meeting, convocation or setting, or whatever you want to call it, was in 1970 in an old dormitory with peeling paint and no air conditioning in the middle of summer in Washington, D.C., when a small group of us sort of huddled together and whispered the word "ethnicity" and started discussing in some ways what all of that meant.

A number of the people who are here today were at that session as well. It's very interesting to see that.

Today we find ourselves testifying in front of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission on Circle Campus in Chicago that was built on the remains of a very viable ethnic community at one time; so I suppose we have arrived, but in sort of a mixed way, I would say.

My task today is to respond to two papers that have been presented, one by Dr. Naparstek and one by Dr. Lopata.

I would proceed to do that, and then I would like to make a couple of comments in response to questions that were raised this morning, and I hope to do that in a short sort of way.

Dr. Naparstek's paper on geographic discrimination, I think, provides very accurate cataloguing of some of the issues facing urban neighborhoods today. They were very much the kinds of issues that the Neighborhood Commission looked at and ones that are very real and very active in terms of the concerns that neighborhood people have.

The issues of redlining, housing redlining, and insurance redlining, FHA appraisal practices, the mental health in neighborhoods, illegal aliens and the sweep of neighborhoods where illegal aliens live, the

dynamics of neighborhood change are all very much issues that are of today, and not necessarily just academic issues, but things that all of us face in the community.

A number of things struck me as I read that survey of housing issues and their context of neighborhoods and based, I guess, in geographic discrimination, based on race, ethnicity and neighborhood.

I see those three things as very much interrelated. My own perception on ethnicity is that the danger comes in with ethnicity or ethnocentrism, especially when it is taken out of context of community and out of context of neighborhood and out of context of a physical setting and where it becomes just an idea that interrelates among people but does not have any grounding in day-to-day events, day-to-day experiences and the way that we live our lives.

And so very much, as you hear repeated today, and I heard the questions this morning – why do we talk about ethnicity in terms of the context of the neighborhood? Because I think the issue of ethnic discrimination, if there is such an issue, exists there, in the neighborhood, because some members of ethnic communities have chosen to stay in ethnic neighborhoods, sometimes because they were forced to stay there, but other times because they have made a choice and said, “We want to live in that sort of an environment.”

And so, therefore, when the deterioration of housing and city services and all sorts of other things happen, that’s where the battleground is. It is in the context of neighborhoods, and so that’s why I think that the neighborhood perception of that is very, very important.

Dr. Naparstek talked of a number of things: the concept of risk in terms of the perception of neighborhoods by bankers, insurance people, real estate agents, and how that results in self-fulfilling prophecies. I think that’s a very important thing to look at because in many ways there has been significant documentation around how redlining has started as a perception of what was going to happen to a neighborhood in the future, and, sure enough, when the resources were not available for the continued ownership, for renovation of homes, ultimately that neighborhood declined and deteriorated. It didn’t decline because redlining had already existed, but because of what the concept of risk had been for.

One of the things that really struck me in both papers, in a sense, is how much research results in policy and results in action and how important it is, as was discussed this morning, that research that takes place by the Civil Rights Commission or anyone else take into consideration the perceptions of an ethnic community.

The example being very much – the FHA Manual that Dr. Naparstek talked about, and the perception that was discussed in that

FHA Manual, and one of the things that struck me very much, on Page 10 of Dr. Naparstek's paper, he talks about who the list of important people in the community were that were recommended, that a real estate agent should talk to them in terms of what their perception of that neighborhood is – the policeman, people in politics in the administration, et cetera.

It struck me because during our research with the Neighborhood Commission, we found almost the identical instruction in 1977 and 1978 from housing and urban development to their contractors to go out into communities to determine the effectiveness of community development subgrant programs and of citizen participation.

It is the same folks that are being talked to in terms of perception. Very seldom are the people in the neighborhood who become recipients of whatever programs may be – or the results of actions – being talked to.

Very seldom do they have an opportunity, if they're not direct participants in a project, in a program, to be able to have their say, and I think that that is very, very, important.

The other point is around the whole human ecology model of invasion and the concept that that is the way that neighborhoods change. If we accept that model, that is in direct conflict, I think, to that part of Dr. Naparstek's paper that talks about the initial perceptions that realtors, bankers, insurance people have, and how is it the fact that the ethnics in the 1920's, or immigrants in the 1920's, moved into a neighborhood. Did that decline make the neighborhood decline or today is it, in the last 20 years, because minorities move into a neighborhood who are also ethnic? I think that point has been made repeatedly today.

Is that why a neighborhood declines, or is it because there were predecisions made to that, the lack of credit, the fact that large houses are being broken up into tenements, as they were broken up into tenements, into smaller units in the 1910's and 1920's for immigrants, as they are being done again for minority people moving into the city.

Which comes first is a very, very important issue, and if we accept the invasion in philosophy or theory, then I think that there are some very significant and major problems that we continue to face.

Again, in terms of Tony Downs, who was discussed, and the whole triage concept – it came out of research, became accepted, became a policy and became an action that has resulted in the devastation of innumerable ethnic neighborhoods, minority neighborhoods.

The importance of how research is constructed at the very beginning becomes critical in terms of the kinds of policy actions that ultimately become the end products of all of that.

Also, I saw in Dr. Naparstek's paper two particular areas that need further research to support the assumptions that he made in the paper. On Page 17 he talks about mental health reaction and how various ethnic groups and people from various cultures react differently in terms of how mental health services are delivered to them, their own perception of life, and in how those services ought to be delivered.

I think there needs to be more research in that whole area to show that and hopefully to build the kind of public policy on that, that then we'll become more sensitive to multi-ethnic reality in our community.

Again, in terms of the issue of gentrification, many of us have seen how in core center city areas gentrification is very much occurring and a great deal of displacement is occurring. I think there needs to be much more research conducted to document the assumption that that sort of gentrification is also happening in Euro-ethnic or white ethnic communities as well as in minority communities.

Dr. Naparstek, from my reading of the paper, concludes with recommendations in three general areas. He feels that his recommendations fall into three categories.

One is there are specific legislative and programmatic changes that have to be made.

Two is the need for increased sensitivity and understanding of the dynamics of neighborhood life on the part of those who impact on that life.

And three is the need for capacity building empowerment of neighborhoods.

My perception would be that the second of those two categories are probably the most important: a need for an increase in sensitivity and understanding of those who are in policy- and in decision-making positions and of what the dynamics of neighborhood life in an ethnic community in a multi-ethnic city are because their decisions ultimately impact on that community.

It's very evident in his paper, in the discussions of the FHA practices, in the discussions of Tony Downs and the triage dynamics, and in many ways, as I said at the beginning, in even the perception that some, perhaps, on the staff of the Civil Rights Commission, had about what type of us ethnics ought to be up here and what type of us ought not to be up here, in terms of what you're going to get as an end product out of all of that.

An increased need for understanding of that is very important. I think that comes out of research. We have a great deal of research in terms of the historical dynamic of immigration into the United States.

I feel that there isn't sufficient research into what the realities of ethnic communities are and what the ethnic culture in the United

States is today, and we can only base policy decisions on that, while the historical part of it is very, very important.

As I said, I feel the most important concern is the need for greater understanding.

With that thought in mind, I'd like to move to Dr. Lopata's presentation and her discussion of the historical perspective of immigration into the United States, which provided us with a great deal of insight into what has happened historically with a number of ethnic groups as they came into the United States and as they struggled to become part of society.

I have a great deal of concern, however, in the presentation, in the sense that, both in terms of the idea of the invasion concept of how a community changes, and also that, as it is pointed out, by the third generation there is little sign of discrimination, there is a great deal more mobility, there is a great deal of educational opportunity, et cetera.

If that's the case, then I think our argument or the Civil Rights Commission's argument ought to be that what we need is time, that ultimately we'll all melt down into some form or another and we'll be able to function in society, and, therefore, the great distinction between what happens with white ethnics and what happens with racial ethnics, is the sense that we can wash off our ethnicity by giving up our identity, giving up our culture, giving up the place where we live. But, those of us ethnics who come from a minority community can't do that.

But I do not see that as a valid argument. I think it is very important to take a look at the issue of ethnicity in terms of those people who choose to continue to preserve their ethnic identity, who choose to continue to live in their community, who choose to live a life style that might be different from the overall culture of the community, and what is the result of that choice, and, therefore, are their opportunities restricted in terms of their participation in the American society.

In conclusion with all of that, one thing that I would argue for is that we are not talking here about ethnicity in the sense of old world ethnicity or nationalism.

But I very much believe in the concept of a new ethnicity that is peculiarly American, that is very much a mix of where we came from, but it is an identity that has been forged, as it were, in the crucible of America and it is an identity that is an American ethnic identity.

I have a Hungarian cultural background, but I am an American. I am a Hungarian-American with a particular idea of what my identity is in this country, and I think that that is a very important distinction because once we make the break of saying there is a valid American ethnic identity, then we can proceed to talk about the question of what

does that mean in terms of public policy, the kinds of decisions we need to make in terms of public policy, and the kinds of discrimination that continue to exist for all ethnic Americans.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Thank you.

Our next panelist is Dr. David Guttman. Dr. Guttman is an Associate Professor and Director for the Center for the Study of Pre-Retirement and Aging at Catholic University.

He is the principal investigator for four major studies on aging and has written extensively on aging and on education and social work.

He holds Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctoral degrees in social work from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, the University of Maryland, and The Catholic University.

Dr. Guttman.

RESPONSE OF DAVID GUTTMAN

I am delighted to be able to respond to my colleagues' excellent papers. Both papers deal in a historical context and, through scholarly use of references, with age-old prejudice and discrimination against the newcomer, the immigrant, and the ethnic residents of old neighborhoods.

The presentations of my colleagues focus on housing and on geographic discrimination, that is, on discrimination at the neighborhood level. They both address a major issue in this consultation. This issue, however, is not the neighborhood per se. Rather, it is the social environment, the community, which affects directly the mental health of people. I would like to direct my comments to this matter as a social scientist and as a researcher in aging. I am in full agreement with Dr. Naparstek's perception of a neighborhood, that of a cultural and social microcosm composed first and foremost of human beings with various needs. Chief among these needs are the need for dignity, for community, and for security, as my colleagues have expressed these needs so eloquently in their papers.

There is sufficient evidence in research about mental health which indicates that the community in which one lives can spell the difference between coping with stress and institutionalization. The connection between a sense of community and mental health has been found, for example, in our recent study titled "Informal and Formal Support Systems and their Effect on the Lives of the Elderly in Selected Ethnic Groups" in which we investigated the perception of the elderly in eight ethnic groups from Eastern, Central and Southern Europe regarding their situation in the community and use of support systems.

We studied elderly people from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. We studied Jewish, Polish, and Italian elderly. We studied Greeks and Hungarians. As you can see, we had representatives of the smallest and of the largest of ethnic groups of European origin. We had representatives of many religions: Jews, Catholics, Lutherans, Greek Orthodox, and others. We had elderly people living in closely-knit ethnic neighborhoods, such as Little Italy in Baltimore, and people dispersed in the suburbs of Metropolitan Washington, D.C., and Baltimore, Maryland. We had people from all socio-economic backgrounds. We believe that a study of ethnicity and support system use must encompass the variety and richness of the different experiences people bring into any situation. Therefore, we also studied elderly who were old immigrants and new immigrants and those who were born and raised here in America but identified themselves as ethnic people. Our most significant findings relate to these people's perceptions of their community. We found that the majority lived in their own homes for long periods. We found that two-thirds considered their communities safe and desirable. We found that elderly people did not want to change their living arrangements. Less than 1.3 percent perceived their communities as less than desirable for living there than other communities. As Dr. Naparstek noted, the perception of racial change as a precursor of decline is a myth. Like any myth, it is not supported by facts. Attachment to the old familiar communities is an expression of the need for security for older Americans of European ethnic origin. This attachment to a place called home is even more significant considering the fact that 90 percent were living in ethnically mixed communities. For over half of the respondents in our study it did not matter whether their neighborhood was ethnically homogeneous or mixed. What mattered was the fact that they felt themselves part of a social environment which enhanced their dignity. This feeling of our older respondents about their living arrangements was more strongly expressed in assessing the treatment accorded to the elderly in the U.S. at large than with the treatment given to the elderly by the community.

While only 29 percent thought that the elderly are treated well in the U.S. and 26 percent saw the treatment as bad, and while 33 percent expressed a need for better care of the elderly by the society, 54 percent considered the treatment as well by the community. Only 5.8 percent thought that they needed better care. More significant were our findings about the treatment of the elderly in their immediate surroundings. Close to 54 percent saw this treatment as better than that given by society or the community at large.

It is important to recognize that the formal and informal care-giving systems serve best in an environment familiar to persons who need the

service. People need and use neighborhoods for a variety of life-sustaining functions. For example, one out of five retired men, and two out of five retired women report that they have no one to turn to for help when they have very basic problems. Deprived of the very fabric of our society, deprived of life-sustaining social networks and interaction with fellow neighbors and ethnic or non-ethnic organizations, their aloneness gives rise to increasingly aberrant socio-somatic symptomatology. Yet, those who live and participate actively in the social world of the community report fewer symptoms reflecting mental health impairment. Social networks, sometimes called helping networks, refer to the various people each of us turns to for coping with daily problems of living. Research indicates that these social bonds provide 80 percent of the coping abilities of average persons, compared to 20 percent of the same provided by various professionals in combination.

Research thus creates a new awareness of the community, of the neighborhood, not as a geographical place, not as a matter of bricks and mortar, but as a critical resource in maintaining, nurturing, developing and enhancing positive mental health. Both Professor Lopata and Dr. Naparstek call for increased sensitivity and understanding of the dynamic of neighborhood life and for empowerment of the neighborhoods and their residents to assume a more meaningful role in the management of their lives. As a researcher of ethnicity, I consider central to both requests the acceptance of research as a mechanism for discovering, substantiating, and assessing the needs and the abilities of Euro-ethnics, as well as other culturally diverse groups to live in dignity in this country. At the present, research, especially as related to the living conditions of millions of people in many ethnic groups, is in its infancy. Until now, the bulk of the literature on ethnic people, and ethnic aged in particular, has dealt entirely with differences between blacks and whites. Moreover, seldom do we encounter any attempts or any efforts to study more than a few groups. Yet, the realization of prevailing cultural diversity and marked differences in perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors of people from different cultural backgrounds necessitates the need to study the basic questions about the multitude of groups that make up the essence of America as a culturally pluralistic society. General surveys of whites, or blacks, or Asians, or Hispanics, can no longer be considered appropriate and relevant for providing accurate and useful information in planning policies and services for a heterogeneous body of consumers.

Briefly, I recommend the following areas for increased study:

- 1) Studying the ways in which ethnic communities can meet the needs of the people. Understanding the present conditions for

reliance on various supports cannot be artificially separated from people's past and present patterns of behavior;

- 2) Studying the ways in which government can assist ethnic communities in offering meaningful services to people. As we know, the smaller ethnic communities lack the necessary funds for creating needed services in their communities.
- 3) Studying the meanings which each cultural group attaches to such terms as needs, resources, and use of services;
- 4) Studying the criteria by which the adequacy of services will be measured; and
- 5) Studying the actual participation and involvement (at all levels) of people in neighborhoods in the decision-making process.

Euro-Americans, along with any other group of Americans, are entitled to the basic rights of independence and well-being. Translating these rights to actions on behalf of all groups, from the smallest to the largest, will be a formidable task for the Commission and for all those upon whose decisions the welfare of Euro-Americans largely depends.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Thank you Dr. Guttman.

Our third and final panelist is Dr. Richard Kolm, a Professor of Social Services at Catholic University.

He is the organizer and first President of the National Ethnic Studies Assembly.

He holds a Doctorate in sociology, has written extensively on the role of ethnicity in an urban pluralistic society and has been a consultant on ethnic groups to the White House, the National Institutes of Mental Health, the Ford Foundation, the Urban Coalition and the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs. Dr. Kolm.

RESPONSE OF RICHARD KOLM

DR. KOLM. I am very happy to be here and to attempt to contribute to the discussion.

Dr. Naparstek has limited his paper to geographic discrimination defined as being determined on the basis of location. He gave a very useful survey of the varieties of these kinds of discriminations which we may assume refer also to the Euro-ethnic communities, though he has not specifically mentioned them.

He further indicates past and present policies and practices of governmental agencies from local to Federal involved consciously or unconsciously in these discriminatory practices.

He also pointed out some important aspects of problems of human relations involved in this area, such as the relationship between the professional helper and the natural community helpers which implies a

need for cultural relevance in training of professionals in social services.

In his numerous recommendations, Dr. Naparstek uses the generic term "minorities" and thus apparently equalizes the Euro-American groups with racial minorities with regard to their need for protection and assistance, which essentially is the subject of this conference.

With reference to the subject of housing, it is certainly a bridging issue common to all ethnic groups. Nobody would deny that housing is a very important issue to the general welfare of the population as it affects family and community life and consequently the growth and development of every member of society as well as of the society as a whole.

From the point of view of the Euro-Americans, the most important issue is that of the ethnic neighborhood or, in more general terms, of the ethnic community. This has its direct implications for the discussion of this subject, particularly with reference to aspects differentiating the non-white and the white population in general, and the east and south Euro-Americans in particular.

For the non-white population, the main issue with regard to housing is direct discrimination affecting availability of decent housing for them. For the Euro-Americans, the main issue is the disintegration of their neighborhoods, with their networks of social relations and institutions, and their distinct culture and life styles derived from the Old World culture and modified by their American experience.

To understand the full meaning of the ethnic community, we have to look back at the history of immigration to America and also look into American history in general. This, to some extent, has already been done by the previous speakers, and I think I can omit it here.

The main factor in the formation of closed communities by the Euro-Americans, in addition to the availability of employment in the urban centers, was the fact of social discrimination against them.

The rejection and often hostile attitudes of society towards these millions of newcomers – mostly deep country subsistence farmers, ignorant of the language, customs, and manners of the new land, and seen by the hosts as being inferior and incapable of assimilation – forced these masses to create their own social conditions necessary for their psychological security, their mental health, or simply for their sheer psychological and physical survival.

And they created these conditions by recreating the only way of life they knew, which was that of the Old Country village, complete with the church and the inn, the old style family and community patterns including the corollary traditions, customs, as well as superstitions, all of which gave their lives meaning and purpose.

They did not plan it that way. They came here, lured by the American dream, filtered down to them through Western Europe over the decades. They dreamed of economic betterment and of freedom from political and religious oppression.

They had no conscious intentions of continuing their cultural identity or of isolating themselves from the new society. It was simply and purely a natural, self-defensive reaction to the non-supportive, at best indifferent, and very often hostile social environment.

And even with the creating of their communities, their survival was not easy. But survive they did, though not without paying a high price in personal and family disorganization and cultural fossilization.

It so happens that this tendency of immigrant groups to develop their own settlements and maintain their social and cultural patterns is being recognized at present throughout the world as the most effective mode of adjustment for immigrants to their new society and culture. It is called the group adjustment principle in immigration and it is recognized and encouraged as the best mode of integration of immigrants by most receiving countries.

The most striking case is that of Australia, which, after World War II, having received for the first time in their history large numbers of non-Anglo-Saxon immigrants prevailingly from East and South Europe, abandoned the originally adopted philosophy of individual adjustment and officially adopted, by an act of Parliament, the group adjustment principle I believe in 1958 or 1957.

The United States never officially changed its traditional emphasis on individual adjustment of immigrants, but recognized the group adjustment principle, tacitly, by allowing in 1939 the Jewish-American community to take care of 40,000 Jewish refugees fleeing the Nazi persecution.

The group principle was also tacitly recognized and applied to the over 400,000 displaced persons who were admitted to this country in the years of 1940 to 1953. This operation is called the most successful mass resettlement of immigrants in the history of mankind.

In returning, however, to the ethnic communities of the East and South Europeans which developed mainly in the pre-World War I period, their initial closed community survival methods did not fit the needs of later developments. The critical moment came when after World War II the ethnic veterans returning to the communities could not accept the small houses built by their parents and the narrow and confining parochialism of the ethnic communities and began to move out to the suburbs to establish their own families. The general increased prosperity in the country as well as the experience of the camaraderie of the trenches or of the defense work in factories widened the aspirations of the younger ethnic generation.

Deprived of the most vital membership, some of the old, ethnic communities began to succumb to disintegration. The subsequent infiltration, under the pressure of needs by the surrounding non-white ethnic groups, often led to panic, to sellout and abandonment of whole neighborhoods. Ruthless exploitation of such situations by the real estate agents, bankers and insurance brokers did not allow the time for finding other solutions. In some cases confrontations with the new neighbors led to conflicts causing negative reaction of the society toward ethnic communities and accusations of exclusiveness and backwardness.

Despite these problems, most of the ethnic communities survived and are regaining their vitality.

Meanwhile, the societal attitude toward ethnic communities remains ambivalent, though a great deal of improvement has taken place in the recent decades in the wake of the Black Revolution.

At the same time, increased governmental intervention aimed at equalization of life chances to those most deprived – economically, socially and culturally – were often seen by the Euro-American communities as favoritism toward non-white groups, or even as being aimed at the destruction of the white ethnic communities, creating among them feelings of frustration, bitterness, and alienation.

Thus, the Euro-Americans have found themselves at a critical point in their history. They are afraid that by losing their ethnic turf they will lose their distinct identity and they know that they cannot afford to maintain their identities through their traditional methods of isolation from society.

The answer to this dilemma may lie in the reorientation of ethnic communities from maintenance of identities through residential concentration and exclusiveness, towards the skillful use of dispersed patterns, and towards the ability to live and interact with other groups in an open neighborhood, community, and society.

On the other hand, efforts should also be made towards greater acceptance of ethnic diversity by society, both in its informal and formal forms, including ethnic communities with their visible, distinct patterns of expression and of interaction based on ethnic bonds.

Signs of growing acceptance of ethnic diversity are multiplying. The recently published report of the President's Commission on Mental Health recognizes the existence of ethnic groups by consistently using the term "racial and ethnic groups," instead of the commonly used term "racial-ethnic groups."

The report also strongly emphasizes the need for "culturally relevant services," which is a new concept with far-reaching implications for the helping professions. It compels those professions to revise

their hitherto universalistic approaches and to recognize the significance of ethno-cultural differences among their clients.

Above all, the report, as quoted by Dr. Naparstek, emphasizes the community approaches and the identification and use of the natural networks of support, mentioned also by Dr. Guttmann a moment ago. Finally, the report points out strongly the need for research to increase our knowledge of informal and formal community support systems.

Such approach and emphasis seems to be tailored for ethnic communities which, due to their strong social and cultural bonds and their extensive formal and informal support systems, could most effectively demonstrate, with little help, the usefulness of these approaches, aimed in the end at achieving self-sufficiency and self-reliance.

Dr. Lopata's report on the Euro-American families in urban America gives a wealth of detailed, documented information on the circumstances of the settlement of the European immigrants in this country, the background conditions of immigration, and settlement and the development of ethnic communities and the problems these communities experienced and coped with in their history, and finally on the problems of families and individuals.

Dr. Lopata also carefully describes the conditions of American society at the time of influx of the masses of European immigrants around the turn of the century. Without blaming the society, she points out its many inadequacies and shortcomings at that time which caused many hardships to and maladjustments of the newcomers.

I also agree, however, with Mr. Ujvagi's remarks that at times the paper gives an impression of a rather pessimistic approach towards the meaning of ethnic groups.

On my part, I would like to add here some comments on the ethnic family and its significance in American society.

I will quote again from the President's Commission on Mental Health. In the section on "Diversity and Pluralism in American Family Types," (Vol. III Appendix, p. 28) the report states:

The richness of the American heritage and the diversity that typifies American families have just begun to be recognized and appreciated. No typical or ideal family exists.

The report stresses the contribution of families to the maintenance of personal mental health through "their roles as advocates, stabilizers, and defenders of individuals confronted with societal forces which are, at times, overwhelming" and refers to minority families which "have nurtured and maintained their members through centuries of societal indifference, if not outright hostility toward their welfare."

The report states further that, "Paradoxically, minority families have received very little credit for the admirable job done in this sphere."

The above quotations are as relevant to the east and south Euro-American families as they are to families from other ethnic or racial groups. Economic hardships and deprivations, discrimination and prejudice were, in the past, and to some extent still are, common experiences to them.

The worst deprivation to the east and south Euro-American families is the long-standing denial by the American society of the legitimacy of their efforts to socialize their children in their ethnic cultures. The constant pressures by society toward assimilation and toward abandonment of ethnic patterns, carried out through the educational system, mass media, and public opinion, undermined the ethnic family and its socialization processes and instilled in ethnic children feelings of inferiority and insecurity. Alienation of children from their families and intergenerational conflicts are frequently the results leading in some cases to personal and family disorganization.

But despite these deprivations and discriminations, most east and south Euro-American families coped as well as they could with these problems. By keeping their simple religious faith and traditions, by maintaining their relentless work-ethic and their unperturbed life optimism, they raised their children as American citizens willing to prove their commitments to American ideals through sacrifices on the battlefield as well as through their contributions in brain and brawn to the development of the most powerful nation in the world.

But there are limits to coping. Theoretically one can say that the well-being of the family should be the central concern of all social and cultural systems. But in the young, pluralistic American society, the family in general, and especially the ethnic family, is largely left to its own resources. The only support ethnic families can get is from their ethnic groups.

According to the President's Commission on Mental Health report, mentioned above, there are about "50 million. . . Americans who are children or grandchildren of immigrants from southern and eastern Europe, out of an estimated 100 million Americans, white and nonwhite (who) identify with an ethnic group." (Vol. III, Appendix, pp. 878 and 879.)

One of the main characteristics of the eastern and southern Euro-Americans is their strong emphasis on family and community life. Generally regarded as basic components of societal functioning, family and community are also extensively discussed in the President's Commission on Mental Health report as being a "major coping strategy" for maintenance of individual mental health. The report also

cites the neglect of minority families, especially in research, as a reason for the "retardation of the recognition of the skill and dedication with which minority families can marshal limited resources to maintain positive mental health in the minority community"; it further states that "Some efforts are now being made to study ways in which these informal networks can be strengthened and how some of their coping skill can be utilized by the majority culture as well." (Vol. III, Appendix, p. 572)

These are important pronouncements which may result in meaningful action. Meanwhile, however, the historical neglect by society and negative societal attitudes and even actions, together with changes in the urban scene are endangering ethnic communities and weakening ethnic families, thus adding to social disorganization in American society.

Help is urgently needed. It is still possible to revitalize ethnic communities and to reinforce their potential for self-reliance. Ways must and can be found to reconcile the self-determination of ethnic groups with the need for their integration in the open American society. Any constructive action aimed at assisting the eastern and southern Euro-Americans in the development of their potential for full participation in American society and for contribution to it should probably include the following general considerations:

1. The increased acceptance by American society and recognition of their positive role in society.
2. Intensive data collection on these groups, and especially on their communities and families, through detailed census data and through special research.
3. Increased sensitivity and response to the cultural uniqueness of these groups and development of culturally relevant social policies and social services for them.
4. Consistent involvement of the groups concerned in all planning, decision-making and programming of activities related to them.

The passing of an act securing equal protection of the laws under the Constitution will be an important step in providing support and assistance to these groups in their efforts to become equal partners in the future development of American society.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Now we have had the presentations and the panelists; the remaining portion of this period will be for questions and comments from the Commissioners and Staff Director.

DISCUSSION

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Dr. Naparstek, you probably are familiar with the fact that the Commission fairly recently issued an oversight report relevant to the enforcement of fair housing legislation.

In that report we took the position that our nation had made very little progress in the direction of an effective implementation of fair housing laws.

We called for two things. We called for two among a number of recommendations – two I'd like to underline.

One was that we urge an amendment of the Fair Housing Law so as to give the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development cease and desist authority.

The second thing is that we urge that the Department of Housing and Urban Development mount a far more effective and vigorous enforcement program than has characterized the Department up to the present time.

Do you feel that the Euro-ethnic community can support recommendations of that nature and that a vigorous and effective enforcement of the Fair Housing laws would contribute to the kind of objectives that the Euro-ethnic community has in mind?

DR. NAPARSTEK. I can't speak for all the various communities out there, but of the people I work with in cities as diverse in ambiance as Newark, New Jersey and Boston, Massachusetts, Los Angeles and Chicago, yes, absolutely.

I think with that has to go a real strengthening of the regulatory functions that relate to the credit needs of people with the Fair Housing law. The two have to go together.

I think the issue around – the most critical issue there – if we can strengthen those regulatory functions, I think it will take us out of the bind of the urban-suburban kind of tensions that currently exist in cities like Hartford, New Haven, Boston, et cetera.

But the two really have to go together, and I think the agencies that need to be looked at very carefully in terms of the regulatory functions are the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, in particular, the Federal Reserve, the Federal FDIC, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Those are the agencies that, in many, many ways, create the preconditions that make it impossible to achieve fair housing, so I think that has to be looked at.

Simultaneously, I think we have to look at the subsidy and incentive programs that emanate out of HUD. I think the Civil Rights Commission is in a very good position now because there's approximately 60 pieces of legislation expiring at HUD this year, in 1981, rather, in 1980, the next session of Congress, and I think to take a close

look at those pieces of expiring legislation that relate to the kinds of goals that you establish would make a lot of sense.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. As you know, we're in complete agreement with you on the regulatory agencies, and we did make some very specific recommendations in that area, also.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Mr. Vice Chairman?

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. I'd like to pose this question to all of the panelists.

The reason we have segregated housing — that's obvious. This panel is devoted to ethnicity and housing, and the problem with segregated housing is — as a lot of your papers and comments describe — that it is very difficult to get a mix of various groups in a given geographic area, partly for reasons of ethnicity, I suspect mostly for reasons of economic class, in the sense that those who might be there have become middle class, lower middle class, et cetera.

A new immigrant wave comes in and starts absorbing, doubling up, et cetera, in older housing stock, and so forth. People panic, flee; we know the story. And we go through this type of cycle. We are seeing this now in reverse, as I note your papers comment in terms of the inner city. We may be on our third or fourth cycle in some of the inner cities of America.

And I guess my question is this: We listened to the panel this morning; we listened to you and read the papers, and we say what we need is self-determination. We need sufficiency. We need a chance for people to live where they want to live, to have a neighborhood, to have an ethnic identity, et cetera, et cetera.

But one of the problems, the reason we are where we are in public school desegregation, where we move children around because we couldn't move their parents around, is that some groups did not have that choice of self-determination and sufficiency.

So I guess I'm asking you, if you were a Federal Judge who has to sit on a case that involves desegregation, that's obviously caused by housing segregation, and you have to strike the balance between moving people between neighborhoods because historically, by government forces, by nongovernment forces, by cultural attitudes, by psychological reasons, for whatever reason, they were denied that free choice to live wherever they wanted to live in the city, what would you

do? Where would you strike that balance between the self-determination and sufficiency of neighborhoods you talk about and the fact that millions of people do not really have an effective choice in that regard because they have, in effect, been told "We don't want you to live here in this neighborhood; go try somebody else's neighborhood."

DR. NAPARSTEK. Let me take a shot at that. It's a loaded question.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Well, it's a question a Federal Judge has to decide every day in this United States.

DR. NAPARSTEK. Absolutely, and I think implicit in it are what are the dimensions of the inclusion-exclusion issues related to neighborhood empowerment, the assumption being that if you have a strong neighborhood, whether it be Polish or black, people are going to be excluded.

I've struggled with that issue for the last 15 years in a variety of different ways, and my experience has been – and I think it's beginning to be backed up by the literature now – that where there are strong neighborhoods and there is a sense of not only sufficiency, but equity and security, where people feel they're getting a fair deal and people evaluate that in different ways, people feel that there is security related to their social needs, their educational needs and their physical needs as well as sufficiency, which I would define as access to those neighborhood institutions that are supposed to be serving them.

Those folks have mechanisms and structures to handle differences.

One of the things that's really been lacking, I think, because so many of the networks and so many, regardless of the jargon you use, mediating instructors, whatever, churches, synagogues, have been destroyed and weakened in these neighborhoods, is that we've lost the mechanisms for handling differences.

Take Boston for example. I sit on Dr. Wood's panel on dealing with desegregation up there, and we found, for example, that many of the parents of Roxbury did not want their children bused into South Boston. They do not want their children bused into South Boston because for 15 years now through the compensatory education programs provided in the '60's, many of those parents have gotten control of those local neighborhood schools.

Many of those schools, quite frankly, are much, much better than the schools in Dorchester and South Boston, and, in fact, the lowest reading scores in Boston several years ago were in Louise Day Hicks' district.

The mechanisms for handling those differences have to be in strong neighborhoods, and if they're in strong neighborhoods, then I think we have a much better chance of dealing with those differences and negotiating them out.

So that's the only kind of answer I can come to. When it gets to the point of a Judge, as it has in Boston, with Judge Garrity, it's often too late. It's very, very difficult.

Father Groden tried harder than any one person I know in Boston, with the support of Garrity and others, to deal with just that question you're raising; and I think he's had some limited success within the control that he has.

I think of Gary, Indiana, for example. The white ethnic neighborhood - there are 57 different nationality groups represented in a white minority city that was experiencing the institutionalization of black political initiatives.

The mechanisms for handling the differences in the Glen Park area of Gary and the other areas that had those various nationality groups were weakened tremendously, tremendously. They couldn't handle the difference, and that's when I made the commitment to get involved in white, working class, ethnic neighborhoods, and not say let the Tony Imperiales, let the Louise Day Hickses, let the Frank Rizzos become the leadership in those communities. There's positive leadership possible, like the Barbara McCluskeys and many others through the - Steve Attibotto in Newark and many others throughout the country.

So your question's loaded in that you're taking it to the extreme of bringing it before the Judge. I think we've got to look at the process from the beginning. I do not believe it's too late, but I think we've got to provide alternative leadership to some local demagogues that are exacerbating fears.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Okay, I agree with you. Now, let's then go back to the stage at which you can work in a city such as Gary, Indiana.

Given the ethnic identity, weakened though it might be, it still exists and -

DR. NAPARSTEK. The ethnic identity is not weakened. There are institutions that could have been utilized and have been since utilized to handling differences and decreasing tensions and building on issues related to equity, security and sufficiency in those neighborhoods.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Well, expand on that for me as to what institutions were weakened and why in a city such as Gary, or any other cities with which you are familiar. I am also curious how you work prior to the Judge's order in order to keep these things from escalating into problems.

So what is a constructive way to approach the city in its varying stages now and its varying relationships between ethnic identity and the institutions and networks one can use to get to some of these problems?

DR. NAPARSTEK. Running the risk of oversimplification, I mean -

in fact, in Gary, we – when I was there, between '65 and '70, we paid careful attention to the – how public housing should be built in that city, and I might add public housing was not built in Gary from 1953 to 1968 because the City did not allow it, through local zoning ordinances, et cetera, and codes, although we did achieve some degree of race mix and income mix. The work of the Potomac Institute suggests that.

To get to your question, specifically and very dramatically, when highways go right through a neighborhood and result in the tearing down of churches and synagogues, that's a very dramatic example.

When you build public housing as occurred in this city, the Robert Taylor homes, 30 blocks of public housing, all right, over 15 to 20 stories high, with elevators outside that don't work in the winter, separated from the rest of the city by – what is it, the Dan Ryan Expressway – or whatever that expressway that runs off the Eisenhower Expressway – separated from the rest of the city by that, that's a new form of urban apartheid.

That's a mistake. Those kinds of public policies, the Highway Transportation Act, the public housing of 1948, the urban renewal programs of '54, have led to unintended consequences that get directly at the issue you're talking about.

A second way I think we need to look at, in terms of avoiding these kinds of conclusions, is to take a process approach as well as a program approach.

We're not going to be able to legislate all things, but it's wrong when you use community development and block grants in a way that does not strengthen existing communities, and in fact in many ways weakens it. Cleveland is a good example of \$24 million that was allocated to Cleveland a year ago, two years ago. Only 1.2 million was used for housing rehab; 12 million was used for overhead in City Government, and the rest was turned back to the Federal agencies, and you wonder why you have tensions in that city. And you can find that happening over and over again.

The Urban Development Action Grant Program, \$400 million program, when it's used for downtown development in a city like St. Louis or Detroit, Renaissance City – it wasn't used for Renaissance City, but the appendages of it now – and you have urban ethnic week in Detroit, neighborhoods contiguous to the downtown area receiving absolutely nothing in terms of any kind of subsidy or incentive; you're going to have those kinds of problems.

When in St. Louis a group of mothers in a public housing project, Cochran Gardens, which is contiguous to the Pruitt Igo site – thank God that's no longer there – want to get control of their public housing project and want to go to work and ask for Title 20 money

and they can't get it out of the state to create a day-care center, or a group of Irish women in Cambridge want to do the same thing and are confronted with legal, administrative and physical obstacles to the point of having urinals three feet off the ground because of some anachronistic state law, and they can't do it, that becomes a problem and exacerbates further tensions.

So I think those are the kinds of issues; what we had in Gary in the '60's and early 1970's was a sense that the black community was getting everything and the white community was getting nothing.

All right. That was the perception in the white community, be it real or not, further reinforced by the media, all right?

It wasn't until we got into the white community and the white, working class, ethnic community you began talking about it and developing the issues that were coalitional they were able to bring that together.

Same thing happened between the North Ward in Newark and the Central District. They were coalitional issues. That's the process approach.

I argue very strongly for recommendations related to capacity building on a neighborhood level so people can begin to put this kind of thing together and come together on some of these issues.

DR. LOPATA. I would like to support what was said this morning about education. I think we have an extremely inefficient, outdated, nonhumanistic educational system.

There is no reason for the schools to be organized the way they are now; I think a lot of the problems of ethnics of many continents in America are solvable to a great extent by a reconstitution of our educational system.

We're certainly not doing very well with education right now.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Well, as I understood this morning's comment, it went more to the private and alternative, which could be public school, than it did to the public school.

DR. LOPATA. No, I mean all kinds of schools. Public schools do not have to be organized the way they are.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. I have great worries about the private school being simply a way to further segregation by economic class.

DR. LOPATA. No, I'm sorry. I take that back. Yes.

No, I'm talking about public schools. I think Chicago's a perfect example.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Well, let me ask you, if the other panelists agree with the comments that Professor Naparstek made, or would you add anything to his response to my question as to how would you rule if it does get to court, and if you don't want it to get to court, what do you suggest in terms of utilizing existing structures within a

particular neighborhood, so that it isn't segregation simply for those that arrived on the boat ahead of another boat, although too often it has been segregation by those who arrived on the boat three or four centuries after others arrived on the boat, except the later arrivals were not in chains?

DR. KOLM. I generally agree with Dr. Naparstek on the basic issues. I do think that understanding and cooperation cannot be legislated, or forced.

I think that the working out of the differences has to be done by the people in the neighborhoods where these differences exist; they also have to find solutions to these problems of differences.

I also think that the preparation of the communities or neighborhoods for the meetings and discussions of their problems is a very important aspect which requires a great deal of skill and of understanding of cultural differences by the community organizers or official workers.

I think the biggest problem in the area of intergroup relations is that we do not have enough skilled community organizers who have a good understanding of cultural differences.

This is a neglected area in the training not only of community workers, but, as the President's Commission on Mental Health report states, of all workers in the field of mental health.

The proper preparation of workers working with communities and trying to help people to get together and to discuss their common problems is the first condition for success in this work.

Then, obviously, the careful selection of people for community work is also very important. They should have enthusiasm for working with people, competence, sensitivity, and a capacity to relate to their groups.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Commissioner Ruiz?

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. The more I hear the more confused I become, but confusion is healthy though, because one then strains to solve the dilemma.

The statements made by this panel for the record are going to require much analysis.

The panel has raised several questions which, in my mind, are an attempt to define policy for the future.

Is it too late to revitalize the old communities? Is it desirable to do so? Can we in any viable way preserve some of the old and adopt some of the new, and, if so, how can the old and the new best exist side by side?

How do we balance the two? You see how I'm confused?

"There are apparently many neighborhoods in various stages of community cohesion; some have been described as weak, others as very strong.

There's one thing that I have selected from the discussions, and I've pulled it out, with respect to the theme that the strong, ethnic community has the best mechanism to deal with the problem. Did I get it right?

DR. NAPARSTEK. No, I didn't say that. The strong ethnic community does not necessarily have the best mechanism. There is a greater likelihood that there is a mechanism within the community to handle differences between class as well as race and ethnicity.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Then that would be a mechanism for purposes of dealing with the problem?

DR. NAPARSTEK. The problem-solving.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Are we going to build new communities, and if so, where? We have built communities and they've been a mess, as you just described. Where do we go and build those communities if we do not vitalize those that already exist?

These are a lot of questions, a hodge-podge in reality, but I'm trying to come down to the bottom line somewhere.

DR. NAPARSTEK. Well, I think we've gone through the process since World War II of building communities. I mean that's what suburban development's been all about.

But when we did our study in 1970 of redlining in Chicago in zip code 60622 and we found what happened to that \$33 million that didn't go back in the community, went for suburban development, even though it was the working people's money from that neighborhood or West Division Street.

It went to Florida for development; it went to Portugal, and it even went to South Africa. That's wrong. That's structure disinvestment.

What we have and what we're dealing with now is our cities - our rural areas are becoming suburbs, our suburbs are becoming slums, and our cities are becoming wastelands - and we've got to begin stopping that process.

In other areas our cities are becoming gentrified where only the very, very rich can live there.

So it's not just one thing. It's many, many things.

What we do not have right now, and what I said at the beginning of my remarks, is a policy that can deal with the issues of discrimination as it impacts on individual groups as well as on neighborhoods as a whole.

I've given many, many examples in my paper of geographic discrimination, how certain neighborhoods are discriminated against in

terms of credit, and how that can affect the total fabric of that neighborhood.

In many of the urban industrial areas in the Northeast, the Midwest and cities like San Francisco and Los Angeles, and others, people who live in those cities, the white people who remain, many of them are – if you want to use the term, it's the first time I've ever used it – Euro-ethnic, fine. There are people who define themselves as Polish, Italian, eastern European, et cetera.

In New York, you have over a million and a half Jews, tremendous Jewish poverty there. There are mechanisms emerging in New York City – the Poverty Council, the various religious institutions are beginning to deal; there's a lot of tension there.

There's a lot that has to be handled, because it wasn't handled for the last 40 years.

I do not think we want to build new communities. I think we need to look at ways in which existing communities can be rehabilitated for the people who live there now.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. And your prognosis from that point of view is favorable.

DR. NAPARSTEK. My prognosis is favorable if there are substantial changes in the regulatory functions – and this is one of the roles I see of this Commission and one of the reasons I came to Chicago today – and there are substantial changes in the current legislation.

Some communities need targeting of Federal money. There's no question about it.

When you talk about a Youngstown, Ohio, you can't talk about self-help. Those communities have been disinvested in a structural way through the private sector over a period of 15 years. There's nothing that's going to help that community except targeting of Federal money, and the same thing is true in communities like Gary and others throughout the country.

It's going to be a bundle of strategies, but we have to get at the issues that set one group off against another, and I think a lot of those issues relate to geographic discrimination.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. I want to thank you. This has been very helpful. I can tell you that from the questions, that we could probably go on for another hour, but we do have another session, and I want to say thank you to all of you, the presenters and the panelists.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. I want to join Commissioner Freeman in expressing our deep appreciation for the contributions that have been made.

Third Session: Education and Ethnicity

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. We turn now to the area of education, and I'm going to ask my colleague, Commissioner Ruiz, to preside during the consideration of the issues in that area.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Education and Ethnicity, the presenter, Francis Femminella, Professor of Sociology and Education, State University of New York, Albany, New York since 1967.

In 1976, he presented the keynote paper at the White House Conference on Ethnicity and Education. He has served since 1975 on the National Advisory Council on Ethnic Heritage Studies and was appointed Chairman of the Council in 1977. He holds Bachelors' degrees in philosophy and sociology, a Master's degree in psychiatric social work, and a Doctoral degree in sociology and anthropology.

Welcome, sir.

STATEMENT OF FRANCIS FEMMINELLA, PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY AND EDUCATION, STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, ALBANY

DR. FEMMINELLA. Thank you, sir. Thank you.

I'd like first of all to thank the Commissioners and the organizers of this consultation for inviting me to participate and present this paper. It represents the work of a humanistic social-science theoretician, rather than a practitioner, but it is my hope that some practical consequences will come out of it.

The central problem facing the United States with respect to education and ethnicity is that prejudice and discrimination against European ethnics exists, and it is both overt and covert.

The central focus of my paper addresses subtle, covert, pervasive prejudice and injustice foisted upon European ethnics by selected other European ethnics, as often as not without malice, usually without awareness, and mention of its existence is generally met with disbelief and denial.

The paper is long, and so I would just like to mention what the major headings are and then move to the recommendations.

I begin in my paper by discussing what sociologists of education have referred to as "meritocratic" versus "revisionist" arguments. The meritocratic argument essentially is that education outfits people for society and the most talented get the best jobs.

The revisionist argument very simply states that this is unfounded. In fact, the structure of society is such that other kinds of things determine who gets what.

The critical literature of the past 15 years has said something different. It has said that schools destroy teachers and pupils both.

Neither the revisionists nor the meritocratists confronted directly the Coleman thesis that the extent to which an individual feels that he has some control over his destiny appears to have a stronger relationship to achievement than do all the school factors together, a thesis to which the educational critics often refer.

What I have tried to do in this paper is to syncretize these three positions by utilizing the theoretical constructs of Erik Erikson and particularly his notion of "ego identity" and specifically the stage that comes before the development of ego identity, namely, the stage of "industry."

Children, for their part, are actively engaged in the process of developing a sense of industry. They now learn to win recognition by producing things. This is what happens when kids are in school. This is the age when they begin to see themselves as having worth because they produce something worthwhile, and teachers tell them that this is good, and so they come to know it.

But the danger to the psycho-social development of the child at this stage lies in a sense of inadequacy and inferiority. The opposite of a sense of industry is a sense of inferiority.

"A danger threatens individual and society where the school child begins to feel that the color of his skin, the background of his parents, the fashion of his clothes, rather than his wish and his will to learn will decide his work as an apprentice, and thus eventually his sense of identity."

That is the way Erik Erikson spoke about this 30 years ago.

The traditional success of the curricula of our schools in teaching self-reliance and industry is matched by a traditional failure of the curricula of our schools to teach children the dual dimensionality of their heritage.

I think this durability of heritage is an important concept. It is important for us to know that every American, and I mean every American, has two heritages. By virtue of citizenship, he is entitled to a domestic heritage, and by virtue of family biography every American has an alien heritage, including the native Americans who were not "United Statesians," although they are Americans.

The lack of education for a global perspective and the elimination of foreign languages from curricula are all linked in this problem.

I would like to mention briefly the subtitle of this work, which I think is the key to where I am going. It is called "Education and Ethnicity: Euro-ethnics in Anglo-ethnic Schools."

The schools in the United States were thought of from the earliest period, in Revolutionary times, to be a viable source of nation building, and there are some interesting paradoxes involved in this.

From the very beginning they were established for the sake of this ethnicity, whether it be for religion or for the establishment of the preservation of the white Anglo-Saxon culture.

Now, having been established for the purpose of maintaining the cultural heritage of the people, by the time of the Revolution the major distinguishing characteristic of the school was, as Gutek puts it, basically to consist of the reconstruction of imported English institutions.

Higher education in that period was imitative of the two major English universities, Oxford and Cambridge.

And so what we have then is a kind of an English school system educating in the early days the Dutch, the French, the Spanish, the Portuguese, the Afros that were here, and later on all of the other peoples who came to the United States.

And so the dominance of one ethnic group over all others brought about a situation where, today, the purpose of the schools is to eliminate ethnicity.

Children in school today, even in those cases where ethnicity is taught, where there has been some reform, where multi-cultural education, for example, goes on, are nevertheless taught by a method and a mode of instruction that carries with it the Anglo-German tradition that was developed in the country, and this tradition serves to destroy some of the unconscious aspects of ethnic heritage of non-Anglo children.

Now, I'm going to say more about that in a moment, but for now I'd like to mention that in the schools we do have overt prejudice; in the paper I record some of that, particularly with respect to research that I've conducted in New York State at the City University and the State University.

There are no nationwide statistics easily available, and it is fascinating why not. I think it is in part because Euro-ethnics believe in that meritocratic myth.

They think that when they were prejudiced against – and we talked about that earlier – when they were exploited, that this was a fair and proper obstacle that newcomers could be expected to overcome as a kind of “price of admission.”

They believe that they were supposed to go through all that exploitation; that was their dues; and so they paid their dues. And they didn't look at themselves as being prejudiced against. They do not even see it sometimes, even though they are suffering it.

More importantly is the covert prejudice which goes not only to Euro-ethnics, really, but to all Americans. The fact is that we are essentially a monocultural society whose major characteristic is our multi-ethnicity.

So when we talk about ourselves as having pluralism here, we are not talking as Mr. Levine mentioned this morning about the Horace Kallan – or really originally the Deweyan – notion of cultural pluralism, such as they had, let's say, in Switzerland.

When I, as an Italian-American, go to Italy, they make it very clear that I am an American. They make it very clear to me. And so it is with each of us, as we go back to the lands of our fathers, we find out very quickly we're Americans. But we are Americans who, because this is a cultural democracy, are allowed to have a sense of our own ethnicity and our own heritage. At least that is what we think we ought to have.

Individual and group values and value-orientations constitute a comparative aspect of culture that can be found to be transmitted by socialization, and these have been extensively studied; but there's another dimension of culture found in individuals and transmitted by socialization, but rarely studied, and that's the particular and distinctive mode of "processing information" that is characteristic of each group.

By "information processing," I'm talking now about the way people learn, analyze, express, or, stated from a cognitive learning perspective, the way we order our world.

The manner or mode of acting out these learning behaviors is what we mean by cognitive style. That is an important notion for us.

There are different cognitive styles for different people; the psychological literature shows that. One of the questions that we have is whether or not there are, in fact, group cognitive styles. People have hesitated to get into that area, but certainly the ethnological and historical, and even the linguistic literature gives us some clues.

In my paper I deal with that, and I won't have time to go into it deeply, except to say that if our schools are English in orientation, one might compare English schools with non-English schools in Europe, and what I do in the paper is talk briefly about Italian schools and describe differences.

For example, the Italian style is an aural/oral style. You can read a book, if you want to, but it's more important, if you're in the Italian school, that you just pass the exams by whatever method you want, and "we'll offer you lectures to help you, if you care to use those lectures."

The English school is quite, quite different. It stresses a reading style and it is much more concerned with form and format.

What that means is that when people come into this country, having been raised under those other kinds of styles, the acculturation process that they go through is mediated by linguistic encoding which goes on for at least two to three generations, so that the United States is being

changed whether we like it or not; and all I am saying is, while I am not gainsaying the value of Anglo-German educational cognitive styles, what I am saying is that there are alternative styles that should be made available to all Americans. We have a right to that.

And, in fact, they are being destroyed, and somebody ought to defend why they are allowed to destroy those styles.

The challenge to the school in the 1980's, with respect to ethnicity and education, will be to effect the complete reversal of that stance which the schools have taken historically, insisting upon Anglo norms of education and behavior.,

And I have a few pages of recommendations, which I'm not going to get to, except to point out that what we need to do is to get into research in these areas and then to start to develop programs. With the newly formed Department of Education, one would hope that they would be encouraged to develop an integrated perspective on ethnicity and intercultural education, in all aspects of education, not just in so-called ethnic education, but rather in all aspects of the curriculum so that it is not just another add-on, but rather there is a real reform and a real sensitizing of the entire educational institution, of which school is only one part.

So that eventually children, as they "become", as they grow, are able to make America over in their image, which is their right as Americans.

I would like to acknowledge the bibliographic assistance and help in clarifying ideas of Michelle Keegan, Peter Stoll and Linda Constantine, and the students in my educational sociology seminar.

Thank you.

[The complete paper follows]

EDUCATION AND ETHNICITY: EURO-ETHNICS IN ANGLO-ETHNIC SCHOOLS

Francis X. Femminella, Ph.D.*

I.

In the mid 1920's W. I. Thomas introduced the principle that how people define their situation is of far greater importance than the actuality of the situation. "If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequence." Robert Merton, writing in the late 1940's, has

* Associate Professor of Sociology and Education, State University of New York at Albany

shown that we act on the basis of our subjective understanding of the meaning of the situation. We thereby unwittingly create a self-fulfilling prophecy. Our definition evokes behaviors and consequences which makes the original false conception come true.

Just over a decade ago Rosenthal and Jacobson in their report of experiments conducted in the Oak School, a public elementary school, and subsequently Corwin and Schmidt in their study of children in inner cities schools, noted that children tend to achieve at the level expected of them by their teachers. The evolution of this thought and relevant research findings have generated what has been referred to as the “meritocratic and revisionist” arguments.

The *meritocratic* argument largely emanated out of sociological functionalism, particularly the work of Talcott Parsons; Peter Blau and Otis Dudley Duncan followed up this work with empirical research. A basic premise of this argument is that all the institutions in society are structured in order to serve a particular function. Derived from the doctrine of organism developed specifically by Herbert Spencer, this premise further implied that the differentiation of the organic structure of institutions occurs in order to serve the needs of those in an increasingly high organized society. In regards to the institutions of education, this principle translates into the notion that the educational system functions as a selection agency, allocating those with the highest intelligence to societal positions that are critically central to the workings of a complete society. The sociologist David Goslin has captured the essence of the meritocratic thesis in stating that “the school affords individuals from all racial, ethnic and class backgrounds an opportunity to continue their education and eventually to get a job that is commensurate with their abilities and training.”¹

The *revisionist* argument, on the other hand, emphasizes the deterministic aspects of the social structure rather than the element of individual merit in explaining the structure of social institutions and predicting the behavior created by them. Emanating mainly from sociological conflict theory, this argument is predicated on the assumption that “every society rests on the constraints on some of its members by others.” Taking this orientation, many social scientists such as Gintis and Bowles, Parenti, Katz, Tyack, and Karier, have examined the institution of education within American society. They believe that factors outside the school are very important in influencing children’s school performance, aspirations and motivations; that social class is the most important variable in predicting how far a person gets in school. Carnoy, a revisionist economist, formalizes this view of the school as follows: “The school system is structured,

¹ Goslin, 1965, p. 113.

through its tests, rewards system, and required behavior patterns, to allow children of an urban bourgeoisie to do well, and to filter out the children of the poor, who are not socialized to function in the highest echelons of a capitalist economy and bourgeois culture. The school system is therefore a mechanism to maintain class structure in a capitalist society.”²

The critical literature of the last 15 years – Hentoff (1966), Greene and Ryan (1966), Kohl (1967-1969), Kozol (1967) (1973), Illich (1971), Farber (1969), Levy (1970), etc. – all point to the educational system as a destroyer of both teachers and pupils. In such a system teachers come to expect too little from pupils (middle-class teachers – lower-class children, in particular) with respect to motivation and competence, factors which may in turn affect teachers’ sense of efficacy. There is frequent reference in this literature to the interplay of pupil and teacher attitudes towards themselves and each other. Neither the revisionists nor the meritocratists confronted directly the Coleman thesis that “the extent to which an individual feels that he has some control over his destiny. . . appears to have a stronger relationship to achievement than do all the ‘school’ factors together,” a thesis the educational critics often refer to.³

II.

Teacher perception of student motivation and competence, as ego-psychological constructs, must be linked, just as student and teacher attitudes are linked, to wider societal complexes. Both revisionists and meritocratists, as well as educational critics, see these as important issues even though each attacks the problems from different perspectives. One method of syncretizing these positions is to employ Erik H. Erikson’s construct of “ego-identity” and his theory of “ego-identity formation.” These notions bridge the psychological and sociological roles of the person by linking aspects of personlity and aspects of society in a way that incorporates the work of Charles H. Cooley and goes beyond him by adding a dynamic cast to his notion of “Self image” or the “Selves system.” Our explanation of the practical consequences of ethnic discrimination in public and private institutions and systems is rooted in this higher order of propositions.

From this point of view, the individual teacher’s ego identity that is including and involving the teacher’s ideologies and domain assumptions, his/her attitudes, skills, sense of self-worth, and vocational convictions, come into contact with the child’s – not directly – but through the mediation of the social system, that is, the educational institution in which they function. The interaction of teachers and

² Carnoy, 1974, p. 215.

³ Coleman, 1966.

children, must not, however, be thought of as a one-way process. Children for their part are actively engaged in the process of developing a sense of *industry*. They now learn to win recognition by producing things. The danger to the psycho-social development of the child at this stage "lies in a sense of inadequacy and inferiority. . . a danger threatens individual and society where the school child begins to feel that the color of his skin, the background of his parents, the fashion of his clothes, rather than his wish and his will to learn will decide his work as an apprentice, and thus his sense of *identity* - to which we now turn."⁴ Thirty years ago Erik Erikson was thus impressed with the dangers awaiting the minority group child. As the child succeeds in learning to involve himself with and besides others as he develops a sense of the division of labor and of differential opportunity, that is, what Erikson calls a sense of the *technological ethos* of this culture; his successes expose him to what Erikson calls the shock of American adolescence, "namely the standardization of individuality and the intolerance of differences."

The traditional success of the curricula of our schools in teaching self-reliance and industry is matched by a traditional failure of the curricula of our schools to teach children the dual dimensionality of their heritage.⁵ In addition to other things, this understanding requires an international perspective that involves comprehension of our place and our potential in the world. As James Banks puts it, "the current school curriculum is not preparing most students to function successfully within a world community of the future. . . students must be helped to develop the vision and commitment needed to make our world more humane."⁶ In their recent report, the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies stated that the problem extends from our elementary schools to the nation's leading centers for advanced training and research on foreign areas. "Nothing less is at issue than the nation's security. . . . America's incompetence in foreign languages is nothing short of scandalous, and it is becoming worse." The lack of education for a global perspective and the elimination of foreign languages from curricula are linked in this discussion on ethnicity and education for good reason. As we shall see, the interrelationship of language and multicultural sensitivity are the antecedents to ego identity formation through the acquisition of a sense of respect for one's own heritage and the development of a sense of respect for others. However, contradictory it may appear to be, it is a well known dictum that the study of foreign languages helps us to

⁴ Erikson, 1950, p. 245, 260.

⁵ Femminella, 1976, p. 296 ff.

⁶ Banks, 1979, p. 25.

learn our own language and the study of foreign cultures also helps us to learn our own culture.

The history of the relationship of education and ethnicity in the United States also offers some interesting paradoxes. The earliest educational institutions in the United States, as we know, were the schools that were established by the various colonial groups, usually for religious purposes. The advocacy of religion, and even in some cases the advocacy of "White Anglo-Saxon culture," was often the stated purpose and aim of the school. Higher education too, was established in the United States with and for these same purposes. The first paradox that strikes us is found in the Common School movement of the Colonial Period. The great political leaders of the time, including Jefferson and Franklin, already saw that the schools could be a viable institution for nation-building. What is important here is a recognition of the ethno-cultural aspects of the schools. As Gutek puts it, "the American Colonial education experience, then, basically consisted of the reconstruction of imported English institutions in light of the new world environment. Higher education in that period was imitative of the two major English universities, Oxford and Cambridge. By superimposing the German graduate school upon our English-based liberal arts college, we created our modern, American university system. Overall then, from the earliest Colonial times through the Revolutionary period, the American schools were characterized as being institutions for teaching literacy, religion, transmission of the cultural heritage and particularly the "Americanizing," which is to say, the teaching of the English language and the removal of all foreignness, by which was meant "non-Englishness," from the inhabitants of the colonies.

The schools, then, from their very beginning were established for the sake of ethnicity. And herein lies the paradox: in the dominance of one ethnic group over all others, the schools came to be tools for the elimination of ethnicity. In this respect, the curricula of today's schools is largely unchanged from those Colonial and Revolutionary times. Children in school today, even in those cases where ethnicity is taught, where the curriculum has been reformed and multicultural education does exist, even in those schools, there is a method of teaching and a mode of instruction that carries on the Anglo-German tradition that was developed in higher education in this country, and, which as we shall see, filters down into the elementary and secondary schools. This tradition serves to destroy some of the unconscious aspects of the ethnic heritage of non-Anglo children. What these unconscious ethnic ideological themes are we will see in a moment.

III.

Before moving into that, a few words should be said about some of the prejudice that continues toward Euro-ethnics in the American schools. On the one hand, there continues to be overt prejudice, such as exclusion from participation, in certain aspects of our higher educational institutions. Particularly, this discrimination is found in college admissions, in the awarding of assistantships, in departmental assignments at professional levels, and, most particularly, at the higher levels of educational administration. Studies done at both the City University of New York and at the State University of New York show this differential exclusion at the various levels. Although, for example, Italian-Americans constitute something in the area of 23 percent of the state population, a survey completed in June of this year at the State University of New York at Albany showed that while 10 to 12 percent of the faculty is Italian-American, only 2 percent of the administration is Italian-American. Obviously, this does not happen by accident. The so-called pool of talent is available and is underutilized. The same can be said for other Euro-ethnic groups, especially Catholic groups, including eastern and southern European Catholics, and also to some extent, the Irish.

Certain state legislators in New York have called for an extensive study of this kind of discrimination in both private and public institutions, but to date no systematic analysis has been done. The reason for this and for the fact that nationwide statistics are also not readily available requires some analysis. Complex dynamics account for these lacunae in our ethnic and desegregation literature, including, paradoxically, belief on the part of Euro-ethnics in meritocratic myths and the view that former overt prejudice was a fair and proper obstacle that newcomers could be expected to overcome as a kind of "price of admission." The experience of the Jews elsewhere in the world through so much of history prepared them to be on guard for, and alerted them much earlier to, the real meaning of certain behaviors, allowing them to see the discrimination for what it was.

Until recently, most non-Jewish Euro-ethnics have been unwilling to see themselves as being discriminated and prejudiced against. Therefore, they have not only failed to support efforts at investigation and public exposure, but indeed, have gone on record deriding such undertakings. These so-called "melted" ethnics, a term which in this case I believe to be an uncalled for and inappropriate invective, dissociate themselves from and repudiate those ethnic organizations which attempt to bring to light, and seek redress for, acts of discrimination. There are some too, who, sensitive to the injustices done to racial minorities, have joined their cause in freedom marches

and demonstrations; but through the mental processes of denial and distantiating they have been unable for various reasons to see the exploitation and unfair impositions put upon themselves, their families, and others of their ethnic and religious background.

More difficult to assess, but more important, is the covert prejudice that goes on in our schools, and indeed other institutions as well. While the discrimination and prejudice against Afro-Americans, Native-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, and Asian-Americans has been studied, little attention has been paid to the discrimination and prejudice against most Euro-Americans. Nevertheless, much of the prejudice that exists in the schools, and which is detrimental to the minorities, affects also immigrants and the children and grandchildren of immigrants; and it matters little whether they are Euro-ethnics, Asians, Africans, South Americans or Native North Americans. The Anglo-Saxon superiority myth and the melting pot assimilationism, for example, are as detrimental to non-Anglo-Saxon Euro-ethnics as they are to the other minorities.

Another kind of covert prejudice exists which is more important because it is so pervasive and, at the same time, so subtle, and it affects nearly all of the peoples of the United States. In a certain sense, all Americans have been short changed – have been robbed in some way because there has been denied to us something to which we have a right. The fact that we are essentially a mono-cultural society whose major characteristic is our multi-ethnicity gives each of us, as members of this cultural democracy, the right to aspects of the cultural heritages of all our people. As the ethnic themes of those people are diminished, and as they disappear, they are lost to all of us.

Individual and group values and value-orientations constitute a comparative aspect of culture that can be found to be transmitted by socialization, and these have been extensively studied by anthropologists, social psychologists, sociologists, and educators in the United States. Another dimension of culture found in individuals and transmitted by socialization, but rarely studied, is the particular and distinctive mode of “processing information” that is characteristic of each group.

IV.

The renewed interest in recent years in cognitive psychology, particularly the study of “cognitive styles,” has a more extended history. The Personal Construct theory of George Kelley in recent times, the psychoanalytic perspectives of the ego-psychologists in earlier times, and the culturological perspectives of such anthropologists as W.H.R. Rivers, Melville Herskovitz, Donald Campbell, Marshall Segal, and others extend the interest in ethnic differences in

(what might broadly be called) "information processing," back to the late 1940's and even to the turn of the century.

The results of those earlier studies which show that there were cross-cultural differences in "information processing," have been confirmed by more recent research. One important aspect of the earlier studies, for example, is that differences in perception and inference habits were shown to possess both neurophysiological and social structural involvements as well as cultural involvements.⁷ Because of its practical applicability to the training of teachers and counselors in multi-ethnic education, it may be worthwhile to spend a brief moment in clarifying what is meant here.

"Information processing" as used here refers to any and all of the behavior engaged in by individuals as they deal with experience intellectually. That is, it includes learning, analyzing, expressing, or, stated from a cognitive learning perspective, ordering one's world. While it should be obvious that different, sometimes even opposing, propositions may be deduced from various theoretical perspectives, most would accept the general notion we are using here.⁸

The notion of information processing is broadly conceived to include a wide array of cognitive properties. The notion of "cognitive styles," on the other hand, is only slightly more delimited. It refers to the *manner* or *mode* of engaging these properties. Individuals differ in the way they organize knowledge, in the way they transform it, in the way they conceptualize, in the way they remember, and so on. The literature on cognitive styles contains a wide variety of specific functions described; an extensive body of research following distinct theoretical lines; and it contains a story that spans many decades of eminent psychologists peeking into this elusive area. For those just beginning to get into this field, Goldstein and Blackman's book entitled *Cognitive Style* can be recommended as a useful beginning. For them cognitive style has been defined as a "hypothetical construct that has been developed to explain the process of mediation between stimuli and responses. The term *cognitive style* refers to the characteristic ways in which individuals conceptually organize the environment." After describing historically the many theorists and researchers that have entered into this field, they sum up by stating that "common to all theory and research on cognitive style is an emphasis on the structure rather than the content of thought. . . . Structure refers to *how* cognition is organized; content refers to *what* knowledge is available."⁹

⁷ Goutek, 1970, page 21.

⁸ Campbell, 1964, p. 313.

⁹ Berry, 1971, *Passim*.

To illustrate very briefly what specifically we are referring to, let us look at an example of one of the many cognitive styles that have been identified. One of the earliest was the work done by Witkins in 1954,¹⁰ on what is called field-independence and field-dependence. Everyone has probably at some time or another come across one of those figure/ground optical illusions that abound in introductory social psychology textbooks. The one I am thinking of is the black and white illustration that may be viewed either as a black vase against a white background or two white profiles facing each other against a black background. In the first case the vase is the figure, in the second case, what was the vase is now the background and the faces are the figure. Field-dependence and field-independence are two ways of perceiving figures in complex contexts. A field-independent person perceives the figure without readily being confused by the ground, a field-dependent person is, as the label signifies, much more dependent upon the ground highlighting the figure. Field-independent persons perceive analytically, easily extracting figures from irrelevant contexts. Field-dependent persons have more difficulty since they attend to relationships between the figure and the ground. Depending upon which researcher is being studied, one may list anywhere from three to 19 or 20 categories of cognitive styles.

A more important point to note about cognitive style is that in the research that has been done there has been a movement from a concern with cognitive styles relating to *ability* to perform, with standards established for comparison, through greater value placed upon the stylistic categories, to a third type of style that does not relate to ability at all.

In a book entitled *Human Ecology and Cognitive Style*, John W. Berry reports on cross cultural studies in this area. His work is of particular interest to us for it brings *cognitive functioning* into relationship with *social functioning*, something that was only hinted at in earlier psychological studies. For Berry, *differentiation*, that is, an ability to break up or analyze a problem as a step toward its solution, is a useful process for analysis. Berry relates his work to earlier theorists including Witkins mentioned earlier, and to the work of George A. Kelly, whose personal construct theory has been mentioned earlier as an important theory for this kind of research. With respect to social function, Berry leans on Witkins in relating it to three cognitive styles. Introducing the notion of a sense of separate identity, he notes that it can manifest itself in various ways: 1) a person with a developed sense of identity functions with little need for guidance or support from others, 2) such a person would be able to face up to

¹⁰ Goldstein and Blackman, 1978, pp. 2-3.

contradictory attitudes and judgments from others, and 3) he/she would have a relatively stable view of him- or herself in different social milieus. Here again the field-independent and field-dependent cognitive styles are used as measures of separate identity. What Berry leads to in all of this is the notion of social complexity which he states has emerged to cover both aspects, that is, the psychological and sociocultural domains of *differentiation*. This he feels presents a framework for developing a model for cross cultural research.¹¹ Finally, in the conclusion to their book, Goldstein and Blackman report on child rearing correlates of cognitive style. The results from a number of studies in this area are reported to be consistent.¹² This, with Berry's work, seems to reinforce the argument for introducing the idea of ethnic differences in cognitive styles. Research done at the State University, conducted by Professor Bosco and his associates, has attempted to apply cognitive style theory to individual instruction through what is called "cognitive mapping." Cognitive mapping is simply a process of testing and developing profiles on individual students with respect to their learning styles. Preliminary results seem to indicate that differential cognitive styles exist between Afro-Americans, Puerto Ricans and nondifferentiated white groups. Three principal cognitive styles were studied: 1) the independent learning style, 2) the dependent learning style and 3) the authoritarian learning style. To describe these styles very briefly: when given the task of reading a literary selection and extracting the major themes, the independent learners read the work and extract what they believe is the leit-motif. The dependent learners read and then seek out peers, friends with whom they then discuss before they are able to feel certain of their judgment. The students exhibiting the authoritarian learning style, after reading are found to seek out the teacher or some very bright student with whom they may or not be very friendly in order to get affirmation of their opinion before they are confident that they know the answer.

It is important to note that the best style, the style that we believe everyone should use in learning, is determined by our value system. Viable and rational arguments can be presented in favor of each of these styles over each of the others. The tragedy in our society is that we do in fact prefer some of these styles over others, and we impose rewards and sanctions on them. Although different cognitive styles probably existed between European ethnic groups, it is only as a result of integrated education that we are beginning to recognize these differences and the specific values inherent in each of the different styles. Finally, I might mention that at Albany we are just beginning to

¹¹ *Ibid*, pp. 174 ff.

¹² Berry, 1976, Chap. 3

collect data on differences between the cognitive styles of Jewish-Americans, Italian Americans and Polish Americans, but unfortunately no results can be reported at this time.

V.

From the psychological literature that we have been reviewing we have seen that individual differences in cognitive styles do exist, and that there is consistency in correlating selective styles with aspects of child rearing. In spite of the lack of hard psychological data on group differences, some other kinds of data can be presented. From the historians and ethnologists we discover differences in teaching styles, and from the linguists we obtain some important material to inform our psycho-ethnology. We shall focus now on these kinds of data. Since, as we mentioned earlier, American educational institutions were essentially English, it becomes necessary to contrast, however briefly, the English with some other European educational systems. For this purpose, I'd like to describe briefly the Italian educational system.

To begin, the Italian university system is essentially an aural/oral system. The accent is on lectures, and the language of the academe is a distinct language. In contrast, the English system stresses the visual, that is, reading, and the language of the academe is not so different from the spoken English. These linguistic differences will be addressed in a moment.

Secondly, the emphasis in the Italian University is typically on competency. The lectures are offered but there is essentially no requirement to attend those lectures. One can enroll in the univeristy and go, attend or not attend as one pleases. When one feels competent to take the examinations, one may do so. In the English university, on the other hand, much more weight is attached to form and method. Upon entrance into Oxford or Cambridge, or almost any of the other universities in England, one is assigned to tutors, usually senior professors who advise and supervise the student's learning. Meeting twice a week, the students are given extensive reading lists and they discuss these readings with their tutors when they meet with them. Lectures are available, but there too, extensive reading is prescribed both in preparation for the lecture and as follow up after the lecture.

Thirdly, the central ideal of the Italian University was to educate in order to produce an independent and autonomous gentleman who would be prepared to enter into commerce, and in early times, that meant world trade. The traditional education in the English university, on the other hand, was for the formation of gentlemen who would be participants in the Court. Contrasting practical methods for achieving these different aims is interesting. In England, following the platonic ideal of establishing a kind of holy place away from the family so as to

educate the best people in the best possible way, the individual is removed from society and brought into the dormitory. There one learns discipline and proper attitudes and manners, and there one is relieved of both the cares and distractions of the world.¹³ In Italian universities, on the other hand, there is not concern for the students' lives outside of their participation in lectures and in examination. Typically they live with their families or relatives or in private lodging, living in the real world, confronting daily the realities of their parents' society, absorbing parental attitudes and values with respect to business management, financial investments, business-government relationships, international commerce, etc. Maturation takes place at home, dormitories are rarely provided; self-discipline was expected to evolve out of the student's dialectical involvement with his work, rather than from the imposition of external controls.

A fourth difference is found in the localism of Italian universities. Each region and every major city had its own university. Students were expected to live at home, and grow up with their own people. In contrast, the English norm was for universities to be national rather than provincial. Being cosmopolitan, they drew their students from those families that were able to use the national public schools.

The fifth difference was alluded to earlier and involves differences in the language of the university. These differences involve other Euro-ethnic Americans as well as Italians and English, so it may profit us to spend a moment considering them.

VI.

Aside from being obviously different languages, there is a startling linguistic variance that influences learning. Language in Italy may be classified as having four levels – if not actually four different languages. First, there is the spoken dialect in the various regions of Italy. These are really different languages: *Siciliano*, *Calabrese*, *Barese*, *Napolitano*, *Romanese*, *Tuscanese*, and so forth. Above that there is a kind of a polished dialect, understandable and spoken by the more educated people within the regions. Beyond that there is the academic language, the high flown language of the truly educated gentlemen. This often is the language spoken by politicians in public addresses and it is, too, the language found in some of the media, but typically not in local newspapers. Finally, at the fourth level, there is a so-called literary language, the true Italian language which is simply not spoken language. The linguistic tradition in Italy is that the literary language was a contrived language based upon a high form of *Tuscanese*. This took place from the 13th and 14th centuries beginning with the

¹³ Goldstein and Blackman, 1978, page 222.

writings of Dante Alighieri and of Petrarca and Boccaccio. Linguistic unification in Italy is a post-World War II phenomenon. Academicians throughout the Italian university history (and for that matter English university history) until the 18th and 19th centuries all learned Latin. Academicians all spoke polished dialects in their homes and in their villages, but in formal environments and in their lectures at the university they spoke academic language. They read and wrote the literary language. The very best people spoke polished dialects and, of course, only the very best people went to the universities. Teachers attended not the university, but the *Magisterio*, where some academic language was used but where the usual language for communication was the polished dialect. Teachers had to develop some, but not a high level of, facility in literary Italian; and this was clearly not the spoken language. Children starting out and attending the lower classes at school were taught in the dialect – both the language they used at home and the teacher’s polished dialect, reflecting again the aural/oral tradition. As they move to the higher grades they more and more spoke the polished dialect. This was particularly important for those who went to the *Liceo*, who even began rudimentary work in literary Italian, in preparation for university work.

In England there was a different development. The language of the Court, when it moved to London, became the official language of England. Reflecting this early linguistic unification, the universities (Oxford and Cambridge) utilized that language. The literary language was essentially this language – the language of the people which was standardized in the Court (the “King’s English”), largely southern in style with some northern influences. Here we see the major difference, the Italian literary language has become a model for Italian spoken language; English spoken language, in contrast, is the literary language. In both England and Italy, as I mentioned, Latin was studied by all, but over the past six- to eight-hundred years the differences and linguistic variances of which I spoke, existed.

For people who are educated for so long in the tradition of separation of spoken and literary language, where schooling was aural/oral oriented, where expression of intellectuality was easily found in symbolism other than literary, viz. art, dance, music, sculpture, architecture, etc., for such people to move suddenly into a tradition where the spoken language is the literary language, and the school language is that spoken language, is so different from what they were accustomed to that it required and demanded a shift, such that their styles of learning, the original styles of learning inherited from their forebears over many centuries, were lost.

Language acquisition for the academic elite in Italy was apparently facilitated by this linguistic phenomena. As children they learned to

speak a dialect, and in the better homes learned to speak a polished version of the dialect as a second language, not a second language built upon the first, but they were indeed bilingual. In fact, since they were being prepared for higher education as very young children, they began to study the language of the Church, Latin. They began to study the Italian academic language in the *Liceo* so that by the time they were at the university learning literary Italian, they had acquired at least four and possibly five different languages. As I said earlier, this was in preparation for their future roles as business and commercial people in international trade.

The situation was quite different in England. It is true that the children of the best families were instructed in Latin, but usually this was something that took place in "prep" school after the child was already well formed. If we can accept the statement of Pensfield and Roberts that neurophysiological changes take place in brain mechanisms that make the acquisition of new languages progressively more difficult after the age of nine, then it stands to reason that this later introduction to a foreign language must have some detrimental effects.

Following the British system in the United States, we usually refrain from introducing foreign language teaching to children until well into the secondary schools; and there the data is that foreign language is diminishing and postponed until college years. What this means is that by the time children are at age seven, the first language encoding is already such that any new language being studied is being learned through the mediation of the first language encoding. That being the case we have children learning culture through language usage that represents their primary encoding. This is a different situation from the one in which children learn multiple languages in their early years. Multiple coding takes place which enables future language learning to be engaged in directly with at least differential and probably diminished mediation.

VII.

With respect to an immigrant, an interesting corollary of all this takes place. The immigrants have a foreign language (encoding) through which they learn their native culture. On entrance in the United States, they enter a society of a different culture. Immediately, therefore, they begin to learn both a new language and a new culture, and they find themselves surrounded by it. Thus, for immigrants, an acculturation begins to take place. In each individual a new language is added to the former; a new culture begins to replace more or less, but never all, of a former culture. Socialization of the immigrant's children also takes place. It must be remembered that this process of

socialization refers to the children's internalizing the culture *as it is interpreted by the parent*.

In the case of second-generation persons, we have children who, while they¹ may have been born in the United States, learn about American culture from parents who are interpreting the culture through the perspectives of a different culture and a different language. Those second-generation persons grow up and have children and they, in turn, interpret the culture to their children through the special linguistic and cultural encoding passed on to them, so that over time, American culture as a whole continues to evolve and change, reflecting the presence of the remnants of languages and cultures of each new wave of immigrants. This linguistic and cultural persistence may be thought of as another argument for the so-called "emerging culture" theory of ethnicity.¹⁴ Two other important corollaries may be drawn from this. First, in this age of internationalism, the recent report of the President's Commission, which was mentioned earlier, indicted the nation's schools for their failure, on all levels, in teaching foreign languages. Although we are probably right in thinking that other people need to learn English, it must be recognized that when they do, it puts us at a disadvantage if we do not know their language. This is true in business, diplomacy, commerce, science, the arts, etc. Our tradition of putting foreign languages in the secondary school ignores the contributions to be made by people of very many different cultures, so many of whom have multilingual traditions.

The second corollary is that the schools have for the most part failed to see the implications of all of this. They have assumed that anyone born in this country could or should adopt the Anglo-Saxon cognitive styles of our schools. Thus, we have a very subtle form of prejudice operating in favor of Anglo-American groups and against other Euro-American groups (to say nothing of what that does to Americans of Asian, African, South American and Native North American ancestry). For second and sometimes even third generation persons this discriminatory practice is quite detrimental not only to the individuals but, from yet another perspective, to the nation. For by the time a person succeeds academically in our society, he has adapted to Anglo-German styles. But in adapting to those styles he has lost the cognitive styles of his alien heritage. Subtle, covert prejudice and discrimination operates here which hurts individuals and their education, and, at the same time and more importantly, hurts the intellectual capability of the United States. Just as we lose the foreign languages and become diminished in our foreign relations capability, foreign trade capability,

¹⁴ Halsey and Trow, 1971, pp. 79 ff.

and diplomatic capability because of that, so we become diminished in the cognitive styles that we ought to have.

I would like to point out as emphatically as I can, that nothing that I am saying is meant to gainsay the value of the Anglo-German educational or cognitive styles. What I am saying is that there are alternative styles which should be made available to all Americans and which all curriculum developers and counselors and all teachers must be aware of. Visual, auditory and kinesthetic styles are all needed in creating materials in counseling and in teaching. In any good teaching program, books, filmstrips, cassette recordings, etc. may all be used, determined by the combination of teacher's style, student's style, and nature of the material being taught. If a child does well and is found in the early grades to be favoring one or another of these learning aids, then a decision must be made as to whether and how the child can be assisted to engage in other kinds of cognitive approaches. If we believe that everyone has a right to an education, then we have to adapt the education to who is learning and for what purpose.

Basic education in the three R's is commonly accepted as essential. It must be pointed out that essentially it is an assumption based on who is educated and why we are educating. In the age of mass education it may be required that different conceptions of education be developed. The history of university education is a history of education for the elite and in this respect, Southern European and Anglo-German universities are not different.

The work of Basil Bernstein is particularly relevant at this point. Bernstein raises questions about how social structure becomes part of one's experience, what the main process is for achieving this, and what this implies for education. He proposes that forms of spoken language, in the process of being learned "elicit, reinforce, and generalize distinct types of relationships with the environment and thus create particular dimensions of significance."¹⁵ Speech defines what is affectively, cognitively and socially meaningful for us, thereby enabling us to attach meaning to our experience. As a result, cognitive as well as social skills may be gained or denied to us by virtue of certain linguistic forms, affecting both academic and vocational success. ". . . and these forms of language are culturally, not individually determined." Bernstein emphasizes the deterministic aspects of socio-cultural forces upon the development of language skills which in turn conditions how we learn.¹⁶ The restricted and elaborated communication codes and styles of verbal behavior that Bernstein describes in lower class families are typically found also in immigrant families where the language of the host society is spoken poorly. Language

¹⁵ *Femminella*, 1979, Part IV.

¹⁶ Bernstein in Halsey et al., 1961, pp. ??? ff.

differentials for the children and grandchildren of immigrants must therefore be taken into account in curriculum development again in order to avoid a covert form of discrimination against such children.

At the same time, in the conclusion to the study done by Hollos five years ago, it is suggested that possibly different social environments may be producing "high" level performance in different cognitive areas, which has, of course, been the major implication of the present paper. "In turn, this raises the question of what cognitive behaviors one values and whether it is always correct to adjust the performance of other cultural [ethnic] groups to any single standard."¹⁷

VIII.

This paper has been addressing how and what we have been doing to destroy alternative cognitive styles in the schools. I will not argue either for or against the primacy of Anglo-German cognitive style in schools, but the argument here has been against the destruction of alternative styles. These alternative styles, handed down through generations and brought to the United States by the immigrants to America, represent ages of contributions to philosophy, mathematics, science, literature, poetry, art, dance, music, sculpture, architecture, to moral development and ethnics, and to the well-being of people for many, many centuries. It is not necessary to defend the choice in selecting one style over all others; it is necessary to defend the elimination of all other styles.

The challenge to the schools in the 1980's with respect to ethnicity and education will be to effect the complete reversal of that stance which the schools have taken historically, insisting upon Anglo norms of education, of behavior, of methods of learning, and of method of expressing for all Americans.

In order to meet this challenge the schools will have to consciously enter into programs that inspire and generate higher levels of ethnic sensitivity. More extensive implementation, for example, of the recommendations of the Ethnic Heritage Center for Teacher Education of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education would be a meaningful beginning. There are yet many states where implementaion of these recommendations has not begun.

The more general response from a civil rights perspective is the elimination of discrimination against Euro-ethnics. The impact of the affirmative action programs for minority peoples has awakened Euro-ethnics to their own condition since they, and not the established persons in our society, are the ones that are being asked to bear the

¹⁷ *Ibid.* p. 309.

burden for the injustices perpetrated upon the minority peoples in this country over the past three hundred and fifty years.

A more positive and academic recommendation might be made following the usual observe – think – act model. A) With respect to observe, research of the following types should be encouraged: 1) Programs for research into various cultures and ethnic groups in the United States should be continued and the materials should be made available for ethnic studies courses in the schools and in the colleges as well. Such research requires foreign language training which should be made available. 2) Research in psychological, sociological and ethnological aspects of cognition should be encouraged and the materials utilized in determining new programs and methods of teaching. 3) Research into new techniques of interpersonal communication interaction based upon the findings obtained above should be supported and encouraged. Research into survival techniques utilized by immigrants to this country should be described in order to provide counselors and teachers of new immigrants the kind of knowledge they need to help immigrants cope. B) With respect to thinking, conferences, seminars, and writings should be encouraged within the academic and educational community to develop theoretical explanations and enhance our understandings of the materials obtained through the research. C) With respect to action, numerous programs can be recommended. Overall, the most inclusive recommendation should be made with respect to reforming the curriculum so that all aspects of the curriculum reflect an ethnic sensitivity. Thus, the teaching of ethnicity and teaching of ethnic studies should not be the final goal of the reform, but rather the goal should be to have all subjects which are taught done so with ethnic awareness. Thus, for example, not only should there be course materials presented on various ethnic groups in the social studies curriculum, but rather even in the art curriculum, in the history program, and even perhaps in the physical education aspect of curriculum, ethnic sensitivity can be incorporated. In a word, we are dealing with holistic human beings who must be treated in a manner that reflects this holism. Additional curricular reforms should be made in specific ways by supporting the inclusion of ethnically concerned persons in all major programs supported by the Federal Government as, for example, in the Vocational Education Program, in the International Education Program, and so on and so forth.

The Federal Government's role in ethnicity and education has taken essentially two major forms: 1) the Bilingual-Bicultural Act and 2) the Ethnic Heritage Studies Act, Title IX. Both of these programs require revitalization and renewed conceptualization. With respect to the Ethnic Heritage Studies Act which relates most directly to what we

are dealing with here, major reforms should be made. The result of the Title IX program is that some ten to twelve million dollars worth of projects have been funded over the past five years. Most of the money was spent in the development of curricular materials on every major ethnic group and most other ethnic groups in the United States. A major shift should be made from funding the development of curricular materials to funding dissemination of these materials and the training of teachers in the use of these materials. The dissemination should be made for the purposes of making more widely known the current state of knowledge and skills and the sharing of ideas about ethnicity in all of its aspects. This dissemination can be done through various materials including the contractual development of clearing houses, the establishment of a journal which would include review of materials that are available, reviews of various books on ethnicity and, finally, a newsletter whose purpose would be the rapid and facile dissemination of events which have a specific ethnic import.

An important part of government support of ethnicity and education could come through support of ethnic centers around the country whose purpose would be relate to all of the ethnic organizations in order to conduct a continuing dialogue into the problems of ethnics in all of its ramifications. Out of this a more profound understanding of the relationship of ethnicity and education can be engendered. The integration of ethnicity as an aspect of community life in general should not be overlooked. In this respect Anderson's important study of the Title IX Program should not be overlooked, neither should the ideas developed at the important conference on dissemination organized by the Ethnic Heritage Studies Clearinghouse at Boulder, Colorado in 1978.

All of this brings us back to the initial points we made at the beginning of this paper. If indeed we see in the ethnic heritages of the students a tradition to be valued and a style of learning and of expressing which will be of importance for the making of the United States, then we will see in students the positive contributions and we will expect them from our students. In this way students themselves will feel that they have something to bring to the classroom and to the United States.

Teachers' own self-respect and respect for heritage will be translated into a personal sense of self-worth so that coming into contact with the child will in itself positively enhance the child's world and the world the child will make. For it should be recognized that, in the final analysis, the spirit of cultural democracy can be concretized and realized only when young Americans can make America in their own image.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, James Michael, Government Support of Ethnicity, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, the University of Michigan, 1978.
- Banks, James A., *Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies*, 2nd Ed. Boston, Mass., Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1979 (orig. 1975).
- Bernstein, Basil, "Elaborated and Restricted Codes: Their Social Origins and Some Consequences" *American Anthropologist*, (1964) 66:II, 55-69.
- Bernstein, Basil, "Social Class and Linguistic Development: A Theory of Social Learning" in A.H. Halsey, Jean Floud and C. Arnold Anderson, (eds.) *Education, Economy and Society*, New York, The Free Press of Glencon, 1961.
- Berry, John W., *Human Ecology and Cognitive Style: Comparative Studies in Cultural and Psychological Adaptation*, New York, Sage Publications (John Wiley & Sons), 1976.
- Bieri, James, "Cognitive Structures in Personality" in H. M. Schroder and P. Suedfeld (eds.) *Personality Theory and Information Processing*, New York, Ronald Press, 1971.
- Block, Marc, *Feudal Society*, L. A. Manyon (trans.), Chicago, Ill. University of Chicago Press, 1964 (2 vols).
- Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis, *Schooling in Capitalist America Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*, New York, Basic Books, 1976.
- Cafferty, Pastora, "The Return of the Language Issue" *Heritage*, 2:2 n.d. Newsletter of the Illinois Consultation on Ethnicity in Education.
- Calandra, John D., *A History of Italian American Discrimination at City University of New York*. Albany, New York. New York State Senate, 1978.
- Campbell, Donald T., "Distinguishing Differences of Perception from Failures of Communication in Cross Cultural Understanding: Epistemology in Anthropology," New York, Harper & Row, 1946, pp. 308-336.
- Carlson, Robert A., *The Quest for Conformity: Americanization Through Education*, New York, Wiley, 1975.
- Carnoy, Martin, *Education as Cultural Imperialism*, New York, David McKay, 1974.
- Carnoy, Martin, *Schooling in a Corporate Society*, New York, David McKay, 1972.
- Castro, Ray, "Shifting the Burden of Bilingualism: The Case for Monolingual Comments" *The Bilingual Review*, Vol. III, (Jan.-April) 1976, 1:3-28.
- Church, Robert L. and Michael W. Sedlak, *Education in the United States: An Interpretive History*, New York, The Free Press, 1976.

- Cohen, Rosalie A., "Conceptual Styles, Culture Conflict and Nonverbal Tests of Intelligence" *American Anthropologist* (1969) 71: pp. 828-856.
- Cohen, Rosalie, "The Relation Between Socio-Conceptual Styles and Orientation to School Requirements" *Sociology of Education*, 41 (Spring 1968) 2:pp. 201-220.
- Coleman, James S., E. Campbell, C. J. Hobson, A. Mood, J. McPartland, F. Weinfeld and R. York, *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, Washington, D.C., Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U.S.O.E., 1966.
- Erikson, E. H., *Childhood and Society*, 2nd ed., New York, W. W. Norton, 1963 (1950).
- Farber, Jerry, *The Student as Nigger*, North Hollywood, Calif., Contact Books, 1969.
- Farquhar, Elizabeth, "Title IX: The Ethnic Heritage Studies Program - 'What' and 'How to', " *Momentum*, VI:3 (Oct. 1975) p. 46 ff.
- Fasold, Ralph W. and Roger W. Shuy (eds.), *Studies in Language Variation: Semantics, Syntax, Phonology, Pragmatics, Social Situations, Ethnological Approaches*, Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press, 1977.
- Femminella, Francis X., "Ethnic Heritage and Citizenship" in D. W. Robinson (ed.) *Selected Readings in Citizen Education*, Washington, D.C., Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare, U.S.O.E., 1976.
- Femminella, Francis X., "Social Ramifications of Ethnicity in the Suburbs" in S. LaGumina (ed.) *Ethnicity in Suburbia: The Long Island Experience*, Garden City, L.I., N.Y., Nassau Community College, 1979.
- Figuroa, John, "Education in and For Human Community," *Philosophy of Education*, 1966, pp. 285-297.
- Goldstein, Kenneth M. and Sheldon Blackman, *Cognitive Style: Five Approaches and Relevant Research*, New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1978.
- Goslin, David A., *The School in Contemporary Society*, Glenview, Illinois, Scott Foresman, 1965.
- Greene, Mary Frances and Orlette Ryan, *The Schoolchildren*, New York, Pantheon Press, 1966.
- Guttek, Gerald Lee, *An Historical Introduction to American Education*, New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1970.
- Halsey, A. H. and M. A. Trow, *The British Academics*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1971.
- Hentoff, Nat, *Our Children are Dying*, New York, The Viking Press, 1966.

- Hess, Robert D. and Virginia C. Shipman, "Early Experience and the Socialization of Cognitive Modes in Children" *Child Development*, (1966) 36: 869-886.
- Hill, J. E., *Cognitive Style as an Educational Science*, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, Oakland Community College Press, 1970.
- Hollos, Marida, *Growing up in Flathill: Social Environment and Cognitive Development*, Oslo, Universitetsforlaget, 1974.
- Illich, Ivan, *Deschooling Society*, New York, Harper & Row, 1971.
- Illich, Imar, "The Alternative to Schooling" *Saturday Review*, June 19, 1971, p. 44.
- Katz, Michael B., *Class, Bureaucracy and Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America*. New York, Praeger, 1971.
- Keen, P.G.W. and J. L. McKenney, "The evolution of an Experimental Design for the Study of Cognitive Style" working paper, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, Boston, Mass. 1973.
- Kelley, George A., *A Theory of Personality: The Psychology of Personal Constructs*, New York, The Norton Library; W. W. Norton, 1963 (orig. 1955).
- Klassen, Frank H. and Donna M. Gollnick, *Pluralism and the American Teacher*, Washington, D.C., AACTA, 1977.
- Kolb, David A., "Four Styles of Managerial Learning" in David A. Kolb, Irwin M. Rubin, and James McIntyre (eds.), *Organizational Psychology: A Book of Readings*, 2nd ed. New Jersey, Prentice Hall, 1974, pp. 27-34.
- Labov, William, *Language in the Inner City*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.
- Lambert, W. E. and G. Richard Tucker, *Bilingual Education of Children: The St. Lambert Experiment*, Rawley, Mass., Newburg House Publishers, Inc., 1972.
- Lucas, Isidro, "Language as a Civil Rights Issue," *Heritage* 3:1, n.d. Newsletter of the Illinois Consultation on Ethnicity in Education.
- Mancuso, James C. (ed.), *Readings for a Cognitive Theory of Personality*, New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970.
- McKinney, J.L. and P.G.W. Keen, "How Managers' Minds Work," *Harvard Business Review*, 1974, 53.3; pp. 79-90.
- Meyer, John W., David Tyack, Joanne Nagel and Andre Gordon, "Public Education as Nation-Building in America: Enrollments and Bureaucratization in the American States, 1870-1930.," *American Journal of Sociology*, 85:3 (Nov.) 1979, pp. 591-613.
- Nelsen, Karen H., "Contemporary Models of Cognitive Style: An Introduction" paper presented at the Convention of the American College Personnel Association, March 3, 1975.

- Pap, Michael S., "A History of the National Ethnic Studies Assembly," *NESA Newsletter*, 4:1 (Dec. 1977) pp. 14 ff.
- Penfield, Wilder and Lamar Roberts, *Speech and Brain Mechanisms*, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1959.
- Pisani, Joseph R., *Merit: Opening the Channels of Advancement*, Dunkirk, N.Y., Address before the Acquaviva American Legion Post, Dunkirk, N.Y., May 1977.
- Sperry, Len, *Learning Performance and Individual Differences*, Ill., Scott Foresman, 1972.
- Tsu, John B., "Ethnic Studies: Where To From Here?," paper presented at the *White House Conference on Ethnicity and Education*, Washington, D.C., May 1976.
- Tyack, David, B., *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1974.

* * *

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Thank you very much. I will first call on Dr. James A. Banks to comment upon your presentation.

James Banks is a Professor of Education at the University of Washington and a specialist in ethnic studies and social studies.

He has authored 10 books on multi-ethnic education and more than 70 articles, contributions to books and book reviews through professional publications.

He holds Master's and Doctoral degrees in elementary education and social studies and has served as a consultant to school districts, professional organizations and universities throughout the United States, Great Britain, and Canada.

RESPONSE OF JAMES A. BANKS*

I would like to speak on the educational implications of the expanding identifications of ethnic youths. In his comprehensive and complex paper¹ (complex because he is dealing with a complex topic), Professor Femminella focuses on a range of topics and issues related to education, ethnicity, and the school experiences of Americans of Southern, Eastern and Central European origin. Femminella states that the schools are Anglo-ethnic and that the cultures of other American ethnic groups of European origin are largely ignored by the schools. Consequently, ethnic youths of European origin, as well as

* I am deeply grateful to Cherry A. Banks for her helpful and thoughtful comments on an earlier draft of this paper. It benefited considerably from her insights.

¹ Francis X. Femminella, "Education and Ethnicity: Euro-Ethnics in Anglo-Ethnic Schools," paper presented to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights at a Consultation entitled: "Civil Rights Issues of Euro-Ethnic Americans in the United States: Opportunities and Challenges," University of Illinois, Circle Campus, Chicago, December 3, 1979.

ethnic minorities such as blacks, Mexican Americans, and American Indians, often find the school culture alien and self-defeating. Femminella's analysis of the character of American schools is essentially accurate. As a result of their Anglo-centric and mono-ethnic character, the schools have not recognized and supported the ethnic identifications of most ethnic students or helped them to develop reflective and clarified national and global identifications.

Ethnic, National and Global Identifications

In this paper, I am defining *identification* as "a social-psychological process involving the assimilation and internalization of the values, standards, expectations, or social roles of another person or persons. . . into one's behavior and self-conception."² When an individual develops an identification with a particular group, he or she "internalizes the interests, standards, and role expectations of the group."³ Identification is an evolving, dynamic, complex and ongoing process and not a static or uni-dimensional conceptualization. All individuals belong to many different groups and consequently develop multiple group identifications. Students have a sexual identification, a family identification, a racial identification, as well as identifications with many other formal and informal groups.

A major assumption of this paper is that all students come to school with ethnic identifications, whether they are conscious or unconscious. Many Anglo-American students are consciously aware of their national identifications as *Americans* but are not consciously aware of the fact that they have internalized the values, standards, norms, and behaviors of the Anglo-American ethnic group. Students who are Afro-Americans, Jewish-Americans, Mexican-Americans, and Italian-Americans are usually consciously aware of both their ethnic and national identifications. However, many students from all ethnic groups come to school with confused, unexamined and nonreflective ethnic and national identifications and with almost no global identification or consciousness.

Identity is a global concept that relates to all that we are. Our societal quest for a single, narrow definition of "American" has prevented many Americans from getting in touch with that dimension of their identity that relates to ethnicity. Ethnic identification for many Americans is a very important part of their personal identity. The individual who has a confused, nonreflective or negative ethnic identification lacks one of the essential ingredients for a healthy and positive personal identity.

² George A. Theodorson and Achilles G. Theodorson, *A Modern Dictionary of Sociology*. New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 1969, pp. 194-195.

³ *Ibid*, p. 195.

The school should help students to develop three kinds of highly interrelated identifications that are of special concern to multi-ethnic educators: and an *ethnic*, a *national*, and a *global* identification. The school should help students to develop ethnic, national, and global identifications that are *clarified, reflective and positive*. Individuals who have *clarified* and *reflective* ethnic, national, and global identifications understand how these identifications developed, are able to thoughtfully and objectively examine their ethnic group, nation, and world, and understand both the personal and public implications of these identifications.

Individuals who have *positive* ethnic, national and global identifications evaluate their ethnic, national, and global communities highly and are proud of these identifications. They have both the desire and competencies needed to take actions that will support and reinforce the values and norms of their ethnic, national, and global communities. Consequently, the school should not only be concerned about helping students to develop reflective ethnic, national, and global identifications, it should also help them to acquire the cross-cultural competencies (which consist of knowledge, skills, attitudes and abilities) needed to function effectively within their ethnic, national, and world communities.

Ethnic Identification

The school within a pluralistic democratic nation should help ethnic students to develop clarified, reflective, and positive ethnic identifications. This does not mean that the school should encourage or force ethnic minority students who have identifications with the Anglo-American ethnic group or who have identifications with several ethnic groups to give up these identifications. However, it does mean that the school will help all students to develop an understanding of their ethnic group identifications, to objectively examine their ethnic groups, to better understand the relationships between their ethnic groups and other ethnic groups, and to learn the personal and public implications of their ethnic group identifications and attachments.

A positive and clarified ethnic identification is of primary importance to students beginning in their first years of life. However, rather than help students to develop positive and reflective ethnic identifications, historically the school and other social institutions have taught non-Anglo-ethnic groups to be ashamed of their ethnic affiliations and characteristics. Social and public institutions have forced many individuals who are Polish-Americans, Italian-Americans, and Jewish-Americans to experience self-alienation, desocialization, and to reject family heritages and cultures. Many members of these ethnic groups have denied important aspects of their ethnic cultures and changed

their names in order to attain full participation within the school and other American institutions. However, we should not deny the fact that many ethnic individuals consciously denied their family heritages in order to attain social, economic, and educational mobility. However, within a pluralistic democratic society individuals should not have to give up all of their meaningful ethnic traits and attachments in order to attain structural inclusion into society.

The National Council for the Social Studies Task Force on Ethnic Studies Curriculum Guidelines writes cogently about the importance of ethnic identifications for individuals in our society and about the cost and pain of assimilation:

For individuals, ethnic groups can provide a foundation for self-definition. Ethnic group membership can provide a sense of belonging, or shared traditions, of interdependence of fate-especially for members of groups which have all too often been barred from entry into the larger society. When society views ethnic differences with respect, individuals can define themselves ethnically without conflict or shame.

The psychic cost of assimilation was and is high for many Americans. It too often demanded and demands self-denial, self-hatred, and rejection of family ties. Social demands for conformity which have such exaggerated effects are neither democratic nor humane. Such practices deny dignity by refusing to accept individuals as persons in themselves and by limiting the realization of human potential. Such demands run counter to the democratic values of freedom of association and equality of opportunity. . . . For society as a whole, ethnic groups can serve as sources of innovation. By respecting differences, society is provided a wider base of ideas, values, and behavior. Society increases its potential power for creative change.⁴

National Identification

The school should also help each student to acquire a clarified, reflective, and positive national or American identification and related cross-cultural competencies. Each American student should develop a commitment to American democratic ideals, such as human dignity, justice, and equality. The school should also help students to acquire the attitudes, beliefs and skills which they need to become effective participants in the nation's republic. Thus, the development of social participation skills and activities should be major goals of the school curriculum within a democratic pluralistic nation such as the United States.⁵ Students should be provided opportunities for social participa-

⁴ James A. Banks, Carlos E. Cortes, Geneva Gay, Ricardo L. Garcia, and Anna S. Ochoa, *Curriculum Guidelines for Multiethnic Education*. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1976, p. 11.

⁵ James A. Banks with Ambrose A. Clegg, Jr., *Teaching Strategies for the Social Studies: Inquiry, Valuing and Decision-Making*, Second Edition. Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley, 1977. See especially Chapter 14, "Decision-Making and Social Action Strategies."

tion activities whereby they can take action on issues and problems that are consistent with American democratic values. Citizenship education and social participation activities are integral parts of a sound school curriculum.

The American national identification and related citizenship competencies are important for all American citizens, regardless of their ethnic group membership and ethnic affiliations. The national American identification should be acknowledged and promoted in all educational programs related to ethnicity and education. However, we should not equate an American identification and the American culture with an Anglo-American culture and an Anglo-American identification. Individuals can have a wide range of cultural and linguistic traits and characteristics and still be reflective and effective American citizens.

Individuals can have ethnic allegiances and characteristics and yet endorse overarching and shared American values and ideals as long as their ethnic values and behaviors do not violate or contradict American democratic values and ideals. Educational programs should recognize and reflect the multiple identifications that students are developing. In fact, and I will discuss this in more detail later, I believe that students can develop a reflective and positive national identification only after they have attained reflective, clarified and positive ethnic identifications. This is as true for Anglo-American students as it is for Jewish-American, Black-American or Italian-American students. Often Anglo-Americans do not view themselves as an ethnic group. However, sociologically they have many of the same traits and characteristics of other American ethnic groups, such as a sense of peoplehood, unique behavioral values and norms, and unique ways of perceiving the world.⁶

Anglo-American students who believe that their ethnic group is superior to other ethnic groups, and who have highly ethnocentric and racist attitudes, do not have clarified, reflective and positive ethnic identifications. Their ethnic identifications are based on the negative characteristics of other ethnic groups and have not been reflectively and objectively examined. Many Anglo-American and other ethnic individuals have ethnic identifications that are nonreflective and unclarified. It is not possible for students with unreflective and totally subjective ethnic identifications to develop positive and reflective national American identifications because ethnic ethnocentrism is inconsistent with American Creed values such as human dignity, freedom, equality, and justice.

⁶ Milton M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

It is important for ethnic group individuals who have historically been victims of discrimination to develop positive and reflective ethnic identifications before they will be able to develop clarified national identifications. It is difficult for Polish-American, Jewish-American or Mexican-American students to support the rights of other ethnic groups or the ideals of the national state when they are ashamed of their ethnicity or feel that their ethnic group is denied basic civil rights and opportunities.

Many educators assume that in order to be loyal American citizens, students must acquire the Anglo-Saxon Protestant culture and an Anglo-American identification. These educators assume that American means the same as Anglo-American. This popular but inaccurate notion of American culture and identity is perpetuated by the popular media and by many school textbooks.

This is a widespread misinterpretation of American life and society. While Anglo-Saxon Protestants have profoundly influenced our society and culture (and in many ways very constructively – such as their influence on our political ideals and ideologies), other ethnic groups, such as Jewish-Americans, Black-Americans and Mexican-Americans, have deeply affected American literature, music, arts, and values.⁷

While the school should help students to clarify and examine their national identifications, we need new and more accurate conceptualizations of the nature of American society and culture.

Global Identifications

It is essential that we help students to develop clarified, reflective and positive ethnic and national identifications. However, because we live in a global society in which the solution of the world's problems requires the cooperation of all the nations of the world, it is also important for students to develop global identifications and the knowledge, attitudes, skills and abilities needed to become effective and influential citizens in the world community. The President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies writes cogently about the need to help students to develop global interests and perspectives and the lack of global education in American schools:

A nation's welfare depends in large measure on the intellectual and psychological strengths that are derived from the perceptive visions of the world beyond its own boundaries. On a planet shrunken by the technology of instant communications, there is little safety behind a Maginot Line of scientific and scholarly isolationism. In our schools and colleges as well as our public

⁷For a further discussion of this point see: James A. Banks, "Shaping the Future of Multicultural Education," *Journal of Negro Education*, Volume 48, (Summer, 1979), pp. 237–252.

media of communications, and in the everyday dialogue within our communities, the situation cries out for a better comprehension of our place and our potential in a world that, though it still expects much from America, no longer takes American supremacy for granted. Nor, the Commission believes, do this country's children and youths, and it is for them, and their understanding of their own society, that an international perspective is indispensable. Such a perspective is lacking in most educational programs now.⁸

The Need for a Delicate Balance of Identifications

In a paper presented at the 1979 annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Professor Nagayo Homma of the University of Toyko points out that ethnic and national identifications may prevent the development of effective global commitments and the cooperation among nations that is needed to solve the world's global problems. He writes of this paradox:

The starting point of our quest for a global perspective should be the realization that the world today is a world of paradox. On the one hand, we live in the age of increasing interdependence among nations and growing awareness of our common destiny as occupants of the "only one earth." . . . But, at the same time, nationalism is as strong as ever, and within a nation we often witness a movement of tribalism, an assertion of ethnicity, a communitarian experiment, and, according to some critics and scholars, an ominous tendency toward narcissism. Apparently the force for integration and the force for fragmentation are working simultaneously in our world.⁹

Professor Homma points out that nationalism and national identifications and attachments in most nations of the world are strong and tenacious. Strong nationalism that is nonreflective will prevent students from developing reflective and positive global identifications. Nonreflective and unexamined ethnic identifications attachments may prevent the development of a cohesive nation and a unified national ideology. While we should help ethnic youths to develop reflective and positive ethnic identifications, students must also be helped to clarify and strengthen their identifications as American citizens – which means that they will develop and internalize American Creed values such as justice, human dignity, and equality.

There needs to be a delicate balance between ethnic, national, and global identifications and attachments. However, in the past educators have often tried to develop strong national identifications by repress-

⁸ *Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability*, A Report to the President from the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, November, 1979, p. 2.

⁹ Nagayo Homma, "The Quest for a Global Perspective: A Japanese View," a paper presented as a keynote address at the 59th Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, November 23, 1979, Portland, Oregon, p. 1.

ing ethnicity and making ethnic Americans, including many Euro-ethnic Americans, ashamed of their ethnic roots and families. Schools taught ethnic youths "shame," as William Greenbaum has so compassionately written.¹⁰ This is an unhealthy and dysfunctional approach to building national solidarity and reflective nationalism and to shaping a nation in which all of its citizens endorse its overarching values, such as democracy and human dignity, and yet maintain a sense of ethnic pride and identification.

I hypothesize that ethnic, national, and global identifications are developmental in nature and that an individual can attain a healthy and reflective national identification only when he or she has acquired a healthy and reflective ethnic identification; and that individuals can develop a reflective and positive global identification only after they have a realistic, reflective and positive national identification. (See Figure 1)


Individuals can develop a commitment to, and an identification with, a nation state and the national culture only when they believe that they are a meaningful and important part of that nation and that it acknowledges, reflects, and values their culture and them as individuals. A nation that alienates and does not meaningfully and structurally include an ethnic group into the national culture runs the risk of creating alienation within that ethnic group and of fostering separatism and separatist movements and ideologies. Students will find it very difficult, if not impossible, to develop reflective global identifications within a nation state that perpetuates a nonreflective and blind nationalism.

The Expanding Identification of Ethnic Youths: A Typology

We should first help ethnic students to develop healthy and positive ethnic identifications, they can then begin to develop reflective national and global identifications. I have developed a typology of the stages of ethnicity which describes the developmental nature of ethnic, national and global identifications and clarifications.¹¹ (See Figure 2) This typology assumes that individuals can be classified according to their ethnic identifications and development. The typology is a Weberian-type ideal-type conceptualization. An ideal-type conceptualization is "composed of a configuration of characteristic elements of a

¹⁰ William Greenbaum, "America in Search of a New Ideal: An Essay on the Rise of Pluralism," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 44 (August, 1974), p. 431.

¹¹ I presented an earlier form of this typology in several previous publications, including: James A. Banks, "The Implications of Multicultural Education for Teacher Education," in Frank H. Klassen and Donna M. Gollnick, eds., *Pluralism and the American Teacher*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977, pp. 1-30; and James A. Banks, *Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies*, Second Edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1979, pp. 61-63. See also the thesis by Ford that developed an instrument to assess these stages of ethnicity: Margaret M. Ford, *The Development of an Instrument for Assessing Levels of Ethnicity in Public School Teachers*. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Houston, 1979.

Figure 1**The Relationship Between Personal Identity and Ethnic, National, and Global Identifications**

Personal identity is the "I" that results from the life-long binding together of the many threads of a person's life. These threads include experience, culture, heredity, as well as identifications with significant others and many different groups, such as one's ethnic group, nation, and global community.

class of phenomena used in social analysis. The elements abstracted are based on observations or concrete instances of the phenomena under study, but the resultant construct is not designed to correspond exactly to any single empirical observation."¹²

Stage 1 Ethnic Psychological Captivity

The individual accepts the negative ideologies, beliefs, values, and norms about his or her ethnic group that are institutionalized within the larger society during this stage. Consequently, the individual exemplifies ethnic self-rejection and low self-esteem. The more that an ethnic group is discriminated against in society, the more likely are its members to experience some form of ethnic psychological captivity. Many Americans, as well as many minorities such as Blacks and Chicanos, experience some form of ethnic psychological captivity.

Stage 2 Ethnic Encapsulation

This stage is characterized by ethnic encapsulation and ethnic exclusiveness, including voluntary separatism. The individual participates primarily within his or her own ethnic group and believes that his or her ethnic group is superior to that of other groups. An increased number of individuals within an ethnic group can be expected to experience some form of ethnic encapsulation when the group has recently experienced an ethnic revitalization movement and

¹² Theodorson and Theodorson, op. cit. p. 193.

a quest for ethnic pride after having experienced institutionalized discrimination and political oppression historically. Individuals within this stage are likely to be perceived as bigots and racists. The number of individuals in this stage within an ethnic group are likely to decrease as the group experiences economic and social mobility and structural inclusion into society.

Stage 3 Ethnic Identity Clarification

The individual within this stage is able to clarify his or her attitudes and ethnic identity and to reduce intrapsychic conflict. He or she is able to develop clarified positive attitudes toward his or her own ethnic group. The individual learns to accept self, thus developing the characteristics (skills, attitudes, and abilities) needed to accept and respond positively to outside racial and ethnic groups. Self-acceptance is a requisite to accepting and responding positively to others. The more economic and social mobility and structural inclusion that an ethnic group experiences within a society, the more individuals within the group will move from Stage 2 to Stage 3.


Stage 4 Bi-ethnicity


Individuals within this stage have a healthy sense of ethnic identity and the psychological characteristics and skills needed to participate successfully in his or her own ethnic culture, as well as in another ethnic culture. The individual is thoroughly bicultural and is able to

Figure 2

The Expanding Identifications of Ethnic Youths: A Typology

This figure illustrates the author's hypothesis that students must have clarified and positive ethnic identifications (Stage 3) before they can attain reflective and positive national and global identifications (Stages 5 and 6). For a more detailed discussion of these stages see James A. Banks, "The Implications of Multicultural Education for Teacher Education," in Frank H. Klassen and Donna M. Gollnick, eds., *Pluralism and the American Teacher*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977, pp. 1-30.





engage in cultural-switching behavior. The individual knows which behavior is appropriate for which particular cultural setting. He or she is bidialectal and/or bilingual.

Stage 5 Multi-ethnicity and Reflective Nationalism

The Stage 5 individual has clarified, reflective, and positive personal, ethnic, and national identifications, positive attitudes toward other ethnic and racial groups, and is self-actualized. The individual is able to function, at least beyond superficial levels, within several ethnic cultures within the United States and to understand, appreciate, and share the values, symbols, and institutions of several American ethnic cultures.

The individual has a reflective and realistic American national identification and realistically views the United States as the multi-ethnic society that it is. The Stage 5 individual has cross-cultural competencies within his or her own nation and commitment to the national ideas, creeds, and values of the nation state.

Stage 6 Globalism and Global Competency

The individual within Stage 6 has clarified, reflective, and positive ethnic, national, and global identifications and the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and abilities needed to function within ethnic cultures within his or her own nation as well as within cultures outside of his or her nation in other parts of the world. *The Stage 6 individual has the ideal delicate balance of ethnic, national, and global identifications.* This individual has internalized the universalistic ethnical values and principles of humankind and has the skills, competencies, and commitment needed to take action within the world to actualize his or her values and commitments.

Summary

During their socialization, students develop multiple group identifications. The school should help ethnic students develop three kinds of identifications that are of special concern to multiethnic educators: an *ethnic*, a *national*, and a *global* identification. To successfully help students to help ethnic, national, and global identifications that are clarified, reflective, and positive, the school must first recognize the importance of each of these identifications to students and to the nation state and acknowledge their developmental character. It is very difficult for students to develop clarified and positive national identifications and commitments until they have acquired positive and clarified ethnic identifications. Students will be able to develop clarified, reflective, and positive global identifications only after they have acquired thoughtful and clarified national identifications.

Most of the nation's schools are not giving students the kinds of experiences they need to develop clarified, reflective, and positive ethnic, national, and global identifications. Most of the nation's schools are Anglocentric in their cultures and orientations.¹³ American culture is frequently conceptualized as Anglo-American culture in the nation's schools. Students are often encouraged or forced to develop a commitment to Anglo-Saxon values and culture and identifications with Anglo-American culture and institutions. This Anglocentric approach to education forces students who belong to non-Anglo-Saxon ethnic groups to deny their ethnic identifications and cultures and to experience self-alienation and shame. The Anglocentric approach to education also prevents students from developing reflective global awareness, skills, and identities.

The total school environment in the nation's schools should be reformed to reflect the developmental nature of students' multiple identifications and attachments. Multi-ethnic education should be viewed as a process of curricular reform that will result in substantial school reform and in more pluralistic and humanistic education.

¹³ Francis X. Femminella, *op. cit.*

* * *

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Our next reactor is Georgia Theophillis Noble.

Georgia Noble is a Professor of Education at Simmons College in Boston, where she specializes in contemporary problems of American Education, including sexism, racism, and the development of adequate educational response to multi-ethnicity.

She is a recipient of a Master's degree in education from Harvard University. She served on the Citizens' District Advisory Board, the group which has prompted community involvement in Boston school desegregation.

Miss Noble.

RESPONSE OF GEORGIA THEOPHILLIS NOBLE

Thank you, Commissioner.

First I would like to say that Mr. Femminella's paper was very interesting, and I found that the analogy to the Italian schools could be very easily transferred to the Greek experience.

But I did feel that it would be important to try to bring a sharper focus on some of the things that make people such as myself, of Greek descent, a little different. Many common chords were struck by the paper. I say that as someone who has experienced what you are talking

about in that, though I was raised in a small town in upstate New York, my parents felt very strongly about my learning Greek. We were the only Greek family in the town. It was *rumored* that we cooked with olive oil.

We had to drive, mind you, 30 miles to get it. I remember vividly the scene when my third grade teacher confronted my mother in the meat market one day and said, "Mrs. Theophillis, I'm so glad to see you. You never come to our PTA meetings. Your daughter's having all kinds of problems in school. There's just so much I can do about it, and, after all, you are in America now, and you are about to become American citizens. So you must stop speaking Greek to your daughter."

Almost everyone in the meatmarket by this time was all ears. I wished the earth would open up and swallow me. My mother raised herself to her full five-two, looked at Mrs. Grinder and said, in her broken English – which I cannot imitate because I have spent thousands of my father's dollars to come forth with pearl-shaped tones. . . She looked at her and said, "Mrs. Grinder, the President of the university comes in our store and asks me about Greece. The professors tell me about their travels to Greece and ask me questions about the Greek food and all kinds of other things. The students tell me their parents spend thousands and thousands of dollars for them to learn Greek; and I walk and I see the big buildings with Greek letters on them" – she was referring to fraternity houses.

My mother looked at Mrs. Grinder and said – and by this time she's standing up to her full height – "Mrs. Grinder, you teach my daughter English," and then pointing to herself, "I will teach her Greek."

And that was the end of that.

It was that kind of spirit that prevailed in my family. It meant that every time I stepped across the threshold of our home not an English word was spoken; that was understood.

In the store, by the way, it was a little ice cream and candy store – of course, what else did Greeks do in the hinterlands? My father, my uncle, and mother in the store would discuss certain things that were happening all around us. It became sort of a laboratory of cultural differences. It really was fascinating as I think back upon it.

By the time I was 12, in spite of all these discussions, because we were the only Greek family in this small upstate New York community with a university and beautifully kept houses and with manicured lawns, still, I would have given anything to have changed my name, Theophillis, and never have to speak a word of Greek.

My wise, so-called uneducated, father – he had only gone as far as the third grade – made sure that we went to Europe that summer. We did not go just to Greece; I emphasize *went to Europe*. We went to

Paris to the International Exposition and to the Louvre. We took the Orient Express. We went to Greece. I saw the people who looked like me, and met relatives in villages near Sparta.

As we were going back to France on this boat through the Mediterranean, my father, my uneducated father, kept telling me about the fact that Marseilles had once been a Greek colony. He told me all kinds of things about the Greek colonies in Sicily and I thought, how could my poor uneducated father make up these stories. It was because he traveled on all those ships and heard all those stories, I concluded, and dismissed them. After all, I had not read about any of that in the books that I had in school. That trip to Europe proved to be a major point in my life. Of course, when I came back to Hamilton, New York, none of the teachers were interested in my trip. Never once did they refer to my Greek ethnicity, although students would call me "greaseball" and make other derogatory remarks about my parents. It was said we were rich because we worked 7 days a week and the summer spent in the old country was ample proof.

On the other hand, I can remember going in to a counseling session to help me decide where I might apply for college entrance; the vice-principal looked at me and said, "I think maybe Antioch would be a good place because you could work your way through."

I got very angry inside because the money had been saved for my education. Every week a small amount had been put in the bank since I was 6 years old.

There were other kinds of inferences that were made by my counselor just because he had seen me washing dishes in the store.

I had to reach out and prove myself. I learned to play the games of the public school, and I played them well, I assure you. By my senior year in high school, I was president of the class, and that represented something very special to me.

But it had been a strategy that had been worked out very carefully to get there, and this is the kind of thing that some of us have to do.

When did my own ethnic commitments begin? In my senior year at Syracuse University, when World War II was still a grim reality I decided, I wanted to go back to Greece. I went back and taught English as a second language at Anatolia College in Thessaloniki. I experienced what Mr. Femminella mentioned a moment ago. When you get there, you are seen as the American, and here in America you are the Greek.

But, you know, through the agony and ecstasy of it all emerges something very beautiful when you begin to realize that you have something very, very special, and this is what I want to speak about. In the public schools we are shortchanging our students. I am tired of hearing the issue being centered around so-called *problems* of ethnicity.

Actually, these ethnicities are beautiful, beautifully colored mosaics if you will, of our cultures here in the United States that we have not been willing to really see and value as such.

May I share for a moment with you something which gives all of us of Greek descent a great deal of pride, and it also explains something about where we are coming from, so to speak, and the kind of thing we would want to see emphasized within the schools.

It was announced on October 18th of this year that the Nobel prize for literature had been awarded to the Greek poet Odysseus Elytis.

In a citation, the Swedish Academy of Letters stressed the character of Elytis' poetry, which in Greece has made him known as the Poet of the Aegean.

The citation speaks of, quote, "Poetry which against the background of Greek tradition depicts with sensuous strength an intellectual clearheadedness modern man's struggle for freedom and creativeness."

When Elytis, in an interview, was asked what constitutes a Greek, or what is it to be a Greek, he talked about the fact that the light in Greece affects what happens to people's thinking.

He spoke of frozen truth, and that was the truth that is found in books, but he spoke of a *living truth*, which is the interaction of human beings in a particular historical sense. The last point he made was that it is not only a sense of feeling, but that each human being has to reconstruct Greek history in a way.

And I think this is something which I feel very strongly about in terms of our young people having an opportunity to be creative. Frankly, the only way I emerged as a human caring person at Hamilton High School was through the extra-curricular activities, such as the orchestra, drama group, and the choral group.

This is where it was possible for me to meet other students on a different basis. This is where I could excel and feel that I was part of a group. This is where I also had a chance to feel quietly proud, because reference had to be made of the ancient Greek plays, of Italian opera, of French poetry.

These were the things that meant the most to me. My Roumanian violin teacher – God rest his soul – was the only teacher in the entire school that understood what was happening to me.

And as I would go in to my lessons, he would say, "I don't understand it. One day you can play so well, and other times so terribly. Come. We will read poetry."

These are the kinds of experiences I am terribly concerned about seeing disappear. They have begun to disappear from the American point of view in regard to curriculum. The arts are considered to be the first to go in school budgets.

It seems to me that if we had made it possible for our young people to be developing their creative talents in small groups, we would be building new bridges of understanding.

In Boston, the young people have leadership qualities within the schools which have not been properly understood.

Administrations have felt that they have known what was best for the individual school without involving student input. We are beginning to see glimpses of change.

The arts are not frills. Actually there are other ways of thinking. Some scientists recognize this symbolic language of the arts. Some scientists at MIT, whom I have talked to, and are excellent string quartet players, talk not only of refreshment of soul, but speak to the fact that they do not see a dichotomy. However, in our public schools administrations appear to insist that the arts over here are not really necessary to an education. They dismiss those who think otherwise as a handful of dreamers.

So I would make a plea that, in order to become that global citizen that Mr. Banks is talking about, you are going to have to try to understand my culture, you are going to have to understand something about what *moves me*.

You have got to understand why a certain painting, a certain poem, a certain musical composition, means so much to me.

That is an important part of my Greek being. A poet in Greece is considered above any politician, above any industrialist. To be a poet is the highest reward that you can have, and that seems strange to us as Americans.

Also, in terms of modern Greek writing, in the United States we have just begun to get translations. I am hoping to go to Greece next year on my sabbatical and do two things. One, to work on a translation of a novel dealing with the life of an Athenian woman written by one of our best Greek writers, and the other is to look at the impact of American television on the lives of some of these young women in Greece, because I have many questions about what we are destroying and changing within our global village.

I am concerned about the fact that in Boston and other cities, we have public television which is not being used properly, which is not being put to use. We are getting many canned programs from England, but as far as really helping in the desegregation effort, most of the public stations are staying away from the challenge.

I know I have made certain proposals within Boston, and they have been dismissed. We have news coverage, and that has been it. Our role is to go no further.

What deeply troubles me is that when you look at the life of a child, say, in the City of Boston, you find that on Saturdays that child in the

ethnic neighborhood cannot go to the branch library, because the library is closed. The very time when the libraries should be open so that children can have access to books, those libraries are closed. The libraries in the suburbs are open on Saturdays.

I asked a city librarian about it and she said, "Well, you know, we like to work nine to five, and there are budget cuts."

I said, "But isn't there something else that could be done? Couldn't you close on a Monday or a Tuesday?" The subject was changed immediately.

I would like to see a crossing of professional lines. I would like to bring librarians, and educators together, in with some of the human services people and representatives from the various groups to speak to the needs of our children.

I wonder what would happen in Boston if we could put Mel King, one of our outstanding black leaders and some of the people from the South End, and from the other neighborhoods, on a boat in the harbor, for at least two days, to have a chance to get to know one another as human beings.

I think that going the other route of simply looking at statistics and not *getting to feelings* is not getting us as far as we could go.

I have taken a rather nontraditional approach, I know, in my response to the focus of this consultation.

Let me in my closing remarks share something that John Ciardi, the Italian poet from the north end of Boston, wrote in speaking to American businessmen a few years ago.

This is what Ciardi wrote:

There is no poetry for the practical man. There is poetry only for the mankind of the man who spends a certain amount of his time turning the mechanical wheel. But let him spend too much of his life at the mechanics of practicality, and either he must become something less than a man, or his very mechanical efficiency will become impaired by the frustrations stored up in his irrational human personality.

An ulcer, gentleman, is an un-kissed imagination taking his revenge for having been jilted. It is an unwritten poem, a neglected music, an unpainted water color, an undanced dance. It is a declaration from the mankind of the man that a clear spring of joy has not been tapped and that it must break through muddily on its own.

This is the kind of thing that I feel very strongly about, as you may have gathered.

I cannot close without also bringing to your attention that the concept of library for the Greek is uppermost in his scale of values.

This morning Mr. Levine talked about the right of ethnics to be able to speak to a special issue; in foreign policy the Greek Americans who have been lobbying on the Cypriote issue have been accused of being un-American by some people.

And I submit to you that that is a very unfair remark to make to these fine people. Although there are only three million Greeks in this United States, the small number has not prevented us from being able to have four representatives in Congress, two Senators, and with great pride we point to the fact that one Congressman is a Rhodes scholar; so is one Senator.

So our contribution to this country is of no small measure. In closing I will read a page from Hikos Kazantzakis' book *Report to Groco*.

I remember a certain Cretan captain, a shepherd who reeked of dung and billy-goats. He had just returned from the wars where he had fought like a lion.

I happened to be in the sheep fold one afternoon when he received a citation inscribed on parchment in large red and black letters from, quote, the Cretan Brotherhood of Athens.

It congratulated him on his acts of bravery and declared him a hero. "What is this paper," he asked the messenger with irritation. "Did my sheep get into somebody's wheat field again? Do I have to pay damages?"

The messenger unrolled the citation joyfully and read it aloud. "Put it into ordinary language so I can understand. What does it mean?" "It means you're a hero. Your nation sends you this citation so you can frame it for your children."

The captain extended his huge paw. "Give it here." Seizing the parchment he ripped it in shreds and threw it into the fire beneath a caldron of boiling milk. "Go tell them I didn't fight to receive a piece of paper. I fought to make history."

COMMISSIONER RUIZ: It is unusual to have a poet, a musician, a dancer and a softball player all at once wrapped up in one person. Thank you.

Our next commentator on the prior presentations and reactions of your two colleagues is Dr. Thomas Vitullo-Martin, who is a consultant on public policy, specializing in education and urban development.

He is also an associate with the Brookings Institute, a principal investigator with the Ford Foundation, and a visiting Professor of Political Science at the University of Pennsylvania.

He holds Master's and Doctoral degrees from the University of Chicago and has written numerous articles and reports on major issues impacting both public and private schools.

Dr. Vitullo-Martin.

RESPONSE OF DR. THOMAS VITULLO-MARTIN*

I would like to speak on the impact of public and private schools on ethnic Americans and their communities. In his presentation, Dr. Femminella has convincingly argued that the approach American schools have chosen to take in educating children is hostile to the immigrant cultures. He has shown that "foreign" children suffer because American schools actively work to weaken or break their connection to family and ethnic culture, a connection that has already shaped their way of thinking before they enter school. He also argues that by committing ourselves to only one mode of education, Americans give up many others that may be far more suitable and productive. Succinctly put, we are narrow-minded.

My comments supplement Dr. Femminella's. He has emphasized the educational reasons for supporting policies that nurture existing cultural differences in the American population. I will discuss the social reasons for supporting these policies: to guarantee equal opportunity, and to encourage the full emergence of ethnic groups – which have suffered disadvantages similar, but not identical, to those suffered by groups normally designated "minority," and to integrate and stabilize urban communities.

Dr. Femminella has focused on the impact of public schools on ethnic students. I will discuss the impact of schools on their communities, especially private schools' impact on ethnic communities. This topic is a difficult one for USCCR because private schools have generally been portrayed as segregative. But I will show (1) that available data does not support that conclusion, and (2) that the interpretation of existing data is not as simple as it appears. The data suggests that urban private schools, particularly in the inner city, can have broadly integrative effects.

1. Guarantee Equal Opportunity

The United States Commission on Civil Rights has consistently and with great success fully focused attention on evidence of the educational disadvantages suffered by minority students. Fundamentally the Commission has taken the position that if minority students consistently exhibit levels of educational attainment lower than the median of the country's students, the system of education is failing its responsibilities. The Commission's position makes sense. We do not want an educational system that simply reinforces preexisting status differences among racial groups in our society.

If data existed that showed ethnic groups suffering the same kind of disadvantage in the schools – either ethnic groups taken together or individually – the Commission would be equally concerned. But data on ethnics comparable to what has been collected for racial and

* Consultant and Visiting Professor of Education, University of Pennsylvania

officially identified minority groups does not exist. The Bureau of the Census and the National Center for Education Statistics have grappled with difficult questions in attempting to identify and collect information about ethnic groups. They have made some progress in their attempts to devise questions that permit a reasonable classification of white groups into ethnic categories. Overall, however, this data on ethnics is based on inconsistent definitions of who is an ethnic, and is therefore difficult to interpret simply.

The data that does exist *suggests* that there are serious, systemic problems in the education of children of ethnic families. The data requires investigation by the Commission in the light of its commitment to the principle that no child shall be denied equal educational opportunity because of race, religion, sex, or national origin. The best data available comes from the National Center for Education Statistics, in the new Department of Education.

In 1976 NCES conducted a Survey of Income and Education, which collected income, education, and language characteristics of the American population. The survey is the most sophisticated ever conducted of language minorities, identifying individuals both by the language they spoke and by the language normally spoken in their home. It permits us to compare the educational attainments of members of several non-English-speaking groups with both racial minorities and the national averages.

The survey found, first, that those persons enrolled in grades 5-12, who usually speak a language other than English, were more than three times as likely to be two or more grades below grade level than those with English-language backgrounds.¹ It found that "9 percent of those persons with English-language backgrounds were two or more grades below levels expected of their age group, 15 percent for persons with language-minority backgrounds who usually spoke English, and 32 percent for persons who usually spoke their native languages." This data suggests that significant numbers of (ethnic) students are not being promoted to the next grade level automatically. The survey also found that ethnic students tend to fall behind in school and are far more likely to drop out. "While 10 percent of persons (age 14 to 25) with English-language backgrounds were high school dropouts, 40 percent of those in this age group who usually speak a non-English language were high school dropouts." Of this group, Hispanics appear to be the most disadvantaged; their dropout rate is 45 percent, compared to 30 percent for those who speak other non-English languages. (However, these differences may be produced by the admixture of higher-income families and of high-achieving families

¹ Leslie J. Silverman, "The Educational Disadvantage of Language-Minority Persons in the United States," Spring 1976, *National Center for Education Statistics Bulletin*, 78 B-4 [Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics: Washington, D.C., 1978], pp. 1-3.

speaking oriental languages in the "other" group.) In any case, ethnics who speak languages other than Spanish suffer substantial disadvantages similar to those suffered by the Hispanic group. We would expect students from a non-English-speaking culture to have difficulty in American schools until they learn the language well, and may be inclined to dismiss the problem without further investigation. This would be a mistake. Even a preliminary examination of the data finds serious problems.

Among Americans who "usually" speak in the non-Spanish European languages, *a high proportion are native Americans*. Fifty-five percent of the French-speakers, for example, are American born. When we compare the educational attainments of this group, we find extraordinary problems. Of this native-born group of French-speakers, *only 8.5 percent, aged 19 and older, have graduated from college, compared to 69.8 percent of the English-language population of the same age group*. The record is better, but only slightly, for those whose language background is French, but who usually speak English: 40 percent of this group aged 19 or older have graduated from high school. Other statistics confirm the problem: 47 percent of those who are native born and speak French as their usual language have fewer than five years of school, whereas this is the case for only 2.5 percent of the American population.

Although persons with French language background account for only 1 percent of Americans aged 19 or older, they account for almost 4 percent of adults with less than five years of schooling. In the English-language population, 36.1 percent of those 19 years old or older have had at least one year of college. Among the native-born Americans who usually speak French, only 5 percent of the men and 1 percent of the women have one year of college. Among those with French language backgrounds who normally speak English, only 20 percent of the age group have any college experience, slightly more than half the average for English-language persons.

These statistics strongly suggest significant structural problems with the educational opportunity given this ethnic group. The analysis has not been performed for other non-English language groups as of this date, but the general statistics given previously suggest that we will find similar problems in many of these groups.²

A second data source also suggests that ethnics suffer a disadvantage in schools comparable to the serious disadvantages suffered by blacks. Beginning in 1972, the National Center for Education Statistics monitored the educational experiences after high school of a sample of

² See Dorothy Waggoner, National Center for Education Statistics, the latest analysis of the educational attainments of non-English-speaking persons taken from Survey of Income and Education.

students. NCES presented data from the *National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972* in its *Condition of Education, 1977* (Table 4.15, page 200). The national high school sample is not broken down by ethnic group. I would argue, however, that white ethnic groups generally fall into the low and middle SES categories and make up a significant proportion of the low SES category. There is no reason to believe that white ethnics could substantially outperform other nonethnic members of that status. That data shows that for each of the three post-high school years, for each socioeconomic status, and for all low-ability and middle-ability students, black high school graduates had a higher propensity to attend postsecondary schools than did whites (See Table I.). Since the data is dealing only with high school graduates, and because blacks have a higher rate of students not graduating from high school, the black statistics are inflated by self selection. Nevertheless, the data does point to some problem areas. The high ability group is particularly interesting: high-ability blacks in the class of 1972 are half-again as likely to attend college as high-ability whites in the lower and middle SES groups. Only for the high SES group is there no significant difference between black and white college attendance. Approximately the same differences are found at the middle SES groups, with the exception that high SES whites of middle-level ability are far less likely to attend college than are high SES blacks of similar ability. Low and middle SES whites are least likely of all to attend college. In all cases but one, the trend is for students to leave college after initially attending, so that first-year-after-graduation college attendance rates are higher than third-year-after-graduation rates. The only exception is high-ability blacks, whose college attendance increases significantly by the third year—and is then higher than it was even in the year immediately following graduation.

The data does not comment on what proportion of each group finishes high school. But for those who do, the path is much easier for blacks than it is for either lower or middle SES whites, whatever the ability of the students. This results partly from a deliberate policy to encourage black scholarship. But the data suggests that lower and middle SES whites may require similar support. The published data does not permit us to identify the proportion of lower and middle SES white students who may be considered ethnics. However, we can tentatively assume that ethnics are more likely to be found in the lower-SES groups than in the middle, and that ethnics are unlikely to outperform the median achievement of either lower or middle SES groups.

The existing data is not conclusive, but points to the possibility that ethnics experience serious educational disadvantages not dissimilar to

TABLE I**Participation Rates in Postsecondary Education for the High School Class of 1972, by Race, Ability Level, and Socio-economic Status: Fall 1972, Fall 1973, and Fall 1974**

Ability level and socio-economic status (SES)	Fall 1972		Fall 1973		Fall 1974	
	White	Black ²	White	Black ²	White	Black ²
Low-ability level						
Low SES	19.8	34.0	10.9	23.9	8.7	22.5
Middle SES	29.0	42.9	20.1	35.5	14.1	29.0
High SES	46.6	61.2	36.8	51.2	31.4	49.4
Middle-ability level						
Low SES	33.2	55.9	25.5	41.7	19.8	42.8
Middle SES	53.3	61.0	43.0	54.3	31.8	55.8
High SES	76.4	86.5	65.3	75.6	56.8	83.1
High-ability level						
Low SES	66.2	68.6	56.7	62.0	47.2	71.4
Middle SES	77.4	74.2	68.3	82.1	56.3	89.2
High SES	92.6	91.3	86.2	72.1	81.2	78.9

¹ Excludes those students who could not be classified by race, ability level, or socioeconomic status.

² Note that the sample sizes for blacks categorized in the high ability of high socioeconomic status cells are relatively small and subject to greater sampling error.

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, *National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972*, preliminary data.

those of blacks and other minorities. The question deserves a more thorough examination.

2. Private Schools Support Ethnic Communities

Dr. Femminella discussed the indifference, even hostility, that the mode of education in most public schools visits upon ethnic students. He calls for an acceptance of schools informed by the cultures of the many American immigrant groups. On the whole, the schools most supportive of ethnic groups have been private (most often parochial)

schools. The German communities of the central United States have been encouraged to keep their special ethnic identity by their church schools – Lutheran, Mennonite, and Amish – which continue to use German as the primary or secondary language of instruction. The same could be said for French, Russian, Hispanic, and Polish communities.

For many communities, private schools serve as bridges between the old culture and the new American one. The difficulty in establishing this link in public schools – even when school leaders wish to – stems from the pattern of recruitment and selection of school teachers by the large public system. As political scientist Robert Dahl has shown, public school systems distribute teaching and administrative positions (as local governments do most other local government jobs that carry both job security and status) in rough proportion to the political strength of the ethnic groups in the community.³ Dahl found that for several generations in the community he studied, the most recent immigrant groups to the community could get only the lowest-status jobs, custodial positions. These workers' children, however, obtained teaching positions, and their grandchildren moved up the supervisory ladder. Only in the third generation after entry into the work force of a school system were members of an ethnic group likely to move to the top. The implications for ethnic groups in public schools are quite serious. While the flow of immigrants is greatest, the system is unlikely to be able to recruit and hire teachers closely connected to that immigrant culture.

Private schools are frequently supported by lower-income ethnic groups because they can offer an ethnic hospitality not offered in the public schools. Private schools can circumvent the problem of finding ethnic teachers by relaxing the standards of state accreditation. (Because of the income necessary to support the schooling accreditation requires, state standards in effect eliminate first-generation immigrants from eligibility.) Private schools can thus hire teachers who are themselves immigrants or who strongly identify with the immigrants' culture – teachers who speak the group's language, share its religion and religious celebrations, live in the neighborhood, are related to the group's members, and know its traditions and literature.

In the case of the Catholic schools, these teachers were often highly educated members of religious orders from the mother country. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, Irish Catholics staffed their schools with teachers from Irish convents. A little later Italian, Polish, and other European national groups establishing parishes and schools in America

³ Robert Dahl, *Who Governs?* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1961) Book 2, *passim*, especially pg. 154.

drew on teaching orders in their homelands. The tradition is carried on today by the newer immigrant. Several Mexican-American parishes in the Southwest have begun to draw teachers from Mexican convents to staff their schools; and Filipino parishes in the Far West and Hawaii have brought teaching sisters from convents in the Philippines.

As a general rule, private schools serving ethnic communities are affiliated with a community church. They are normally not independent schools for several reasons. Many immigrants to the U.S. fled religious persecution. They came to join members of their own faith practicing their religion freely. The parish schools were a natural extension of this concern. Other large groups came – and continue to come – to escape poverty. Not infrequently, the church of their homeland was politically involved in protecting the privileged and did not command the strong affections of the lower classes. Nevertheless, even these ethnic groups tended to cluster in areas in America where relatives lived, where their language was spoken or generally understood, and where national foods were available.

Typically, these immigrants are suspicious of Federal, State, and local government agencies, which exercise greater authority over immigrants – who are often aliens, poorer and in need of more social services – than over the average American citizen. Immigrant groups also frequently view themselves as political minorities with limited representation and access in government. Initially, rather than seek government aid, immigrant groups try to help themselves through business, fraternal, and religious societies. In ethnic communities – with some variations from group to group – churches have been one of the principal organizing forces, attending to the social needs of the group, turning ethnic religious feasts into days of celebration of the national group's traditions, pride, and achievements in America.

Even national groups that were not active church members in the old country appear to turn to churches in America. A dramatic and recent example is the experience of the Russian Jews who have concentrated in the Bay Ridge and Coney Island sections of New York City. Even though they appear to have lost the traditions of the Jewish faith – after years of Soviet persecution – they have sent their children to the Orthodox Yeshivas and Reform day schools in large numbers, rather than to the public schools. Their reasons for doing so are avowedly not religious but cultural; the schools, in response, have begun to instruct children in Russian, as well as English and Hebrew.

It takes little imagination to suggest the many ways national groups might find it in their interest to sponsor their own schools. In fact, the *ability* to sponsor schools to serve the needs of ethnic communities (typically organized about a religious congregation) may be a sign of the emergence of the group as a social and political force in its area. It

is unfortunate that the relationship between the success of immigrant communities and neighborhood schools which reinforce their ethnic identity has not been thoroughly studied by educators or social scientists. We cannot state with certainty the role these schools play in the group's emergence from its immigrant minority status. The literature does suggest that students are sensitive to the attitudes of teachers toward them, and do not perform at their full potential in schools hostile to their ethnic or cultural characteristics as minorities, or which regard ethnic minorities as having inferior educational potential. Many of these studies have dealt with black students, but the applicable theoretic principles are the same in the case of other minority students.

Private schools are most capable of accomodating themselves to the characteristics of ethnic minorities, and the presence and influence of these schools has been least studied. If further study finds that ethnic children reach higher rates of academic achievement in schools which reflect their ethnic background (especially in staffing patterns, language, religious attitudes, national celebrations, heros and models, history and literature), then the Commission should direct particular attention to private schools, which are the most capable of accommodating themselves to the ethnic group's characteristics. The Commission may find that private schools, in particular, play an important role in the group's emergence, a role more rare in public schools because their greater degrees of centralization of policy and labor organization make their adaption to ethnic group idiosyncracies more difficult. We cannot say for certain that private schools, or ethnically aligned schools whether private or public, do in fact especially aid the achievement of ethnic students and the emergence of the ethnic minority to the level of status equality. But many observers of ethnic groups and ethnic neighborhoods find evidence that they do. The outcome is particularly important to the concerns of the USCCR, and the questions should be given careful study.

3. Impact on the Stability and Integration of Urban Neighborhoods.

Ethnic schools have other social impacts which should be recognized and encouraged. To the extent that ethnic schools support the language, traditions, celebrations, and other social relationships of the families in the ethnic community, they strengthen the family and encourage its development as a social force in the community. It is unlikely that a school could develop a strong, reinforcing connection to the ethnic community unless the ethnic group had representatives in control of the school. Thus an ethnic school can help forge the ethnic community into a political group, one capable of bringing its own

social institutions under its control. The parish school is more likely than public schools to encourage the social development of the ethnic community, because it is more likely to be the exclusive project of that community than the public. The role is not impossible for public schools, however, and in some communities – especially smaller and more autonomous communities – the public schools do as well.

In general, however, public schools have tended to treat ethnic characteristics of their students in the way the Bureau of Indian Affairs used to treat the cultures of the native American tribes: they have switched philosophies from acceptance to outright hostility, to partial acceptance and back again. Ethnic parish schools – with no exceptions that I am aware of – have never taken a position of open hostility to the ethnic culture of the group they served. The degree of accommodation to the ethnic culture is more often a consequence of the degree to which the leadership of the schools shares the ethnic culture. Not only have parish schools been more consistent in their attempt to accommodate and reflect the ethnic group's traditions, but the ethnic schools can go further than public schools in accepting a significant aspect of ethnic cultures that public schools, by law, must ignore or secularize: the religious beliefs of many ethnic groups which are integral to their culture.

Grant for a moment the possibility that ethnic private schools may strengthen the ethnic group. Is that desirable, given the American ideal of the integration of our communities. Do ethnic community schools not encourage segregated enclaves?

Are Private Schools Segregative?

If ethnic community schools are segregative, that effect should be most clearly visible in the racial composition of private ethnic schools. However, private schools enroll too many blacks, other minorities, and children from low-income families to be deliberately segregating on any large scale. The Bureau of the Census 1976 Survey of Income and Education found that 10 percent of the 48 million elementary and secondary students in the United States attend private schools, and that these schools enrolled a surprising proportion of lower-income and minority students. Counting only cash income for families (and not in-kind income, such as subsidized rent provided by social welfare agencies or housing agencies in some states), the survey found (1) that 6 percent of all students from families with incomes below \$1,000 per year were enrolled in private schools; (2) that in the Northeast and North Central states, 9 percent of that group were in private schools;

and (3) that nationally, 12 percent of elementary students from families with incomes below \$7,500 were in private schools.⁴

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) found that in 1975, 7.4 percent of black and 6.6 percent of white elementary school students in the West were enrolled in private schools.⁵ *Private schools are serving proportionately more blacks than whites in the West.* NCES found that the enrollment of blacks in private schools has more than doubled between 1970 and 1975 in that region. More than half the western States have higher proportions of minority students in private than in public schools. For example, New Mexico's private schools are 57 percent minority; its public schools 48 percent minority, according to a 1970 survey by HEW's Office of Civil Rights.⁶

In 1975, 21 percent of all school-aged children in the United States were Spanish-surnamed or racial minorities. Of these, about 13 percent were black. If private schools were, on the whole, deliberately segregating, they would enroll much lower percentages of minorities. How have they done? The two private systems enrolling the greatest number of non-European minorities are the Catholic, which enrolls about 75 percent of all private school students and 90 percent of all blacks in private schools, and the Lutheran (Missouri Synod), which enrolls about 4 percent of all private school students and about 5 percent of all blacks in private schools.

The Catholic system was 18 percent minority in 1976, and the minority percentage was growing. It was particularly high in some Catholic dioceses: in 1974 the Montgomery, Alabama District Schools were 63 percent black (and 59 percent non-Catholic); Birmingham diocese, 43 percent black; District of Columbia elementary schools, 77 percent minority. In 1978 about half the elementary students of the New York City Catholic system were Spanish-speaking. In the Lutheran schools, 10 percent of the elementary and 18 percent of the secondary students were black, a greater percentage at the secondary level than in public schools. Black student enrollments in both Catholic and Lutheran schools were substantially higher than black membership in either church. Only about 1.5 percent of Catholics and one percent of Lutherans are black. The high percentage of minorities enrolled in private schools is not consistent with the belief that the

⁴ U.S. Bureau of Census, *Survey of Income and Education*, as reported in the *Congressional Record-Senate*, March 20, 1978, pp. S4158-60, Table 1B.

⁵ National Center for Education Statistics, *The Condition of Education, 1977, Vol. 3, Part 1* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970), p. 192, Table 4.05.

⁶ U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Civil Rights, *Directory of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Selected Districts: Enrollment and Staff by Racial/Ethnic Groups* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, Fall, 1970); and Diane B. Gertler, Linda A. Barker, National Center for Education Statistics, *Statistics of Nonpublic Elementary and Secondary Schools, 1970-71* (DHEW Publication No. (OE) 74-11420) p. 15.

schools are elitest or deliberately racially segregating.⁷

This is not to argue that there are *no* segregating private schools. According to the best available data, 18,000 of the 20,500 identifiable private schools have nondiscriminatory admissions policies. Only one organization of private schools in the United States is avowedly segregationist: the Southern Independent School Association, which claims only 375 member schools in nine Deep South states. Many of the remaining 2,125 schools, about which we have little information, are unaffiliated schools – some nominally Christian, some segregationist, some integrationist, some minority schools – most of them quite small. Although they represent perhaps 15 percent of all private schools, they enroll no more than 5 percent of the total private school population, or 225,000 of the 4.8 million students in private schools. The other 4.575 million children attend nondiscriminatory private schools.⁸

Private schools have received an underserved reputation as segregation academies because of *public* authorities' attempts in the late 1950's and early 1960's to avoid the impact of the *Brown* decision. Many of today's segregated academies were not originally private schools, but subterfuges created by state and local authorities to skirt *Brown*. In fact private schools in the South led the resistance to segregation. It was a private school, Berea College, that resisted the black codes, already applied to public schools of the South, until the Supreme Court ordered its segregation in the 1908 *Berea College* case.

After the 1954 *Brown* decision, private schools were the first to desegregate voluntarily in the South. New Orleans' Catholic system desegregated voluntarily two years before the public system acceded to a court order to end its dual system. St. Louis Catholic Schools' decision to desegregate broke the resistance of its public school board to desegregation. In Mobile and Birmingham, Alabama, in Lafayette, Louisiana, and in several other southern cities, private schools voluntarily integrated before the public schools integrated (voluntarily or under court orders). Several systems reported a temporary loss of students as a result of their actions. Again the argument is not that private schools are good and public schools are bad, but that the stereotypes are incorrect. Private schools have been integrative forces.

Perhaps the most difficult charge faced by private schools is that they segregate despite their integrationist commitments. Parents seeking to avoid public school integration can flee to private schools, whatever the school's intentions. Private schools are guilty, charge

⁷ Racial census of each of these private systems were made available by their respective departments of education for the years cited.

⁸ Robert Lamborn, executive director, Council for American Private Education (Unpublished memo, 1979).

some critics, of holding a large supply of white students when the public schools need those students to integrate their classes.

The argument and the problems with it can be illustrated with an example drawn from Brooklyn's Coney Island section. In 1974 the Federal District Court heard a suit seeking a remedy to school segregation in the area (*Hart vs. Community School Board*). Slightly less than half (12,000 of 29,150) school-aged students in the area went to parochial schools. Were these Catholic and Hebrew schools to be closed, a special master argued, perhaps facetiously, the integration problem in the public school would be solved. On strictly racial grounds, he would be correct. The Catholic schools at the time were predominantly white, with perhaps a 15 percent black enrollment. The Hebrew schools were only about 1 percent black. However, an estimated 45% of the Catholic students were either Spanish-speaking or black, and an unknown percentage of the remaining white proportion were children of recent immigrants. The Hebrew schools enrolled a high percentage of students whose mother tongue was Yiddish, Russian, or another language. Even though these two systems were predominantly white, only the most formalistic integrationists would have argued that their racial integration would have helped solve the problems of racial integration of blacks.

If the court had ordered the Catholic and Hebrew schools closed to accomplish the integration of the public schools (presuming, for the moment, that it had the power), would it have been successful in fostering integration? Take the Hebrew schools. To Orthodox Jews, yeshivas are not simply a slightly more desirable type of public school; they prepare youngsters for entrance into the Orthodox community. The court order would have meant the end of Hebrew schools in the Coney Island area, but it would not have affected Hebrew schools in Westchester or Suffolk counties, or in New Jersey. Immigrants faced with the choice of moving to a community where the schools are permitted or one where they are prohibited would be most likely to choose the former – outside the city. There has already been movement from Brooklyn to new communities beyond the city limits, and any move to close the Hebrew schools would almost certainly have accelerated the migration. In the end, the effect of the action on the Brooklyn area would have been to drive out large numbers of white families and to deprive the area of one of its attractions to immigrating white families. The change would have accelerated racial segregation by destroying one of the institutions which helps the Hebrew community cohere.

The Orthodox Jewish communities of Brooklyn and Queens are highly organized, even insular groups. But they reside in what is – by the standards of American cities – an ethnically, racially, and

economically integrated area. The elimination of their schools would foster the segregation of that area.

Of course, no court is seriously speaking of closing these schools, but the example does force us to consider the obverse of the argument: private schools appear to anchor in urban neighborhoods white families who would otherwise leave the city for suburban communities. Closing urban private schools damages the racial integration of cities. Catholic, Lutheran, Episcopal, and other private schools in inner-city and central-city areas – those schools which have the greatest integrative impact on the cities – are most in jeopardy of closing as a result of the costs that their own efforts to serve lower-income and minority students imposes on them. The Hebrew schools have few blacks or Hispanics, because they admit only Jews and these minorities are not Jewish. But the parish schools of the major churches do, especially in the inner-city areas, admit students whose families are not members of the parish, which support the schools. (The yeshivas encounter a similar problem with Russian Jews, whose families are not members of the synagogues that support the schools.) Generally, the larger the proportion of blacks in Catholic or Lutheran schools, the fewer the parishioners to support the school. The most integrated schools are the most likely to close.

4. Federal Taxation Policy Promotes School Segregation

Existing public policy, in particular taxation policy, exacerbates the difficulties of the central-city and integrated private schools. I have dealt with the impact of taxation policy on the choice of schools, on private schools and on the integration of cities in greater detail in an article which I am including as an appendix to my testimony. Because of the complexity of the issues involved, I will only summarize my reasoning and conclusions in my direct testimony, and refer you to my article for a fuller exposition of the problem.

Church schools, in general, obtain their income from parish contributions (or contributions from the central church offices) and from tuition. The fewer the parishioners – a typical condition for inner-city Catholic schools – the more the school must rely on tuition and central support. For all churches, the fund of central aid available is quite limited, the rule having been that church schools were supported by those in the parishes who used them. The higher the tuitions, the more likely white families – who are more mobile because their incomes are higher on average, and because they do not experience racial segregation in suburban housing – are able to move to suburban areas, where free and more segregated public schools offer education which often is more luxurious in what it provides its pupils than the central-city school the family is leaving. Close the central-city

private schools and that stock of white parents leaves for the suburbs; they do not stay in the city. Suburban public schools have stripped the cities of their white middle class. Both religious and independent private schools in central cities have helped keep middle-class parents in neighborhoods where minorities live, or at least within the bounds of the same political jurisdiction.

The critics of private schools fear that these schools offer families a racially selective alternative, and that if families have such an alternative, they will prefer it. This view is shortsighted, as well as unduly pessimistic. It is shortsighted because it regards only one kind of competition facing integrating public schools: microcompetition – the competition from private schools in the same neighborhood.

But our population is highly mobile. For the past 25 years American families have averaged one move every 5 years, with ethnics the least likely to leave their old neighborhoods. Researchers have found that for many families the decision to relocate involves two stages: (1) the realization that a different size home with different amenities is needed; and (2) a choice of new home in a new location. Very important in the selection of the new home is the school serving it. In moving, families choose public schools. And public schools in different areas are in competition with one another: macrocompetition. Microcompetition takes place in one neighborhood, usually over educational issues: religious instruction, pedagogical approach, class size and amenities, academic achievement record, and tuition costs. The competition tends to encourage a variety of offerings in the neighborhood and improvements where the schools meet head on. The schools compete to outperform each other. Private schools rarely compete on racial policies, although in large urban areas like Manhattan, some private schools may attempt to develop a more heterogeneous student mix than others. In general, private schools – like public schools – drew from relatively compacted neighborhoods and their population characteristics reflect the area. In their socio-economic composition, private schools rarely differ sharply from nearby public schools. Those differences which do develop are most likely differences in the socio-economic composition of the religious group which is the private school's principal and predisposed client.

Macrocomposition takes place between schools (both public and private) in one neighborhood and another. To choose, parents must move. Parents choose public schools, paying a kind of tuition in the form of a premium on the purchase of a new house due to the attractive value of the high-quality school district, as well as in the form of local taxes devoted to educational expenses, which also affect (and depress) the value of the house. In general, the better the reputation of the public school, the more expensive the property. The

competition has the effect of separating metropolitan area residents by income class.

Ironically, the movement of the wealthy from city residences which integrate the cities and provide tax base for public schools which enroll most minorities is fostered by Federal and State taxation policy. Existing taxation policy permits the deduction of the interest costs of purchasing a home from individual tax liability and permits the deduction of taxes which support public education. The wealthiest suburban communities which lie just outside urban centers in the United States are little more than highly selective school districts, where high income is a necessary condition for the attendance of most students.

Local taxes are, realistically, a form of tuition for economically and racially exclusive schools – schools far more exclusive than even the members of the National Association of Independent Schools, the most prestigious private schools in the country. Fifteen percent of NAIS students were on scholarship in 1978 and 7 percent were minorities. But in the wealthiest *counties* outside New Orleans, New York, Washington, Chicago, San Francisco, Philadelphia, and other major cities, about 1 percent of public school enrollments are minorities, and these students tend to be concentrated in one of two communities within the counties.

The taxes that support exclusive suburban public schools, taxes which are a kind of tuition to those schools, are deductible from taxable income. For the family in the 50 percent tax bracket, the deduction of \$4,000 in local taxes is worth \$2,000 in income tax savings. The real cost of raising \$4,000 for the schools in a community of such families is only \$2,000 per family. In the city, where most people forego income tax deductions (choosing the standard deduction when filing their returns), it costs almost \$4,000 to raise \$4,000 per pupil through local taxes. There is no subsidy from the Federal or State tax system. In city private schools, a \$4,000 tuition is not deductible from taxable income. The family would have to earn \$8,000 in order to pay the \$4,000 tuition.

Consider the option open to an urban family: a modestly integrated private school that keeps the family in the neighborhood, but costs almost \$3,000 per pupil per year for the 14 years of private education. Let us say the family has two children, costing it \$6,000 per year in private school costs. The family would have to devote almost \$12,000 of its earnings per year to the education of these children – a lifetime commitment of \$168,000. Alternatively, the family could move to a suburban district and get free public education of equivalent or better quality that is paid for through the tax system. School taxes do not increase according to the number of children one has enrolled: the

total cost of educating two children in this system for 14 years (at an annual tax levy of \$3,000) would be only \$42,000, or one quarter of the cost of the private system. The suburban system is far less expensive, and most likely existing tax policy virtually requires the move to the suburban school to be far less integrated both racially and economically than the urban private school. The existing tax systems, in their treatment of education expenses, bear a great portion of the responsibility for the segregation of urban schools. The system reinforces, rather than opposes, the pressures to segregate (by differentiating according to income) inherent in the economic system.

The role of the local schools, especially the private school, is particularly important to the ethnic community. It helps keep families and attracts new families to the community. For an ethnic community to cohere, it must be attractive to the second generation and to succeeding generations as they raise their children. But as ethnic communities grow wealthier and more established, it becomes difficult for the younger families to remain in them. Housing must be renewed to compete with new suburban homes. The recent escalation of new home costs have increased the attractiveness of community renewal to these families. But the community must also have strong schools that reflect the traditions of its residents. Private schools are not the sole providers of education in these neighborhoods, but their presence is at least as important as that of the public schools. Socially and racially diverse American cities need private schools.

* * *

DISCUSSION

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Thank you very much. I think it would be well that we lead off our commissioner questions or comments by first calling upon Stephen Horn, because he is a - this is a panel on education and ethnicity - our Vice President. He is President of the California State University of Long Beach, and he has dedicated his professional career to education, the subject of education.

Do you have any reactions?

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Well, I suspect I would be better off talking as a first generation American than as an educator, but let me ask one question in particular of, really, all of you, but perhaps Mr. Banks might be most appropriate to start it off.

We hear a lot of talk from this panel and nationally about the quest for ethnic identity and how there has been disadvantages in the way the public school systems are set up because they have destroyed ethnicity.

We've heard examples where teachers tell students "Do not speak the language of your parents." A lot of us went through a number of experiences like that which we can all cite, and I am sure they go on.

As we look at another phenomena that is going on, where we are talking about bilingual and and multicultural education, and often both entwined, not disentwined, can one have ethnic identity without mastering the particular language of one's ancestors and whether one can somehow master the basic language we are speaking in this country without perhaps giving up some of the language of the ancestors, depending upon the year in which one enters the school system?

And I think of testimony – I was mentioning to one of my colleagues at lunch today – the testimony that we heard during our 1972 New York hearings. There was a young Puerto Rican student at Hunter College, and she said everybody should be learning only Spanish in the Puerto Rican community in New York and down with English, et cetera.

My reaction to her was: "Well, just where do you expect to get a job in this society? Are you going to be an attendant always in a Puerto Rican hotel or what are you going to do? Where are your job opportunities?"

And I wonder often, as I listen to this dialogue, whether we are not talking about ethnicity joys for parents and limiting opportunities for children. I am sure the question we would want to answer is how do we do both.

I think of the black English situation, where we now have a court case in Michigan on black English; and what that means – it is one thing to deal with a given state of affairs, to try and move people along to some standard method of cultural interchange, and it's another thing to perpetuate the disadvantage any group has from taking advantage of whatever society has to offer.

So I wonder if you could help me struggle with the problem of how is bilingual education best conducted, what is its relationship to multicultural education, and whether or not multicultural education can be spread throughout the school system without necessarily having an emphasis on the second language, although I would be the first to say that Americans are immensely weak in this area, that we ought to be learning foreign languages at the elementary school level where it is fun and not delayed until high school and college, where it becomes a chore.

But I am curious with your reflections on this matter.

DR. BANKS. Yes, and a complex question. I will try to respond as I interpret it, and then perhaps you can raise it again if I do not respond adequately.

It seems to me that one question you raise is what is the relationship between ethnicity in a modernized society and the linguistic characteristics of students. One of our problems has been that we've been looking at ethnicity as a unidimensional conceptualization.

Ethnicity in a modernized society is a very complex concept with a lot of indices which include, depending upon the group, ideology, ways of knowing, values, cognitive styles, and so forth.

I think for some ethnic groups, such as Puerto Rican Americans and Mexican Americans, the linguistic factors are enormously important. I think that in some instances language is intimately tied to ethnic identity.

However, for other ethnic groups, such as black Americans, I think one can be very black ideologically and not ever speak Black English; so I think it depends on the ethnic group you are talking about when you raise the question of how language relates to ethnic identity.

I think we have to look at ethnicity within a modernized society, and it has to be a very fluid concept, in that we can't equate ethnicity of a hundred years ago with ethnicity today.

It seems to me that some of the most meaningful kinds of ethnic identifications and behaviors among blacks, for example, are their commitment to black liberation, the commitment to end discrimination, and they may speak very standard English.

Secondly – I feel very strongly that all children should be able to function efficaciously within our shared society, within the mainstream universalistic culture – whatever word you would like to use. However, I think we should recognize that students can do that and yet be bilingual. I think, however, that we've often assumed that to speak Spanish is un-American. I think we need to look at new conceptualizations of what it means to be American, that one can indeed speak several languages and be an effective American citizen.

But I think it is essential that the student is able to speak standard Anglo-English, if you will, but I do not think that means we have to necessarily stamp out Black English or necessarily stamp out Spanish.

We follow the English system which puts language teaching up into the secondary or even into the post-secondary level when, if you take some of the neurophysiological evidence, even the older material like Pensfield and Roberts, but even some of the newer, where they are talking about neurological connectives becoming more rigid with age, so that, for example, beyond age nine it is very difficult to learn a second language. It is not impossible, by any means; it is just more difficult, because the initial encoding is such that you are building a language on top of a prior language.

If, on the other hand, you begin learning a second language before the age of six, then you learn those languages side by side. The

encoding is simply wider, and you can bounce from one language to another.

Now, in Italy, we have – as I describe in the paper – at least four languages: the basic dialect of every region, which is really a different language; and then the polished dialect, the language of the educated people in that area; then there is the academic language, which derives from the literary language which is a contrived language, which is kind of interesting.

In England it's just the reverse. Linguistic unification in England was a process that took place on the language of the people standardized in the court, when it moved to London, and out of which derived the literary language.

Now that difference, I think, is unfortunate for us. We went the wrong way and are suffering with our bilingual program as a result. If we take the view that we are going to be multilingual in this country, and that every child shall learn to speak English – no question about that; that has to be done – but that every child shall be taught English by communicating with him where he is at, so that there will be many languages utilized in the schools.

If we take that approach, I think we can do a better job. But if we are going to have multilanguages taught in the school, then there is an economic problem which can be in some way modified by virtue of the fact that since those languages are available, they will be available for other children as well, so that for those children for whom English is the first language, there in the very early grades, they will be introduced to foreign languages; and that is one way of doing it.

So that is my view on the language issue, but to just answer the identity question, which was the first thing you brought up, I do not think that you have to master the foreign language in order to have a sense of identity.

I think the confusion there is this: what is the identity that you are talking about? As Americans, our identity is as Americans, okay, as “United Statesians.” Put it that way, more properly.

When I asked the question what does that entail, what is involved in “United Statesians.” there is always some alien heritage, all right, and one has to be aware of that; and the more one has a sense of that, the more fully formed one is.

And to have the language, naturally, is better, but it is not essential now for having a sense of identity.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Mr. Louis Nunez, would you like to comment?

STAFF DIRECTOR NUNEZ. I have one question, Professor. As I understand your argument, you indicated that there is a need for special services to understand the needs of ethnic Americans in our

public school systems, which is a very similar argument that most minorities, traditional minorities, make also.

But also, you make the argument that there might be a need for private schools, private schools which cherish the needs or understand more closely – or am I mixing up your argument with –

DR. FEMMINELLA. That was Mr. Vitullo's argument. I did not mention that.

STAFF DIRECTOR NUNEZ. Well, we will stick to the public schools. In other words, your argument on the public schools is that in the same way that other minorities, such as blacks and Hispanics, have to have special services in the schools, Euro-ethnics also have to have those social services.

DR. FEMMINELLA. Well, I will be very clear about where I stand on that because I didn't say that.

I am going to say two things. One, I think black studies, for example, and black history is a disaster that we can't live without, because history was taught so badly. Okay?

Literature is taught so poorly in the schools that we have got to have black literature, because they did not include it in American literature. They left it out. They left out a lot of other ethnic literature, so we have got to do something about that, too.

They left all the black stuff out of the history, and they left out a lot of ethnic stuff out of the history. So, unfortunately, we have got to have that put in, too.

But what I am saying is, when you start adding on, you know, now we have history, and then we have black history, and then we will have Italian-American history and Polish-American history, and you know, and on and on and on, and that is ridiculous.

What you have to have is American history taught truthfully. That is what you have; and you have to have that ethnic sensitivity – and this is what I was arguing for – intruding into every aspect of the curriculum.

You have to do it in third-year art class. You have to do it in the physical education program. Why not? They do it, but they don't know that they are doing it in an Anglo-American way; and what they have got to do is have the teachers and the schools develop a consciousness of what it is they are really doing and then adjust it and make it right. Make it American.

That is all I am asking for.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Commissioner Saltzman?

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Relative to that question and the comment you made that the ethnic child has the right to make America into his own image: How do we resolve the problem of opening up our neighborhoods and yet maintaining ethnic identity?

Does not ethnic identity require an enclave to preserve itself, with at least some numbers of people.

If a group is to preserve itself, I think it needs a central focus with institutions that are available within some proximity to where the people live. The schools, too, help the child to achieve a sense of identity and pride where there are some models within his peer group and within the teaching profession.

Do you understand where I am going?

DR. FEMMINELLA. Yes. I want to come back to this topic. I totally disagree with that, and I'll explain why.

I think, first of all, that this is really why we need so much research. There are very few people doing research. I mean Banks talked about ethnic identity, and other people talked about ethnic identity, and I want to talk about ethnic *ego* identity. That is a very special kind of a concept.

I am using Erik Erikson's notions and I am couching this in a theoretical framework where you can get something going.

If you take that perspective that every person has a self, a personality, and that part of that self is one's social heritage, and that that is very profoundly internalized within an individual – we say in the unconscious if you want to have the psychoanalytic perspective, or it is one of the major constructs of the individual, to take a kind of a Kelleyan perspective. I don't care how you put it. The point is it is there, and there is no way you can get rid of it. It is almost, as Louis S. B. Leaky once said to me, "it's genetically inheritable."

I said "I can't buy that, but it's damn close. Okay?"

The point I am making is that if that heritage is there, then the ethnic communities will go on irrespective of whether they have a locale. Ethnic communities are not necessarily special communities.

We have to make a distinction. There is a difference between an immigrant collectivity and an immigrant community, and an ethnic collectivity and an ethnic community and an ethnic organization.

We had better get clear on what we are talking about when we use these terms.

And when we talk about ethnic groups or ethnic communities, they don't necessarily require a special enclave.

If they have one, or if there is one existing someplace, that's fine. I live in Albany, New York, and our problem is that we cannot get very good Italian cheese.

But thank God there is an ethnic enclave in New York City not too far away, and we can go there for it, you see; so we are very happy to have ethnic neighborhoods even though we do not happen to have one close to where I live.

Now we are changing all that, but in the meantime there is a sense of commonality among Italian-Americans throughout the entire nation. Well, Italians are a very poor group to use for an example of this. There is no such thing as an Italian – the Sicilian-Americans, of which I am a part – we have a sense of commonality or the Neopolitans, they have a sense of commonality –

You see, that is what I mean. There are these groups –

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. I am not sure that history really confirms what you are saying. I think historical experience shows that ethnicity may be lost.

DR. FEMMINELLA. Well, the historical – I mean, you know, if you just look at us sitting here today, now that is got to be the proof that ethnicity is not lost.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. By us? Because you go to New York for your cheese?

DR. FEMMINELLA. Well, you know, that is who the Americans are, us. There are enough Americans declaring ethnic affiliation today

–

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Right now.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Well, as an ethnic, this is most interesting to me.

I have not been living in an enclave since I was about 4 years of age, and since then I have still continued to learn and speak better and become more engrossed in my ethnic background where I am completely bilingual.

I just wanted to differ with what was coming out here from personal experience, because we had two personal experiences, and I wanted to contribute a third one.

DR. BANKS. I wanted to comment on that, too.

In fact, ethnicity, when dispersed geographically, may be augmented. Living in white suburbia, I find that my ethnic affiliations, in some ways, are augmented.

They may take new forms, but they do not necessarily go away or fade.

Sometimes we misinterpret new forms of ethnicity as disappearance.

DR. NOBLE. Yes, and the other thing I would like to point out is that there is a whole host of networks of ethnic radio programs. These radio programs are really newspapers and magazines. They keep you informed of all kinds of things.

At this point, it is possible, for example, to circumvent the established broadcasting system of the United States. They simply bring the tapes – fly them over from Athens – and you are listening to the news as if you were in Greece.

You know where to go to get a job; you know who has been married, and who has gone on a trip.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. You are all suggesting that assimilation does not take place in America –

DR. NOBLE. That's right.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. – and I can understand when you are one person in the community, a sense of resistance of pride wells up and you affirm yourself, but assimilation has taken place.

In some Midwestern cities in particular, the homogenization in those communities is such that, though there may be memories of some ethnic loyalties after the second or third generation, there is nothing that they really know or do that distinguishes or differentiates their life from their neighbors.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. I'll turn the podium back to our Chairman and ask him to make comments from here on out because he will be under control.

Chairman Flemming.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. There is one question I would like to address to the members of the panel.

As I listened to the presentation of the paper and I've listened to the comments, I have noted the objectives or conclusions that were set forth in your paper. I've noted the objectives that were identified by Professor Banks, and it seems to me that there is general agreement on the part of the participants in the discussion on those objectives.

Now starting from there, many communities in this nation over a period of the last few years have desegregated their school systems. In my judgment, a good many additional communities will desegregate their school systems in the years that lie ahead. There are going to be some struggles before that happens and additional court cases, and so on, but I feel that we can assume that by and large we are going to be dealing with desegregated school systems.

Do you feel that these desegregated school systems can be administered in such a manner as to contribute to the achievement of the objectives that were set forth in your paper and that members of the panel have also identified?

DR. FEMMINELLA. I'd like to answer that and also just make a remark on Commissioner Saltzman's last remark.

See, the question is that assimilation in American society does not necessarily mean homogenization.

As people acculturate in American society, America changes, and so sometimes it is very difficult to know whether in fact America is – whether in fact the individual is different or not – the society itself has been changed.

The reason why I tie them together is because the desegregated school can best be administered utilizing that notion for the betterment of all people in the school, all the students in the school, pupils in the school, and also of the society at large.

I don't see any problem in that at all. In fact, I see one as enhancing the other.

DR. BANKS. Yes. I think the whole desegregation movement opens up enormous possibilities for using the tremendous diversity within the classroom.

However, and I didn't get to that part in my earlier presentation because I thought I was going to run over my 5 minutes whatever I had, is that we need to take a hard look at what happens after the physical mixing, to look at the hidden curriculum, the attitudes and expectations of the school staff, the learning styles favored by the school, the total school culture; it tends to be Anglo-centric in values and expectations.

I have done most of my work on the school curriculum. We need to look at the formalized curriculum and so forth. I think desegregation opens up enormous possibilities, but we have to work real hard, both in terms of research and development, to create those strategies which will facilitate the development of the kinds of identities I talked about.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Right along that line, I do not know whether your attention is called to a study that - dealing with Kalamazoo, Michigan or not, a study that was ordered by the Court and was conducted by Wilbur Cohen, former Secretary - the faculty of the University of Michigan, and I think it was Dr. Greene - Michigan State University; and they have identified, in my judgement, in a very effective way the issues that you have just identified.

DR. NOBLE. I wanted to add that as far as we are concerned at the institution where I teach, multiethnicity and the study of it is in the new curriculum for the preparation of any future teachers.

We feel very strongly about it, and it came out of my 2-year project in Charlestown where I had a chance to get to know these young people on a very unusual level in the branch library - I had gotten the cooperation of the Boston Public Library and the John F. Kennedy Multi-Service Center.

The Charlestown students that were coming in to the Study Center at night, knew they could come in and talk or they could get tutored. It was a relaxed kind of atmosphere.

And out of this, in two years, I got to know these Charlestown students very well. If anything, the kinds of questions they asked of my future teachers, and the exposure to different cultures on a one-to-one level, brought new perspectives. The kinds of discussion we would have back in my classroom about assimilation influenced their thinking

about their teaching these young people. My future teachers had to role play a classroom composed of these students.

We found that their public school experience was really quite bleak. Hockey was the one thing that seemed to be able to turn them on; and as a result, we constructed all kinds of strategies.

Why can't you teach math using the hockey rink? You have got some students who are interested in hockey; well, if they are top hockey players they are going to go to Canada. They are going to have to learn how to speak some French, so you start teaching them French, starting with the hockey terms.

There are all kinds of strategies, but I think there is a richness that can be brought out by reaching and examining another culture; It teaches you as a human being to find out more about who you are. When you find out about another culture.

DR. VITULLO-MARTIN. I am not at all convinced there are no important conflicts between integration and ethnic-centered schools.

Much depends on the specific integration policy. I studied an integration decision in Teaneck, New Jersey, in which the one black neighborhood school was closed. Its students were bused around the whole community, so families would have children in three and four different schools. There was no effective way the black community could mobilize itself as a group to encourage the system to do very much of anything for blacks, particularly in that town at that time.

The specific integration plan can very much inhibit the ability of an ethnic community to express itself in the system.

I do not think there is an intrinsic opposition. A private school in Little Italy in New York City, for example, is a third Spanish-speaking black, a third Chinese, and a third Italian-speaking whites.

It's quite possible for integrated schools to serve quite mixed ethnic communities. That is possible. But, the specific integration plan can do substantial damage to the practicability of the system to respond well to ethnic minorities.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. The challenge is to figure out ways and means of utilizing a desegregated system or an integrated system in such a manner that it will achieve the kind of objectives that the members of the panel seem to have agreed upon.

It seems to me that this is the direction in which our nation definitely is headed.

DR. VITULLO-MARTIN. Yes, I think if one is sensitive to the problem and intends to solve it, and that it is possible to solve it, a number of possible integration plans will not necessarily be compatible.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Mr. White, did you have a -

ASSISTANT STAFF DIRECTOR WHITE. Yes, this is just related to the question that was just asked, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to ask the panelists whether you perceive any differential need for the preservation of ethnicity with respect to elementary school students as compared to secondary school students?

DR. BANKS. Well, I don't know, but that gives me an opportunity to make the statement that I think, in talking about ethnicity, that we certainly have to keep options open.

Some Jewish kids may not have a need to maintain Jewishness, so in a democratic society, we ought to keep options open.

It seems to me that secondary students may have worked out identity clarification more than elementary schools, but I think it is very difficult to speak to your questions without more data and research.

DR. NOBLE. I would say it would be very important to be able to make sure that at a very early age a child, in terms of the whole ego identity, is able to have positive reinforcement. If I don't feel comfortable about who I am, am I going to have to wait until I am 13 or 14 to find out who I am?

By that time, all kinds of strange things could have happened.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Any other questions?

DR. FEMMINELLA. You know, I am not really sure I understand the question. I think that if we are doing education right, then we are doing different things at different levels. I think that if we have a sense of respect for ourselves, for our families and for white ethnic groups, and so on, generated in us in those elementary grades, then when we come to the secondary school and become more conscious of differences, we can address them, because then the time will be there to address those differences. There will be mutual respect, you see, because we will have a sense of respect for ourselves.

So I think yes and no. Yes, there are different things we do. I think it is part of education, but no, I think the intensity is the same all the way through.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. I think that is a very important point as is the whole argument in your paper – your argument about the ego development and this whole idea of self-respect.

I listened to different ethnic groups note all of the ethnic problems they ran into in elementary school. I suspect I am perceived as an Anglo-German WASP.

I can assure you that Anglo-German WASPS run into ethnic problems from other groups in elementary school. Children run into problems from other children and children can say very cruel things about other children, as we all know.

So I think your point is well taken. If one can learn a certain respect for diversity and difference early on, this will help receptivity to all sorts of things later on.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. May I express to all the members of the panel our deep appreciation for presenting and developing your papers, coming here, and participating in this dialogue. It has been very, very helpful. Thank you very, very much.

Fourth Session: Social Services and Ethnicity

COMMISSIONER FLEMMING. Commissioner Saltzman will preside this morning while we consider the area of social sciences.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Thank you, Dr. Flemming.

Our first presenter will be Dr. Marvin L. Rosenberg. Dr. Rosenberg is a Professor of Policy Planning and Research in the School of Applied Social Sciences at Case Western Reserve University.

He has designed several integrated social service delivery projects. He has authored a book on the subject, entitled, "Systems Service People: A Breakthrough in Service Delivery."

He is currently researching how new facets of the British social service system may be applied to the American system and has published related articles in both British and American journals.

Dr. Rosenberg, we're delighted to have you.

STATEMENT OF MARVIN L. ROSENBERG, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF SOCIAL PLANNING, SCHOOL OF APPLIED SOCIAL SCIENCES, CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY, CLEVELAND, OHIO

Thank you very much, Mr. Saltzman.

As the United States enters the 1980's, policy makers are going to be confronted with a burgeoning demand for social services from all segments of American society.

Statistical indicators are all about us. The rate of divorced families exceeds the divorce rate at the turn of the century by some 700 percent; four out of ten children born in the last decade will have to cope with growing up in a single parent household.

The number of American families headed by women has increased from five and a half million to eight and a half million, or one in every seven families.

In human terms, this means that millions of single parents will need counseling and supportive social programs; millions of children from broken homes will need child development programs, therapy, and residential treatment.

A 5-year increase in life expectancy, since 1950, will result in an elderly population of about 25 million, about 11 percent by next year.

In many cities, the elderly already constitute between 15 and 16 percent of their total community population.

Persons over 75 years of age are most likely to need social services, and they constitute the fastest growing segment of this population.

Thus, there will be millions of older people in need of services to cope with the loss of spouses and friends, help them find new goals after retirement, provide them with new opportunities to preserve their mental health.

For those elderly too frail and impaired to be mobile, there will be a need for long-term care services such as homemakers, meals on wheels, friendly visitors, and transportation and, unfortunately, more institutions will be needed for those too incapacitated to be taken care of at home.

In addition, millions of mentally ill patients have been de-institutionalized, only to be cast into the community's back wards, such as flop houses and broken-down tenements. These people, in addition to the severely mentally retarded and their families, as well as the home-bound physically disabled, are largely dependent populations needing multiple social services.

Now, what these statistics in fact mean for social services, particularly for Americans of European heritage, is the central thesis of what I am going to try to say today.

As a culture, the society, despite the rash of books emphasizing the family in demise, the "me" society, and the "culture of narcissism," the indications are that the large majority of American families do assume great responsibility for their dependent and incapacitated family members. That is a myth that does not seem to want to go away. People do take care of their elderly people in much larger numbers than we believe.

A recent study of the elderly in Cleveland, conducted by the U. S. Government Accounting Office, noted that 80 percent of all social services are provided by members of the older person's family.

Among early immigrant groups, such as European ethnics, the ethos of self-help and self-reliance on the family, is especially strong.

These findings, however, must be tempered by the fact by these other statistics about the American family today.

In addition, the birth rate is plunging downward, leaving fewer adult children to care for their aging parents or dependent relatives.

With the increase in life expectancy, many elderly, who are themselves retired, will have an older parent to care for as well; so you'll have two parent households, one with a younger older and an older older.

And inflation is causing married women who have traditionally performed caretaking roles in the family to enter the job market; thus the fact that families are the primary caregivers at present does not mean that they can maintain that caregiving forever.

Nor should families be expected to shoulder the entire burden.

For members of a family who are mentally ill, retarded, frail, impaired, or physically handicapped the costs, the physical demands, the emotional strains, often lead to breakdown of the entire family unit.

Social agencies, both public and voluntary, must provide supplemental and supportive services in times of adversity.

The increasing need within the American populace requires reexamination of policy that relates – affects the family, religious, and cultural institutions, as well as the importance of local neighborhoods.

Consideration must be given to issues that bear directly on the relationship between ethnicity and service delivery; but this kind of an examination requires a little bit of understanding of some recent history.

And while I'm sure the Commissioners are familiar with it, I'm just going to summarize it very rapidly.

Before the late 1960's the services I described, which I call personal social services, were largely neglected by Federal Government. They were the exclusive province of voluntary agencies, sometimes State and local.

The emphasis 10 years ago was on income maintenance and fostering power for the poor and dealing with these kinds of issues, and there was a fight that raged over whether services were more important or jobs were more important.

We realize that that's a false dichotomy. You need both.

It's recognized that a group can be disadvantaged without necessarily suffering poverty or racial discrimination. The elderly, the handicapped, the blind, the mentally retarded, along with other disadvantaged groups, are victims of stereotyping and discrimination and in need of government help.

Incapacitated and dependent groups are found in every racial, ethnic, socio-economic group in American Society.

Certainly poverty and racial discrimination compound the suffering of those already handicapped groups.

The growing recognition, by government, that social services cannot be for the poor alone, has led to a series of legislative acts appropriating Federal funds to different categories of clients.

The most prominent being Title 20, of the Social Security Act, the Older Americans Act, Community Mental Health Act; and really, for the first time in history, the American Federal Government is playing

a central role in the financing of social services, not just income maintenance.

What took place in the Depression is now taking place in relation to personal social services.

Appropriations have risen from about 746 million in 1971 to over five billion in 1973; they may be closer to eight billion now, for personal social service alone. This is exclusive of income maintenance. It has nothing to do with income maintenance.

However, accompanying this expansion, we have created hundreds of State, Federal, and local agencies. The present system is a fragmented, chaotic, multiplicity of public and voluntary agencies that are often inaccessible, unresponsive, and insensitive to people who most need help.

And perhaps the most penetrating criticism was made by Elliott Richardson in 1973. I'm not going to read you the whole quote about the proliferation of agencies stepping over each other. I'll read you the bottom line of his comment - and Secretary Califano made a similar comment before he left office. "The chances are less than one in five that a client referred from one service to another will ever get there. The present maze encourages fragmentation."

The emergence of Title 20 in the mid '70's, while adding to the dollars, also added to the fragmentation.

It's important to differentiate now among different types of social welfare policies.

For example, a universal policy, which mails a Social Security check or pays a medical claim, is much less impersonal than a program trying to help a discharged mental patient support a family or an elderly person at home.

The essence of a personal social service hinges on the trusting relationship between the local community and the agency, between the helper and the client; otherwise, it does not work.

Impersonal bureaucracies that are stigmatized because they are associated with public welfare, that have elaborate intake procedures and means tests, cannot be effective in delivering personal social services.

And this may be particularly true for European Americans, although I think it's true for every group in American society.

Among early immigrant groups, an antiwelfare, self-reliant tradition is strong. Newer European refugees, fleeing tyranny from totalitarian regimes, tend to view government bureaucracies with defiance and distrust.

Reaching out and serving these client groups requires intimate knowledge of their life styles and values.

There is a growing body of research which documents the importance of ethnicity in neighborhoods as a key factor in the willingness of people to use social services, particularly among working-class ethnic groups, and I'll just highlight a few of these research findings, so I can move on.

Fandetti, in a study in Baltimore, found that 82 percent of a random sample of ethnic residents "indicated their feeling that their relatives could not be comfortable" – and these are elderly people – "could not be comfortable in homes for the aged staffed by individuals from different ethnic backgrounds. A key factor was language. The sample included people from different groups, such as Greeks, Italians, Poles, Germans."

The conclusion was that "ethnic staffing of old age homes was . . . important for 'old timers' with limited language ability."

When asked where long-term care services for the elderly should be delivered in the community, the respondents stated their highest preference to be the Catholic Church or local ethnic organization.

Another study by Fandetti and Gelfand stressed the importance of family, friends, and local networks in relation to mental health.

The distant or impersonal mental health center is not an acceptable place to seek help among working-class Americans. It's probably not the most acceptable place to seek help among a lot of Americans, but if you have to go there, you go there. But European-Americans will simply not go there.

Mental health specialists frequently are not perceived as appropriate agents for meeting problems that are beyond the expertise of family and local community. They'd rather go in their own family and talk to each other, before they go to a mental health specialist.

My own research with the Jewish community of Cleveland indicates similar patterns. Among elderly Jews in Cleveland, there's enormous resistance to using personal services not provided under Jewish auspices.

Now it should be noted that, in general, when people have serious personal problems or family problems, they don't want to cope with a crisis. They shy away from organized services of any kind.

There is a lot of stigma attached to getting help, which means that if you're going to get help during a time of crisis – a poor marriage, a depression, a possible suicide, alcoholism – you must go to a place that you regard as friendly, as yours, and conducive to delivering services under auspices that are not bureaucratic.

I'd like to enter one caveat to this discussion, and that relates to social class. The research evidence is not all in on this, and it may be that we're talking more, in some of this importance of social agencies and ethnicity, about people who are of lower income or of working

and middle class, because from what we do know, there is evidence that affluent people, regardless of ethnic origin, prefer to pay for services in the marketplace, rather than seek help from social agencies.

They go to private counselors, to psychiatrists, homemakers, other proprietary service.

This suggests the plausibility of a policy in which low income people would receive vouchers, so they would have the same freedom of choice as their more affluent counterparts and be able to buy services perhaps in the marketplace.

It's important when I discuss this Government insensitivity to different ethnic groups, not to make global generalizations. It's not true every place in the country, and it's not true among every director.

Let me say some things about pluralism and civil rights. The issue of whether sectarian agencies should receive government funds is also riddled with ambiguity. Let me give you a couple of illustrations that bring this home.

A congregate meals program provided in a Jewish community center, serves kosher food because they know that's the way they will be able to get people there under Title 7. But they also serve non-Jewish clients willing to eat a kosher meal.

However, a mental health agency will not award a contract to a sectarian agency or to an ethnic agency, because it will not serve a catchment area.

This is very disturbing and sometimes it's disastrous. Often, the only link for a mental patient is his ethnic group and his identification with his religious group.

Let me point to a few legal dilemmas, and I'd like to point to two cases that make the legal argument. I say they're hypothetical; they're not hypothetical. They're in the Courts somewhere, and I don't have the exact citations, so I call them hypothetical.

One is the case of nuns in California who want to serve a group of Mexican-American unwed mothers. They're told they can't serve them. They have to serve the entire catchment area, or they can't serve them.

They say, "We only want to serve this one group. That's who we know best," and they were told no.

Let me give you another illustration. A Jewish nursing home voluntarily admitted two black residents several years ago. The condition of admission was that the home was Jewish-oriented; the food was kosher. The two black residents want to sue the home for not serving them food that is more in keeping with their ethnic tradition.

Since that would involve pork products, complying with the request of the two residents would be extremely offensive to the other residents of the institution.

The question is: Does the home have a right to remain kosher? It's a dilemma.

These illustrations highlight the central policy point I'm bringing out. If we are in an essentially pluralistic society, can public policy disregard this fact? That is, can we have a culturally and religiously diverse society and still maintain public policy which fails to recognize and support such diversity?

Now, by the way, I have very great respect and interest in broad public social services, and I think we need a system of public social services in this country that serve everybody, but I think they must be delivered in a way that make it possible for ethnic and religious groups to be particularly sensitive to their constituencies, and I point out later in the paper that this is done in Great Britain.

They have a very well-developed social service system that's humane and caring, a base line of all kinds of social services; but they contract to all kinds of sectarian and voluntary agencies and make it possible for those voluntary and sectarian agencies to be subsidized and to serve their own constituents.

So let me conclude with three points.

I don't cite the British system because I think we can adopt it for the United States, but because the British have some concepts I think we can borrow. One, the single door concept.

Every neighborhood should have at least one visible office, staffed by friendly, sensitive professionals, who give information, advice, advocacy. The staff, if necessary, should be trained in the ethnic neighborhood, religious, or cultural traditions of the neighborhood and where it's located. It should provide access for services to people with any problem, anywhere.

Two, social care services should get a much higher priority than they presently get. We need therapy, but we need social care as well: those services that help people to maintain themselves over time. If they're physically ill, if they're incapacitated, if they're retarded, and they're not going to improve, I think we need a much greater emphasis on that, and I would call that to your attention.

The most crying need we have in this area of ethnicity is a whole new relationship between Government and private agencies.

Right now, I tell you, it is antagonistic. I sit on Boards and committee after committee. There is a strain between public agencies and voluntary agencies and sectarian agencies, and it's very, very serious and works a hardship for creating the kind of public policy that is sensitive to the kind of people who need social services.

Thank you.

[The complete paper follows.]

ETHNICITY AND SOCIAL SERVICES: SOME POLICY PERSPECTIVES

By Marvin L. Rosenberg, D.S.W.*

As the United States enters the 1980s, policy makers will confront a burgeoning demand for social services from all segments of American society. The statistical indicators are all around us. The number of divorced families today exceeds the divorce rate at the turn of the century by 700 percent.¹ Four out of ten children born in the last decade will have to cope with growing up in a single parent household.² A recently released Department of Labor report states that during the past decade, the number of American families headed by women has increased from 5.6 million to 8.5 million or one of every seven families.³ In human terms, this means that millions of single parents will need counseling and supportive social programs. Millions of children from broken homes will need child development programs, therapy, and residential treatment. The fact that 5.5 million wives have entered the labor force in the past ten years adds child day care to the growing needs of the changing American family.⁴

A 5-year increase in life expectancy since 1950 will result in an elderly population of about 25 million (about 11%) by 1980.⁵ In many cities, the elderly already constitute between 15 and 16 percent of the total community.⁶ Persons over 75 years of age, who are most likely to need social services, constitute the fastest growing segment of the population.⁷ Thus, there will be millions of older people in need of services to cope with the loss of spouses and friends, help them find new goals after retirement, and provide them with new opportunities to preserve their mental health. For those elderly too frail and impaired to be mobile, there will be a need for long term care services, such as, homemakers, meals on wheels, friendly visitors, and transportation. More institutions will be needed for those too incapacitated to remain at home.

In addition, millions of mentally ill patients have been deinstitutionalized, only to be cast into the community's back wards, such as flop houses and broken down tenements. These people, in addition to the

* Associate Professor, School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University.

¹ Statistical Abstract of the U.S. 1978, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Census.

² *Ibid.*

³ "Dept. of Labor Report," *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, Nov. 1, 1979.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 1978.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ "The Well Being of Old People in Cleveland, Ohio," Report to the Congress, Comptroller General's Office, April 1977.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, Statistical Abstract of the U.S. 1978.

severely mentally retarded and their families, as well as the home-bound physically disabled, are largely dependent populations needing multiple social services.

What these statistics signify for social services, particularly with regard to ethnic Euro-Americans, is the central issue of my presentation today.

As a society, our first line of support has, and will continue to be, the family. Despite the rash of books and articles about the "me" society and the "culture of narcissism," the research evidence indicates that the large majority of American families do assume great responsibility for their dependent or incapacitated family members. A recent study of the elderly in Cleveland, conducted by the U.S. General Accounting Office, noted that 80% of all social services are provided by members of the older person's family.⁸ Among early immigrant groups, such as European ethnics, the ethos of self-help and total reliance on the family is especially strong. These findings, however, must be tempered by the statistics mentioned earlier, which indicate the stress on the American family today. In addition, the birth rate is plunging downward, leaving fewer adult children to care for their aging parents or dependent relatives in the future. With the increase in life expectancy, many elderly, who are themselves retired will have an older parent to care for as well, and inflation is causing married women, who have traditionally performed caretaking roles in the family, to enter the job market. Thus, the fact that families are the primary caregivers at present does not mean that they can maintain that role under adverse conditions. Nor should families be expected to shoulder the entire burden of caring for one of their members who is mentally ill, retarded, frail, impaired, or physically handicapped. The costs, the physical demands, and the emotional strain often lead to breakdown of the entire family. Social agencies, both public and voluntary, must provide supplemental and supportive services to such families in times of adversity.

The increasing needs within the American populace require a re-examination of public policies affecting the family and religious and cultural institutions, as well as the importance of the local neighborhood. Consideration must be given to issues that bear directly on the relationship between ethnicity and service delivery. Such a re-examination, however, necessitates a clear understanding of past developments in social policy.

⁸ *Op. cit.*

Legislative Background

Before the late 1960's, the services I have described, which I will call personal social services, were largely neglected by federal government. They were the exclusive province of voluntary agencies and sometimes state and local government. The Federal emphasis, ten years ago, was on income maintenance and fostering a power base for the poor. At that time, an ideological debate pitted economic provisions such as income, jobs, and housing against personal social services such as counseling, day care, and residential treatment. It is now recognized that this is a false dichotomy. While money and jobs may well take priority over personal social services, inadequate services lead to a deteriorating society.

It has also been recognized that a group can be disadvantaged without necessarily suffering poverty or racial discrimination. The elderly, the handicapped, the blind and mentally retarded, along with other disadvantaged groups, are victims of stereotyping and discrimination and are in need of government help. Incapacitated and dependent people are found in every racial, ethnic, and socio-economic group in American society. Certainly, poverty and discrimination compound their suffering.

The growing recognition by government that social services cannot be for the poor alone has led to a series of legislative acts appropriating federal funds for services to different categories of clients. The most prominent of these is Title XX of the Social Security Act, the Older Americans Act and the Community Mental Health Centers Act. For the first time in American history, the federal government was given a central role in the financing of social services. Federal appropriations for personal social services rose from 746 million in 1971 to almost five billion in 1973.⁹

Fragmentation and Lack of Coordination

This rapid expansion in public spending created hundreds of new Federal, state, and local agencies. Each act had its own administrative rules and regulations requiring separate state agencies. The result is that each categorical program had different eligibility criteria, different policy objectives, and different conceptions of service boundaries.

The present system is a fragmented, chaotic, multiplicity of public bureaucracies and voluntary agencies that are often inaccessible, unresponsive, and insensitive to the people who most need help.

Perhaps the most penetrating criticism of the problem was made by Elliott Richardson, in 1973, when he was Secretary of HEW. He stated:

⁹ Paul E. Mott, *Meeting Human Needs: The Social and Political History of Title XX*, National Conference on Social Welfare, Columbus, Ohio, 1976, p. 22.

Since 1961, the number of HEW programs has tripled and now exceeds 300. Fifty four of these programs overlap each other; thirty six overlap programs of other departments. This almost random proliferation has fostered the development of a ridiculous labyrinth of bureaucracies, regulations, and guidelines. . . . The average state now has between 80 and 100 separate service administrations and the average middle-sized city between 400 and 500 human service providers, each of which is more typically organized in relation to a federal program than in relation to a set of human problems. . . . The chances are less than one in five that a client referred from one service to another will ever get there; the present maze encourages fragmentation.¹⁰

The emergence of Title XX in the mid-seventies, while adding to the dollars, also added to the picture of fragmentation.

Compounding the problem is a new governmental emphasis on scientific management and fiscal accountability. While both principles are necessary, their application is often mindless and has led to excessive data reporting requirements and invasions of client confidentiality. Social programs within the bureaucratic maze are carried out with a uniformity that fails to consider how to effectively reach diverse populations who need help.

It is important to differentiate the various types of social welfare policies. Some are clearly universal and therefore need not be sensitive to ethnic differences or neighborhood. Others, which are of a more personal nature, require trust and consumer participation. For example, a universal program which mails a social security check or pays a Medicare claim is far more impersonal than a program to help a discharged mental patient or support a family trying to maintain an elderly person at home. The essence of personal social services hinges on the trusting relationship between the local community and the agency, and between the helper and the client.

The Consequences of Impersonality

Impersonal bureaucracies that are stigmatized because of association with public welfare, that have elaborate intake procedures and means tests, cannot be effective in delivering personal social services. This is particularly true for Americans of Euro-ethnic background. Among earlier immigrant groups, an anti-welfare, self-reliant tradition is strong. Newer European refugees, fleeing tyranny from totalitarian regimes, tend to view governmental bureaucracies with defiance and distrust. Reaching out and serving these client groups requires intimate knowledge of their life styles and value systems.

¹⁰ Cleveland *Plain Dealer*, April 21, 1973.

There is growing concern that excessive standardization and uniformity will alienate ethnic groups from public and voluntary organizations. A casual stroll through the Little Italies, the older Jewish neighborhoods, Hungarian neighborhoods, and other nationality enclaves, immediately reveals local social patterns that are different from those found in the suburbs of other inner city areas. There is also a growing body of research which documents the importance of ethnicity and neighborhood as key factors in the willingness of people to use social services, particularly among working class ethnic populations. (I use Greely's term "ethnicity" to mean, "peoplehood, a sense of commonality or community derived from networks of family relations that have over the generations been the carriers of common experience.")¹¹

By analyzing secondary data, Greely has uncovered fascinating evidence that many present traits of second and third generation immigrant families in the United States resemble ethnic cultural traits found in their ancestral countries of origin.¹²

Giordano has identified several studies which point to ethnic differences in specific areas. Value orientations, definition of family roles, responses to physical and mental illness, utilization rates of mental health facilities, and the incidence of mental disorders vary significantly among different Euro-ethnic populations.¹³

Both researchers reject assimilation or melting pot conceptions as a way of understanding ethnic groups.

Let me briefly highlight selected research findings that offer some perspective on this issue of cultural diversity. In an impressive study of attitudes of Euro-ethnic families toward the elderly, Fandetti found that 82 percent of a random sample of Baltimore's ethnic residents "indicated their feelings that their relatives could not be comfortable in homes for the aged staffed by individuals from different ethnic backgrounds. A key factor was language. The sample included people from different ethnic groups, including Greeks, Italians, Poles, and Germans." The conclusion was that "ethnic staffing of old age homes was important for " 'old timers' " with limited language ability." When asked where long-term care services for the elderly should be delivered in the community, the respondents stated their highest preference to be the Catholic Church or local ethnic organizations.¹⁴

¹¹ "Report of the Special Population Subpanel on Mental Health of Americans of European Ethnic Origins," p. 877. (Submitted to the President's Committee on Mental Health, Feb. 1978)

¹² Greely, A., *Why Can't They be Like Us?* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1971).

¹³ Joseph Giordano and Grace Giordano, "The Ethno-Cultural Factor in Mental Health," Institute on Pluralism and Group Identity, American Jewish Committee, New York, 1977.

¹⁴ Donald Fandetti and Donald Gelfand, "Care of the Aged: Attitudes of White Ethnic Families," *The Gerontologist* 16:6, 1976.

Another study, by Fandetti and Gelfand, stresses the importance of family, friends, and local networks in relation to mental health services. The distant or impersonal mental health center is not seen as an acceptable place to seek help among working class Americans of European heritage. Mental health specialists frequently are not perceived as appropriate agents for meeting problems that are beyond the expertise of the family and the local community.¹⁵

My own research with the Jewish community of Cleveland indicates similar patterns. Among elderly Jews, there is enormous resistance to using personal social services not provided under Jewish auspices. It should be noted, that in general, when people are having serious personal or family problems, or need help to cope with a crisis, they tend to shy away from organized services of any kind. There is still considerable stigma attached to the notion of seeking help, whether for alcoholism, a poor marriage, depression, or a disturbed child. When public policy completely standardizes the way in which services must be delivered, the barriers to utilization are further intensified. There is ample evidence that people are more likely to seek and use help if it is available in a local neighborhood and is delivered under auspices that are regarded as friendly and non-bureaucratic. In addition, staff of such agencies must be trained so they are attuned to the variations in values, life style, and help-seeking patterns of the constituencies they serve. For some neighborhoods, this may mean knowledge of Italian, Russian, or Yiddish. In one area, it may mean sensitivity to religious differences; in another, it may be an awareness of differences between rural and urban life styles.

An important caveat to my previous discussion pertains to the importance of social class. Most of the research and experience I have cited is based on samples of lower income, working class populations, where these culturally different characteristics seem to persist into third and fourth generations. Some new research dealing with middle class Italians, not yet published by Fandetti, suggests that ethnic identification largely dissipates when income, occupation, and educational status appreciably increase. This finding must be regarded cautiously since Columbia, Maryland may be very atypical of other American cities. More research is needed to verify such conclusions. In any case, it does not alter our concern, since the bulk of people who use social agencies, public or voluntary, are poor or lower middle class. There is considerable evidence that affluent people, regardless of ethnic origin, prefer to pay for services in the market place rather than seek help from social agencies. They go to private counselors, psychiatrists, homemakers, and other proprietary services. Indeed, this

¹⁵ Donald Fandetti and Donald Gelfand, "Attitudes Toward Symptoms and Services in the Ethnic Family and Neighborhood," *Amer. Journal of Orthopsychiatry* (July 1978).

suggests the plausibility of a policy in which low income people would receive vouchers, so they would have the same freedom of choice as their more affluent counterparts.

In discussing the apparent governmental insensitivity to different ethnic groups and to the concepts of neighborhood and family, it is important *not* to make global generalizations. The fact is that some policies and programs are more sensitive than others, and in some areas of the country, public officials are wiser and more sensitive than in other places. It is the lack of a clear-cut public policy, based on solid research, that allows so much confusion and contradictory policy to prevail. Let me illustrate some of the differences in philosophy and contradictory policies that plague social agencies and confuse clients. Title VII, of the Older Americans Act, provides funds for congregate meals for older people. Under this legislation, a means test is explicitly prohibited. However, this same service is also provided under Title XX and does require a means test. In areas of high poverty, however, individual eligibility can be waived and the principle of group eligibility can be applied. There are many agencies and small churches that have purchase-of-service contracts through Title XX and through Title VII, and they must somehow reconcile these contradictory eligibility requirements. This confusion is only the tip of the iceberg. Each state interprets the federal regulations in its own way. Sometimes this works in favor of Euro-ethnics; sometimes certain of their benefits are lost.

These bureaucratic hurdles add one more obstacle to making services easily accessible and responsive to the people who need them. Furthermore, data reporting and proposal writing procedures are so complex and ambiguous, that small voluntary agencies or neighborhood churches are discouraged from applying for government funding and therefore are unable to deliver vital services.

Pluralism, Civil Rights, and Government Funding

The issue of whether sectarian agencies should receive government funds is also riddled with ambiguity and contradictory civil rights interpretations. Under some legislation, such as the Older Americans Act, contracts for services are often awarded precisely because an agency is sectarian or neighborhood based and under the auspices of an ethnic organization. There is a recognition that this approach to service delivery would facilitate reaching the largest number of people in need, since such an organization would be trusted and accepted by prospective consumers. Obviously, agencies receiving such funds, must comply with civil rights law and cannot discriminate against other consumers who seek the services. Thus, a congregate meals

program in a Jewish community center would serve kosher food but would also serve any non-Jewish client willing to eat a kosher meal.

A mental health board, awarding contracts to agencies serving discharged mental patients, provides a contradictory illustration. In a number of cities, such funding bodies have refused grant applications from Catholic, Jewish, or ethnic agencies, because they would not serve an entire catchment area. From a mental health rehabilitation standpoint, this is disturbing. Often, the only remaining link to reality for a mental patient is identification with his ethnic or religious group. Programming in ethnic and sectarian agencies stresses a sense of community, of ethnic tradition, and common cultural heritage. Why should such agencies be refused mental health funding? Throughout the country, funding policies are ambiguous and the interpretation of civil rights laws and regulations varies from place to place. Because of this ambiguity, many of the issues are now being brought before the courts. In effect, public social policy is being decided by judges whose opinions are substitutes for the legislative process.

Legal Dilemmas

To sharpen this dilemma, I would like to pose two partially hypothetical situations to the Commission. One involves an order of nuns who want to provide special social services to unmarried mothers of Mexican-American heritage. The nuns do not want to serve other populations because the effectiveness of their program requires a very special approach. Government funds are being refused because of this selectivity. The local public agency wants the nuns to serve everyone in the area who seeks services, despite the fact that there are other agencies available to serve other young unmarried mothers. My question is, "What is legally right and morally right in such a situation?" A second situation involves a Jewish nursing home that voluntarily admitted two Black residents several years ago. The condition of administration at that time was that the home was Jewish, the programming was Jewish-oriented, and the food was kosher. Now some years later, the two black residents want to sue the home for not serving them food that is more in keeping with their own ethnic traditions. Since this would involve pork products, complying with the request of the two residents would be extremely offensive to the other residents of this institution. Does the home have a right to remain kosher?

These illustrations highlight the central social policy dilemma for the nation: if we are an essentially pluralistic society, can public policy disregard that fact; that is, can we have a culturally and religiously diverse society and still maintain public policy which fails to recognize and support such diversity?

The Broader Issue of Public Social Services

Let me try to place the matter into a broader perspective of social service for all Americans. Clearly, one of the dilemmas, that is faced both federally and locally, is how scarce social service resources should be apportioned. To assert that a sectarian or ethnic group should be permitted to use government funds to exclusively service their own members when at the same time there are not services for others in the community may seem unjust. The voluntary and sectarian sectors cannot be expanded at the expense of a good public system of social services for all. But neither can insensitive public bureaucracies be expected to serve client groups with very special ways of seeking and using services.

In a recent paper on the family, Irving Levine called for an approach to public policy that he labeled, "A Social Conservative Approach."¹⁶ Essentially, it was a recognition that the planning and delivery of social services required a partnership between the public and voluntary sectors and between family, neighborhood, and professionals.

Perhaps some of the most valuable lessons for the United States in applying this social conservative approach are to be found in Great Britain. Britain has a long tradition of caring for people in trouble, and in recent years has developed a very comprehensive personal social service system that has a strong but considerable latitude for voluntary, sectarian, neighborhood based, and self help organizations.

The British Personal Service System

In 1970, Parliament passed a far reaching act which unified previously fragmented social programs and made them more responsive to people who needed help. First, they separated social services from health, housing, and public welfare. Then, they integrated all the existing social service programs to children, families, the handicapped, the mentally ill, and the aged. Local governments have the actual responsibility for the administration and delivery of the social services. Each city and rural government is required to create a single social service department which brings together the heretofore separate agencies serving different client groups. The department is an integral part of city government along with education, housing, and transportation. The front-line staff, in the reorganized department, are social workers operating out of neighborhood offices throughout the city. Their job is to provide direct advice and counseling, but also to be thoroughly knowledgeable about other resources throughout the

¹⁶ Irving Levine, "Bolstering the Family through Informal Support Groups." Presented at the Philadelphia Conference on Jewish

community. The social worker, who is a generalist, is the key link to other agencies such as employment, housing, schools, courts, hospitals, and social security. This worker is the bridge between the family, the community, and the institution. Wherever possible, the goal is to keep people out of institutions, by providing them with community-based services. If a hospital or institution becomes necessary, the social worker helps the client with the transition and works with the family. The new system makes this possible. Social workers in the hospitals, nursing homes, sheltered workshops, and children's institutions are all employees of the same municipal social service department. Anyone needing help, no matter what their problem, age, or income can call or go to their local area social service office. The British call this principle "the single door."

To get a first-hand look at the actual workings of the British system, I chose to study the social service department of the city of Birmingham. Birmingham has interesting similarities to some American cities. It is a large industrial center, located in the West Midlands region of Britain. It has a population of over one million and many of the same social problems as our urban centers. The central city is commercial and houses mainly the poor and ethnic minorities from the West Indies and Asia. More affluent residents live in privately owned homes in the surrounding suburbs.

The social service department has responsibility for a wide network of community-based services and institutions. The city is divided into thirteen areas, with a social service office in each area. Every office houses two to three teams of social workers made up of ten to twelve professionals and assistants. Each team is responsible for covering a specific geographic "patch." Attached to each area office is a home help department, where elderly and disabled people can request homemakers, home delivered meals, and a wide range of other services which help them maintain independent living. Many voluntary organizations and associations are linked to the area offices. The essential principle in the British system is that people living in various neighborhoods can go to this "single door" and be connected to any other service or resource that may be required. Backing up the front-line neighborhood offices are hundreds of services and facilities administered or financed by the department. This includes day nurseries for children, luncheon clubs for the elderly, halfway houses for the mentally ill, and hostels for vagrants. Some are public, some voluntary, and others sectarian.

In addition to the well-organized public system of social services, which is accessible to all, there are numerous voluntary, sectarian, and neighborhood organizations which receive considerable support from the local authority. Catholic and old age homes, sectarian

adoption agencies, and citizen's advisory bureaus all receive grants from the local social service department-with a minimum of bureaucratic paper work. It is an accepted fact of life in Britain that neighborhood and sectarian organizations are trusted by their constituents and should therefore be subsidized to deliver services.

I do not cite the British system as the model that should be adopted for the United States. I point it out because it vividly demonstrates that a service system can be *essentially* public and remain very sensitive to cultural, ethnic, religious, and neighborhood differences.

Finally, in concluding this report, I would like to highlight a number of policy recommendations that would lead to more effective services not only to Americans of Euro-ethnic heritage, but for all Americans.

1. Single door concept.¹⁷ Every neighborhood should have at least one highly visible office staffed by friendly, sensitive professionals who are able to give information, advice, advocacy, and follow-up services. The staff should be trained in the ethnic, neighborhood, religious, or cultural traditions of the area in which it is located.

This office could provide central access to anyone with any problems. Sometimes, it should be directly managed either by a public agency, or by a church, community center, or sectarian institution.

2. Social care services should get a much higher priority in our planning and budget allocations. Therapy and treatment are essential, but they are only a small part of the kinds of services many people need to maintain themselves. There must be greater emphasis on homemakers, meals on wheels, transportation, chore services, in short, the life support services that effect the daily survival of the mentally ill, handicapped, frail, elderly, and physically disabled.¹⁸

3. Public and voluntary agencies must seek new avenues for integrating their professional services with those provided by members of the family. The hospice movement is an example of how this can be achieved. Respite programs, for those who care for handicapped, frail, or disabled family members, can be expanded greatly. Given what we know about informal networks and the role of family, more attention must be paid to educating professionals with this outlook.¹⁹

Finally, I repeat the central policy dilemma I posed earlier – if the United States is in fact a culturally, religiously, and ethnically diverse society – can public policy be promulgated which fails to support and nurture such diversity?

¹⁷ Alfred Kahn, "Service Delivery at the Neighborhood Level: Experience Theory and Fads," *Social Service Review*, March 1976.

¹⁸ Robert Morris, "Caring For vs. Caring About People," *Social Work*, Sept. 1977.

¹⁹ B. M. Moroney, *The Family and the State: Considerations for Social Policy* (London & N.Y.: Longman, 1976).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abramson, H. "Ethnic Pluralism in the Central City," in D. Feinstein (ed.), *Ethnic Groups in the City*, Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company, 1971.
- Ad Hoc Committee on Advocacy. "The Social Worker as Advocate: Champion of Social Victims." *Social Work*, XIV (April 1969)
- American Jewish Committee. *Consultation on the Jewish Family and Jewish Identity* (Proceedings of April 1972). New York: Jewish Communal Affairs Department, American Jewish Committee, 1972.
- American Public Welfare Association. *Redesigned Social Service Systems for Four Pennsylvania Pilot County Board of Assistance Operations*. September 1969. (Mimeo)
- Anderson, Wayne, Bernard Frieden, and Michael Murphy. *Managing Human Services*. Washington, D.C.: International City Management Association, 1977.
- Andrulis, P. "Ethnicity as a Variable in the Utilization and Referral Patterns of a Comprehensive Mental Health Center," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Ann Arbor: No. 74-5189.
- Axinn, June, and Herman Levin. *Social Welfare: A History of the American Response to Need*. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.
- Bax, James A., "Social Services: Today and Tomorrow." *Public Welfare*, (Winter, 1972) pp. 27-30.
- Bestman, E., Lefley, H. and Scott, C. "Culturally Appropriate Interventions: Paradigms and Pitfalls," paper presented at 53rd Annual Meeting of American Orthopsychiatric Association, Atlanta, March 1976.
- Billingsley, A. "The Family and Cultural Pluralism," address at Baltimore Conference on Ethnicity and Social Welfare. New York: Institute on Pluralism and Group Identity, January 1976.
- Bloedorn, Jack G.; MacLatchie, Elizabeth B.; Friedlander, William; and Wedemeyer, J.M., *Designing Social Service Systems*, Chicago: American Public Welfare Association, 1971.
- Blumberg, R., Greer, S. and Winch, R. "Ethnicity and Extended Familism in an Upper-Middle Class Suburb," *American Sociological Review*, 32, April 1967.
- Borelli, K. "The Implications of the New Ethnicity for American Social Work," *International Social Work*, 4, 1975.
- Booz, Allen and Hamilton. *Purchase of Social Services: A Study of Three States for Social and Rehabilitation Services*, Springfield, Virginia: National Technical Information Service, 1971.
- Borman, L. and Lieberman, M. "Self-Help Groups," special issue of the *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. Arlington, Virginia: N.T.L. Institute, 1976.
- Bott, E. *Family and Social Network*. New York: Free Press, 1972.

- Brody, Ralph, "Purchase of Service: The Challenge of Change," *Bulletin of the Ohio Welfare Conference*, March 1973.
- Caplan, G. "The Family as a Support System," paper presented at Butler Hospital Symposium, Providence, Rhode Island, 1974.
- Caplow, T. and Forman, R. "Neighborhood Interaction in a Homogeneous Community," *American Sociological Review*, 15 (3), June 1950. Center Magazine. *The New Ethnicity*, 7 (4), July/August 1974.
- Covello, L. *The Social Background of the Italian-American School Child*. E. I. Brill, Leiden, 1967.
- Fandetti, D. "Day Care in Working Class Ethnic Neighborhoods: Implications for Policy and Programming," paper presented at the Baltimore Conference on Ethnicity and Social Welfare, New York: Institute on Pluralism and Group Identity, January 1976.
- Fandetti, D. "Sources of Assistance in a White Working Class Ethnic Neighborhood," unpublished dissertation, Ph.D., Columbia University Graduate School of Social Work, 1974.
- Fandetti, D. and Gelfand, D. 1976. "Care of the Aged: Attitudes of White Ethnic Families," *Gerontologist* 16:544-549.
- Freedlander, William. "Some Considerations in the Design of Public Social System Systems," *Public Welfare* XXVIII (Winter 1970), pp. 429-35.
- Gans, H. *The Urban Villagers*. Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1962.
- Gelfand, D. "Ethnicity, Aging and Mental Health," paper presented at the Baltimore Conference on Ethnicity and Social Welfare. New York: Institute on Pluralism and Group Identity, January 1976.
- Giordano, J. 1973, *Ethnicity and Mental Health: Research and Recommendations*. Institute of Human Relations, New York.
- Hansen, M. 1958. "The Third Generation: Search for Continuity." In *Social Perspectives on Behavior*, H. Stein and R. Cloward, eds. Free Press, New York.
- Hansfeld, Yeheskel, "People Processing Organizations: An Exchange Approach," *American Sociological Review*, XXXVII (June, 1972) pp. 248-58.
- Herman, S. "The Study of an Ethnic Identity," in S. Herman, *Israelis and Jews: The Continuity of an Identity*. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Hoshino, George, "The Public Welfare Worker: Advocate or Adversary," *Public Welfare* XXIX, (January 1971), pp. 35-41.
- Kahn, A. "Explorations in Family Policy." *Social Work*, 1976, 21, 181-187.
- Kahn, Alfred J., "Perspectives on Access to Social Services," *Social Work* XV (February, 1970) pp. 95-101.

- Kahn, Alfred J., "Do Social Services Have a Future in New York?" *City Almanac*, New York: New School for Social Research, V (February 1971).
- Kahn, Alfred J., *Social Policy and Social Services*, New York: Random House, 1973.
- Kammerman, Sheila, and Alfred Kahn. *Social Services in the United States*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976.
- Kramer, Ralph, "Voluntary Agencies and the Use of Public Funds: Some Policy Issues," *Social Service Review* XI (March 1966) pp. 15-26.
- Kramer, S. and Masur, J. *Jewish Grandmothers*. New York: Beacon Press, 1976.
- Kronick, Jane C.; Perlmutter, Felice D. and Gummer, Burton. "The A.P.W.A. Model Social Service Delivery System: A Preliminary Assessment," *Public Welfare*, XXXI, (Fall 1973), pp. 47-53.
- Landy, D. "Problems of People Seeking Help in Our Culture," *Social Welfare Forum*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.
- Lefley, H. "Approaches to Community Mental Health: The Model," *Psychiatric Annals*, 5 (8), August 1975 (a).
- Levy, C. "Toward a Theory of Jewish Communal Service," *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, 50 (1), Fall 1973.
- Lieberman, M. "Adaptable Patterns in Middle-Aged and Elderly: The Role of Ethnicity." Paper presented at meeting of Gerontological Society, Portland, October 1974.
- Lopata, H. *Polish-Americans*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1976.
- Lopreato, J. *Italian-Americans*. Random House, New York, 1970.
- Morris, Robert. *Toward a Caring Society*, New York: Columbia University School of Social Work, 1974.
- Novak, M. A., "Politics of Family and Neighborhood." *Commonwealth*, May 19, 1972, 257.
- O'Donnell, E. J. and Sullivan, M. M. "Service Delivery and Social Action Through the Neighborhood Center: A Review of Research," *Welfare in Review*, November-December, 1969.
- Orlansky, H. "Jewish Personality Traits: A Review of Studies on an Elusive Problem," *Commentary*, October 2, 1946.
- Pauley, Ruth M., "Redesigning a Social Service Delivery System," *Social Work Practice*, National Conference on Social Welfare, New York: Columbia University press, 1971, pp. 139-51.
- Piliavin, Irving, "Restructuring the Provision of Social Services," *Social Work*, XIII (January, 1968), pp. 34-41.
- Rein, Martin, "The Social Service Crisis," *Transaction*, (May, 1964), Reprint, pp. 1-4.

- Richman, Leon H.; Brody, Ralph; Collins, John; Pauley, Ruth M. and Rosenberg, Marvin, *Social Service Delivery Systems*, Cleveland, Ohio: Human Services Design Laboratory of School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University, July 1972.
- Rosenberg, Marvin, and Ralph Brody. *Systems Serving People: A Breakthrough in Service Delivery*, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, 1974.
- Rosenberg, Marvin, and Ralph Brody. "Britain's 'Single Door' and Setup." *The Plain Dealer*, July 1, 1978.
- Rosenberg, Marvin, and Ralph Brody. "A British Way to House Aged." *The Plain Dealer*, August 21, 1978.
- Rosenberg, Marvin L., "New Directions in Social Service Delivery," *Bulletin of the Ohio Welfare Conference*, March 1973.
- Rosenberg, Marvin L., and Ralph Brody. "Accountable Public Social Services: Threat or Challenge," paper presented at the National Conference on Social Welfare, Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 1973, (mimeo)
- Rosenberg, Marvin L., and Ralph Brody. *Service Management in Action, Proceedings of First National Workshop on Integrated Service Delivery*, Cleveland, Ohio: School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University, January 1973, (mimeo)
- Rubins, J. "The Relationship Between the Individual, the Culture and Psychopathology," *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 35 (3), Fall 1975.
- Sanders, I. T. and Morawska, E. "Polish-American Community Life: A Survey of Research." Community Sociology Training Program, Department of Sociology, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts, 1975.
- Spilka, B. "Religion and Mental Disorder." In *Research on Religions Development: A Comprehensive Handbook*, M. Strommen, ed., Hawthorne Books, New York, 1971.
- Stein, H. "A Dialectical Model of Health and Illness Attitudes and Behavior Among Slovak-Americans," *International Journal of Mental Health*, 5, Summer 1976(a).
- Sussman, M. "Relationship of Adult Children with Their Parents in the United States," in E. Shanus and G. Streib (eds.), *Social Structure and the Family: Generational Relations*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- Sussman, M., and Burchinal, L. "Kin Family Network: Unheralded Structure in Current Conceptualizations of Family Functioning." *Marriage and Family Living*, 24, August 1962.
- Tomasi, S. *The Italian-American Family*. New York: Center for Migration Studies, 1972.

- Townsend, P. "The Emergence of the Four Generation Family in Industrial Society." In *Middle-Age and Aging*, B. Neugarten, ed. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1968.
- Traunstein, M. and Steinman, R. "Voluntary Self-Help Organizations: An Exploratory Study," *Journal of Voluntary Action Research*, 2 (4), Fall 1973.
- Turem, J., et al. *The Implementation of Title XX: The First Year's Experience*. Working Paper 0990-08 Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, 1976.
- Utah State Department of Social Services, *Blue Print: Planning the Social Service Delivery System*, Salt Lake City, 1972, (mimeo)
- Weber, Shirley, "From Separation to a 'Turned On' Model of Services," *Social Casework*, (December 1972), pp. 593-603.
- Wolkon, G. et al. "Ethnicity and Social Class in the Delivery of Services: Analysis of a Child Guidance Clinic," *American Journal of Public Health*, 64, July 1974.
- Wrobel, P. "Observations on Organizing the Polish Community," in D. Hartman (ed.), *Immigrants and Migrants: The Detroit Ethnic Experience*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1975.
- Zola, I. "Illness Behavior of the Working Class," in A. Shostak, and W. Gomberg (eds.), *Blue Collar World*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1964.

* * *

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Thank you, Dr. Rosenberg.

David E. Beigel, our first reactor, is the Director of neighborhood and Family Services Project for the University of Southern California's Washington Public Affairs Center.

He has held a variety of organizing, planning, and administrative positions in mental health and human services agencies.

He has written extensively on mental health and neighborhood support systems and is currently an instructor and Doctoral student at the University of Maryland School for Social Work and Community Planning, and he lives in Baltimore.

RESPONSE OF DAVID E. BIEGEL

Thank you, Mr. Saltzman.

I appreciate the opportunity of participating in this consultation. Dr. Rosenberg reviews the major problems that exist in social service delivery today and correctly points out the growing need for social services in this country. I agree with Dr. Rosenberg that among the major issues are fragmentation of services, lack of coordination of services, and services being delivered in an impersonal and culturally

sensitive manner. I would add, however, that lack of accessibility of services is a critical issue, also.

My own view of policy initiatives needed to improve social service delivery, especially the delivery of services to Euro-ethnic Americans, differs in approach from Dr. Rosenberg, however. Dr. Rosenberg discusses the importance of the family in ethnic communities and the need for integrating social services with the services being provided by the family.

I believe our focus should be upon strengthening the entire range of social and community support systems in ethnic communities and then linking these support systems with professional services. Such support systems would include, but not be limited to, the family.

I believe that such an approach is consonant with the thinking of both the recent President's Commission on Mental Health and the National Commission on Neighborhoods. It builds upon the strengths, resources, and positive neighborhood identification of residents in urban ethnic communities.

I'd like to discuss the following three issues today. First, what are community support systems and why are they important?

Second, what are essential principles of a renewed social service delivery system, and third, what policy initiatives are needed to strengthen our social service delivery system?

Our social service system has failed to understand the concept of community and has ignored neighborhoods and their support systems. I believe the answer to these issues is not, as many would have us believe, a program approach involving another new program or another new service. Rather, these issues can best be addressed through a process that utilizes the naturally occurring strengths and resources in ethnic communities.

The elements of community support systems are varied. They include: the woman in her 60's on the block that neighbors turn to for help or support when their welfare checks are late; the bartender the customers talk to about marital problems; the widowed persons group the Church sponsors to provide mutual support and socialization; the neighbor who takes in the 14-year-old girl who has been thrown out of her house by her family; the clergyman that parishioners talk to about family problems; the community organization that helps residents develop the needed community-based hot line; the ethnic organization that help the middle-age parents with the strains caused by value conflicts with their children; and the co-worker who helps with the problems of caring for aged parents.

In a pluralistic society such as ours, people seek help, solve problems, and meet needs in various ways. Thus, family, friends, neighbors, co-workers, clergy, neighborhood organizations, and mutu-

al aid groups can all provide meaningful assistance in times of need. These are all groups that I would include under the rubric of community support systems.

There has been much research concerning the importance of these support systems. Community support systems can serve a preventive function by contributing to an individual's sense of well-being and of competent functioning. They can assist in reducing the negative consequences of life stress.

They can be especially important, for example, with the chronically mentally ill who need assistance in recovering from the isolation of institutional life. Unfortunately, Federal initiatives aimed at helping former mental patients, have been geared solely to the provision of professional services. NIMH has a program called the Community Support Program that attempts to provide a wide range of support services to former mental patients, but this program excludes the non-professional elements of community support systems that I mentioned above.

Community support systems are natural, in that person-to-person caregiving efforts develop without professional support or assistance.

Most organizational forms of community support systems, such as mutual aid groups and neighborhood organizations, similarly develop without professional intervention.

Support systems are also natural in the sense of being ongoing and not formally organized. Some particular forms of support systems develop in response to a specific societal problem.

For example, the problem of divorce leads to support groups for the divorced. Or groups sometimes get organized in response to the lack of professional services to address a particular problem.

Thus community support systems serve all of us in some degree and in different ways. More specifically, however, community support systems serve many population groups that are unable or unwilling to seek professional help or for whom professional services are currently lacking. Included here would be ethnic and racial minorities, women and the aged.

Community support systems offer help in a culturally acceptable manner, without stigma or loss of pride, and I feel this is extremely important in ethnic communities. The individual seeking help does not need to identify themselves as having a problem, being weak, sick, - a client or a patient - as they would in seeking professional help. Community support systems are thus an important component of the strengths and resources often found in neighborhoods.

For the past four years, the University of Southern California has been working on a project that is examining mental health resources

and needs in two urban ethnic neighborhoods, Baltimore and Milwaukee.

Our research there has shown that there are a large number of professional and lay helpers; by lay, I mean family, friends, neighbors, clergy, et cetera, offering services in these communities. Many of these helpers not only live in the neighborhoods they serve, but have done so for years. They express generally positive feelings about these neighborhoods, despite the existence of many community issues and problems that we uncovered.

Our data also show that lay helpers expressed a strong sense of community pride and in turn they are highly regarded and trusted by community residents. Additionally, we found that residents prefer to take care of their own problems, often without seeking professional assistance, but they do so with the support and assistance of lay helpers. One of the most important findings in our study was that professional agencies, social service agencies, mental health agencies, health agencies, are generally unaware of the operation of these networks and support systems, and in fact professional services often tend to be "parachuted" into communities, ignoring the support systems that exist and not linking their services with those support systems.

In sum, I would say that the positive involvement of lay helpers in the neighborhoods, the inclination of community residents towards selfhelp, the large number and availability of helpers, the trust afforded these helpers, and the selective preferences for the services of lay help emphasize the importance of these support systems.

I might add that nothing I'm really saying here, in any way, implies that professional services aren't needed. Rather, quite the opposite is true.

Both professional and community support systems are important, but to be most effective, they need to be linked with each other. This brings us to the second issue I'd like to discuss, which is what are the essential principles of a renewed social service delivery system.

I believe that a renewed social service delivery system, that utilizes the resources of community support systems, should be based on the following six principles:

First, the focus should be upon the promotion of health, not the treatment of illness or pathology.

Second, services should be designed to account for age, sex, class, ethnic, and racial differences.

Third, neighborhoods are a positive resource that can and should be used as a basis for service delivery. Professional services should be designed to complement, augment, and strengthen neighborhood based support systems.

Fourth, the community, and not agencies, needs to take primary responsibility for their own social services. A sense of competency, self-esteem, and power is extremely important to the health of a community and is a critical factor in efforts at prevention and rehabilitation.

Fifth, a neighborhood capacity building process, not a program model, is needed in order to self-define strengths, problems, resources, and services to ensure the community will seek and receive help within a relevant value framework. In that way, people overcome the stigma of problems, seek help earlier, increase utilization of services, and strengthen their neighborhood helping system.

A partnership among service providers, government officials, and neighborhood residents is needed as a precondition to an integrated service system. To ensure full community partnership, however, empowerment of consumers is essential.

I believe if our social service policies were based on these principles, service delivery systems would be able to serve more individuals in a more cost effective manner that would strengthen the nation's communities as well as help individuals in need.

In the research that we've been doing for the last four years, we've collected a lot of information and data that show how support systems are effective, and I have a number of vignettes that indicate these points.

There really isn't time here to go into all of them, so I'd just like to list briefly a number of ways in which we found that a community support systems approach can be effective.

The first is that it can reach populations in need of assistance, who would never seek professional help. The second is that it's built upon the strengths of communities. The third, it builds upon the unique ability of community residents to know what will work in their particular community. Professionals oftentimes have a hard time getting a handle on a neighborhood in terms of its needs, strengths, and resources. Community residents who have lived there for a long while, who are familiar with the problems of people in the community, often have a much better sense of what programs will work and what won't work. Fourth, creating linkages between support systems and professional services can also help reduce fragmentation of services and thus provide help in a more effective way. Fifth, community support systems, by creating linkages between community support systems and social service professionals, can help reinforce the work of lay helpers and demystify the role of professionals. In our work we had a conference, bringing together clergy, human service professionals, and neighborhood residents; about a hundred persons attended. After the conference was over a number of lay helpers, from a Catholic church

in the area, remarked to their pastor that they really felt energized about participating in the conference. When the pastor asked why, they said that they found out that professionals didn't have all the answers either.

This might seem self-evident to us, but oftentimes professionals like to give people the impression that they do have all the answers, thus making lay helpers feel somewhat inadequate. Once they get a chance to interact with professionals and see that they don't have all the answers either, they're a lot more willing to go out and help people.

The third major issue I'd like to focus on today is what policy initiatives are needed to enhance community support systems and to link them with the social service delivery system. I want to concentrate on one specific recommendation that we made in our work to both the President's Commission on Mental Health and the National Commission on Neighborhoods; that is, we'd like to see the creation of a federally administered Self-Help Development Fund that would be designed to strengthen community support systems and to enable linkages between these systems and the social service help and mental health service systems.

The area of focus of the Fund would thus be human services. There are a number of precedents for such a Fund, including the Inter-American Foundation, the Co-Op Bank Self-Help Fund for Economic Development, and HUD's Neighborhood Self-Help Development Fund, which focuses on neighborhood revitalization.

The fund, as we see it, would be administered by a board consisting of consumers and professional representatives and have three principal components. The first component would be capacity building of neighborhood-based support systems. Small seed grants could be provided to neighborhood organizations for training and technical assistance in strengthening their support systems and linking them with the professional sector.

The second component of the Fund would involve regulatory oversight. There are currently many obstacles - administrative, physical and legal- which inhibit and hinder community support systems. These are many of the same obstacles that also tend to lead to fragmentation, lack of accountability, and lack of accessibility of services. The Fund would be charged with recommending statutory and administrative changes on Federal, State, and local levels to enhance community support systems.

The third component of the Fund would be working through states and local communities to develop standards for assessing the impact of human service programs on community support systems. The goal would be to prevent programs from weakening or undermining local support systems in neighborhoods.

Four years ago when I was working for Associated Catholic Charities, Inc., in Baltimore, and we started a program of providing supports to elderly persons. The program was funded through the State of Maryland to help maintain elderly persons in their homes. The program had a very good goal, to prevent the premature and unnecessary institutionalization of older people, by providing chore services, light house-keeping services, et cetera, to help maintain older persons in their homes.

We did a very good needs assessment and we found out what part of the city was most in need of our services, and we contacted organizations and made sure we didn't duplicate other professional services. One area we really didn't know about or think about, was the hundreds and hundreds of community residents in this particular community, that we were working in, that were already providing those supports to elderly people in their neighborhoods.

What we've basically found, was that rather than seeing a large increase in the number of people being served as a result of our program, our professional services in many ways undermined and replaced some of the services that individuals were providing on a voluntary basis. This is why I think that it's important to look at the impact that professional programs have on the support systems that already exist in communities, so we make sure that we're really strengthening and not weakening what's already there.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Thank you.

Our second reactor will be Dr. William C. McReady.

William McReady has worked with the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago since 1971 and has been the Director of that organization and Center for the Study of American Pluralism for the last two years.

He has written many articles, reports, and books on the ethnic experience in the United States, is the editor of the quarterly journal *Ethnicity* and holds a Doctorate in Sociology from the University of Illinois.

Dr. McCreedy

RESPONSE OF WILLIAM MCCREADY

Thank you.

I'd like to focus my remarks on four issues, which emerge from Professor Rosenberg's paper.

The first are various obstacles for social policy in a pluralistic society.

The second is the role of litigation in the formation of social policy.

The third is a sort of a hidden agenda item, having to do with religious preference, which becomes involved in a lot of the discus-

sions about social policy and Euro-ethnics; and finally, some models for policy formulation, which will expand on the comments that Professor Rosenberg made.

One of the main reasons why I think these issues are important is that people in the policy making forums of our society frequently have conceptions or stereotypes of the society, which simply do not fit the facts.

The data is rather persuasive that we continue to be a pluralistic people; yet policies are either made for a few neglected many, or for the generalized many, none of whom actually exist.

Why this continues to happen will be the focus for the remainder of my comments.

First of all, one serious obstacle to pluralistic social policy making is rather the inherent clash between the ideology of pluralism and the technique of responding to social problems using what I call the deviant case approach.

Take, for example, Professor Rosenberg's hypothetical situation of the social service agency serving kosher food.

The deviant case approach would prohibit such an agency from receiving public funds since it could not serve everyone who came in the door, meaning those who would not care to eat kosher. The policy would be determined by the deviant case, in other words.

On the other hand, ways could be found to keep the agency open while still respecting its heritage, but it would mean that some special arrangements and funds would have to be allocated to deal with special requests; perhaps an occasional meal could be brought in from outside so they would not pass through the agency's food process at all.

Whatever the solution, the prerequisite to formulating it is that those in charge of the funding and policy making have to be cognizant of what they are giving up in order to facilitate things for the deviant case.

It seems all too common today that policy makers see only the infringement of rights, and that they seldom put into their thinking elements of group heritage or community cohesiveness as being of comparable importance, especially when both factors can be accommodated within one policy, if a little imagination is used.

It's usually erroneous to allow the policy discussions to be cast in terms which oppose individual rights and respect for the heritage of the group.

A related obstacle to effective policy making in a pluralistic society stems from the increased use of litigation as an instrument of policy formulation.

Litigation usually results when a question of rights emerges in a conflict situation, and the settlement of the litigation often has policy implications, because it establishes the future parameters in the discussion.

However, the problem occurs because while litigation can be a useful way to resolve questions of rights and obligations, it is not necessarily a useful way to approach questions of trust and respect.

Many policy questions involving Euro-ethnic heritage are best discussed in terms of respect and trust, rather than as a conflict of rights. The prevalence of litigation as an avenue for settling conflicts frequently makes it the easy way out.

The conversational mode of pluralism is compromise and negotiation, and to the extent that issues become cast in terms of unequivocal rights, pluralism tends to suffer.

A corollary to the above statement is the resentment which can brew within a people, when they perceive that their heritage is not being respected, or that it is being abandoned for the sake of what should be, in fact, a policy exception.

For example, most people do not mind when some exception to a long-standing rule is made based on individual need. But they do resent it when the exception then substitutes for policy, and the customary rule is replaced with another which has not withstood the test of time, but has as its sole value the incorporation of the most recent exception.

This method of policy making, by the addition of exceptions, is deleterious to social trust, because it fosters no sense of a return to normal after the exception has been made.

Instead, policy seems to wander all over at the beck and call of whatever voice of litigation can be heard most clearly and compellingly.

The third issue buried in the topic is the problem connected with the fact that Euro-ethnic is something of a code word for factors related to religious preference.

Ethnic has, in some policy-making forms, taken on specific religious connotations, most notably as a substitute for Catholic.

It, in effect, becomes a polite way of talking about religion, whether it be Catholic, Protestant or Jew, at those levels of society where social policy is discussed and where religion is an uncomfortable topic.

There are still enough stereotypes, for example, about Catholics which come to light in policy debates, such as the recent tuition tax credit debates in Congress, to give the impression that anti-Catholic sentiment is still alive and well within our society.

Privately, one still comes across comments from professionals and scholars about the inability of Catholics to do objective research on

social issues, or the inadvisability of funding research on Catholic issues, such as parochial schools or religious behavior.

These stereotypes are also layered on the term "ethnic" and the prejudicial cycle is complete; and all of this persists in the face of solid evidence that Catholics are no longer a predominantly working-class group. They're not generally social or political conservatives, and they're not the only people in the society opposed to abortion on demand.

Yet the stereotypes continue. At the National Opinion Research Center, we've looked at a lot of data on these things, and these findings support the contention that the stereotypes are out there.

We can only speculate as to how and why that particular strain of anti-religious bias continues in the country. But the fact that it does raise its head once in a while does not seem out of the question.

Finally, with regard to services, I'd like to expand on Professor Rosenberg's notion of the single-door model, of the delivery of social services, and modify it for a society which may be a bit more pluralistic than Great Britain.

The idea of having a single point of contact for many social services is very efficient. But, if that point cannot be receptive to a great variety of pluralistic styles, then they will be unable to use it.

Perhaps an improvement would be to have social services adopt something of the family medicine model. In this instance, we would have generalists available within various communities who would have access to the single door. These would be people trained in services in general, rather than specialists, and their tasks would be to sort out the requests coming from within their community and direct them to the appropriate service agency using the resources provided by the single door concept.

It may even be possible to use some of the more natural helping networks in the community in this way, thereby reducing the load on the full-time professional and increasing the quality of the contact between the potential clients and the service agencies.

In effect, the above-mentioned generalists become service brokers or middle persons in today's language, and would, in effect, manage the service deliverers themselves.

They would become advocates for their people in the community and should be able to broker services in such a way as to avoid the conflicts which can lead to litigation, while respecting the heritages of the people they help.

This conception of the general practitioner dovetails with the single-door theory of agency organization to create a service delivery system which is both efficient and amenable to pluralistic differences.

However, before any of these things become a reality, a basic change must take place in the way in which Government, including the Civil Rights Commission, perceives the situation of Euro-ethnics in the country.

Ethnicity is less a lobby group than an identity. It's less a self-conscious collectivity than an internalized heritage.

It's less a social movement than an individual need for respect.

People need to know that their society respects their story, the place from which they came, the people they know, and the valued aspects of their culture.

Social policies which continue to ignore the variegated stories in our country will fail to gather the support they require to succeed, and perhaps more seriously, will disenchant and alienate people needlessly.

Social services do not need to be tailored to every possible ethnic background, but they do need to be structured so that as few people as possible are kept from using them.

As our population grows older, and as older Americans become more numerous and in greater need of services, we may be embarking on the most ironic tragedy of all.

As immigrants, we tried to keep them out. As the "DP's" of the 1940's and 1950's, we tried to ignore them, and they had to make it on their own.

Now, as they grow old and die, we design service programs which either exclude them or simply offend them. This is more than a violation of their civil rights; it's a violation of their most elemental respect and dignity, and it need not happen.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Thank you.

Joseph Giordano is the Director of the American Jewish Committee's Louis Kaplan Center on Group Identity and Mental Health.

In 1977, he was appointed to the President's Commission on Mental Health, and this year was elected Vice Chairman of the Coalition for the White House Conference on Families

He is a university lecturer and writer on the subject of community mental health and holds a Master's degree from Columbia University, where he is pursuing a Doctoral degree on social policy and the family.

Mr. Giordano.

RESPONSE OF JOSEPH GIORDANO

Thank you.

I appreciated, yesterday, many of the comments that I listened to from the Commissioners. Some I agreed with; many I disagreed with.

I think particularly, I appreciated Commissioner Ruiz' comments, particularly where he related to his own Mexican-American background, and I could identify very much with that; because what I felt in his comments was that although we were talking from different perspectives, different kinds of experiences, different value systems, there was a connecting on the feeling of one's own identity and one's own experience.

And I think as we engage in the process to better understand the nature of ethnicity, in particular the significance of it to Americans of European background, we are not only going to be talking about the abstract theories of ethnicity and ethnic groups and the demographics and the numbers, but the very human experiences in behavior of European Americans. We're going to be talking about values, and these values are deeply felt.

They may evolve out of a highly assimilated process and a way of adapting to living in today's society, or have roots that may be modified over time but reach back thousands of years as part of a religious, ethnic or cultural group.

The thing Irv talked about yesterday, that sense of peoplehood that's transmitted to the family over generations, is almost – a lot of it is unconscious behavior, and I think the difficulty in grasping some of this yesterday is that it's difficult to grasp, because a lot of it is not terribly conscious.

We see the festivals; we see the food as we talked about yesterday; but they're only surface manifestations of what lies much deeper.

Let me give you one little example. We take something like urban renewal. We know that the purpose of that is to create new housing in a community, and yet we are totally unaware oftentimes of when the bulldozer goes in it not only destroys the physical buildings there and replaces them, but destroys a very sensitive social fabric of that community – the hallways, the corner candy store, the block, the stoop where people congregate.

Those social aspects of the community almost lie in the unconscious glueing of the communalism of a neighborhood; so when we destroy them, what we found – and this is documented in a lot of research – is that people who experience urban renewal go through a mourning period. They are actually depressed, and there's a sense of mourning for a deep loss, but they are not oftentimes aware of what is happening to them.

So we're talking about some very deep kinds of feelings that are not oftentimes easily articulated or visible.

I think we are all part of this process of values, and we must be aware that our own values and preferences will have strong influences

on how we perceive the question under consideration today, yesterday and today.

In the field of mental health, understanding of ethnicity is particularly important, because in mental health we're basically talking about how a person feels about him or herself, their self-esteem, their relationship to other people, their identity, their ability to pursue their goals with the least amount of emotional pain, their attitudes, their values and their perceptions of society at large.

With that kind of brief introduction, let me state the following up front, and then try to develop some documentation around that.

What I think generally, mental health care in this country has been culturally incompatible with ethnic, racial, and minority groups, and particularly white ethnic groups. Although over recent years there's been some changes, particularly in relationship to minority groups, we still have a very long way to go.

And I think the Commission can be awfully helpful in stimulating that change by just beginning to review, I think, what is already on the books. There are many laws and regulations related to mental health care in this country that are not being enforced, and we need to hold the systems, particularly the Federal Government, accountable to implement those particular laws and regulations, and I will list two or three of them a little later.

Why has there been an avoidance by white ethnic groups to the mental health system?

Well, I think in general that white ethnics have a tremendous feeling of self-reliance – take care of their own, take care of their own problems.

There's a basic untrust of professions and government; there's a sense of protection of privacy. The stigma, of course, of mental illness and mental health services cuts across all groups, and basically, what has been the approach of many white ethnic groups has been the use of their own cultural system, and we heard a lot about support systems.

People turn to their own particular systems first – the family, the extended family, the neighborhood, the sanctioned helpers in that particular community, and those institutions close to them.

If we look at the mental health system and compare that with European-American values, we see that there's a great deal of conflict around this incompatibility.

If you take the basic values of mental health and you just take two, they really represent American core values, the white Anglo-Saxon Protestant value systems.

If you take one value, around individualism, you are an individual; this comes through in treatment. You can make it on your own. We've got to plan for the future. It's that kind of value that's communicated.

And if you look at many European-American groups, that is not their priority – maybe second or third. Maybe their first priority usually is family and group, that they're more concerned about the present than the future. Just help me solve my problem now.

So there's a difference in how the deliverers of service communicate their values and the European-Americans who feel it in their gut, which is different.

The mental health system is operating out of large bureaucracies, powerful expertise, impersonal, rational kind of thinking. You compare that with European-American groups, and you see there's an emphasis on family, irrationality, a lot of face-to-face kind of communications, the emphasis on neighborhood.

The mental health system, if we look at the Community Health Act, defines community along a catchment area, which is geographical boundaries.

Ethnic groups define themselves going beyond neighborhood boundaries. They say they live in an Italian community, which extends outside of a catchment area.

The mental health system is professionally led. Much of the help that goes on in these communities is self-help and mutual help – differences.

There's a different language. The professional language versus the language of the people. An emphasis in mental health has been on racism. In European communities they've often been seen as the racist, which adds to feelings of being left out.

And lastly, in the mental health system, there's an emphasis on pathology. We've heard a lot about support systems. There's an emphasis on the problem; how do we solve the problem. You are ill.

Where in European-American value systems, there's a great emphasis on what little help do I need in order to solve my own problem on health.

So we find there is a great deal of cultural incompatibility between the two systems. The result is that we find there's a lack of access, equal access for European-Americans to the use of the mental health system. And even in cases where the access is there, they come into the agencies so they get the services; they don't stay there too long.

And of course there's an unacceptability of the way the service is provided to them. So you find, for example, in a number of studies, that people come in for one or two sessions and then drop out, so they just don't connect with it.

And this was one of the major items on the President's Commission on Mental Health, that basically mental health services in this country have not adequately related to ethnic minority groups or racial groups in this country.

And this is a very serious problem. Let's have no doubts about that.

The President's Commission talked 15 years ago about 10 percent of the population in need of mental health services. They recently issued a statement of 15 percent and it's very much closer to 20 percent.

So to me there's a rise right across in all groups. The White House Conference on Families is particularly highlighting that families are in trouble, and this very much hits white ethnic communities. The rapid social change, the change from traditional values to new life style values, the changing role of women - tremendous impact on the family.

Inflation, unemployment, the breakdown of families and neighborhoods, and the support systems that are weakening, in some cases, have created a great deal of problems. The statistics are skyrocketing, as you well know.

The problem today is that there's a greater need; there's a greater awareness by white ethnic groups. "Dear Abby" has worked in many cases to break down some of the stigma attached to use of services.

And this comes at a time when we have limited services and limited resources. So that if we look to the 1980's, we're going to find there's going to be a great deal more intergroup tensions, because many groups are aware their needs are greater; their awareness is greater, to use the services, but they're going to find less services and they're going to find less resources, and they're going to be in competition with groups that already laid a beachhead there. And so we may be in for some very difficult problems in communities, particularly around mental health services.

There's significant research that indicates that because of this cultural incompatibility, we find that many white ethnic groups, when they come in for services, individuals and families are misdiagnosed and get inappropriate kinds of treatment. To give you a very quick example: In a community in Brooklyn, a Polish-immigrant woman is brought into the Emergency Room, and she's met by a Filipino doctor.

I mean, the communication is a little difficult to understand in an area where you're talking about feelings and attitudes, very difficult to communicate.

Or Jewish therapists working with an Irish family, or delivering services in a community of discharge patients of establishing and beginning to get a big backlash from the community, because it just does not fit in with their own perception of how services should be delivered.

We find a great deal of variation among how services are used. In a study we did in New York City of five ethnic and racial groups, we find a great deal of variation on perception of services and the utilization of those services by the groups.

There's a high correlation between mental illness and immigration and the settling of refugees. We do a bad job in understanding the cultural context of these groups and helping them to settle in a new country and reducing the stress of being newcomers.

As I indicated, the intergroup tension is an issue which is beginning to show, not only in the communities between groups, but in the large institutions. The way careers have been entering in, in some institutions, the doctors are foreign, the nurses are black, the aide is Hispanic, and there are white supervisors.

And so you have group tensions even within these large state and municipal hospitals related to ethnic and minority differences.

In the policy and delivery of services, well, we can talk about universal services. We find that people use it differently. So while we say, take something like community mental health, which is to serve the total community, we know that the total community is not served, because people perceive it differently.

Let me just highlight two things on the Community Mental Health Act, which I think is already in the legislation, which I don't think has been adequately dealt with.

And this relates to more than just mental health. It's the Health Revenue Sharing Act and applies to community mental health centers, neighborhood health centers, and migrant health centers, and requires that in the case of a center serving a population including a substantial portion of individuals of limited English-speaking ability, the center must develop a plan and make arrangements responsive to the needs of such populations, for providing services to the extent related to language and the cultural context most appropriate to such individuals, and to identify a person on staff who is fluent in both that language and English and whose responsibilities include providing guidance to such individuals and to appropriate staff members, with respect to cultural sensitivities and bridging linguistic and cultural differences.

Now that's on the books, and I don't think that's being applied, particularly in white ethnic communities.

Now the intent of the community mental health services has been to serve the total community, and it has not. And I emphasize that, and I think the great contribution of the Commission can be to see that those laws are implemented.

And I think it would go a long way, because it would stimulate, within the system, that kind of emphasis on serving the community from a pluralistic perspective and would build upon much of the work that many people have done in this country, and I think you can make a vast contribution.

In closing, let me sum up what I think is much of what we have said today, and many of the things we have said today, and some of the

things yesterday, and something we have been operating out of our own shop, which has been developed by Irving Levine, called social conservation, which is a kind of perspective, theoretical model, I think, that harnesses the dynamism of contemporary group identity.

And let me just list those four points, and then I will end.

One, that individuals are strengthened if they can relate positively to their group identity.

Awareness of and respect for one's ethnic group customs, traditions, and family history contribute to one's sense of self and provide psychic energy for managing life.

Two, that the natural and informal systems of family, neighborhood, work, and ethnic group should be an important base for providing human services to individuals in need.

Three, programs should be fine tuned to offer choice of preferred forms of help for different groups of people in different ethnic, social, economic circumstances, and different living arrangements.

And finally, the expertise of professionals and technicians should be meshed with the experience and common sense of the people; a partnership that respects both the training and everyday existence. is the best arrangement for providing help for those in need.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Thank you, Mr. Giordano.

DISCUSSION

MR. NUNEZ. I have several questions for Dr. Rosenberg. Current social policy concerning the delivery of human services does not focus on the question of pluralistic society.

Would you advocate that - we're talking about Federal policy and State policy and local policy - would you advocate a turning away from the delivery of human services to the public institutions and turning them over to the Euro-ethnic institutions in our society?

DR. ROSENBERG. You pose the question to me in a very hard way, and I must answer the question the way you posed it. No, because my basic stand is that we need a strong public system and that public system has to contract with ethnic and sectarian and neighborhood groups to do a good deal of the business for them, but under the auspices of a sound public system.

I would not erode the creation of a solid, strong, public system. I think that would be defeating.

MR. NUNEZ. Well, you also indicated all the problems that the current public system has - bureaucracy, it's impersonal - and you pointed out all of the values of the community structure that develops.

The way you describe the public system, I see little benefit of it for any group in our society, aside from the Euro-ethnics. I can't conceive of a group that would want that kind of social service delivery.

DR. ROSENBERG. Yes. Well, the question is: If we had to continue with the same public system as it's organized today, and turn it over to ethnic groups, what we would have is a new system of gaps and overlaps?

What we have now are huge gaps and overlaps, and you'd create new systems of gaps and overlaps.

We don't have to have the present system we have now, even with the existing money that's being spent. I mean we haven't really identified the source of the kind of uniformity and standardization in social service legislation that's coming in. What's the source of this uniformity?

It's not the legislation itself. Where the standardization takes place is in the rules and administrative regulations promulgated by people who take the legislation after the bill is passed.

They write a bunch of boiler plate rules on how that law is going to be administered, and it leaves for so little variation and so little variety, and that is simply not necessary.

MR. NUNEZ. Mr. Giordano, you indicated the dilemma that a public agency faces in having a staff that is not identified with the clientele group, and that is a problem that exists in the delivery of social services for any disadvantaged group in our society - Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, blacks, American Indians.

But it's also a very difficult problem to deal with in the context of the way you pose it. We heard testimony yesterday that in Gary, Indiana there are 59 identifiable Euro-ethnic groups, and I'm sympathetic to the idea of having social service professionals of similar backgrounds to the clients.

But in a society such as ours, this is a very difficult thing to do, and how would you deal with it, given the problems that do exist. For example, having foreign doctors dealing with people who already are difficult to communicate with; a problem that exists in every large American city today.

MR. GIORDANO. Well, I think there are two. I think the foreign doctor is a separate problem related to the particular nature of who they are, but I think both can be answered in a way.

I think the question is not that the community has to be matched exactly, because there's no guarantee that they will be any better. I mean there's enough research that indicates where the same ethnic group helper is serving his or her group in the community, you can have some similar kinds of problems.

I think what we're suggesting here is that it becomes a perspective in the delivery of services; the recognition that you have a pluralistic community out there, whether there are 3 or 59 groups; you need an

approach to deal with them, and a lot of that has to do with training of your staff.

If you have a sensitivity to those differences, then you will, when you run into a problem, you will seek out that kind of help, get that kind of training that will allow you to give the best kind of service to that particular community.

So we're really, in many ways, saying that, that ought to be a given, that the recognition that there are differences, that these differences are important, that people have to be trained in order to recognize the differences – and it's not very difficult.

Irv and I teach a course at Fordham University to Social Workers. We have many Puerto Rican black students who are hungry to understand how to deal with an Italian family.

I mean they're not going to all serve Puerto Rican and black families. They're going to deal with a lot of whites, and there's differences among whites, which they will have to struggle with, as well as many of the Irish and Polish and Italian students have to deal with understanding the diversity in Hispanic communities, because in New York City you just don't have Puerto Ricans now; you have Colombians, lots of people from South America.

And so the understanding of cultural context is frightfully important. So I think that it's really training, and it's an approach that recognizes, policywise, that there are differences and that we must respond to them.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Mrs. Freeman?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Mr. Giordano, I would like to pursue the question that Mr. Nunez made, because in the example which you gave, it came through as a negative when you said that the white ethnic is treated by the Philippine, the Jewish therapist, is treated by somebody else.

And I think it would be – you're not saying, are you, that the white ethnic would have to be treated by a white ethnic?

MR. GIORDANO. Not at all.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Then if you're also saying that there has to be training, that the training and the orientation would also be a two-way street, that the white ethnic or the black or whoever goes in, ought to recognize that the person who is treating them or providing something for them also has the same kind of warmth and desires that they have?

MR. GIORDANO. Much of the research indicates that there are different perceptions on both sides. The helper and the helpee have different perceptions of what that help was and a lot of it comes right through your own cultural value system on both sides of the street.

I don't think it's incumbent - My feeling, if I understand your question - I think the responsibility is on the person who's providing the service to make those kinds of links, to have that kind of background, to be sensitive to those differences.

That helps the person in giving treatment and helps that person who's receiving it to understand those differences.

It's not incumbent upon them to be prepared to come in. They're coming in for help. They're coming in with their problem, and usually a person coming in with their problem is very diffuse in their own sense of who they are, and they almost need to be put back together, and being put back together is also being out back in your cultural context.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Maybe that is not their burden, but would it not also be incumbent upon such organizations as yours to at least help the helpee to understand the value of diversity, and that these people also are somebody?

MR. GIORDANO. Oh, I have no doubt. I think there's nothing that works like success. I mean, with all the resistance in white ethnic communities towards mental health services, when they go in - it works for them. Twenty years ago there was much resistance, as I'm talking about today in the white ethnic communities as there was in black and Hispanic communities.

Then the black and Hispanic communities and other minorities said, "Hey, brother, your services are not connecting with us." And they said, "Look, you know, to come to the hospital for help is not our way of doing it. Maybe it's better to deliver it in the church; maybe it's better to deliver it in a storefront." And now we find, in many studies, within minority and racial communities, that there's a great access to services, because they feel they're more culturally compatible.

What we're saying is that same approach can be applied to many other communities who are not receiving help at this point for that kind of incompatibility.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Yes, I know the organization of black psychologists came into being because they felt that the mental health providers themselves were too racist, that they were distorting the whole picture.

I have a question for - just one question for Dr. Rosenberg.

You suggested a voucher system for social services, and I want to know if you would give some examples of how such a system could be implemented.

DR. ROSENBERG. Well, I wasn't prepared to develop a full-scale program for it, but -

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Well, if you just have some example.

DR. ROSENBERG. Well, let's say assuming that a person is entitled to a social service, and you need some eligibility mechanism for that to take place, rather than dictating to the person where they have to go for that service - they don't have to go to the Welfare Department or they don't have to go to the mental health agency - the voucher is as if it were cash.

I mean middle class people are buying their services in the marketplace. Why can't lower income people have this substitute of money to buy their service in the marketplace as well?

And it is a viable possibility.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Is it similar to the food stamp program?

DR. ROSENBERG. I think it has some parallels to the food stamp program, yes.

But it maximizes choice.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Dr. Flemming?

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. I've been very much interested in the references on the part of a number of the members of the panel to the whole area of age discrimination.

As some of you know, this agency, by direction of the Congress, did make an in-depth study of the question of whether or not persons were being denied access to services, supported in all or in part by the Federal Government, by reason of age, with particular emphasis on older persons.

We found that it was a widespread practice.

Now, as I gather from the discussion this morning, there is a feeling on the part of at least some members of the panel that in addition to older persons in the ethnic communities being discriminated against in the delivery of services on the basis of age, on top of that, there is also a tendency to exclude older persons because, in effect, they are members of ethnic groups.

As you know, there is now on the books an Age Discrimination Act. It was passed in 1975; it became operative on July 1 of this year.

Prior to that time, there were hearings throughout the country on proposed regulations to be issued by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and an opportunity was also given to people to file written comments in addition to participating in the hearing.

I'm wondering whether or not some persons appeared at those hearings and presented the situation from the standpoint of the ethnic groups, and if so, I personally would appreciate having that testimony identified, so that we could have access to it and could make it a part of the record of this consultation, because I assume that if there was such testimony, it dealt very specifically with some proposed regulations that in your judgment would tend to operate in such a way as to discriminate further against members of ethnic groups.

In addition to that, there was issued a few months ago proposed regulations to implement the 1978 amendments of the Older Americans Act, which of course, as you know, is the basis for the delivery of services to older persons. That's another response on the part of Congress to discrimination on the basis of age.

Hearings were held on those proposed regulations. They have not yet been issued; the closing date is past for comment on them.

Here again, I'm wondering if persons concerned about the tendency to discriminate against members of ethnic groups, in the delivery of the services under the Older Americans Act, appear to comment on those proposed regulations and to make specific recommendations for changes in the regulation.

Once again, if you know of such testimony or the filing of such comments, I would appreciate it if you would call it to our attention, so that we would have the opportunity of examining it, and in that way finding out specifically what you feel can and should be done in terms of the regulations under both the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 and the Older Americans Act.

DR. ROSENBERG. I do not know of testimony in relation to discrimination, but if you'd permit me a minute response on the issue of discrimination in relation to services to elderly people, I would appreciate it.

I think the issue of discrimination is less the issue in relation to services to elderly people. The Government Accounting Office of Cleveland indicated that some 70 percent of elderly people do not know of their entitlements under all sorts of programs, including the Older Americans Act.

It meets Mr. Biegel's notions that in neighborhoods where people got lots of information and were friendly places and had support groups that told them of their entitlements, the likelihood that they would take advantage of these entitlements are much, much greater.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Might I just say on that, that is discrimination; the failure to conduct an outreach program and bring to the attention of older persons these services, the most notable area, being the area of mental health - that is clearly discrimination against the older person.

DR. ROSENBERG. Okay.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. But again, do you know whether or not any representatives of the ethnic organizations or ethnic groups did go in and comment on the regulations proposed under the Age Discrimination Act and the regulations proposed under the Older Americans Act, because particularly those proposed under the Older Americans Act deal very directly with these issues that have been discussed here on the delivery of services.

And I'm just wondering whether HEW had the benefit of the points of view that have been expressed here before they made up their minds on the Age Discrimination act regulations, and now before they make up their minds on the Older Americans Act regulations.

You do not know -

DR. ROSENBERG. I am not aware of such testimony.

CHARIMAN FLEMMING. Do any other members of the panel know if any persons in the audience or that may be on the panel, who had been on the panel or may be on the panel in the future, know of any such situation? I would appreciate it being called to our attention.

That is all.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Dr. Horn.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. I think my colleagues have adequately covered the subject. In the interest of time, I'll waive.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Mr. Ruiz?

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. With relation to the cash voucher system that you mentioned, would it not really cost more for an individual to get services in the open market if he says, "I have cash here," than services presently available to such a person under the cost system which keeps medical doctors under Social Security from overcharging, and they have formulas, et cetera? Wouldn't there be a danger of the freedom of choice. "I have cash. I'll go to Dr. X. Dr. X says, "Fine, I'll treat this person like the rest of my patients."

DR. ROSENBERG. I think some - and I don't want to say anything to hurt the medical profession - but I think there is a difference between people in the social service professions and the medical professions.

The experience today is that if people go and purchase services from mental health or social service personnel, the unit costs are considerably cheaper than the mounting of the gigantic agencies with large reporting forms and accountability procedures.

I think actually there would be a cost benefit.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. It is controversial then.

DR. ROSENBERG. I think it needs to be researched. I mean I don't think I could just assert that so simply.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Now with respect to any other member of the panel on the following: This question relates to institutionalization and self-help without institutionalization and government policy of when to assist, let us say, a needy aged person with government funds.

Let us say, the need for a psychiatrist or a psychologist.

Assume an aged, mentally ill person, who is not incapacitated physically and can take care of himself with the aid of supplemental income and psychiatric or psychological treatment from Social Security. Assume also, that his children are affluent but would not and

will not give him any support because they want to get rid of the old man and have him institutionalized.

It was stated that support systems may be preventive in nature, to assist mentally ill persons from being institutionalized.

Would there be Social Security supplemental income available to such a person whose mental illness is not incapacitating, but does need treatment by, let us say, a psychiatrist or a psychologist so that such a person might be able to make it on his own without being institutionalized?

MR. GIORDANO. Well, I certainly would think so. I think that there are many services – certainly not enough – that relate to the kind of person you indicated, who does not have those support systems and needs the intervention and the help of outside agencies. And there are many services for the aged that I know of, and I'm speaking out of my own experience in New York City, that reach out into the community with the sole purpose of providing those necessary services which not only involve the high technology of psychologists or psychiatrists, but also the very practical needs that people have in day-to-day living, to give them those necessary supports.

I think we know a heck of a lot more about that than we do about the support systems that are in the community and how to utilize them and to protect them, which is actually in many ways prevention, to see that that particular person doesn't get into that situation.

I think we need a lot more emphasis, a lot more study, a lot more understanding, and a lot of humility on the part of the professional establishment and government on understanding how people do cope on a day-to-day basis.

We know a lot. In any community you go to, where there are social services, you're dealing mostly with about 20 percent of that community. I'm speaking particularly of mental health services.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Let me interrupt you.

The main point, the bottom situation: Is family backup a necessary ingredient?

MR. GIORDANO. It's most important.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. And if you don't have family backup, do you still get the services?

MR. GIORDANO. Yes.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Okay.

MR. SALTZMAN. I'm going to have to interrupt because we are running a little late.

I want to thank you all for your splendid participation this morning.

Dr. Flemming.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. I also want to express our deep appreciation for these presentations. They raised very relevant issues, it seems to

me, and issues that definitely should be kept in mind by the public sector.

Fifth Session: Ethnic Women

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. We turn now to consideration of ethnic women, and I'm requesting my colleague, Commissioner Freeman, to preside during the presentations that will be made under this heading.

Commissioner Freeman.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. I would like to invite the panelists and the presenter to come forward now.

The topic for this session is ethnic women. The paper which is under consideration is, "Euro-Ethnic Women: Some Observations," by Dr. Kathleen McCourt, who is an Assistant Professor of Sociology at Loyola University.

Prior to that, she was a Senior Study Director at the University of Chicago National Opinion Research Center.

She has written a book entitled *Working Class Women and Grass Roots Politics*, and last year she presented a paper at the National Institute of Education Conference on the educational and occupational needs of white ethnic women.

She holds a doctorate in sociology from the University of Chicago.
Dr. McCourt.

STATEMENT OF DR. KATHLEEN McCOURT, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY, LOYOLA UNIVERSITY

Thank you.

I think in one way that's obvious the relevance of Euro-ethnic women to this Commission and this Conference is especially evident, because ethnic women share in the discrimination and oppression of all women in this country.

Beyond that, most are members of urban working-class families, and consequently they also share in the particular problems of that class, caught between the officially designated poor, who are eligible for special services, and the comfortable middle class, who are able to provide adequately for themselves.

My focus is on women of the working class, because this is the social class first of all which most people who are identified as ethnic or identify themselves as ethnic are located. But also I think this is the group of major concern to us.

There are, of course, middle-class individuals who view themselves as members of an ethnic group and may take great pride in that group's achievements and culture, but we are not, I think, primarily concerned with the situation of the more economically advantaged groups.

Working-class women have never shared in the economic and political decision-making in this country. They number about 40 million; they live in families with incomes above poverty but well below affluence, married to men with blue-collar jobs or low level white-collar jobs. These women seldom made it through college. Many started but dropped out after a semester or two to earn some money, help support the family, or to get married. Generally, they have lived in the large cities of the East and the Midwest, but more and more they are moving now to the suburbs.

The women today are the daughters and granddaughters of immigrant women, who struggled and saved for the survival of their families and a better life for the next generation. They are the next generation, the generation that was frequently able to buy their own homes and have visions of their children graduating from college. They are good citizens, who obey the law and pay their taxes; good wives, who stick by their husbands; good mothers, who raise their children to be obedient and patriotic; good workers, who accept low wages and don't make trouble. In short, they are the kind of Americans who can be ignored.

I think it's essential, when we discuss ethnic women, to keep in mind that members of this group, like those of other groups, are not inhabitants of a self-sufficient community. They live within the wider society. Their marital relationships are influenced by the media. The quality of their community life is affected by national unemployment rates. Their work experience is influenced by the presence of unions, minimum wage laws, and health and safety standards.

But just as it is impossible to understand people's daily lives without understanding what is happening in the wider society, so it is impossible to fully comprehend the impact of national policies and programs without seeing what results at the level of community and family.

For women especially, the way in which they handle various segments of their lives - work, education, child care, friendships - must be adapted to the realities of what the community does or does not offer.

It has been frequently pointed out in the literature of social science that working-class women are a traditional people. They adhere to traditional values, beliefs, and behaviors. They still go to church, although statistics show that's decreasing. The value family life. They like living in the neighborhoods where they grew up. When Lee Rainwater and his fellow sociologists wrote "The Working Man's Wife" 20 years ago, they expressed the belief at that time that they had examined the most conservative members of our society. There is both historical and literary evidence of working-class women's strong

defense of their cultural traditions. Immigrant women and their families made valiant efforts to preserve the ethnic culture in the face of attempts by employers, teachers, and social workers to "Americanize" the immigrants. As well as being traditional keepers of the ethnic culture, immigrant women did whatever they had to do to keep the family together, despite the pressures of an expanding and often brutal industrial system.

Now, I don't wish to unduly romanticize the traditions that ethnic women inherited. Many of those traditions, after all, were designed to keep women in their place, and that was a very subordinate place, indeed. A couple of examples follow: In 19th century Ireland, women walked behind men, ate their meals only after the men had finished, and were expected to help men with work in the fields, but got no help in return for their work, which was also strenuous. Among Irish women of this period, there were, not surprisingly, high rates of poor nutrition, early aging, and early death. During the same period in Eastern European Jewish homes, the birth of a son was cause for celebration; sons were pampered, while daughters were taught to early assume care of the household and care of younger children. In Italy, too, a girl's childhood ended early. Italian women married young, frequently in their early to midteens. They were expected to bear many children, and they were unable to divorce their husbands.

History shows that many Euro-ethnic women improved their lot by coming to the United States where it was often more difficult for the ethnic group to sustain a definition of women as inferior. The absence of many of the institutional structures that supported that definition combined with the practice of women working outside the home, and these together more nearly equalized the position of women.

So the ethnic traditions were a mix of positive and negative desirable and undesirable for the immigrant women, producing, in all probability, the kind of ambivalent feelings that ethnic women today experience when they assess the changed roles that may or may not be available to them. For the most part, ethnic women and ethnic families today have become Americanized. The rhythm of American factories, shops and schools has become the life rhythm of Euro-ethnic women and their families.

Yet ethnic women do not always feel themselves to be in step with middle-class values and behavior. It has been frequently pointed out, for example, that many ethnic, working-class women have not identified with the ideology of the women's movement, because they perceive that movement to be an attack on values they cherish: The nuclear family, child-bearing, monogamy, the role of housewife, male authority and clearly defined sex roles. Despite this negative reaction to the women's movement, working-class women are struggling with

precisely these issues in their own lives. Confusion and uncertainty characterize many working-class families today. Routine family problems are exacerbated by the breaking down of traditional role expectations for women especially, but for men as well. "If I were to get a job tomorrow," one Italian-American woman said to me, "It would break up my marriage. My husband will not have his wife financially independent of him." Both men and women are changing in their own behaviors and how they relate to each other, and the changes expectedly have painful aspects.

As Sennett and Cobb have discussed in *The Hidden Injuries of Class*, the only thing many working-class men have left to feel pride in is their ability to provide adequately for their families. When this begins to erode through unemployment, the impact of inflation, or their wives taking jobs, as more and more women are compelled to do, men may feel stripped of a certain amount of their dignity.

Yet, on the other side of the marriage, working-class women are following national demographic trends, living longer, having fewer children. Like middle-class women, they must face the question of what to do with their lives for the 30 years or so after their children are gone. It is certainly not the case that having a paying job is a new experience for working-class women. On the contrary, most immigrant women had to take jobs to assure the family survival, despite the traditional prohibition against the practice. Today, a clear majority of married women of working-class families work for pay. Clearly, it is not the experience of work itself that is at issue, but for some families at least the issue is the way in which a woman's life is to be defined.

Despite the currently fashionable emphasis of the "me decade" on self-personal fulfillment, and individual goal attainment, ethnic women are still strongly tied to a tradition that encouraged them to submerge their egos and find life satisfaction either in a husband's achievement, or more frequently, since most husbands did not have the kind of jobs that brought reflected glory, in having a nice home, healthy and well-behaved children, and a good family reputation.

In the realm of schooling, for example, ethnic parents frequently assumed that a child's education and individual advancement would pull him or her away from the family. This was threatening both psychologically and financially. For daughters, education not only posed this threat, but was additionally seen as simply irrelevant. Women, after all, were to be wives and mothers, and in many cultures they assumed these adult roles at a young age. There was little space in their lives for self-fulfillment and self-advancement, although there was characteristically self-sacrifice.

Just to relate a little bit to the discussion earlier of social services in the ethnic community, as was mentioned, the family has cared a good

deal for its own elderly, its own sick, its own retarded, but the burden of this care has fallen largely on women. The historical changes the family has gone through have added to the expectation that women must provide emotionally as well as physically for other family members. Eli Zaretsky, in his study of the family, points out that with the development and expansion of industrial capitalism, the family lost its productive function and the realm of work became separated from the realm of personal life. As people found less meaning in their work, the family became the place in which the search for personal happiness, love and fulfillment took place. So while the industrial revolution largely freed women from some traditional patriarchal constraints, the expansion of personal life which accompanied the rise of industry created a new basis for their oppression. To them fell the responsibility for maintaining a private refuge from an impersonal society.

To the extent that the outside world becomes more difficult to deal with, more pressures are placed on the family to provide comfort and support for its members. All family members feel this, of course, but women especially are expected to meet the needs of others, and there are relatively few resources with which to share this burden. Service agencies, as was pointed out, are less available to the working class than to the poor, and professional helpers like doctors, lawyers, and therapists are used less by the working class than the middle class.

One of the things I do want to mention is that I have found in my studies of women and community groups that many don't become involved until someone reaches out and invites them to become involved.

The same thing has been found in reentry programs for ethnic women returning to school. I think this raises for us the reality that for equal opportunity to truly exist – and I'm glad that this was pointed out earlier – we need programs that are – a lesson we've learned – affirmative in terms of their action, not just programs that exist if people are able to find them.

Ethnic women are not used to thinking of themselves first, and this isn't likely to change, and I don't think such a change would be particularly desirable in any case, because the family has played an important role for working-class people. Bill Kornblum in his study of south Chicago families talks about the fact that the personal attachments that parents developed in the community were what they were able to pass on to their children, and this was what assured them that their children would have something.

I want to move quickly to make a couple of points about the community before my time is up. I recently read something that pointed out that the cities that comedians just mention to get a laugh,

like Gary, or Buffalo, or Pittsburgh, are working-class cities, and apparently the joke is that these are cities that are totally lacking in cosmopolitan culture.

Yet, for their residents, these communities have been of extreme importance. If one visits many of the working-class neighborhoods of the old cities, one finds families that have lived there for several generations. It's not a cosmopolitan life. Parents, children, brothers, and sisters may all live nearby; daily life, social events, shopping, perhaps work, are carried on in the neighborhood.

So for women especially, to lose this neighborhood can be a source of real trauma. Working-class communities have been lost to their residents in a number of ways: urban renewal, highway construction programs, the current, quote, "gentrification" of the inner city, the threats of racial and ethnic change; and also, in more benign ways, through upward mobility and success when families move out.

The community is especially important to women because they have traditionally chosen their friends from the parish, from the block. As a result, their social networks in the community are often well developed. They are made up of family, friends, neighbors who feel affection for one another and who can be called upon in times of crisis. And this is frequently the substitute for the formal service agencies.

So, under these circumstances, the loss of community, the breakdown of networks, can be quite traumatizing, and there is a good deal of social science research that substantiates the psychological and somatic reactions that women have to the loss of their community.

Working-class women have more problems and get less help with those problems than either working-class men or middle-class women. When the network breaks down, the women are often left in a state of severe isolation, and I will just reinforce what was said earlier, that this is especially the case with elderly women. So the importance of the community to the ethnic working-class women who inhabit it helps to explain, I think, why we have seen not only historically, but in recent years, women stepping out of traditional roles to take whatever steps they may see as necessary for the survival of their community.

Let me just end by calling to mind something that I just recently read. It illustrated the old truth, "Powerlessness corrupts." When people feel powerless over any length of time, they begin to accept aspects of the world and of themselves that they know to be contrary to their own best interests.

The neighborhood or community action movement, which I have discussed at more length in the paper, but I don't want to go into it here, can be an important antidote to this powerlessness.

As members of active community groups, women and men have had the experience of feeling that they have a voice in decision-making, an

experience that many of them did not have before. One of the major tasks now, of course, confronting organizers and political leaders is the yoking of this activist tradition with a vision that transcends a narrowly defined self-interest, whether it's ethnic or otherwise, and looks to the good of the wider political collectivity.

I just want to end this paper by saying what I really believe cannot be emphasized enough in this context. And that is that the problems of Euro-ethnic women are the problems of all women. They are exacerbated by the conditions of class, and they are shaped by a particular historical tradition. But Euro-ethnic women are far more like other minority women than they are different. The passage of an equal rights amendment, the elimination of discrimination and harassment at the workplace, a government and community commitment to quality day care for the young and the elderly would help ease the burdens of ethnic women, as they would all women.

And finally, the problems of individuals will not be resolved until the wider community in which they live becomes a place that offers security and enhances the quality of daily life. And this, I think, will not happen until there is some reordering of national priorities. The working-class community would have a better chance of remaining viable if banks and insurance companies were not able to take finances from the residents and refuse to re-invest them in the community. The working-class community would have a better future if corporations could not simply close up shop and move a factory or plant to a locale offering lower taxes.

Okay. I will end it there, but I do want to end on the emphasis that the problems of ethnic women are the problems that are shared by men of their class and by women of other groups as well.

[The complete paper follows.]

EURO-ETHNIC WOMEN: SOME OBSERVATIONS

By Kathleen McCourt *

By now it is presumably clear to those gathered at this consultation what is meant by Euro-ethnics. Which European origins, for which generations, constitutes the basis of something of concern to the Commission on Civil Rights and is probably less clear. My task here is to discuss the condition of Euro-ethnic women. In one obvious way,

* Assistant Professor of Sociology Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois

the relevance of this group to the Commission is more evident. These are women; as such, they share in the discrimination and oppression of all women in this country. Beyond that, most of those whom we refer to as "ethnic" are members of urban, working-class families; thus, they share in the particular problems of a class caught between the officially designated poor, who are eligible for special services, and the comfortable middle class, who are able to provide quite adequately for themselves. In addition, women of some ethnic groups are victims of further discrimination because of their religion or their ethnic background.

It is difficult to generalize about Euro-ethnic women. Irish, Italian and German-American women have histories, traditions, and cultural values that differ from each other. Even more strikingly, groups such as these who were the earlier immigrants had experiences in this country in many ways unlike those of the later immigrants from eastern and southern European countries such as Greece, Poland, and Russia. Additionally, while some class, sex or ethnic based problems persist over time, the condition of third generation American women is quite different from the condition of first generation Americans. How, then, to approach these many aspects in one paper?

I will discuss some of the situations that I think are or have been major concerns or sources of tension in ethnic women's lives. I will sometimes have empirical data to back me up, sometimes only literary or impressionistic data. Wherever possible I will draw on historical experience and point out the differences between ethnic groups.

My focus is on women of the working class. This is the social class in which most people who identify themselves or are identified by others as ethnic are located. Also, this is the group of real concern to us. While some middle or upper-middle class individuals may view themselves as members of an ethnic group and may take pride in that group's culture and achievements, we are not, I think, primarily concerned with the situation of the more economically advantaged groups.

Working-class women - "the subordinate partners in subordinate families", to use Robert Lane's terminology - have never shared in the economic and political decision-making in this country. And the recent movements of middle-class women, blacks, and other minorities have little touched working-class women. They remain, 40 minorities or so, living in families with incomes above poverty but well below affluence, married to men with blue-collar jobs or low level white-collar jobs. These women never made it through college; some began but dropped out after a semester or two to earn some money or to get married. Generally, they live in the large cities of the East and the Midwest, but more and more they are moving to the suburbs. They are

the daughters and grand-daughters of immigrant women who struggled and saved for the survival of their families and a better life for the next generation. They *are* the next generation, the generation that was able to buy their own homes and have visions of their children graduating from college. They are good citizens, who obey the law and pay their taxes; good wives, who stick by their husbands; good mothers, who raise their children to be obedient and patriotic; good workers, who accept low wages and don't make trouble. In short, they are the kind of Americans who can be ignored.

They have been ignored and invisible in the past; they have been, in the words of Nancy Siefer, "absent from the majority." Recently, though, we have begun to hear and read a little more about them. A few academics have focused attention on working-class women (Rubin; Sidel; Siefer; McCourt). Some segments of the women's movement have attempted to involve them by appealing to concerns they share with middle class women – concerns like equal pay, child care facilities, and good health services. The media have begun to portray working-class women, not only Edith Bunker and Laverne and Shirley, but sometimes even sensitive and well developed characters like Norma Rae in the recent film of that title.

Primarily though working-class women are less invisible today because they are demanding attention. In cities throughout the northeast and midwest, when community residents organize and struggle for a voice, women are in the forefront. In the fights for better housing and schools, in the organized citizen resistance to highway construction, neighborhood demolition, and racial blockbusting, working-class women are leaders.

In the workplace, too, there is more organizing of those in "female" occupations. Sometimes women are organized into traditional union locals; frequently now, clerical workers are joining the new working women's organizations like 9 to 5 in Boston or Women Employed in Chicago. Still, the community seems to be where the ethnic women are becoming most visible – and it is in the community that many of the women's important struggles are being played out.

It is essential to keep in mind that ethnic women, like any other group, are not inhabitants of a self-sufficient community. They live within the wider society; their marital relationships are influenced by the media; the quality of their community life is affected by national unemployment rates; their work experience is influenced by the presence of unions, minimum wage laws and health and safety standards; the kind and quality of the education they receive is shaped by national policy, academic trends, and the allocation of State and Federal resources.

But just as it is impossible to understand people's daily lives without understanding what is happening in the wider society, so it is impossible to fully comprehend the impact of national policies and programs without seeing what results at the level of community and family. For women, especially, the ways in which they handle various segments of their lives – work, education, child care, friendships – must be adapted to the realities of what the community does or does not offer.

I would like to approach this discussion of Euro-ethnic women using three themes that help me conceptualize what I see as sources of strain or tension in the lives of working-class women today. These are as follows: First, the general theme of “tradition versus change,” and the only slightly more specific themes of “the individual and the family” and “the community and its loss.”

Tradition and Change

Working-class women, it has been frequently pointed out in the literature of social science, are a traditional people. They adhere to traditional beliefs, values, and behaviors; they still go to church (although in decreasing numbers); they value family life; they like living in the neighborhoods where they grew up. When Rainwater and his fellow sociologists wrote *The Workingman's Wife* twenty years ago, they expressed the belief that they “had examined the most conservative members of our society.” They wrote, “Within these women are imbedded the deep and enduring values of our culture.” (p.vii)

Working-class women historically have been strong defenders of their cultural traditions. You may recall the Jewish immigrant woman in the film *Hester Street*, who countered the wishes of her husband by resisting assimilation, keeping alive as best she could the old language and religious rituals. Ethnic women often were more reluctant than men to assimilate, perhaps because they tended to stay closer to home, perhaps because they had prime responsibility for the socializing of children and so had to more consciously deal with the values which were to be transmitted.

(More recent studies, by the way, have suggested that ethnic or working-class women are more likely than their husbands to accept middle-class attitudes and standards of behavior, the contemporary equivalent of assimilation.)

In any case, immigrant women and their families made valiant efforts to preserve the ethnic culture in the face of attempts by employers, teachers, and social workers to “Americanize” the immigrants. The historian Herb Gutman tells us how the pressures of the factory system, the time clock, the dawn-to-dark work day and a

rational system of production threatened to destroy the ethnic subcultures which had a different rhythm. For example, a Polish wedding in a Pennsylvania mining or mill town would last, as in the old country, between three and five days. Practices such as this were an annoyance to many employers and, eventually, the immigrants had to give way. While Jews in Eastern Europe held a festival of celebration the eighth day after the birth of a son, in America such events were not allowed to interfere with the work week. In the face of massive attempts to break down indigenous culture, it is of little wonder that stubborn and loyal immigrant women frequently dug in their heels, clung to their own values, and did their best to transmit these to the next generation.

As well as being keepers of the ethnic traditions, immigrant women did whatever they had to do to keep the family together despite the pressures of an expanding and often brutal industrial system. In 1895, Charles Zeublin wrote in *The Hull House Maps and Papers*: "It must of course be recognized that it is almost impossible to maintain the old family life in the environment of the factory system. . . with its long hours, and employment of women. The astonishing fact is the preservation of so much of the tradition of the family in the face of modern social disintegration." Zeublin wrote specifically of the Jewish immigrant family, but what he says applied to other ethnic groups as well. And family preservation was largely the result of incredible efforts on the part of women.

I do not wish to unduly romanticize the traditions that ethnic women inherited. Many of those traditions after all were designed to keep women in their place, a very subordinate place indeed. In nineteenth century Ireland, for example, women walked behind males, ate their meals only after the men had finished, and were expected to help men with work in the fields but got no help in return for their heavy domestic chores. Among Irish women of this period there were, not surprisingly, high rates of poor nutrition, early aging, and early death. (Kennedy)

During the same period, in Eastern European Jewish homes, the birth of a son was cause for celebration since "a male child would not only ultimately assume all the religious responsibilities of Judaism. . . he might even bring renown to his family as a scholar." (Baum, Human and Michel) So sons were pampered while daughters early assumed housework and the care of younger children.

In Italy, too, a girl's childhood ended early. "From the age of 7, girls were apprenticed in learning household skills, developing the qualities of womanhood under constant supervision." (Femminella and Quadagna) Italian women married young, frequently in their early to mid-

teens, were expected to bear many children, and were unable to divorce their husbands.

History shows that many Euro-ethnic women improved their lot by coming to the United States, where it was more difficult for the ethnic group to sustain a cultural definition of women as inferior. The absence of many of the institutional structures that supported that definition combined with the practice of women in the United States working outside the home to more nearly equalize the position of the ethnic woman.

So the ethnic traditions were a mixture of positive and negative, desirable and undesirable, for immigrant women, producing, in all probability, ambivalent feelings similar to what ethnic women today feel, when they assess the changed roles that may or may not be available to them.

I do not think that most working-class women today attach a great deal of importance to maintaining the traditions of their particular ethnic group. The ethnic traits of language, ritual, custom, and food are nice and interesting – indeed, ethnic crafts and ethnic restaurants are quite in vogue in the mainstream society – but they are seldom central to the lives of third or fourth generation Americans. (Religion is the one area where traditional values continue to be very important for many ethnic women.) For the most part, the rhythm of American factories, shops, and schools has become the life rhythm of Euro-ethnic women and their families.

Yet ethnic women do not always feel themselves to be in step with the middle class values and behaviors. It has been pointed out that many ethnic working-class women do not identify with the ideology of the women's movement because they perceive that movement as an attack on what they cherish: the nuclear family, child-bearing, monogamy, the role of housewife, male authority, and clearly defined sex roles. Despite their resistance, working-class women are struggling with precisely these issues.

Confusion and uncertainty characterize many working-class families today. Routine family problems are exacerbated by the breaking down of traditional role expectations and new role options, for women especially but for men as well. As indicated earlier, some studies suggest that working-class women are more likely to develop middle-class values and attitudes than are their husbands. They share in aspects of middle-class female culture through women's magazines, and they are further exposed to that culture in their office jobs. This exposure to middle class values, to some of the ideas of the women's movement, and to the possibilities of expanded role options appears to be putting increasing pressure on blue-collar husbands, who fear they may not "measure up" to their wives' new expectations. Sometimes

the men attempt through force or intimidation to keep things the way they have been. "If I were to get a job tomorrow," says one Italian American woman, who is married to a blue-collar worker, "it would break up my marriage. My husband will not have his wife financially independent of him." Both men and women are changing in their own behaviors and how they relate to each other and the changes, expectedly, often have a painful aspect. As Sennett and Cobb have discussed in *The Hidden Injuries of Class*, the only thing many working-class men have left to feel pride in is their ability to provide adequately for their families. When this begins to erode through unemployment, the impact of inflation, or their wives' taking jobs – as more and more working-class women are compelled to do – they feel stripped of a certain amount of their dignity and manhood.

Yet, on the other side of the marriage, working-class women are following national demographic trends, living longer and having fewer children. Like middle-class women, they must face the question of what to do with their lives for the 30 years or so after their children are gone. Most women faced with this problem of what to do with their lives do not "go crazy" like the leading character in the film *A Woman Under the Influence*. (Although many do; neighborhood mental health centers, I am told, cannot begin to keep up with the number of people – largely women – coming to them for counseling.) But there are increasing incidences of alcoholism, depression, and conflict in working-class families. These problems, of course, are due not only to the pressures exerted when familiar worlds break down; they are also heightened and in some cases created by an economic system whose inflation and unemployment hit hardest at working-class families.

Having a paying job is not a new experience for working-class women. On the contrary, most immigrant women had to take jobs to assure the family's survival despite the traditional prohibitions against the practice. Today a clear majority of married women in working-class families work for pay. So, clearly, it is not the experience of work itself that is at issue but, for some families at least, the issue is the way in which a woman's life is to be defined.

Nineteenth century immigrant women found jobs that did not remove them from the family whenever they could. They took in boarders or did piece work or laundry at home. Many women even denied that what they were doing was really a job; they would not report themselves to census takers as wage earners. (Yans-McLaughlin) This was done at least in part to protect the family's definitions of the male as provider and worker and the female as the house and family keeper. This practice of defining situations in a way that builds

up and reinforces a certain view of the family – even at the expense of the individual – is at the heart of the concern I wish to address next.

The Family and the Individual

The media blare forth the messages of the “me decade” with television models justifying the purchase of products that “cost a lot” because “I’m worth it,” and the current cultural heroines are individuals who have achieved executive status by single-mindedly pursuing their dreams and ambitions. While this emphasis on self, personal fulfillment, and individual goal attainment is all around them, the ethnic women are still strongly tied to a tradition that encouraged them to submerge their egos and find life’s satisfactions in a husband’s achievements or – more frequently, since most husbands did not have the kind of jobs that brought reflected glory – in having a nice home, healthy and well behaved children, and a good family reputation.

In the realm of schooling, for example, in many ethnic groups education for self-advancement was seen to be far less valuable and commendable than working for the well-being of the entire family unit. Italian families took their children out of school as soon as possible that they might contribute to the family’s earnings. Parents correctly assumed that a child’s individual advancement would pull him or her away from the family and this was threatening both psychologically and financially.

For daughters, education not only posed the threat of pulling them away from the family but was, additionally, seen as simply irrelevant. Women, after all, were to be wives and mothers and in many cultures they assumed those adult roles at a young age, frequently in their mid-teens. Michael Novak tells of his grandmother, who was mother to seven at the age of 22. There was little space in such lives for self-fulfillment and self-advancement; there was, characteristically, self-sacrifice. Indeed, the cultural and religious model for women in both the Catholic and Jewish traditions was one of self-sacrifice.

Cultural experiences varied of course. Among Jews, even of the immigrant generation, education and individual advancement were more than tolerated; they were strongly encouraged. But while this was typically the case with male children, it was less frequently the case with female children. Indeed, it was not uncommon for young Jewish women to go to work in order that their brothers might be able to continue school.

Among Irish women there is some sign of independence and attempts at personal advancement if one views the emigration figures. Many unmarried Irish young women came by themselves to the new country to find a life better than that promised in Ireland. Single women appear to have emigrated at least as frequently as men; census

data show that in some years women were more than 50 percent of the immigrants. (Groneman) Women chose to leave Ireland because prospects for marriage were slim, since only one son in a family would inherit the small plot of land and be able to support a wife and children. Even with marriage, little more than a subsistent existence was likely. The alternative for the unmarried female in Ireland was to remain on the land of parents and brother as an unpaid servant. Given the sex ratio of Irish emigration and the very strong tendency for immigrants to be endogamous, women leaving the old country were in no way assuring themselves of future marriage partners. The women appeared to be emigrating for other reasons, including the chance for independence and the opportunity to improve their personal standard of living. But many of these women did nothing for themselves with the money they earned; they scrimped and saved that they might send enough back home so that a younger sibling, a parent, or cousin could come over. One observer of the times noted how important this was for the young women, an "imperative duty which they do not and cannot think of disobeying. . . One by one, she has brought them all across the ocean, to become members of a new community." (Magurie) Between 1848 and 1900, the money sent home by settlers in America paid for at least three-fourths of all Irish emigration.

There is a long and strong tradition in ethnic families of women's denying their own pleasures in order to make life better for husbands, children, or parents. One author looks back at her Slavic community and says: ". . . the strong took care of the weak. The retarded, the mad, the deformed, the illegitimate. . . none of them were sent away. Families cared for their own, accepting these burdens as fatalistically as rain and thunder. The drunken, the desperate, the stupid - these, too, fit into the community. . ." (Prosen) In the ethnic community, the family cared for its own elderly, sick, and slow. And the burden of care fell largely on women.

The historical changes the family has gone through added to the expectations that women provide emotionally as well as physically for other family members. As Eli Zaretsky points out, with the development and expansion of industrial capitalism, the family lost its productive function. The realm of work became separated from the realm of personal life. As people found less meaning in their work, the family became "the primary institution in which the search for personal happiness, love, and fulfillment takes place." So, Zaretsky says, as the industrial revolution largely freed women from traditional patriarchal constraints, the expansion of personal life, which accompanied the rise of industry, created a new basis for their oppression. To them fell the responsibility for maintaining a private refuge from an impersonal society.

The family, the home, continues today to be the refuge for those who cope daily in the wider society. It has become, in the words of Christopher Lasch, "a haven in a heartless world." To the extent that the world outside becomes more difficult to deal with, more pressures are placed on the family to provide comfort and support for its members. All members of a family feel some of this pressure, but women especially are expected to meet the needs of others—husbands, children, and aging parents. And there are few resources with which to share the burden.

Service agencies are available less frequently to the working class than to the poor. And professional "helpers," like doctors, therapists, and lawyers, are used less by the working class than by the middle class.

Having played such central family roles themselves and having seen and lived with the sacrifices of mothers and grandmothers, today's ethnic women are not particularly comfortable with the idea that a top priority for them should be personal fulfillment, self-actualization, or their own advancement or pleasure. Nor, I might add, are their husbands and families always pleased with the possibilities of such a scenario.

The commitment to self-sacrifice is deep and has not disappeared over the generations. Mary Gordon's recent novel, *Final Payments*, depicts a contemporary situation where a Catholic woman sacrifices her years of young adulthood to devote herself to the care of her invalid father. She wanted, of course, to do other things with those years; but she wanted, too, to do as she did. Her behavior fit with her sense of moral obligation, her culturally and religiously formed definitions of love, respect, and gratitude. She did, simply, what one did.

A few years back a film called *A Woman Under the Influence* gave insight into this dilemma between self and family for one ethnic woman. Mabel Longhetti, the Italian American leading character is dedicated to her husband and children and has over the years grown more and more "crazy." Desiring only to be whatever her family needs — "Tell me what you want," she says desperately to her husband, Nick; "I'll be whatever you want" — she is never able to figure out who she is or what she needs herself. There is no room in her life for herself. She is married to a man who loves her but is incapable of giving her the support and acceptance she needs. Yet, he might have been able to give her more if she had had more insight into her own needs and been able to communicate these to her husband.

Many ethnic women today are in touch with what they want. They may want to go back to school to complete a high school degree or get started on a college program; many want to take advantage of some of

the more challenging jobs that are becoming available to women. And many are eager to get involved in all sorts of activities in their communities. Many, women, of course, already do some or even all of these things. But personal needs and desires are frequently in opposition to family demands or wishes. This tension is found in the woman who wants to get a paying job but will not go against her husband's wishes that she stay at home; it is found in the woman who returns to school but is filled with guilt at the time away from her family that her studies demand; it is found in the woman who is the victim of physical abuse but will not seek help for fear of besmirching the family's reputation; and it is found in the young woman who wants to explore all sorts of new avenues of life but feels she must "marry and settle down" in order to make her parents happy.

The absence of personal life was made concrete for immigrant women by the minimal amounts of privacy their circumstances allowed. A 1911 *American Journal of Sociology* article on Chicago's housing conditions notes the case of a West Side family of two adults and three children, living in four rooms, who had taken in seven boarders. Records indicate this was not an unusually crowded situation.

Those women today who do act to find their space, either physical or psychic, find frequently that the move is accompanied by doubts, feelings of guilt, and the pressures that accompany the playing of many roles. A woman, active in her community and respected for her work and energy, told me: "I'm always home in time to have dinner on the table when my husband gets home from work. I've never missed in 24 years of marriage." The strains produced by such demands are real, the result of mixed values, old and new, the result of patterns of social organization in family and work that burden more than they free people.

One of the things I found in my studies of women in community organizations was that many did not join until someone invited them to. When they began finally to believe that not only was it all right for them to get involved in this new activity, but they were needed, then they joined. Re-entry programs for ethnic women returning to school have found something similar: potential students must often be located and invited, assured that it is all right for them to take classes and indeed that they are wanted.

Ethnic women are not used to thinking of themselves first or only. This is not likely to change. And I do not think such a change would be particularly desirable. For those in the working class, families have offered something more than individuals are able to secure on their own. Bill Kornblum speaks of South Chicago parents' realization that even if their children do a little better, they "will continue to need the

security of the local community and its network of primary relations.” The steel workers and their wives that Kornblum talked with believe that what children attain in life will largely depend on the personal attachments their families have established over the generations. Holding the family together, then, remaining “decent and respectable,” and adhering to the community’s shared values becomes not a clinging to tradition for its own sake but the way the family of the next generation will survive.

Not even the impact of the “me decade” will change this. The emphasis on the family as the important social unit is not just a survival mechanism; it is a continuing emphasis on the only institution that seems able to meet some basic needs. Yet submerged somewhere in that collectivity are many ethnic women struggling to emerge as the individuals they would like to be.

The ethnic woman and her family, I think, are caught somewhere in the middle of social change. We are living in a time when more and more of people’s needs are being met outside of the primary groups of family, friends, and neighbors. One analyst puts it: “With few exceptions (people) must go to market and only to market, not only for food, clothing, and shelter but also for recreation, amusement, security, for the care of the young, the old, the sick, the handicapped.” (Braverman, p. 276)

Yet what happens to those families that are largely priced out of the market? The members continue to turn each other for as much as possible – not only because of tradition, not only because of pride, but also because alternatives are few.

Still, ethnic families have not been *completely* on their own; the immediate community sometimes offers help today as it did in earlier times. The statement, “I can turn to my neighbors,” carries a great deal of genuine meaning and importance in the ethnic community. And this leads me to a third theme I would like to address: the importance of the ethnic community to its inhabitants, especially women.

The Community: Its Importance and Its Loss

Something I read recently pointed out that the “joke cities” for comedians, the cities that get a laugh just by being mentioned, cities like Gary, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, are all working-class cities. The joke is, apparently, that everyone knows that such cities are lacking in any kind of cosmopolitan culture. (Robinson)

Yet to their residents, working-class communities have been of extreme importance. They have been more than just a place to live.

Today, these neighborhoods are, by and large, not ethnically homogeneous. Indeed, historians tell us they were seldom homogeneous in the past. Now descendants of Irish, Italian, Lithuanian, Polish and

German settlers share neighborhoods with each other and with more recently arrived Greeks, Koreans, and Russians. Indeed, statistics show that a sizeable number of white urban dwellers share neighborhoods with black families as well (Greeley).

Despite their lack of ethnic homogeneity, if one visits the working-class neighborhoods of America's old cities, one finds families that have lived there for two or three generations, often in the same house. Frequently, parents, married children, or brothers and sisters and their families live nearby. It is not a cosmopolitan life. Daily life, social events, shopping, and frequently work are carried on in the confines of the neighborhood.

Despite strong ties to the neighborhood though, there is often some conflict in residents' feelings about their community. There is, on the one hand, the warmth, familiarity, and sense of belonging that is comforting. Simultaneously, though, there is often a sense of isolation, or stagnation, and of narrowness that oppresses. Working-class people wish for success, upward mobility, and the fulfillment of the American dream for themselves and their children, but at the same time they may long for old, familiar neighborhood. "To stay down here, where he grew up," said one woman of her husband, "would be a sign of failure." Yet when this woman and her family moved up and out, they moved to a community inhabited by dozens of other families who had made the same move from the old neighborhood. A community both new and familiar had been created.

Sennett and Cobb talk of the need they found in their working-class respondents to feel that they are people worthy of respect. Often this was seen as attainable only with movement to a higher social class, which would entail leaving behind the extended family and the old neighborhood. Respect and success were seen to carry a high price tag.

However, the community is not always lost to its residents through such favorable events as upward mobility and good fortune. Over the last few decades it has frequently been lost in less benign ways. In the late 1950's and early 1960's urban renewal was the culprit. Neighborhoods, sometimes quite comfortable for their ethnic residents, were designated "slums" by government agencies and destroyed in order that new housing might be built. The housing almost invariably turned out to be too expensive for the displaced working-class residents (Gans; Suttles). Later in the 1960's, highway construction programs destroyed ethnic communities in Boston, New York, Baltimore, and Chicago in order that middle-class commuters might complete their runs in shorter time. Today it is the "gentrification" of the inner city that is displacing the working class. With remodeling and an infusion of funds, the old houses in the old neighborhoods provide homes both

more substantial and more attractive than anything being built in the suburbs. Finally, in addition to all these physical changes that threaten the working-class neighborhoods, there is racial and ethnic change, typically felt as the greatest threat to the community.

The neighborhood has been especially important to women. Like children and the elderly, women, especially mothers of young children, have little physical mobility and consequently are bound to the community. One author painted an appealing picture of female culture in the Italian immigrant community of years ago:

Grandmothers sitting on front stoops, gossiping, knitting, praying, and scolding and minding grandchildren along with general neighborhood business were a common feature of Little Italy's landscape. If they did not share their daughters' homes, many lived nearby. (Yans-McLaughlin, p. 51)

Although the presence of extended family is much less common today than it was in the past, still, in many cases, relatives do live nearby and help fill some of those functions that for others are filled in the marketplace.

Even if family does not live nearby, women of the working class will choose their friends from the parish and the block more frequently than anywhere else. As a result, in stable, ethnic neighborhoods, social networks are often well developed. They are made up of friends, family, and neighbors who feel affection for one another and who can be counted on for help and support in times of crisis.

Under such circumstances, the loss of community and the concomitant breakdown of social networks can be a traumatizing experience, one which produces extreme loneliness and leaves the women with literally nowhere to turn with their problems. Parish priests do not for most women play an adequate counseling role; professional help is not available to families on working-class salaries and, as indicated earlier, would in any case be viewed as a shameful need. Husbands have often not been able to serve as primary confidants for working-class women (Kormarovsky); this role has more often been filled by a mother, sister, other female relative or close friend who lives nearby.

Working-class women have been found to have more problems and to get less help with those problems than working-class men or middle-class women (Warren). What help they do get comes from relatives or neighbors. When the network breaks down, through geographic mobility, whether desired by the family or not, the women are often left in a state of severe isolation.

Some take serious measures to combat this. I talked with a woman who said that for a year after she moved, she got on the bus every

morning and went back to her mother's house in the old neighborhood.

The reaction to the loss of home and community can be profound, producing somatic symptoms that are akin to those that accompany the grieving process when a loved one dies (Fried). The isolation such a move produces can have further negative consequences. With the loss of their close network of friends and family, some women begin to place additional demands and expectations on their husbands. The marital relationship is then expected to meet all the needs that were formerly met by a range of relationships. One researcher found this produced such a strain on marriages that a higher than expected percentage of marital separations occurred within a year after the move from city to suburb (Tallman).

Movement from the old neighborhood can be particularly hard on elderly women. Whether it is they or their children who are doing the moving "disruption of the close proximity between aging parents and their married children presents the threat of isolation, loneliness, and insecurity, conditions which familistic neighborhood organizations developed to prevent." (Kornblum)

The importance of the community to the ethnic, working-class women who inhabit it helps to explain why women who see that community to be in jeopardy have stepped out of traditional roles in the past and taken whatever steps were necessary for communal survival. In 1902, for example, a mass demonstration against meat prices on the Lower East Side of New York was led by Jewish women. "The nation's financial metropolis saw angry immigrant women engage in seemingly archaic traditional protest," says historian Gutman. "Outsiders could not understand its internal logic and order. These women did not loot. . . they punished. Custom and tradition that reached far back in historical time gave a coherence to their rage." Tenants associations were formed and rent strikes were carried out by Irish, Italian, and Jewish women (Seller). In 1910, Buffalo's Italian women, supporting their striking husbands, led protest delegations to the offices of the mayor and the chief of police. "The women's goal was bread, not power. . . The political goal of the strike, a closed shop, did not concern them; their children did." (Yans-McLaughlin, p. 250) More recently, the role of women in the Chicago stockyards strike of 1921 and the housing riots after World War II has been examined (Hirsch and Pacyga). Women were prominent in both actions. In the 1921 strike, they battled the police in the streets of their neighborhood and were blamed as the instigators of the violence. On Chicago's South and West Sides after World War II, white ethnic women played a major role in attacking the black families who were the first to integrate the public housing projects. Housing officials who

believed they would circumvent resistance by moving the black families in during the day when the men were at work were taken by surprise by the women's behavior.

There is, then, evidence that ethnic women have on numerous occasions been political activists. Their activities, like men's, have taken on different political directions, sometimes espousing progressive causes, sometimes reactionary; sometimes it has been purposeful and organized; sometimes it has been a spontaneous reaction based on fear, anger, or powerless rage.

Examples of ethnic women's activism in the community are not easy to come by. Two Chicago historians suggest that the reason history has recorded so little of ethnic women's community activism is precisely because those actions were taken in defense of neighborhoods and families. They were communal rather than individualistic actions; consequently, specific participants in those actions were not especially visible (Hirsch and Pacyga).

So there is historical precedent for the community action of ethnic women in recent years. In Chicago, New York, Boston, Baltimore and other cities of the east and midwest, community groups (not always, but frequently from ethnic neighborhoods) have been active on a number of fronts. They have been instrumental in getting utility companies to act more fairly when setting rates or terminating service; they have been participants in the movements that have kept urban renewal projects from destroying neighborhoods of solid housing, have exposed some of the more flagrant abuses by insurance companies, and have reversed the process of urban disinvestment by lending institutions. Congresswoman Barbara Mikulski has referred to these citizen action groups as "one of the bright hopes of this country." And, in most of these efforts women are central and crucial actors (McCourt). As Tillie Tarentino of the National Congress of Neighborhood Women says, "women are the fighters, the ones who really care about the community." (Brightman)

One analyst has recently called attention once again to an old truth, "powerlessness corrupts." "When people feel powerless over any length of time they begin to accept aspects of the world and of themselves that they know to be contrary to their own best interests." (Lerner) The neighborhood or community action movement can be an important antidote to powerlessness. As members of active community groups, some citizens have the experience of being a voice in decision-making, an experience many had feared was lost in a system many had feared was no longer democratic.

Now, one of the major tasks confronting organizers and political and community leaders is the yoking of the activist politics of

grassroots people with a vision that transcends a narrowly defined self-interest and looks to the good of the wider political collectivity.

Conclusion

I must end this paper by saying what I believe cannot be emphasized enough. The problems of Euro-ethnic women are the problems of *all* women, exacerbated by the conditions of class and shaped by a particular historical tradition. Euro-ethnic women are far more like the women of other minority groups than they are different. The passage of an Equal Rights Amendment, the elimination of discrimination and harassment at the workplace, a government and community commitment to quality day care for the young and the elderly would help ease the burdens of ethnic women as they would help all women.

But the problems of individuals will not be resolved until the wider community in which they live becomes a place that offers security and enhances the quality of daily life. And this will not happen until there is some reordering of national priorities. The working-class community would have a better chance of remaining viable if banks and insurance companies could not take finances from the residents and refuse to reinvest them in the community. The working-class community would have a more auspicious future if corporations could not simply close up shop and move a factory or plant to a locale offering lower taxes and cheaper labor.

We noted that ethnic women have played a role in shaping their communities and in maintaining the strength and integrity of their families. But women's lives are not led in isolation. More so than in the middle class the fate of the ethnic working-class woman is bound up with the fate of her neighbors in the community, her co-workers at the workplace, and the other members of her family. Both the history of women and the history of the working class show that there is little individual advancement; progress is made when many members of the collectivity act together to reach shared goals.

REFERENCES

- Baum, C., P. Hyman and S. Micheal. *The Jewish Woman in American*. New York: New American Library, 1977.
- Braverman, Harry. *Labor and Monopoly Capital*. New York: The Monthly Review Press, 1975.
- Brightman, Carol. "The Women of Williamsburg", *Working Papers for a New Society*, Jan-Feb, 1978.
- Femminella, F.S. and J.S. Quadagna, "The Italian American Family" in *Ethnic Families in America* (ed. C. Mindel and R. Habenstein). Elsevier Press, 1976.
- Gans, Herbert. *The Urban Villagers*. New York: Free Press, 1962.

- Greeley, Andrew. *Ethnicity in the United States*. Academic Press, 1974.
- Groneman, Carol. "Working-Class Immigrant Women in Mid-Nineteenth Century New York: The Irish Woman's Experience". *Journal of Urban History*, May 1978.
- Gutman, Herb. *Work, Culture and Society in Industrializing America*, 1976.
- Hirsch, A.R. and D.A. Pacyga, "Defending the Community: The Ethnic Woman as Activist". Paper presented at Conference on the History of Women, The College of St. Catherine, St. Paul, Minn., October 22, 1977.
- Kennedy, R.E., Jr. *The Irish: Emigration, Marriage and Fertility*. University of California Press, 1973.
- Komarovsky, Mirra. *Blue-Collar Marriage*. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.
- Kornblum, William. *Blue-Collar Community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Lerner, Michael. "Surplus Powerlessness," *Social Policy*, Jan-Feb, 1979.
- Maguire, J.F., *The Irish in America, 1868*. Quoted in S. Feldstein and L. Costello, *The Ordeal of Assimilation*. New York: Anchor Books, 1974.
- McCourt, Kathleen. *Working-Class Women and Grassroots Politicians*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977.
- Mikulski, Barbara. "The Ethnic Neighborhood: Leave Room for a Boccie Ball" in *Pieces of a Dream* (M. Wenk, S. Tomasi and G. Baroni, eds.), 1972.
- Novak, Michael, "Confessions of a White Ethnic" in *White Ethnics: Their Life in Working-Class America* (Joseph Ryan, ed). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
- Prosen, Rose Mary, "Looking Back" in *Ethnic Women*. Elsevier Press, 1979.
- Rainwater, Lee, Richard P. Coleman and Gerald Handel. *Workingman's Wife: Her Personality, World and Life Style*. New York: Oceana Publications, 1959.
- Robinson, Lillian S. *Sex, Class and Culture*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978.
- Rubin, Lillian. *Worlds of Pain: Life in the Working-Class Family* 1976.
- Sennett, Richard and Jonathon Cobb. *The Hidden Injuries of Class*. New York: Vintage Books, 1973.
- Sidel, Ruth. *Urban Survival: The World of Working-Class Women*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1978.
- Seifer, Nancy. *Absent from the Majority: Working-Class Women in America*. New York: American Jewish Committee, 1973.

- Seifer, Nancy. *Nobody Speaks for Me: Self-Portraits of American Working Class Women*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976.
- Suttles, Gerald. *The Social Order of the Slum*. — Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Tallman, Irving. "Working-Class Wives in Suburbia: Fulfillment or Crisis?" *J. of Marriage and the Family*, Feb., 1969.
- Warren, Rachele. "The Work Role and Problem Coping: Sex Differentials in the Use of Helping Systems in Urban Communities" Paper presented at American Sociological Assoc. meeting, 1975.
- Yans-McLaughlin, Virginia. *Family and Community*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- Zaretsky, Eli. *Capitalism, the Family and Personal Life*. New York: Harper and Row, 1976.
- Zeublin, Charles. "The Chicago Ghetto" in *Hull House Maps and Papers*. New York: Arno Press Reprint, 1970.

* * *

COMMISSIONER FREEMEN. Thank you very much.

We will now have the replying panel. The first panelist is Galina Suziedelis, a Research Associate at the Center for the Study for PreRetirement and Aging at Catholic University.

In 1978, she served on the President's Commission on Mental Health, working with a panel for the European American subpopulation.

She has participated in numerous panels and forums on women's rights, specializing in issues of Euro-ethnic women, and has written many articles on Euro-ethnic populations and the elderly.

RESPONSE OF GALINA SUZIEDELIS

I thank the Commissioners for the opportunity to sound off.

I wish to respond to two concepts contained in Dr. McCourt's paper.

First, I agree with her that the problems and concerns of ethnic women unfortunately reflect those of all women in general. These problems can be summarized by the following anecdote, if I may be permitted a little bit of levity: It has been said that from cradle to age 20, a woman needs good parents; from age 20 to 40, she needs good looks; from age 40 to 60, she needs a good personality; but from age 60 on, what a woman needs is good money.

In matters of exploitation in the working place, the ethnic woman stands only a notch above the black woman. Evidence shows that the sweatshops of yesterday, even if dealing with space age products, are still very much with us.

Immigrants were, and still are, a good source of cheap labor, and from their ranks the immigrant ethnic woman is the cheapest of them all.

To be a female even in today's society is still often a mixed blessing at best; but research shows that to allow oneself to become an aged female immigrant is not only risky, but downright a mistake. It is a kind of precariousness of existence compounded three times, a case of triple jeopardy. I am referring here to some of the findings regarding women 60 years of age and older from a study we did at Catholic University on eight ethnic groups in the Washington-Baltimore area. ("Informal and Formal Support Systems and Their Effect on the Lives of the Elderly in Selected Ethnic Groups," AOA Grant No 90-A-100, January, 1979.)

They involved the Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Greeks, Italians, Jews, Poles, and Hungarians.

In spite of inner-group supports and close life-long connections, because of longevity, there were more widowed women, more women than men with incomes below \$500 a month, and consequently more women than men stating that they "cannot make it."

There were more women than men with low education, more women living alone, more women unable to assist others not because of lack of desire or generosity, but rather for lack of funds, know-how, and transportation; and, last but not least, we found that more women than men had a low degree of life satisfaction, and that their self-image was largely shaped by their achievements in the area of the family and child-bearing ability. This was sharply and pointedly illustrated by one ethnic woman, who answered the question in regard to her greatest achievement this way: "I guess I have none, since I have no children." And this came from a woman who had had 2 years of college education.

My second response is to the term "ethnic" itself - both the word and the concept.

I strenuously oppose the equation that has been steadily employed throughout this consultation in general and in many individual presentations in particular, namely, the equation between "ethnic" and "working class." Perhaps this is the reason we are experiencing some confusion.

Let us remember again that a culturally bonded group become "ethnic" only when it is outside its original native country. Therefore, just as the members of each country are dispersed along all socio-economic levels at home and still share the same ethnos, so are they represented in the same way in the host country, while still united by the same ethnos, even if separated by dissimilar economic and educational resources.

By now, however, "ethnic" has become a derogatory term, indicating not so much a separate cultural derivation, but more often than not a low-brow mentality, crudeness, ignorance, bigotry, and outright stupidity. This, to me, is the grossest distortion of what we are talking about here.

Ethnicity is not where we go slumming. It is not just exotica, Old World charm. It is not a quaint, old cobblestone street where we occasionally go to partake of some unusual dish, or to hear a strange, but moving song by a costumed balladier.

Ethnicity is an extra dimension of being. And not only that. It is a whole hierarchy of shared meanings, symbols, and values, a hierarchy that exists in reality even after we leave that cobblestone street.

So far, once a person steps up the economic ladder, he or she ceases to be referred to as "ethnic," public opinion presumably being that that person automatically and readily discards all the culture-specific orientations. This is a false presumption. A case in point might be the new immigrants, the so-called refugees, the DP's (I am one myself) who arrived here after World War II as a result of a political absorption of their native lands by a certain foreign power, which shall remain unnamed here. Mostly highly educated, but no longer able to continue their original careers due to language difficulties, these newcomers worked years at menial jobs, and all of them provided their children with higher education; and these same children now are in important, responsible, and creative positions in the larger society, vitally involved and contributing citizens of this country, while at the same time continuing to transmit all of the essential meanings of their particular cultural group to their own offspring.

When I was working on my Master's degree in sociology quite some time ago, I surveyed my own Lithuanian group through a nationwide questionnaire. I found that those who measured high on both pattern maintenance (identification with ethnic group patterns) and adaptation (identification with the host) indices were neither fence straddlers nor fence builders. They were the people who could march in Selma one day, and the next day teach the beauties and complexities of the Lithuanian language to the smallest members of their cultural group.

Why then, you might ask, do they need to belong to a particular group, if they are doing so well? I am convinced that it is because there is an inherent value in such bondings, and the value lies in the function of such groups. In a very important way, they do act as an extended family for its members, and they do perform that very important task of socializing their young for the larger society.

I would like to go on by mentioning some of the some acutely felt needs of these ethnic groups, mainly those that are particular to the elderly women of Euro-cultural background.

Specifically, since they do outlive their mates and as they approach the final cycle of their lives themselves, they experience an urgent need to spend such time in the kind of surroundings that are culturally close and meaningful to them.

I am speaking here particularly of ethnic group nursing homes. In our study a large percentage of men and women stated that they would certainly prefer to have an ethnic staff if they *had to* enter a nursing home.

As I have learned from personal experience, it is a strange and interesting fact that no matter how many languages one acquires, one does eventually revert to the beginnings, that is, one's original mother tongue. My mother could speak Russian, Lithuanian, English, and some French. When she contracted cancer and entered the hospital the first time, she was quite alert and conversed quite ably in English with the nurses. Then, after she became terminally ill, she started talking to them in Lithuanian and was very perturbed when they didn't understand her. Thus the English language ability left her.

When she began to approach the comatose stage but was still conscious, she forgot to speak in Lithuanian and reverted back to her own mother tongue, which was Russian. That is how she died with her last words spoken in Russian.

Therefore I maintain that especially the newcomers, perhaps, when they approach old age and/or become quite old, do not retain the English language, which after all was only an adopted one. When this happens, they really do need the warmth, the close connection, and the security of their own ethnic nursing home or at least ethnic staff who could relate to the needs of these people.

There is also a very great need for research that would substantiate what we are stating here: either new research or a replication of already existing studies in all the major communities containing large culturally diverse groupings. To accomplish this, I urge the Commission to utilize ethnic researchers who are not only well prepared professionally to carry out such research in a most reliable, scientific manner, but enjoy intimate access to their own cultural group as well. This latter qualification is important in order to elicit the greatest cooperation from that group, as well as to ensure the correct interpretation of some of the meanings that might be misconstrued, or undervalued, by researchers outside of the group.

I would like to end my remarks by mentioning a few researchable questions, such as looking into the "desired life versus the actual life" of older Euro-culturally oriented women and perhaps into the impact of raised aspirations of women on the ethnic group itself.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Thank you.

Our second panelist is Dr. Laura Scanlon, a member of the faculty of the New York City Community College, who is also the Director of Project Sister School, a neighborhood based college program for ethnic women.

She is President of the Board of Directors of the National Congress of Neighborhood Women, a member of the Continuing Committee of International Women's Year, a member of the New York City Commission on the Status of Women, and holds a Doctoral degree in curriculum development and women's status.

Dr. Scanlon.

RESPONSE OF LAURA POLLA SCANLON

Thank you. I'm honored to be able to speak to the Commission.

I would like to address myself to Dr. McCourt's paper first by saying that I found it rich and evocative and well written, and to us English teachers, that means a lot.

I would like to focus on one aspect of being an ethnic woman that I feel has been touched on, but perhaps not enough, and that is the dramatic changes that Euro-ethnic women must be going through at this point in time, as are all the rest of the women in this country.

I think the changes are more dramatic for ethnic women because of their intense identification with the family, a role which is being changed even as we utter the words. There's a new dimension to it. We don't know what the future will be for us as women.

If I could be personal, a couple of years ago I went back to Italy, which is where my mother and father came from, and I am the youngest of many children. My mother is now 82-years-old, and I am the only one to return to the homeland.

When I got to that town in the mountains and saw the well that my mother drew water from and watched the other people still tending the sheep on those hillsides, I realized why I have a lot of trouble adjusting to 20th century American society, as an ethnic woman. It is not natural for a human being, I think, to undergo that degree of culture shock.

All right. I am also an ethnic woman who went through other kinds of culture shock, one of them being going to college. Now in my ethnic heritage, going to college for a girl was a bit of an embarrassment. My mother, even though she thought it was a good idea, said things like, "You do it so that you will be able to give your children a fine education. You will be able to raise your children in the right way. You will teach them good things."

Later on, I found myself in the position that I am now in, working with ethnic women who are returning to work and to school. These are predominately Italian-American women like myself who have

been away from school for many, many years, many of them having to leave high school when their parents needed them in the work force, many of them going to work right after high school and then getting married and having their own children, and now confronting the same kinds of changes in role expectation and economic demands that all the rest of the women in 20th century are confronting.

The program that I am directing is located in the community. It is a neighborhood-based college program, which attempts to serve women with a curriculum which is ethnically sensitive to them, which is sensitive to them as women, which is sensitive to their strong commitment to the family, and attempts to make an impact on the neighborhood in which it functions.

When I started working with these women and we discussed why the women went to college, the reasons ranged from "I want to be able to help my children with their homework" to "I want to be smart enough to talk to my husband," and "I want to be smart enough to talk to my children."

No one said, "I want to go because I think it will be a wonderful thing for me." Dr. McCourt touched on just this point: That we do need to find ways for ethnic women to not feel guilty about doing things for their own growth. If we are going to see women, ethnic women, progress and become part of the mainstream, they must have access to education, and one way to do this is to increase the kind of small college idea, whether in the community or in the institution. I happen to prefer the concept of community-based programs for ethnic women. I find that it reduces the alienation and the culture shock that they feel in going into the larger - as Dr. Femminella said yesterday - Anglo-oriented colleges.

There are other areas that need to be attended to, but I wanted to emphasize particularly higher education for ethnic women because, while education for ethnics was mentioned, not enough was mentioned about specific needs of women. Unfortunately, they are not included enough in either ethnic studies or women studies. What we have found is that exploration into the immigration and labors of one's own family history helps to a great extent in building the kind of ego identification that was discussed yesterday, and ought to be introduced into the mainstream of the educational system. We've done it in our college program at the college level for our returning women.

Tilly Olson, an author who wrote after her five children were grown and she could find time to stop working in the factory, speaks eloquently about the silence of the working-class ethnic woman, who just doesn't have time because of the pressures of her life to produce art. We don't yet know what might become of those women. Maybe one thing we might consider are sabbaticals for workers, so that they

would have time to create works of art and literature and music that are at this point excluded from their purview.

In going to college, I opposed not only my mother, but my guidance counselor, who thought I should be a receptionist because I had a nice smile. Today counselors are still apt to steer young women towards traditionally held female jobs, many of them into the pink-collar ghettos, many of them into low-echelon, secretarial, low-skill, dead-end jobs, many of them into, if they are professions, professions which we all know are shrinking, and where there will probably not be jobs. A lot of other needs of ethnic women need to be looked at in terms of how financial aid guidelines, especially with regards to day care and higher education, are drawn by the Federal Government. These are two very specific areas that need to be looked at, because they do exclude working-class women and working-family women. In addition, the Commission might check out the degree to which the CETA funding guidelines are being adhered to in our urban cities, and whether or not in fact they are serving women to the degree that they are intended to by legislation.

Finally, I think that if we could build an ideal society, it would be again a society where we could all feel like we did fit in; and I'm reminded - I'm going to make this quick - reminded of Tilly Olson's story, "I Stand Here Ironing," where she is talking about her daughter and how sad she feels for her daughter, who is not blonde-haired, blue-eyed, tall and thin, but is small and dark and a little foreign-looking. Hopefully we are moving toward a diversity in the culture, that enjoys the darkness, the exotic, the foreign as well as the tall, the thin and the blonde.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Thank you.

Our final panelist is Ms. Jan Peterson, the founder and National Project Director for the National Congress of Neighborhood Women.

She is now working as a psychotherapist and is developing community programs for preschool children and senior citizens.

She has previously worked in the White House Office of Public Liaison and in policy and planning at the Federal agency, ACTION.

Ms. Peterson.

RESPONSE OF JAN PETERSON

What I want to address my remarks today to is the role of women in community. As I said when I started the National Congress of Neighborhood Women some years back, I really did it with my mother in mind, a second generation Scandinavian woman from Minnesota. When the women's movement hit this country and we began to hear about the fact that somehow women were now moving away from the

family and raising children, I heard my mother one day say, "Gee, if I had it to do all over, I guess I shouldn't have done what I did." And I looked at her and I thought, if that's what the women's movement in this country is about or at least the way the media were presenting the women's movement in this country, it's beginning to make women like my mother feel they're needed to be something else.

Here's a movement in one sense that was denouncing the everyday labors of the working-class ethnic women. Indeed, the work that they were doing in their families was often invisible. Even though we have a Mother's Day once a year, a lot of what women do within the home has not been exactly visible.

The fact is over the last number of years women have been itemizing spending time, doing consciousness-raising, itemizing the skills they get out of running a house and then beginning to figure out how to transfer those skills from their home into the job market.

I think what we are seeing is that for most working-class ethnic women, the major parts of their life are their family and their community.

Yet those roles have not been represented by the media, if you think about this and look at the media today. Even though we're now beginning to get some new images of ethnic women in the media, I don't ever see - I have not seen on the media - working-class ethnic women that are involved in their communities. That whole image of what women do in the community is not there, so that a lot of what women are doing every day, doesn't seem fundamentally important. Therefore, as Kathleen McCourt was saying, women are now searching for equal opportunity within the society.

They're going to look for power some place, shape or form for the working-class ethnic woman. One of the places that women are beginning to search for power is within their communities.

We know that women are now playing major roles in keeping their communities alive, in providing the social services within their community and for raising the money for schools, political clubs, and most of the social services. The money is raised by women's fund-raising efforts within those communities because they don't have Government subsidies, and women have been playing major roles in doing all of this.

Yet there is very little support for such unpaid volunteer community services now that women are beginning to look for support for themselves. Also, they're hearing the women's movement again say, well, don't be a volunteer, because being a volunteer means you're going ripped off, because one has not talked about the fact that obviously there's tremendous satisfaction that one can get in taking on

leadership within one's community and developing programs and raising money if we begin to see that that's what we're doing.

And we have just finished a very interesting research piece that I wanted to mention today to the Commission. In many of the neighborhood movements and the ethnic movements and the women's movement, we begin to see that women are playing these major roles in the community, but we're not beginning to understand what's happening to the women that are doing that.

And we've just finished a research paper that was done by Wendy Sherman and Barbara Spence showing that even though women had played major roles in the communities, the more Federal dollars had gone into a community and the longer the Federal dollars had flowed into the community, the more women lost power. And we itemize out that what's happening is that they lose power in very definable ways. Before the Federal dollars went in, the women may have chaired organizations, mediated a task force, done a certain kind of organizing, and done a whole bunch of empowering activities. As the Federal dollars flowed in over time, women began to do those activities less. And why I said I wanted to concentrate on this role of women in neighborhoods – if we're saying that we want to begin to validate new roles for women which is saying that it's all right to stay within the home and in the community – we have to talk about how do you support women being able to choose that, which means that we have to begin to understand that even if those women are choosing that and they're being undermined there, we have to figure out what we're going to do about that.

The fact is that where Federal dollars are flowing the women's roles are being undermined. By the way, this shouldn't be too astounding, because of our aid in State Department monies that flowed abroad to developing countries. We had to develop the Percy Amendment because we found out that as we put our money abroad, we didn't see the economic roles that women were playing in other societies because of our male biases and that we totally were eroding the roles that women were playing there.

We learned that from abroad; it's obviously true for our developing neighborhoods in this country.

But we also found that out that when we analyzed, asked women within organizations, in communities; and we're talking about male and female organizations that are involved in improving their communities.

What their priorities are versus the priorities of the organization were different. Women's needs are not being addressed in our neighborhoods.

And again, it's partly due to what Kathleen and Laura talked about: Women don't put their own selves first. Not only don't they put their own selves first, but they hardly put themselves forth at all. This can be seen in many women's organizations. I've sat in on many meetings – that's what I do all the time is organizing with women who are leaders in communities – and they talk about playgrounds and they talk about senior citizens and they talk about themselves, because they almost culturally have been conditioned not to look at themselves. It takes tremendous push and effort to get the women to say, "Hey, what I really like to do. . ."

But if you talk long enough, there are several things that come up almost all the time. One is women are saying they just need basic information – basic information. They feel totally cut off from getting just clear information about what other women are doing. They don't know what's available for them to do. They're out of the mainstream flow of information. Women are less mobile. They're tied. When we talk about being tied to your family and community, it means you don't get around; you don't get into the flow of information.

Education comes up second. They want a chance to learn. That doesn't mean that they have to have degrees, but they want a chance to learn. They want a chance to learn in a way that doesn't have to be totally threatening to them, which is why we developed the college motto that we did. Should they have to leave their homes and communities in order to go to college? We want a chance to learn in our own environment and to be able to be part of that.

And three is that they obviously are looking at the issues of violence against women in neighborhoods, which comes up over and over and over. We need to deal with the hidden issues that we can't talk about for all the reasons that Kathleen made out in her paper.

So one of the – and the third point is that if women begin programs in communities, that they do it differently than if men begin programs, that they always have a social service component, and if we're understanding, and I think one of the things – the things that we're beginning to understand and talk about – most of the people in this room have talked about it in their papers and been saying it – is that the Government no longer knows how to operate programs that work.

So all of a sudden, since there's no money, they're saying, okay, you out there in the neighborhoods, can participate. It's about time that the people in the communities run their own things – of course, but we don't have any money.

Why is it that women have been doing social service in the communities all along, and they have had tremendous networks, but we've never built on those networks that the women have? Take for instance the day care programs, a big failure. We came up with a

model, and we said this is now going to be the day care program for the country, and we've put it in the neighborhood. We said here it is, and you can't get jobs in it even if you're the most wonderful day care provider in the community, because you don't have an MFW and you don't have an early childhood education diploma, and besides, we're not going to allow you the educational opportunities so you can get it so you can work in it, and even though you developed it and organized it and got the money and wrote the funds and did all this, you can't be in it when it comes. So a lot of people in the day care programs were educated but lacking in the sensitivity and personal concern that would have evolved had women within their own communities become involved.

I'm suggesting that the women's movement must begin to be more sensitive to class and ethnicity. We've got to begin to look at how we empower women where they're at, which means to begin to allow them to design their own programs in their own community, especially middle age women on up in ethnic communities.

I'm supporting Kathleen McCourt's outlook on working class women in ethnic neighborhoods. We must look at those women and how we can provide support. Jobs aren't available for most middle-aged and older women, besides the fact that they're tied to their family community and are not mobile, because the family comes first. Most jobs are just not available to them, which is why a lot of women work in the sweatshops with non-unionized salaries, so they can go home and see how their kids are at noon and stuff like that.

One of the ways we can move is to give women the power to build their own institutions and their communities, which they're beginning to do. Also we can begin education services so that the women can begin to get the necessary training and educational support so they can build on the skills they already have. But first we have to recognize that the wealth of the skills the women have out in those communities have been keeping them alive and going, and we need to let them know that we know what they're doing, so that there's some kind of national sanction and view so that they can begin some self-appreciation.

So that's just one thing.

I think that we need to look for a Federal impact. We need to have a Federal impact statement on all Federal dollars that flow through communities and we have to begin to look at what role women do play in the staffing of those organizations, on the board of those organizations, and how is the program designed in terms of how it will have an impact on women, because I don't think anybody thinks about how they design their programs in relationship to women.

I think that we need to change the guidelines in terms of CETA, day care, education, scholarships. Right now, if you're married, and your husband works, you cannot get to become a CETA worker; you cannot get the college scholarship, and you can't get your child in the day care center unless you lie and say your husband is gone. And the fact is that the guidelines that we now have work against women being able to find their own power and to get jobs and to be able to get the services that they need.

I would say that my mother, now a volunteer in a nursing home, would be the most marvelous organizer you ever saw if we began to have a world that began to perceive her skills and many of the skills of women in those neighborhoods, and that was really what I mainly wanted to address myself to, but I think there's a new women's movement beginning, that will work towards helping women integrate their work for the community and their home life.

Thank you.

DISCUSSION

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Thank you.

This has been a very provocative panel.

Unfortunately, during these last two days, we have not had an opportunity to have enough interaction because of time limitations.

I'd like to just comment on the statement that was made concerning the media. The Civil Rights Commission has released or did two studies on window dressing on the set, and especially highlighting the stereotyping of minorities and women in television. We did an update, and we pointed out the lack—that one of the major problems is the lack of minorities and women in decision-making positions. In other words, the show is produced, but if there are no women who have an opportunity to determine what is produced, then that is itself a factor.

I would just like to make one request concerning those guidelines in need of change. The guidelines are published in the Federal Register, as you know with the respect to CETA and day care centers. Would the members of the organizations that are represented here today, make specific recommendations for the changing of the guidelines and submit copies of such comments for the Commission.

And if you'd just make a quick comment—

Ms. PETERSON. Well, I think one is that we're talking about changing either the income requirements and broadening the amount

of income that a person can have or beginning to look at women as unemployed people if they don't have their own income.

I mean it certainly was true – by the way, we just had a big visit of a group from China, women from China, and they said that the number one factor for eliminating battering and rape within the home in China was women having their own economic base, and I think that comes up all the time.

So somehow, we have to look at women differently if they're – they're all working, but not being paid for the work they do.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Let me say, number one, I think you're a most impressive panel. I think the points you have made are long overdue, and I have been disturbed for years that the women's movements seem to be primarily an upper-class movement and an upper-middle-class movement but some of the letters that I have received when the Commission had endorsed the ERA, came from working women, who correctly said, "What are you doing for us when we're down here in the ranks lifting things in factories and everything else?" So I'm delighted with what all of you are doing in your respective roles.

What I'd like the Staff Director to do to round out this testimony it to secure from the Office of Education the actual guidelines that exist with reference to the various Federal financial aid programs, – grant, loan, work-study – that relate to part-time students, working women, etcetera. I think that is a tremendously important point if we are going to provide access to educational opportunities at the community college level and the senior college level.

Number two, on your point, Miss Scanlon, on working-class sabbaticals, is a very interesting idea, which has been utilized in Germany, France and Scandinavia, primarily for workers undergoing retraining for new jobs before they appear, but when people know what the jobs they are now in are being phased out.

It came up with the Common Market, et cetera.

A number of us have advocated that idea. I think 1970 was when I first advocated it. A number of us met on it. We hoped to pay those entitlements out of the Unemployment Trust Fund; then the nation hit a junior grade depression in the early 1970's that scotched that idea, but I think the concept of an entitlement for a citizen to a certain amount of education and training in certain ways, anytime in their lifetime, a one-time entitlement, whether you have four years or whatever, and you can cash it in anytime, is an idea that is definitely worth pursuing and long overdue.

My only query to all of you, based on your experience in working with working women, would be what have you found to be their educational patterns after the community college level? Is there any

study you have done or any tracking, or personal experience and insight, which you could share with the Commission as to how many working women have gone on from community college into senior institutions of higher education?

Ms. SCANLON. May I respond?

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Sure.

Ms. SCANLON. From our college program that the National Congress of Neighborhood Women has been running now for 4 years, about 200 students by this point or by January will have graduated. Approximately half of them, I would say, go into 4 year institutions, and those that don't tend to go into jobs in the community. Many of them in social service work. Lots of them, also, are older women who do not wish to work but who then go into other kinds of community involvement and community activities and volunteer work.

Ms. PETERSON. The purpose of our program was geared toward helping women become more effective in their neighborhood activities more than it was geared toward work, so they have now built their own institutions and are working.

That was not our original plan, but they're doing it.

Ms. SCANLON. And many of them do create their own institutions in the sense of writing grants and developing projects and working in them.

I do want to just add one more thing, though, and that is that one of the things that our students do experience is peer support since our college model is based upon this. It's totally peer counseling, peer tutoring, peer everything. The women form study groups and work together. They support each other, because they're very intimidated by the idea of formal education. So this gets them through.

Some of the students going into the 4-year schools with that base of support feel that they can handle it, but they are not happy in those institutions, I might say.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. May I join with my colleagues, Commissioner Freeman and Commissioner Horn in expressing to you our gratitude for the kind of presentation that has been made here.

And I agree with Commissioner Horn that you have identified the issues that definitely need to be identified and certainly issues that will be given very careful consideration by the Commission.

Thank you, very, very much.

Sixth Session: Employment and Ethnicity

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Mr. Daniel E. Leach is presently the Vice Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. He has

appeared as a witness before this Commission on a number of occasions. Prior to joining the EEOC, he was General Counsel to the Majority Party in the United States Senate. He has been a trial attorney with the Department of Justice, Professor of Law and in private practice.

Welcome again.

**STATEMENT OF DANIEL E. LEACH,
VICE CHAIRMAN, EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYMENT,
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

MR. LEACH. Thanks, Vice Chairman Horn.

It's a pleasure again to appear before the United States Commission on Civil Rights.

I am here to discuss the question of ethnicity and employment, and of course EEOC must address this issue in the context of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act enacted back in 1964, amended in 1972 and again in 1978, a statute that is designed to end job discrimination based upon race, color, sex, religion, national origin, and to bring those previously excluded from the work place hopefully into the mainstream of the economy, and seeking to administer this law, I think it is most important that the Government do so, that EEOC does so, both with the reality and the perception that it is being done with an even-handed and fair approach to all victims of discrimination.

I have some observations to make on the issues that this Commission is presently addressing, and I would say at the outset that by and large, these issues, as they affect the various bases of discrimination that emerge under Title VII, transcend the Act in a way that makes them general principles, so to speak, in terms of their impact on the various protected groups who fall within our mandate.

It would appear that in the first place, employers have constructed some specific barriers to the hiring of minorities – and as I use it, that term should apply to all ethnic divisions affected by discrimination. The barriers apply mainly in areas of testing and other screening devices and in the area of recruitment as well.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has found a decided increase in recent years in total paper and pencil test usage and a marked increase in doubtful testing practices, which based on our experience tend to have discriminatory effects.

The same is true of arbitrary height requirements or weight requirements which may affect specific ethnic groups to one extent or another.

In many cases, employers have been relying almost exclusively on these tests as the basis for making the decision to hire, to transfer or to promote.

Candidates frequently experience disproportionately high rates of rejection by failing to attain score levels or whatever has been established as minimum standards for qualification.

This may be a valid and acceptable practice, but too often we've found that employers have been using tests that have not been shown to be predictors of job performance.

This is a critical issue under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. Even now, paper and pencil tests, height requirements, degree requirements and a host of other filters are used. Some are used legitimately; others are used as the devices that continue to serve to filter or screen out certain "types" of people for jobs or for promotions.

Recruitment barriers are just as serious. For new hires, employers or incumbent employees are likely to contact only their friends and associates, the buddy-buddy practice that so often serves to eliminate many "types" of candidates of whatever the ethnic background happen to be.

This still occurs and it may well depend on where the hiring net is thrown, be it toward the local high school or college, or in the direction of a particular suburb or a particular part of the city.

And the discriminatory effect continues on downstream. It doesn't stop with initial hiring.

It should be noted that job discrimination on account of ethnic stereotypes often operates in three dimensions: discrimination in hiring; and even if hired, discrimination in the form of segregated or unequal initial job assignments; and after assignment, discrimination in job progression, in the advancement and promotional opportunities that relegate minority workers too often to less desirable and lower paid positions.

Of course, there are pockets of progress. Some ethnic minorities are gaining increased skills through education and training. And some employers or industries are endeavoring to respond to the mandate of Title VII.

But by and large government must continue to press against these barriers, strike them down and prod and push and pull and at times order industry to undertake remedial and affirmative action.

That is my perception of EEOC's work; it is what I have experienced in 3 1/2 years with the Commission.

Part of the answer, I suppose, rests with measures that serve to identify the barriers, measures such as our uniform guidelines on employee selection. These are the standards set by Government, all agencies in this business, to inform employers as to their legal responsibilities in seeking to gauge individuals and their fitness for hiring or promotion.

It has been the use of tests or other devices or standards that are not properly job related or justified that has so adversely affected the hiring, promotion and transfer prospects of all categories of minorities.

The courts have been generous in finding unlawful discrimination where these tests have not been validated, where they don't evince a high degree of job relatedness. Further, the employer giving or acting upon the results of the particular tests must be able to demonstrate that suitable alternative selection procedures are unavailable. While a violation of the uniform selection guidelines may serve to identify unlawful job discrimination, these guidelines do contain a provision that offers encouragement to employers who have sought to respond voluntarily.

Embraced within the guidelines is the so-called bottom-line clause that says that even where an employer can't validate a selection procedure, government will not take action if, in a general sense, it appears that notwithstanding the infraction, those who have been left out or kept down in that employer's work force are being brought in and moved up. In other words there may be a technical violation of the law, but employers endeavoring to correct the effects of job discrimination ought to be encouraged. That's the message of the "bottom line."

Beyond employee selection procedures there are other recent developments that your Commission, the Civil Rights Commission, ought to be looking at. The Weber, Kaiser, Steelworkers case, I think, is relevant to this dialogue. There, you will recall, the Supreme Court placed its stamp of approval on voluntary affirmative action programs as a way of bringing blacks into the economic mainstream, but that decision probably applies to Hispanics and to any others who as a group or class can demonstrate a pattern of discrimination against them.

To briefly review those facts and that holding, let me say that until 1974, the Kaiser Aluminum Company hired, as craft workers, for its Gramercy, Louisiana plant, only persons who already had prior craft experience. As a result, there were, in that particular environment, very few blacks in craft jobs, in part, at least, as the Supreme Court Opinion specifically noted, because blacks had long been excluded from construction craft unions in that area. Perhaps in other parts of the nation it could be another group that been barred. In 1974, Kaiser and the Steelworkers entered into a collective bargaining agreement which changed the practice throughout the country with respect to craft jobs.

Rather than hiring from the outside, Kaiser established a training program to train its production workers to fill craft positions. The agreement provided for separate seniority lists - one black, one white -

with the provision that at least 50 percent of the new trainees would be black until the black percentage of craft workers approximated the percentage of blacks in the SMSA work force. As a result of the agreement, some blacks selected for training had less plant seniority than some of the whites whose bids were rejected.

Brian Weber was one of those whites. He brought suit; the rest is history. While Title VII protects whites as well as blacks, the Court ruled that the plan at stake did not violate the Act because it was an affirmative action plan voluntarily adopted by private parties to eliminate – and I underscore these words – traditional patterns of segregation in employment. While this case should bring to a halt those cries of so-called reverse discrimination uttered in the face of such a long-standing and continuing national blight, that's the way the Supreme Court saw it.

But on this score, I think the verdict is still out. The primary concern of Congress in prohibiting job discrimination was the lowly plight of those in our economy who had been riveted to unskilled and semi-skilled positions – whether it was because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin. The statute was to open up job opportunities, to bring people into the economic mainstream.

What does *Weber* mean in the context of a response to be fashioned by employers? I think it means that employers, without fear of retribution, can train minorities, all minorities, all categories of people for greater participation in the work force. This could mean the inclusion of minorities in occupations from which they have historically been excluded, and perhaps some white-collar jobs, in management, particularly in the upper echelons of management and in upper economic sales jobs.

Government, I think, must do everything it can to encourage employers to take advantage of the *Weber* ruling, and I look forward to the views of this Commission on this issue as it deals in the context of this particular dialogue.

Still another potential weapon that the Government has in its hands is our authority to identify and eliminate patterns and practices of job discrimination. We know from the statistical data that while the old slogan may no longer be visible; “Anglo-Males Only Need Apply,” it still is operating to the detriment of others, many others. Government must better use its power to identify these barriers, which I spoke of earlier, and strike them down.

At EEOC, we are seeking to construct a systemic enforcement program that will help to marshal our resources in a fair and logical manner, taking aim, for example, at the very worst practices in our economy and in our society, in order to achieve the greatest results.

For this purpose, we're just beginning to use this research base of ours as a law enforcement tool, to make more critical and rational judgments about where our resource allocations might make their most effective impact, whether it's in a particular industry, with regard to a given employer, or on a given issue, or geographically, or however job discrimination arises and against whom.

While the Commission brings numerous actions against employers who perpetuate policies and practices that result in low utilization of all available minorities, we have not done enough. Neither have the other elements of the Federal Government who are in this same business. And I guess what this all says is that while Congress has given us some tools to fight employment discrimination, and to attack it institutionally, we are just recently learning how to mount a more effective effort.

Government is trying to do better. I think President Carter's civil rights reorganization plan says that. Also saying it are those strategies fashioned to encourage voluntary compliance with Title VII, whether it's the "bottom line" of the testing guidelines or voluntary affirmative action, as exhibited by the *Weber* ruling, or targeting employers on a worst-first priority basis.

I think we must encourage those who seek to comply and begin to scrutinize more carefully those who appear not to. But these are only the seeds that may lead employers in the 1980's to restructure their work places to meet the demands of the law and national policy.

More immediate is the present, and this is no simple task. There are many questions. There appear few, if any answers. There is traditional resistance. There is political resistance. There is the economy. We appear headed for a period of economic decline. In the past, unemployment has been borne disproportionately on the backs of minorities. Those that entered the work force last are the first to go.

Balance and equity must be struck and to that end, there are many obstacles. I look forward to any recommendations that this Commission might offer as a result of this dialogue, and particularly on the question of layoffs, work sharing, whatever else might be required to mitigate this apparent period of economic downturn.

Thank you very much.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Thank you, Mr. Leach.

We will now move to our next panelist, Mr. Leonard F. Walenty-nowicz, who is the National Executive Director of the American Polish Congress.

He has been a practicing trial attorney for a quarter of a century, a Professor of Law for a decade. He filed briefs in both the Bakke and the *Weber* cases on behalf of the Polish-American Congress and the National Advocate Congress and the National Advocate Society,

which is an organization of Polish-American attorneys. He served in the administration of President Ford for two years as Administrator of the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.

**STATEMENT OF LEONARD F. WALENTYNOWICZ,
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, POLISH AMERICAN
CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D.C.**

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ Fine. I'd like to summarize that material, and I'd also like to give you some observations I've made while sitting listening to what was going on here yesterday and today.

It's my first appearance before the Commission, and I want to especially thank Mr. White and other members of the Commission, in particular the Chairman, Mr. Flemming, for their efforts to make my appearance a reality.

The first thought that I'd like to express to the audience and the Commission is the belief that the most important thing the Commission can do to help solve a lot of these problem areas, whether it's housing, women's social needs and so forth, is to seriously address this problem of employment and ethnicity. To the extent that we get the groups that we're talking about here today, Euro-ethnics, and more specifically Americans of South European or East European origin - involved in the decision-making process, the better the results will be in the areas we have been discussing. This especially includes employment, not only employment in blue-collar work, which we have been traditionally identified with, but also employment in all job categories.

This is why I differ with Mr. Leach. I think Title VII addresses itself to all job categories, not only to lower income job categories.

To the extent we get people from the grounds affected and involved in the nursing industry, and to the extent that we get Judges of East European and South European background involved in such issues as busing, the better the results will be. That's the question that was asked by you, sir, Mr. Horn, yesterday: - How do you get the community to accept, cooperate, and respond? Well, I think decisions can not only be made a lot more acceptable, but you'll find a lot better solutions to many of the difficult and sometimes almost insoluble problems facing us today, if you stop disregarding the grounds we are discussing today.

We will do better if we receive inputs from these groups, what I call, the new classes of left-outs.

And with those preliminary comments, let me paraphrase my statement here.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, speaking for the Polish-American Congress and reflecting what I believe are the sentiments of many Americans of Euro-ethnic origins, I wish to

express our sincere appreciation for this opportunity to present our concerns and views with respect to the subject matter of this hearing.

As we previously indicated, civil rights have long been dear to the hearts and minds of people of Polish and other Euro-ethnic background and tradition, and if anything, are more so with those who are or who will become United States citizens.

We claim no special privilege to speak out on human rights, including civil rights, but we believe that a full and fair examination of our history, both here in America and where our roots originated, will confirm that we also know of the suffering as well as the other devastating effects that discrimination, defamation, and denial of other civil and human rights cause .

What is somewhat unique is that much of this discrimination that we suffered, and still do suffer, has occurred within the context of one race, while this Commission's attention, and including the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's attention, has at least up to now been focused primarily, if not entirely, on discrimination between races, sexes, and people of differing color.

This preoccupation, however, is not unique to this Commission, for it pervades much of the Federal bureaucracy as well as the judicial, executive and legislative branches of government, generally.

What is most unfortunate is that such preoccupation creates mixed feelings of cynicism, neglect, resentment, and alienation, resulting from a belief that our Government is paying lip service to a declared policy of prohibiting without favor and priority discrimination based on race, color, creed, sex, and national origin, but our Government is only acting to overcome and remedy discrimination based on race, color and sex. This feeling is further compounded by the manner in which the concept of affirmative action has evolved and the fashion in which data is being collected and analyzed. This feeling is further exacerbated by the difficult economic circumstances America is presently facing and the failure of many of our institutions to allow for other significant American values and groups in our effort to fight discrimination and the effects thereof.

Thus, we welcome heartily the recent enactment to the Civil Rights Act of 1957 of Section 104(G), known legislatively as Senate 721, which in substance directs this Commission to study policies and practices regarding discrimination and affirmative action and how they affect Americans of East European and South European origin. We wish to thank Senator Jesse Helms and Congresspersons Barbara Mikulski and Donald Edwards for their help in having this legislation passed. We similarly welcome this consultation and we hope that this is just the beginning of a nationwide effort to ensure that our nation's commitment to civil and human rights is fairly and evenly applied and

is not distorted by claims of priority and lack of resources. To repeat, we hope this consultation doesn't finish your interest; instead we hope this is just the beginning.

It is not the responsibility of this paper to cover the broad spectrum of civil and human rights to which all Americans are entitled to, but I make general observations so that my comments on employment and ethnicity may be better understood. Employment and ethnicity can be approached from a number of directions. But given the brief amount of time available for me, because of the nature of this consultation, I think it is best to start from the viewpoint of data collection and the use such data is put to.

For mixed reasons, not all sensible and acceptable, the Federal Government presently collects data regarding employment policies and practices in five categories: black, Hispanic, native American, Asian American and white, other than Hispanic, categories which are repeated for both sexes.

The best examples are the EEOC reporting forms, and - if I may digress for a moment - the importance of these forms is that they reflect Government standards for data collection and analysis. The Federal Government says this is what we are going to do, and everybody naturally follows. Not that one has to follow; perhaps one can independently create other categories, but one follows because not to do so would cost more money, cause a variety of other problems including the possible denial of Federal funds, or what have you. So what developed is a mentality that only five categories count in America. To put in another way, the only categories that we use in deciding who gets jobs and who doesn't get jobs, or who gets Federal monies and who doesn't get Federal monies, who gets educational opportunities and who doesn't get educational opportunities are just those five categories.

And that problem is further confounded and compounded by the use of the term "minorities." I've never found - I've been searching the law for a long time - where the word "minority" is clearly defined. I've also been searching the regulations for a clear definition of the word "minority," and I can't find it. So the word "minority" is used as a code word. It's used to mask different things, depending on how a person wants to use it and what groups he wants to please.

Nevertheless in practice and reality, these are the five categories that count. Over the years, in the efforts to fight discrimination and promote affirmative action, there has occurred a belief that persons in the first four categories have been the victims of discrimination and deserve the benefits of affirmative action, regardless of personal circumstances, and that everyone in the last category either was guilty of discrimination or had to suffer the consequences of providing the

benefits of affirmative action for the persons in the first four categories – and guess in which of those categories we ethnics are?

As we pointed out in the briefs we filed in the United States Supreme Court in the Bakke and Weber cases, such restricted data collection and the use, and the beliefs, and practices resulting therefrom are fundamentally unfair and violate the civil rights of a good many Americans, including a good number of Euro-ethnics, especially those in the last category.

I make the last qualification so that you don't misunderstand my remarks in light of your use of the term Euro-ethnics. I would consider such term equally applicable to people from Spain. People from Spain, of course, are included in a separate category called Hispanic.

Such limited data collection is harmful in a number of respects. For example, a person in any of the four favored categories claiming job discrimination can readily fortify his case by data indicating disparity between the number of persons of his category actually employed in the job by the employer and the number available for employment. That is the SMSA statistic that Mr. Leach referred to. However, a Polish-American, Italian-American, or Slavic-American doesn't have this data available to him. In other words, if he wants to prove a case of discrimination, he doesn't have a ready body of data supplied by the government without expense to him to fortify his case of discrimination. Yet the people in the first four categories have that. So it's much more difficult for a person in this type of situation to prove his case of discrimination, and that's without addressing the impact of Affirmative Action. I'm just talking about a typical case of discrimination.

How absurd some of this preoccupation can get is the recent enactment by Congress of the Small Business Administration Section 8 minority program. There, blacks, Hispanics are definitely established as beneficiaries of the Section 8 program. Then apparently for constitutional and political reasons there is a clause that says in effect, "Well, if you can prove that you're a member of a different group that is socially, culturally, or economically disadvantaged, you can also get the benefit of Section 8 programs." But how can a small businessman, such as an Italian, Ukrainian or what have you, spend money he doesn't have to collect the data to provide it? So it's a Catch-22. It's an absurdity, an illusion. It says others can have the benefits of the program so as to ameliorate for political reasons the fact that really only two groups have been given the benefits of the program. It creates the illusion for the person who is non-black or non-Hispanic that he can have benefits immediately, if he can prove the need and then ironically and cruelly the Government doesn't make the data available for him to prove it. It says, "You go out there and find it yourself." How can the small businessman who's looking for a 60 or 70

thousand dollar loan spend an equal amount of money to prove that he's being discriminated and needs the benefits under a Section 8 program? It becomes even more absurd when one considers that the government concentrates its data collection on the two groups that automatically qualify for Section 8 benefits.

Another example of gross unfairness involves Affirmative Action. There has developed over the years a belief that numerical disparity alone requires Affirmative Action to lock each of the favored groups into almost every job category, particularly those jobs reflecting upward mobility. One prime example is the appointment of Federal judges, where a tremendous effort has and is being made to appoint blacks, Hispanics, and women. Yet no effort is being made to appoint Polish-Americans and other like ethnic Americans, even though a cursory examination of the judicial lists will reveal a dearth of individuals from these groups.

There was a young lady or perhaps professor that talked earlier about litigation. Well, part of the reason that litigation doesn't achieve satisfactory results many times is because the judges that are deciding the cases don't reflect the values or don't have any appreciation or feel for what's going on out there in the community. And that's why I compliment the black community and Hispanic community and women for attempting to get more judges, especially Federal judges. I take no umbrage at that effort, but while we're making that effort, I say we should make an equal effort to see about the other groups. As we have repeatedly stated, we take no offense, and we generally support members of the favored groups trying to improve themselves, provided we are also treated fairly and given the same consideration.

Essentially, our problem is in the area of employment. We are not being treated fairly; nor are we being given the same considerations. A mind set that has been created, that only those in the favored category should benefit from Affirmative Action and cannot be guilty of discrimination, however that term from time to time may be defined, while those in the last category must suffer the consequences of this type of Affirmative Action, regardless of whether they discriminated or were the victims of discrimination themselves. And this, from a Euro-ethnic point of view and my point of view violates an equally important principle of American justice, namely - If there is a harm done, then the people who have caused the harm should be the ones that should provide the remedy. Why should people who have fought like the devil for the civil rights of other Americans, black, Hispanic and others - and still do fight for such rights - be asked now to accept present concepts of Affirmative Action, that in effect says, "Well, you can't have this job simply because the Government doesn't care

enough to count you or doesn't even care enough to take a look at what your conditions of employment are."

Perhaps what is most amazing is that these categories were established without any concern as to the status of groups such as Polish-Americans in American society. As a result, job opportunities and the upward mobility of such groups has been seriously and adversely affected.

Accordingly, and as a first step, we recommend that the Government direct that additional separate categories be created for groups such as Polish-Americans, Italian-Americans and so forth. Much of the authority for such action is already available such as Circular No. 846 issued by the Office of Management and Budget on May 12, 1977, even though such circular is being disregarded in practice. I know about that circular. For it was issued after a long consultation with mid-level Government employees at OMB after I left government service. But to get the rest of the bureaucracy to respond to it - my God, it's like pulling teeth.

The Census Bureau has advised us that the Government has developed the computer capability of handling several hundred different categories so that the persistent claim that it would be unwieldy to create and handle more than the five categories that are currently fashionable can be dismissed as pure obstructionism and just another form of discrimination.

Let me again digress for a moment. If we did create additional categories and if the information showed that groups such as Polish-Americans and Italian-Americans are not doing so bad but instead are doing pretty good, don't you think that that perception would help secure the kind of consensus we need to help those groups that are not doing too good?

This alienation and unfairness is part of the tension. When I heard people talk about tensions and intergroup conflict earlier, I felt that's part of it.

Polish-Americans and other like ethnics condemn as hypocrisy and insult Government policies and proclamations that encourage them to take pride in their roots and preserve their separate identity when it comes to culture - or, as some other person put it here, the three F's - you know, food, festivals and famous heroes. And yet, at the same time, when it comes to employment, educational opportunities, and Federal funds, we are lumped into a category originally labeled as "other." I take offense to that. I'm not an "other." Or a "none of the above." Do you want to be called a "none of the above?"

And then finally, because of the insulting nature of those labels - and I say this without any offense, because the Census Bureau considers the Hispanic community 95 percent white - we were then lumped into

the category labeled "White, other than Hispanic." Is this really an improvement or just another insult? I mean, how do I get my identity by reference to someone else's identity?

We also wonder about the equanimity of Government policies that permit Hispanics to identify themselves as Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Cuban-Americans and so forth, but deny me the same right. I can't be identified in Government statistics as a Polish-American, and other Euro-ethnics can't be identified as an Italian-American and so forth. I wrote to the EEOC months ago about this. Got no reply. Offered to sit down with them. Got no reply. That's part of what we mean when we talk about tensions.

At this time, when jobs are being increasingly distributed at all levels on the basis of numbers, and the belief that equality of result is more important than equality of opportunity becomes more widespread, it is important that each group that makes up this brilliant mosaic called America be separately identified and counted so that it does not end up being left out or locked out or the victim of new, albeit perhaps unintended, patterns of discrimination.

The dynamics of employment and ethnicity are quite complex, and this paper is not intended to be a total review of this area, but simply an effort to illustrate different perceptions and create new attitudes and better initiatives and solutions in this difficult problem area.

I know I come on hard, because that's the way I've been taught as a trail lawyer, but I intend you no offense. I hope all of you understand that. I want to work— we want to work together. We just don't want to be left out. Hear me.

Contrary to what has been said previously in some places, no group needs to be a target group or bear the brunt of Affirmative Action. Instead we need new initiatives, such as the one we suggested in our brief in the *Weber* case. We don't want to only complain. We like to suggest constructive results or programs. We don't say we know it all, but we like to offer help.

We set it forth Affirmative Action based on a point system in the *Weber* case. We said, look, Affirmative Action, as it is presently being conceived and executed, shuts some people out. It's a new form of exclusion. Instead of doing that, when a person really has a case of discrimination — and there are many — and I think Irv said it clearly that the blacks have a unique situation here — let's give them and anyone else that qualifies, extra help like we did veterans, a point system. We identify the people, identify the groups and so forth, and we give them some help in that way.

This idea should be explored, not only to correct glaring deficiencies in present Affirmative Action practices, but also to respond to such issues as to how long should Affirmative Action continue,

whether Affirmative Action should continue to be available to recent immigrants, refugees, and other arrivals – something that perhaps you, Vice Chairman Horn, would be interested in as part of immigration law reform – and the impact of present Affirmative Action policies on such values as initiative, hard work, and competition.

I think a point system would not harm initiative, hard work, and competition as the present system does. I think you would still essentially maintain these other fundamental American values.

For a fuller appreciation of our concerns, I would like to submit for the Commission's consideration, as Exhibit 1, copies of testimony and presentations we made regarding the 1980 census, the so-called Sugarman proposals, before the Civil Service Commission, the EEOC, and comments on Congressional employment, SR 431, as well as our briefs from *Bakke* and *Weber*.

EXHIBIT A

STATEMENT OF LEONARD F. WALENTYNOWICZ, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS REGARDING THE 1980 CENSUS

Mr. Chairman and members of this Committee: On behalf of the Polish American Congress and its President, Mr. Aloysius A. Mazewski, who is unable to be here today because of other pressing commitments in Rome, Italy, I wish to extend our sincere appreciation for this opportunity to express our concerns and views with respect to the subject matter of this hearing.

Americans of Polish heritage view the coming 1980 Census with mixed feelings. We support enthusiastically the constitutional requirement that there be a Census periodically for the reasons cited in the findings and purposes set forth in the Census Act of 1977. These include such purposes as the need for accurate information to plan and analyze policies and to allocate funds so as to promote the general welfare. What troubles us, however, is present plans and practices relating to what kind of information is going to be collected, how it is to be collected and to what use it is going to be put to.

We don't believe anyone will seriously question the utility of an accurate data and analytical base in making informed decisions. The Census Bureau itself issued a 66-page summary detailing the rationale behind the data it will seek in the 1980 Census and the statutory authority supporting it. The importance of such data and analytical base is increased by the impact of our present inflation and declining economic expansion. Such data has become even more important as the American society switches emphasis from assimilation to pluralism. If pluralism is to work, then it is extremely important that all of

the groups that make up America be identified and counted and not just some, and especially in an America that has to tighten its belt. Essential to a successful operation of a pluralistic society is the belief that each group is fairly treated, which means, among other things, equality of opportunity in such areas as jobs, education, housing, federal funds, etc. Fortunately or unfortunately, depending on your point of view, this concept of equality has evolved to a point where equality of result has become more important than equality of opportunity. For example, the U.S. Office of Personnel Management today talks of "underrepresentation", meaning in essence that a certain number of jobs at all levels of government activity should belong to a certain group simply because of the numbers of that group. The U.S. Supreme Court in the celebrated *Weber* case has approved similar rationale in private industry.

We could go on to detail other examples, but the point is clear, numbers are very important in determining group and individual success and position in a pluralistic society, so that it is important to be identified and counted.

These observations bring us to a consideration of what specifically troubles us in the 1980 Census. Neatly put, we believe the proposed census makes only a half-hearted attempt to identify and count us, and unless remedial steps are taken, the census will end up being a source of new patterns of discrimination and unfairness.

For example, we wonder about the wisdom and fairness of including a question relating to race, and national origin or descent for such groups as Spanish/Hispanic, Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Korean, Vietnamese, Guamanian, Samoan, Eskimo and Aleut, on every Census form, but limiting identification of Polish Americans and other like groups to only the long Census form which will be sent to only 21% of America's households.

We have been advised by the Census Bureau that such groups as Samoans, Eskimos, Aleut, Filipino, Korean, and Vietnamese are estimated to be so small in number and so dispersed that an accurate count can only occur if the question is asked on all forms. We understand and support such rationale if the premises are accurate, but we cannot understand nor do we accept the decision to count such large groups as Spanish/Hispanics and Blacks on a 100% basis while failing to count in the same manner significant groups such as Polish-Americans, Italian-Americans, Irish-Americans, etc. We have never been identified and accurately counted. So, how can the Census Bureau conclude that a sample count is sufficient?

We also wonder about the wisdom and fairness of the form of the questions on the long form by which a person can identify himself as a Polish-American, Italian-American, Arab-American, Irish-American

and so forth. We all realize that the Census is a form of burden on one's time. In addition, and without being pompous, it is clear that many people will have difficulty in understanding and responding to the questions. Thus, we can see the utility in creating categories in facilitating a response such as has been done in question four and seven of the short form, i.e., Black or Negro, Puerto Rican, Chicano, etc. Yet, no such categories have been created on the form for groups such as Polish-Americans, Italian-Americans, Greek-Americans, Irish-Americans, etc. To the contrary, a person has to write in how he identifies himself, instead of checking a box. A similar form of question dealing with Spanish/Hispanic used in a dress rehearsal in Virginia proved confusing and was altered. We don't know what confusion will result from the present form of the question dealing with ancestry, but the potential is there. Another aspect of our concerns in this area is that a person can and should be identified two or three times in different ways. For example, a person does not only identify himself as black or white under question four, but can further identify himself as to his national origin on question 14. The way the questions are presented now makes it unclear whether an American of Mexican origin should identify himself as white under question four, as Mexican and Hispanic under question seven, and again as Mexican and Hispanic under question 14. Similarly, it is not clear whether an American of Korean origin should identify himself as Korean twice, once under question 4 and another time under question 14.

Present government practices make categories mutually exclusive. It is important to determine what kind and how data is collected in the first instance so that it later is not misinterpreted or manipulated.

We hope that our remarks are not misconstrued, for we take no offense to and support groups such as Blacks, Hispanics, women Asian-Americans and other groups who have acquired acceptance by the bureaucracy as separately identifiable groups to actively compete for upward mobility and their place in American society, provided we are treated fairly and given the same consideration. We recognize that America is black and white, male and female, and Hispanic and Non-Hispanic.

Our concerns here must be considered in light of what has occurred to groups such as ours for the past 20 years. When the civil rights movement first began in the 1950's, it rightfully concerned itself with the redress of the rights of the groups that were totally or mostly left out at that time, such as blacks. Unfortunately our practices and preoccupation with the problems of groups which were originally totally or mostly left out, has created new patterns of discrimination and the reality of totally or mostly leaving out groups such as Polish-Americans, Italian-Americans, etc. A vivid example of this is the

record of the Civil Rights Commission, upon which we testified previously. Fortunately, members of Congress such as Senator Jesse Helms and Congresspersons Barbara Mikulski and Donald Edwards were sensitive to our pleas and were instrumental in passing S.721 which now directs such Commission to study discrimination and affirmative action, including Federal policies and practices, as they affect Americans of East European and South European origins.

We remember the tremendous effort that was made to include the ancestry question in present census forms, but we also feel and experience the intransigency that exists even now to the justice of such groups as Polish-Americans, Italian-Americans, etc., to be recognized in their own right and not as part of an amorphous group called, "none of the above," "other," or "White other than Hispanic."

While we appreciate the efforts that have been made up to now to rectify this problem area in the census, much more must be done. The people who take the census must be selected carefully so that they reflect a sensitivity to what is involved, an ability and talent to respond, appropriate background to secure confidence, and above all fairness and without any preconceived notion that the census is to benefit only certain groups.

Next, the public must be educated as to how the forms are to be completed, the need for and desirability to identify oneself, and that one is not a disloyal American if he or she does identify his or her national origin.

The bureaucracy and especially the Census Bureau must be made aware that there is no impediment, philosophically, practically, constitutionally, statutorily, judicially, by executive order or otherwise, which prevents them from creating new categories for groups such as Polish-Americans, Italian-Americans, Irish-Americans, etc., and that such groups and categories must be considered whenever decisions are made.

We have been advised by the Census Bureau that they have developed the computer capability of handling several hundred different categories so that we can dismiss as pure obstructionism and discrimination the persistent claim that it would be unwieldy to create and handle more than the five categories that are currently fashionable.

We have also been advised by the Office of Management and Budget that all government agencies can create additional categories for data collection and analysis. We suggest to this Committee that you question the further direction of OMB that all such additional categories be subsumed under the existing five categories.

We are also concerned that the data eventually collected will make no legal distinction between those who are here legally and those who

are here without legal sanction. We understand the argument that local authorities should be reimbursed for providing services to individuals that the Federal government has permitted to remain in our country without legal sanction. We wonder whether the best solution is to create a permanent subsidy for this condition to remain. Turning to a different aspect of this concern, we protest vigorously bureaucratic and judicial decisions, especially quotas, timetables and goals, that are based on data that includes or fails to distinguish between those who are here legally and those who are here without legal sanction, and data that fails to distinguish between those who have suffered discrimination and those who have not.

There are other observations we can make, which we will defer in order to respond to any questions and permit others to be heard. We don't pretend to know all the answers, but we do know when we are being treated unevenly and unfairly.

We are tired of having our legitimate needs, views, and values, neglected or treated with indifference by our government. We are tired of always being included in the target group that suffers the adverse consequences of many of the preferences being created and given today by our government. Simply put, if we are to share in the burdens, we want to share in the benefits.

Even so, and since we are all Americans, we have hope and we want to work with you, the Census Bureau and the bureaucracy to improve the situation so that America lives up to its promise of true equality instead of resorting to pseudo-equality based primarily on political fashionability. Thank you for your time.

**STATEMENT OF LEONARD F. WALENTYNOWICZ,
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS,
TO THE U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
DECEMBER 5, 1977**

The Polish American Congress welcomes this opportunity to comment on the plan proposed by Commissioner Jule M. Sugarman.

It is the first effort, to our knowledge, that attempts to deal comprehensively with all the programs that have been created over the years giving certain groups either preferences or special emphasis in filling government jobs. In its own fashion it attempts to correlate and coordinate all these programs so that those affected, as well as the Commission, can acquire and determine some sense of purpose, direction, and control of government efforts, practices, and policies in this area. We compliment you and the Commission since this proposal and these hearings permit all of us to focus on just what is occurring in government hiring practices.

Nevertheless, we have grave misgivings and reservations about your plan. These stem initially from the lack of clarity in the language used. These misgivings and reservations are further increased by the plan's failure to refer to important elements of the overall problem of providing jobs for everyone who is entitled to compete, on a fair basis, and in accordance with law.

We recognize that it is not your responsibility to provide jobs for everyone who wants one, but it is your responsibility to see to it that everyone who wants a federal government job covered by Civil Service is treated fairly and in the manner provided by law.

This then lends us to the crux of this problem as we now see it. What practices should our government engage in its employee selection process given the following:

1. Ours is a country based on free enterprise and individual initiative.
2. That our economy is not expanding as rapidly as our population base or more narrowly the number of those who want jobs increase more rapidly than the number of jobs available.
3. We have evidence of historic and present discrimination.
4. Traditionally our basic national policy is to achieve recognition by competition and merit.
5. We are a pluralistic nation, composed of many different groups identified on a variety of bases, including race, color, creed, sex and national origin and that mix is constantly changing as a result of different patterns of immigration.
6. As a result of our belief in human rights our legal system places a great premium and priority on individual rights.

Many of these factors and a more detailed consideration of them are set forth in the Statement of the American Jewish Committee submitted to you with reference to this proposal, the essence of which we agree with and support.

Measured against this background, this proposal is most inadequate for at least the following reasons.

First, the plan fails to distinguish sufficiently between those groups that the law definitely gives preferences to, such as veterans and disabled veterans, and those groups that are and should be the beneficiaries of "affirmative action" or "special emphasis" programs. For example, the plan is unclear as to how the veterans preference would be "observed," as in the case of the proposed use of "established registers" as an alternate selection method. Which track in that 2-track system would the veteran be placed in and what would occur if a veteran is not a member of a group such as black, Hispanic or woman, which have been identified already as being subject to "adverse impact?"

Second, the language of the proposal is in many ways vague and deceptive. For example, it is stated that in each authorized selection method there may be no discrimination or reverse discrimination because of race, sex, national origins, religion, age, marital status, or handicapped condition. Yet there is no definition of "reverse discrimination," nor is there any mechanism created to collect and analyze data in each of the prohibited areas of discrimination. The impression is created that there is concern for all, but in practice there is a preoccupation with only certain groups, namely women, blacks, Hispanics, American-Indians and Asian-Americans. America is made up of many more groups than just these. The President himself recognized this in his Executive memo dated July 27, 1977, which requested all departments and agencies to collect data on his Presidential Appointments in more than 16 different categories including Irish, German/Austrian, Italian, Polish, French, Russian, Scandinavian, Middle Eastern and other Eastern European origins as well as the ones which preoccupy this agency and government efforts generally.

You state there is "considerable presumptive evidence of an historical and perhaps current pattern of adverse impacts" yet you fail to detail what you mean. A reasonable observer looking for fairness would consider whether any "special emphasis" program favoring only certain select groups would have a disproportional impact on other groups not so favored. An illustration may be helpful. While whites may be considered as a homogeneous group for racial distinctions, they are not when viewed from an ethnic perspective. Viewed in this fashion Blacks, Orientals or Asian-Americans, Native-Americans, whites and other such categories contain many subgroups. Presently, these subgroups are not important from a black viewpoint (though this may change shortly as a result of immigration patterns) but they are very vital to the various subgroups that are included in the "white" category.

Many of these subgroups have and still are suffering discrimination and include such groups as Polish-Americans, Italian-Americans, Arab-Americans and so forth. We believe this discrimination includes a lack of recognition in many of the 140 occupational categories which you have requested detailed analyses, particularly in the area of professional and other higher grade positions. Yet nowhere have you shown a concern for this "adverse impact" or even indicated a desire to collect data and analyze it in this regard.

Additionally, you fail to specifically define what you mean by "affirmative action" or "special emphasis" creating the perception that you will be giving preferences to groups which have not been authorized by law.

Third, you have failed to justify the proposed criterion of 95% and 80% to trigger the use of special selection methods and schedule "A." Veterans preferences are clearly set forth by law and their use is not triggered by any "adverse impact." The above criterion has apparently been established to implement more rapidly "affirmative action" policies. In the absence of any Congressional directive setting forth preferences for any other group beyond veterans, the only justification for such criterion is to eliminate discrimination and the effects thereof. To our knowledge there is no data and analytical base that establishes these figures as the actual discrimination that has occurred and that these criteria are what is needed to overcome the effects thereof. General comparisons of the proportion of jobs any one group holds or obtains as new hire with that group's proportion of the general population is some evidence that discrimination may exist but falls far short of proving actual discrimination or justifying the exclusion from the selection process of any person or group which was not responsible for that discrimination. In an independent society such as we have, there may be a number of reasons other than discrimination that may account for some, if not all, of the disparity that may exist between the proportion of jobs any one group holds and that group's proportion of the general population. Further, your plan does not allow for regional differences.

Different groups may suffer discrimination in different areas of our country. For example, and this is an oversimplification, white ethnics may not suffer discrimination in the Southwest because few live there. Hispanics because many do live in this area are significantly affected. The situation would be different in the Midwest and East. In any event, any departure from the system of competition and selection on merit as authorized by Congress should be clearly justified by other lawful considerations and reliable data and analyses. In addition, these criteria and the way you plan to use them smack of a de facto quota scheme, since they are exclusionary in nature.

Fourth, your plan is preoccupied with only certain select groups and makes no provision to include other discriminated groups or subgroups that may exist. To say that this plan is available to all discriminated groups and subgroups is nothing but a cruel hoax when no effort is made to collect and analyze a comprehensive data base. It would seem to any sincere, non-partisan observer that a full survey of all the groups covered by prohibited discrimination would be made and maintained before any substantial departure from selection by merit, as suggested here, would be considered. Such a survey is quite possible and is not precluded by any Congressional or Presidential directive and if anything is authorized in the same fashion as those that were done for the groups now being favored by the Commission.

Contrary to the belief of some, neither Congress, the President, nor the U.S. Supreme Court has conferred any special status or protection for the groups the Commission is preoccupied by. In addition, such a survey would also tend to reassure those groups not receiving any "special emphasis" of the fairness of any program or action. A prime example of the present deficiency in your plan in this respect is the inclusion of Hispanics, a group considered by the U.S. Bureau of Census as over 95% white, without even considering whether any other subgroup of the "white" race should also be a beneficiary of your plan or showing that no other subgroup is entitled to such consideration. Failure to do this creates new patterns of discrimination or at least the perception thereof.

Fifth, your plan fails to specify what criteria you plan to use when exercising the special selection method or Schedule A. Specifically, it fails to indicate how you will determine the "proportion of ensuing vacancies" which will be filled when adverse impact is found; when the evidence of adverse impact in an occupational category would "disappear"; what are "normal minimum qualifications" and what would prompt the Commission to decide when these requirements would be "questionable."

The above comments highlight our major concerns but there are others. Your plan fails to allow for more recent arrivals to the United States in the groups favored by you. Many of these persons may not have suffered discrimination and yet may end up as beneficiaries of your plan. If this were all that was involved then perhaps the generous nature of our country would prevail. But when the practical effect of your present plan would adversely affect many individuals who have never practiced discrimination but in fact may have vigorously fought it, then fundamental fairness and justice is again violated even though some may say it is for a "higher" cause.

We conclude by suggesting that the plan should be revised in light of these hearings. We understand that there is much dissatisfaction over the degree of progress in our fight to eliminate discrimination and the effects thereof. Many would want instant and complete rectification. To do this, given our present circumstances, would require at least the temporary abandonment or relaxation of competition on merit, a political decision that should be made by Congress and the President in accordance with our Constitution, and not by administrative fiat.

Our belief in this respect is reinforced when we see a concerted effort to adopt an "Equal Rights" Amendment and we hear our President speak "why not the best." Neither expression contains any commitment or approval of a system whereby groups are given jobs in

our society as a reflection of their numerical strength. In fact, these expressions implicitly negate such an arrangement.

Thus we would hope that every effort to rectify discrimination and the effects thereof be made without relaxing or abandoning competition by merit even temporarily. If, however, a decision is made to relax or abandon this principle bureaucratically, then everyone who has been discriminated in a prohibited manner should benefit therefrom and not just certain select groups.

Finally, we hope that you understand our comments. We are not against anyone, nor do we wish to create resentment. Nevertheless, when the system of selection is being radically changed, and when persons and groups who have attempted to work within that system are being adversely affected even though they themselves have been and are subject to prohibited discrimination and have fought against such discrimination, we must by necessity speak out. We do not see the necessity of creating a fiction that "all white males" are the cause of our discrimination problems and that "all such white males" should bear the brunt of affirmative action and special emphasis programs that in effect deny them the right to compete for government jobs, in order that we may speed up the recognition of certain groups. We would also like to see that such programs, properly conceived, include the whole broad spectrum of women available and desirous of recognition and not just women of certain racial, ethnic, and political beliefs. We hope to continue this dialogue with you and all concerned, for this is a common problem which should be approached with the belief that first of all, we are Americans.

Finally, we hope that this is just the beginning of a new-found interest by the Commission in Euro-ethnics and the Commission efforts to chart a course to achieve true equality.

We recognize and believe that America is black and white, male and female, Hispanic and non-Hispanic, but we also recognize and we also believe that we will never achieve true equality unless we recognize that America is also more than black and white, male and female, Hispanic and non-Hispanic, and part of that "more" is us.

At this time, when the President and other leaders are asking all Americans to share fairly the burden of the increasing difficulties America is facing, it is more important than ever that we achieve better ways of sharing fairly the benefits of America.

We offer our continued cooperation to this end and I'll be pleased to answer any questions you have.

[The complete paper follows.]

EMPLOYMENT AND ETHNICITY

By Leonard F. Walentyowicz *

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission: Speaking for the Polish American Congress and reflecting what I believe to be the sentiments of many Americans of Euro-ethnic origins, I wish to express our sincere appreciation for this opportunity to present our concerns and views with respect to the subject matter of this hearing.

As we previously indicated, civil rights have long been dear to the hearts and minds of people of Polish and other Euro-ethnic background and tradition, and if anything, are more so with those who are or have become United States citizens.

We claim no special privilege to speak out on human rights, including civil rights, but we believe that a full and fair examination of our history both here in America and where our roots originated, will confirm that we also know of the suffering, as well as the other devastating effects that discrimination, defamation, and denial of other civil and human rights causes. What is somewhat unique is that much of this discrimination has occurred within the context of one race, while this Commission's attention, at least up to now, has been focused primarily, if not entirely, on discrimination between races, sexes, and people of differing color.

This preoccupation, however, is not unique to this Commission, for it pervades much of this Federal bureaucracy as well as the judiciary, executive, and legislative branches of government. What is most unfortunate is that such preoccupation creates mixed feelings of cynicism, neglect, resentment, and alienation, resulting from a belief that our Government is paying lip service to a declared policy of prohibiting discrimination based on race, color, creed, sex, and national origin, but it is only acting to overcome and remedy discrimination based on race, color and sex.

The feeling is compounded by the manner in which the concept of affirmative action has evolved, and the fashion in which data is being collected and analyzed. This feeling is further exacerbated by the difficult economic circumstances America is presently facing and the failure of many of our institutions to allow for other significant American values and groups in our effort to fight discrimination and the effects thereof.

* Executive Director of the Polish American Congress, Washington, D.C.

Thus we welcomed heartily the recent enactment to the Civil Rights Act of 1959 of Section 104(G) [S.721], which in substance directs this Commission to study policies and practices regarding discrimination and affirmative action and how they affect Americans of East European and South European origin.

We similarly welcome this consultation and hope this is just the beginning of a nationwide effort to ensure that our commitment to civil and human rights is fairly and evenly applied and is not distorted by claims of priority and lack of resources.

It is not the responsibility of this paper to cover the broad spectrum of civil and human rights to which all Americans are entitled to, but I make these general observations so that my comments on employment and ethnicity may be better understood.

Employment and ethnicity can be approached from a number of directions but given the brief amount of time available for me because of the nature of this consultation, I think it best to start from the viewpoint of data collection and the use such data is put to.

For mixed reasons, not all sensible and acceptable, the Federal Government presently collects data regarding employment policies and practices in five categories: black, Hispanic, Native American, Asian American and White other than Hispanic, which categories are repeated for both sexes. The best examples are the EEOC reporting forms.

Over the years as efforts to fight discrimination and promote affirmative action developed, there has occurred a belief that persons in the first four categories have been the victims of discrimination and deserve the benefits of affirmative action, regardless of personal circumstances, and that everyone in the last category either was guilty of discrimination or had to suffer the consequences of providing the benefits of affirmative action to the persons in the first four categories.

As we pointed out in the briefs we filed with the United States Supreme Court in the *Bakke* and *Weber* cases, such restricted data collection and use and the beliefs and practices resulting therefrom are fundamentally unfair and violate the civil rights of a good many Americans, including a good number of Euro-ethnics, especially those in the last category.

Such limited data collection is harmful in a number of respects. For example, a person in any of the four favored categories claiming job discrimination, can readily fortify his case by data indicating disparity between the number of persons of his category actually employed and the number available for employment. A Polish-American, Italian-

American, or Slavic-American doesn't have this data available to him. Another example involves affirmative action. There has developed over the years, a belief that numerical disparity alone requires "affirmative action" to "lock" each of the favored groups into almost every job category, particularly those jobs reflecting upward mobility.

One prime example is the appointment of Federal judges, where tremendous effort has or is being made to appoint blacks, Hispanics, and women, but no effort is being made to appoint Polish-Americans and other like ethnic Americans, even though a cursory examination of the judicial lists will reflect a dearth of individuals from these groups.

As we have repeatedly stated, we take no offense and we generally support members of the favored groups striving to improve themselves, provided we also are treated fairly and given the same consideration. Essentially that is our problem in the area of employment - we are not being treated fairly, nor are we given the same considerations.

A mind set has been created that only those in the favored categories should benefit from affirmative action and cannot be guilty of discrimination, however that term from time to time may be defined, while those in the last category must suffer the consequences of this type of affirmative action regardless of whether they discriminated or were the victims of discrimination themselves.

Perhaps what is most amazing is that these categories were established without any concern as to the status of groups such as Polish-Americans in American society. As a result, job opportunities and the upward mobility of such groups has been seriously and adversely affected.

Accordingly, and as a first step, we recommend that the government direct that additional separate categories be created for groups such as Polish-American, Italian-American and so forth. Much of the authority is already there, in circular No. A-46 issued by the Office of Management and Budget on May 12, 1977, even though it is disregarded in practice. The Census Bureau has advised us that the government has developed the computer capability of handling several hundred different categories so that the persistent claim that it would be unwieldy to create and handle more than five categories that are currently fashionable can be dismissed as pure obstructionism and discrimination.

Polish-Americans and other like ethnics condemn as hypocrisy the insulting government policies and proclamations that encourage them to take pride in their roots and preserve their separate identity when it

comes to culture. And yet at the same time when it comes to employment, educational opportunities and federal funds, they are lumped into categories such as "other", "none of the above" or "white other than Hispanic". We also wonder about the equanimity of government policies that permit Hispanics to identify themselves also as Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, Cuban Americans etc., but deny the same right to us.

At this time when jobs are being increasingly distributed at all levels on the basis of numbers in the belief that equality of result is more important than equality of opportunity, it is important that each group that makes up this brilliant mosaic called America be separately identified and counted, so that it does not end up being "left out," or "locked out," or the victim of new, albeit perhaps unintended, patterns of discrimination.

The dynamics of employment and ethnicity are quite complex, and this paper is not intended to be a total review of this area, but simply an effort to illustrate different perceptions, and create new attitudes, and better initiatives and solutions in this difficult problem area.

Contrary to what has been said previously in some places, no group needs to be a target group or bear the brunt of "affirmative action." Instead we feel new initiatives such as the one we suggested in our brief in the *Weber* case (affirmative action based on a point system), should be explored not only to correct glaring deficiencies in present affirmative action practices but also to respond to such issues as how long should affirmative action continue, whether affirmative action should continue to be available to recent immigrants, refugees, and other arrivals, and the impact of present affirmative action policies on such values as initiative, hard work, competition, etc.

For a fuller appreciation of our concerns, I would like to submit for the Commission's consideration copies of testimony and presentations we made regarding the 1980 Census, before the Civil Service Commission, and the EEOC, as well as our briefs in *Bakke* and *Weber*.

Finally, we hope that this is just the beginning of a new found interest by the Commission in Euro-ethnics, in the Commission efforts to chart a course to achieve true equality. We recognize and believe that America is black and white, male and female, Hispanic and Non-Hispanic, but we also believe we will never achieve true equality unless we recognize that America is *more* than black and white, male and female and Hispanic and Non-Hispanic. Part of that *more* is *us*. At this time when the President and other leaders are asking all

Americans to share fairly the burden of the increasing difficulties America is facing, it is more important than ever that we achieve better ways of sharing fairly the benefits of America.

We offer our continued cooperation to this end, and would be pleased to answer any questions you have.

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States
OCTOBER TERM, 1976

—
No. 76-811
—

THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Petitioner,
v.
ALLAN BAKKE, Respondent

—
On Writ of Certiorari to the
Supreme Court of California
—

BRIEF OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS,
THE NATIONAL ADVOCATES SOCIETY AND THE
NATIONAL MEDICAL AND DENTAL ASSOCIATION
AS AMICI CURIAE

—
LEONARD F. WALENTYNOWICZ
Suite 714
Walbridge Building
Buffalo, New York 14202
(301) 229-8091

Attorney for Amici

June 7, 1977

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1976

No. 76-811

THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Petitioner,

v.

ALLAN BAKKE, *Respondent*

On Writ of Certiorari to the
Supreme Court of California

**BRIEF OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS,
THE NATIONAL ADVOCATES SOCIETY AND THE
NATIONAL MEDICAL AND DENTAL ASSOCIATION
AS AMICI CURIAE**

This brief amici curiae is filed with the consent of the parties, as provided for in Rule 42 of the Rules of this Court.

INTEREST OF THE AMICI

The amici are 3 national organizations composed of Americans of Polish descent and origin. The Polish American Congress was founded to protect the civil rights of Americans of Polish descent and origin and to promote their welfare. The goals of both the Na-

tional Advocates Society, composed of lawyers and the National Medical and Dental Association composed of physicians and dentists, are to advance the welfare of its members, establish proper relationships with the public and promote the dignified and honorable progress of their respective professions.

Since the heritage of Polish Americans and their own history in America is inextricably involved in the fight against discrimination, we feel we have a vital interest in the issues presented by this case and believe the Court should have the benefit of our concerns so that the Court's final decision may reflect a full range of views.

So much has been written on the subject matter involved herein that it would help little to repeat and recite authority and comment previously made except where absolutely necessary. Furthermore, much of this has been done already by both the majority and dissenting opinions of the Supreme Court of California in this cause.¹

Since this is a constitutional question which will be decided by this Court regardless of what has been said before and by whom, we ask this Court to intensely scrutinize from a broad perspective what is happening in the United States with respect to "special admissions" programs in professional schools and other affirmative action programs. Are these programs in reality and practice living up to the majesty of our Constitution, the language of our laws, and the lofty statements of our leaders, or have they become or will

¹ *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, (1976) 18 Cal.2d 34, 132 Cal. Rptr. 680, 553 P.2d 1152.

they become vehicles by which some disadvantaged and discriminated groups and individuals secure benefits and special privileges while other disadvantaged and discriminated groups and individuals are still denied the promise of America?

It is in this light that we present our brief.

ARGUMENT

In considering the constitutionality and legality of affirmative action programs particularly "special admissions" programs one should be careful to avoid being swept up in a tide of righteousness designed to rectify a particularly serious wrong. It has been said that a sense of guilt and righteousness can be a powerful and legitimate human impulse. Whether it can be translated into wise policy is another matter. Common experience has taught us that good intentions are not sufficient justification to support actions that may infringe on the rights of others. Likewise a long history of discrimination whether confirmed by prior court decisions or not, though sufficient to prevent present and future discriminatory treatment of a like kind, does not necessarily establish a basis for the approval of actions or a program which invades the rights of others. Thus in matters involving discrimination, including efforts to overcome the effects thereof, it is essential and due process requires that those who propose a program which treats particular individuals and groups preferentially over others justify their actions by an adequate data and analytical base.² Over

² Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment. This Court has said so in a number of different cases in a variety of contexts. *McLaughlin v. Florida*, 379 U.S. 184 (1964) pp. 191-192, 196, catalogues them.

the years the Courts have required such a base in the struggle to eliminate discrimination, overt and otherwise, against black people and other racial and ethnic groups³ particularly under the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and there appears no sound reason here to do otherwise.⁴

Such a base serves many other useful purposes beyond justifying laws and policies, for it also provides the basis for securing federal assistance⁵ and can promote public acceptance and approval of efforts to eradicate discrimination and the effects thereof provided such data indicates that those efforts are fair and equitable. On the other hand, if such data or the lack thereof indicates an uneven approach by revealing an indifference to solving the problems of *all* who have been discriminated against or giving attention and favor only to the problems of some discriminated groups but omitting others, great resentment and dissatisfaction results. Efforts based on such an uneven approach, even though well motivated, serve only to delay our goal to achieve full integration as rapidly as possible.

What was the approach of the school authorities here and what base, if any was developed by them? First, it is conceded that Davis has no history of prior dis-

³ For example: *Oyama v. California*, 332 U.S. 663 (1948); *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 356 (1886). There are a number of other cases referred to in the opinions of the California Supreme Court below.

⁴ *McGowan v. Maryland*, (1961) 366 U.S. 420, 426; 6 L.Ed. 393, 299, 81 S.Ct. 1101.

⁵ *Collection and Use of Racial and Ethnic Data in Federal Assistance Programs*. A Report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Feb. 1973.

crimination. Thus, the special admissions program was not designed to overcome the effects of specific objectionable practices at this school but simply to overcome what the authorities there believed to be systematic discrimination throughout the State. Some commentators argue that absent a history of prior discrimination, no affirmative action program can be constitutionally justified. Others say that it is unreasonable to prohibit a state agency from acting on its own to achieve racial balance in its professional schools, equating this goal to a rational if not compelling state interest. There are other commentators who go on to suggest that it is foolish to require a finding of individual cases of discrimination before permitting authorities to act to overcome patterns of general and systematic discrimination.

While authorities need not nor should not wait to correct general and systematic patterns of discrimination,⁶ they cannot act in an arbitrary fashion or create new patterns or types of discrimination even if their action is taken to rectify effects of past discrimination or with benign motives. The advantage in waiting until particular acts of discrimination occur is that it enables the remedy to be fashioned more appropriately to the harm involved without running the risk of creating potential harm to others who may be innocently affected.

Here it is clear that the Regents of the State of California failed to make a comprehensive survey of the kind and extent of discrimination occurring in its professional schools so that a constitutionally justifiable remedy could be fashioned. California perhaps more

⁶ *Board of Education v. Swann*, 402 U.S. 43, 46 (1971).

than many other states, represents the great mosaic that makes up America. Its climate, location and other desirable characteristics attracted and still attract *all* kinds of people: farmers, actors, retired persons, youngsters, adventurers, settlers, Italian Americans, Mexican Americans, Polish Americans, Blacks, White, Orientals and on and on. Yet even though faced by the mandate of 42 U.S.C. 1981 and 2000d⁷ and a national policy reinforced by at least two Presidents explicitly prohibiting discrimination in employment and education based on race, color, sex, religion and national origin,⁸ the authorities in the State of California chose to cast their attention only on select groups and fashioned a remedy not only constitutionally impermissible but patently unfair. There is no reasoned explanation why Blacks, Chicanos and Asiatics have been the *only* beneficiaries of the special admission program and others similarly disadvantaged and discriminated have

⁷42 U.S.C. § 1981. Equal rights under the law.

“All persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have the same right in every State and Territory to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, give evidence, and to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and exactions of every kind, and to no other.”

⁸42 U.S.C. § 2000d. Prohibition against exclusion from participation in, denial of benefits of, and discrimination under Federally assisted programs on ground of race, color, or national origin.

“No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.”

⁸ See e.g., Executive Order 11478.

been excluded.⁹ It is now clear why the People of California amended their Constitution on November 2, 1976, to specifically include race, religion, and ethnic heritage as additional factors which cannot be used to deny a person admission to their State University.

The record is not clear, however, why the administration designed a program which benefited only select groups instead of addressing the problem as a whole. Perhaps it is due in part to the momentum of the civil rights movement which has been characterized by Black problems and participation and in which Blacks have played a significant leadership role from the start. Because of the unsavory role slavery has played in the history of our country, it was only natural for all of us to have our attention centered by the problems which flowed from this most fundamental form of discrimination.

Nevertheless, this Court, Congress, the Executive and our national leaders have repeatedly stated in one form or another that our national policy, with regard to discrimination in general, forbids more than racial discrimination. Color, religion, sex and national origin

⁹ Even though the record fails to specifically show that the University authorities comprehensively surveyed the racial, color, sexual, religious and ethnic composition of the State of California and compared those results with a similar survey of the medical profession, what is in the record, particularly the statement of the Admissions Committee Chairman, shows that the authorities were concerned only with the problems of Blacks, Mexican Americans, Indians and Orientals. While it is true that a full survey could result in a finding that there are no other disadvantaged or discriminated groups, common experience such as the defamation practiced against Americans of Polish descent and origin cause one to be skeptical unless such a finding is firmly established by evidence.

are equally paramount and today we have quite properly added age and the handicapped.

Yet in practice, the attention of most policy and decision makers has been almost totally focused on the problems of race resulting in a de facto priority to the extent that we are approving programs and actions designed to overcome effects of racial discriminations even though they create new patterns of other types of discrimination equally prohibited, as was done here.

We know of no policy, set by this Court, the Congress or the Executive which states that racial or any other type of discrimination deserves a higher priority than other prohibited types. There may come a time when such a decision may be made but it can be constitutionally justified only when a data and analytical base is created fully exploring the status of all groups and individuals covered by our anti-discrimination policies something which has not been done either by the State of California or our national government. This base should also reflect the difference in impact between those efforts which simply prohibit or forbid discrimination and those efforts like the instant program which attempt to overcome effects of past discrimination. We are at a time when we realize our resources are not unlimited, and that our economy has bounds and limits to its growth. Accordingly, the competition for jobs and education is becoming more acute. It is one thing to say that such competition is to be conducted on merit or without regard to race, color, sex, religion and national origin. It is quite another thing to say that our Constitution permits that competition to be conducted in a manner whereby some are

given special benefits and privileges because of their race, color, sex, religion and national origin. If there is a good reason to do this should it not be extended to *all* similarly circumstanced, and at the *same* time? In any event, such a decision should not be made simply because a group is more vocal, better organized, potentially possessed of more political leverage or by the emotion of the moment. It should be made by the full political process exploring in detail all that is involved so that public confidence can be secured and divisiveness avoided.

Nevertheless, most state and national practices and even much of the previous Court litigation pay attention primarily, if not in some instances exclusively, to racial discrimination overlooking not only our other problem areas but also the impact of our efforts to eliminate racial discrimination and the effects thereof on these other problem areas.

Some progress in expanding the scope of our attention has been made, particularly with respect to those people now generally classified as Hispanics.¹⁰ Yet very little data, if any, has been collected indicating what problems, if any, we face with respect to religious and national origin discrimination other than Hispanics. Whether this is so because of limited resources¹¹ or

¹⁰ *Counting the Forgotten*, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, April 1974.

¹¹ Discussion held with John A. Buggs, Staff Director U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, February 18, 1977. He indicated to this writer that the time may be ripe for the creation of a data base indicating the present state of those other forms of discrimination. In the preamble to *Counting the Forgotten*, the Commission states:

“The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is a temporary, independent, bipartisan agency established by Congress in 1957 to:

preoccupation with one form of discrimination, the fact is it should not continue if we are to put in practice what we preach and state in our Constitution, laws, national and state policies.

Some have argued that there is no additional data base because there are no additional problems. We ask this Court whether there is a substantial difference between a Black being called a "nigger" and a Polish American being called a "Pollack", whether telling a Black or Mexican American he cannot qualify is substantially more degrading than telling a Polish American the same thing; whether the lack of recognition of Blacks and Latins in senior levels of corporate management is more serious than the lack of recognition of Polish and Italian Americans.¹² If not, then we suggest

Investigate complaints alleging denial of the right to vote by reason of race, color, religion, sex or national origin, or by reason of fraudulent practices;

Study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, or in the administration of justice;

Appraise Federal laws and policies with respect to the denial of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, or in the administration of justice;

Serve as a national clearinghouse for information concerning denials of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin; and

Submit reports, findings, and recommendations to the President and the Congress."

Given this mandate by Congress, an impartial observer may wonder why the Commission has not acted more forcefully to carry out its full mandate instead of restricting its efforts to certain areas.

¹² *Minority Report, the Representation of Poles, Italians, Latins and Blacks in the Executive Suites of Chicago's Largest Corporations*, (1973) prepared by the Institute of Urban Life for the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, Washington, D.C. 20017. See Appendix "A".

that there is substantial evidence to justify the collection of comprehensive data and the creation of a total analytical base dealing with the problems of discrimination based on national origin within a racial group as well as across racial lines. Polish Americans are not the only ethnic group that deserve consideration, there are many others within all racial categories including Italian Americans, Arab Americans, Jewish Americans just to name a few.

The failure to collect such data and to approach the prohibited forms of discrimination on an even and fair basis brings us to the very crux of why the instant program is constitutionally unsound.

Whenever a special admissions program of the type here is created, there follows, by necessity, a division and the creation of a "group" who does not receive the special benefits. Who is and should be in this "disfavored" group? To meet due process and equal protection requirements this group should not include individuals and groups disadvantaged by other forms of prohibited discrimination in the absence of a clear constitutional mandate that one form of prohibited discrimination is more important than the others.

Though the record does not show precisely how the authorities here came to their decision, it is clear however that in practice any White would be ineligible for the special program even though he or she may have suffered invidious discrimination because of his or her national origin. It is also clear that in practice the program was not designed to benefit all who suffered from prohibited discrimination, but only if you were Black, Chicano or Asian.

The definition of Chicago is not entirely clear but if it is roughly equivalent to Hispanic as defined by the Census Bureau, it is important to note that 98% of the population of Spanish origin¹³ is classified as within the White race by such Bureau. If this group is considered White, giving them preferential treatment and denying such treatment to other Whites similarly disadvantaged is arbitrary and capricious without regard to "reverse" discrimination.

What happened here is also what happens all too often in our national programs. Preoccupation [by the authorities] with certain forms and types of discrimination has resulted in indifference to other types of discrimination equally bad and prohibited with the result that the groups and persons so suffering and forgotten have in effect been told to suffer more for the sake of improving the lot of those receiving attention.

The greatest irony of this result is that many Whites who have championed the cause of civil rights have ended up being in this "forgotten and disfavored" group. Why are "Whites" who never practiced discrimination, but fought for and championed equality, and who themselves suffered discrimination obliged to continue to suffer simply because other Whites practiced racial discrimination? If Whites are to suffer for the "greater good" then for how long and for whose benefit?

The "special admissions" program here is also objectionable on the grounds of vagueness. Though it sets a definite quota it does not readily define who qualifies for it or how long the program will last. The prime

¹³ *Counting the Forgotten, supra*, p. 43.

justification of the program is the numerical imbalance between the number of persons of any one ethnic and racial group and the number of professionals from that group. There is no firm indication that all of that disparity is due to discrimination. Some of the disparity may be due to cultural tendencies as in the case where more Blacks tend to become professional basketball and football players than professional hockey and tennis players or in the case where more Hispanics tend to become professional baseball players than basketball players. Further, no attention has been paid to immigration patterns particularly unusual situations such as the Vietnamese refugee program and the proposed amnesty of illegal aliens presently in the United States. In this context, what justification can be given to those White disadvantaged groups and individuals living here for one, two and three generations for the fact they have to meet higher standards simply because they are White while Chicanos, Blacks, Asians who have recently arrived, in some instances not legally, are to be given a preference.

We do not suggest that a "special admissions" program is never constitutionally feasible or that less significance be attached to the problems of Blacks, Chicanos and Asians. We do say that for such a program to be constitutionally permissible it, (1) cannot be arbitrary as it is here in giving preference to one kind of White ethnic group (Hispanic) without showing why other White ethnic groups similarly situated have not even been considered, (2) cannot be concerned with race alone but must also provide relief for other groups who have suffered prohibited discrimination such as color, sex, religion and national origin of all types, (3) must demonstrate that those included in the "un-

avored" group will not be discriminated in a prohibited manner by the program itself and (4) establish a sufficient data base indicating more precisely why such a program is needed, how long is it to last, and who is to benefit therefrom.

A few final comments. It has been argued by some that this case is not "ripe" for determination;¹⁴ that among other things there is not enough evidence in the record to show the kind of discrimination being practiced against Blacks, Chicanos and Asians. For the reasons previously stated, we believe this case is particularly "ripe". It is important that this Court declare its concern for *all* the types of prohibited discrimination and that they must be allowed for in any special admissions program. The record here makes this case an especially appropriate vehicle for this Court to do so.

The opinions of the Court below have addressed to some extent the concerns expressed herein. We note that the dissenting opinion agrees in its Footnote No. 10 that if the effect of the instant program may in fact be utilized as a means of discriminating against a subclass of the majority (disfavored) group, then the program could not be considered benign and presumptively constitutional. It goes further by stating that there is no such claim that the program had in fact such a differential impact. This brief is devoted to making such a claim, and we agree with the dissent that once the claim is established the present program

¹⁴ See the many briefs of various Amici including the Brief of the National Urban League, et al. on the petition for certiorari and Price M. Cobbs, M.D., et al. on the appeal itself.

is in fact equivalent to invidious racial classifications and is presumptively unconstitutional.

We note also that the dissent in its concluding remarks claims that the use of racial classifications here is a matter of policy for the school authorities and not of constitutional dimension even though the commentators are divided over the desirability of racial classifications. We disagree with the claim and suggest that when racial classifications are used without allowing properly for their impact on other disadvantaged and discriminated groups, it is for the Courts to decide their constitutionality particularly when their utility is in doubt.

We wish to reaffirm our desire to work with all those concerned so that feasible solutions reasonably protecting the interests of all can be found. It has been said that "our society cannot be completely color blind in the short term if we are to have a color blind society in the long term."¹⁵ We suggest that the metaphor is imperfect. Good eyesight sees beyond black and white; it sees a world made up of different sexes, races, religions, colors and ethnic backgrounds. Perfect vision sees a world integrated on all these grounds and not only on some.

¹⁵ *Associated Gen. Contractors of Mass., Inc. v. Altshuler*, 490 F.2d 9, 16 (1973).

CONCLUSION

The special admissions program as presently formulated by the authorities of the State of California should be declared illegal as constitutionally unsound with appropriate advice as to the feasibility and direction of any future such efforts.

Respectfully submitted,

LEONARD F. WALENTYNOWICZ
Suite 714
Walbridge Building
Buffalo, New York 14202
(301) 229-8091
Attorney for Amici

APPENDIX "A"

MINORITY REPORT

THE REPRESENTATION OF POLES, ITALIANS LATINs AND
BLACKS IN THE EXECUTIVE SUITES OF CHICAGO'S LARGEST
CORPORATIONS

By Russell Barta, Ph.D.

This report was prepared by THE INSTITUTE OF URBAN LIFE, 820 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60611, for THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR URBAN ETHNIC AFFAIRS, 4408 Eighth Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20017.

For information about single copies of this report, which are available without charge, or about the cost of quantity orders, please write to one of the above.

© Institute of Urban Life.

The question "How many are there?" has become one of the most provocative and unsettling questions being raised on all levels of American society. It reflects the national preoccupation with evaluating the success or failure of various ethnic groups in gaining their share in the American system for distributing income and power. Thus, in just a matter of a few years questions regarding a person's race or ethnic background, once felt to have no public relevance and even considered illegitimate, now not only are being asked but even require answers by law. Companies with government contracts are now required to file reports indicating their utilization rate of Blacks, Latins, American Indians, Eskimos, and women. In January, 1973, the U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Federal Contract Compliance, issued new guidelines to cover discrimination

Mr. Barta is professor of social science at Mundelein College of Chicago. He had the assistance of Helen A. Smith of the Graduate Program in Urban Studies at Loyola University.

against persons because of religion or ethnic origin. These guidelines said:

Members of various religious and ethnic groups, primarily but not exclusively of Eastern, Middle, and Southern European ancestry, such as Jews, Catholics, Italians, Greeks, and Slavic groups continue to be excluded from executive middle management, and other job levels because of discrimination based upon their religion and/or national origin. These guidelines are intended to remedy such unfair treatment.¹

What the guidelines in effect recognize is that, despite the powerful American rhetoric which emphasizes individual achievement, power and affluence in reality still flow along group lines, and that an individual's religious or ethnic affiliation may in fact still be an obstacle to his advancement.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the extent to which members of the Polish, Italian, Latin, and Black communities have penetrated the centers of power and influences in Chicago-based corporations. This was done by determining how many Poles, Italians, Latins, and Blacks either serve on the board of directors or occupy the highest executive positions in Chicago's largest corporations.

In focusing on Poles, Italians, Latins, and Blacks, this study selected at this point in time is historically significant. The 1960's saw the rise of group consciousness among Blacks and Latins, and their relentless pursuit of parity with other groups in the U.S. This process released the latent consciousness of other groups, such as Poles and Italians, who are becoming increasingly aware that like Blacks and Latins, they may not be sharing equally in the affluence of American society.

¹ 60-50.1 of Chapter 60, Title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

Thus, although this study originated at the request of leaders of the Polish American Congress, Illinois Division, and the Joint Civic Committee of Italian-Americans in Chicago, they were more than willing to see the study expanded to include Blacks and Latins. In the Chicago metropolitan area, where nearly 34 per cent of the seven million population is either Polish, Italian, Latin, or Black, such a perception of mutual concerns could have a positive influence on the future of group relations and thus on the very shape and tone of life in the city and suburbs.

The corporations reviewed in this study were identified by combining the *Chicago Daily News* and *Chicago Tribune* lists of the Chicago area's largest corporations in 1972. Among the thousands of corporations based in the Chicago area, 106 were identified as the largest industrial firms, retailers, utilities, transportation companies, banks, and savings and loan institutions. More than half of them (66 per cent) were included in *Fortune* magazine's 1972 list of the largest 500 industrial corporations or *Fortune's* lists of the largest non-industrial firms in the U.S. These 106 corporations, therefore, comprise the top layers of the economic and financial power structure of Chicago—and of the nation. It was the top management of these corporate giants and their boards of directors who were scrutinized in order to determine the representation of Poles, Italians, Latins, and Blacks.

Information about directors and officers was taken directly from the 1972 annual report of each corporation. The number of directors of all 106 corporations totaled 1341; the number of officers, 1355. For the purposes of this study, honorary board members were not included, nor were officers of less than vice-presidential rank such as assistant vice-presidents, assistant secretaries, or assistant treasurers. Where a firm was controlled by a holding company, only the directors and officers of the holding company were counted. An officer who also was a member of the board of directors of the same firm was counted twice, once as director, again as officer.

TABLE I

Representation of select ethnic groups in the Chicago metropolitan area population and on the boards of directors and among the officers of the 106 largest Chicago area corporations.

	% Area Population	Directors		Officers	
		No.	%	No.	%
Poles	6.9	4	0.3	10	0.7
Italians	4.8	26	1.9	39	2.9
Latins	4.4	1	0.1	2	0.1
Blacks	17.6	5	0.4	1	0.1
All Other	66.3	1305	97.3	1303	96.2
Total	100.0	1341	100.0	1355	100.0

Notes:

The "area population" refers to the Chicago metropolitan area: the six counties of Cook, Kane, Will, DuPage, Lake, and McHenry, whose population in 1970 was 6,979,000.

The percentages of area population was prepared by Michael E. Schiltz, Director of Loyola University's Graduate Program in Urban Studies. For Poles, Italians, and Latins, the estimates include first, second, and third generations, based on U.S. Bureau of Census data.

The Black population is based on 1970 data from the U.S. Census Bureau.

TABLE II

Number of corporations, of the 106 examined, which had no directors or officers who were Poles, Italians, Latins, or Blacks.*

	No. of Corporations without director	No. of Corporations without officer
Poles	102	97
Italians	84	75
Latins	105	104
Blacks	101	105

* 55 of the 106 corporations had no Poles, Italians, Latins, or Blacks either as directors or as officers.

Findings and Conclusions

Thirty-six, or less than three per cent, of the 1341 directors were Polish,² Italian, Latin, or Black. Fifty-two, or less than four per cent, of the 1355 officers were Polish, Italian, Latin, or Black. These four groups make up approximately 34 per cent of the metropolitan area's population. When translated into individual percentages, the findings indicate that 0.3 per cent of all directors were Polish, 1.9 per cent Italian,³ 0.1 per cent Latin, and 0.4 per cent Black. Out of all officers, 0.7 per cent were Polish, 2.9 per cent Italian, 0.1 per cent Latin, and 0.1 per cent Black. (See Table I.)

² In referring to Poles, Italians, Latins, or Blacks, the author means Americans who are of Polish, Italian, Latin (Spanish-speaking background), or Black ancestry.

³ One person of Italian background serves on nine different boards. If he were to be counted only once, the percentage of directors who are Italian would be reduced from 1.9 percent to 1.3 percent.

How does one make a judgment about such information? How can it be used to evaluate the extent to which Poles, Italians, Latins, and Blacks have entered the executive suites of Chicago's major corporations? Are Poles, Italians, Latins and Blacks equitably represented there?

To answer such questions the executive suite data was compared to the population of each of the four groups in the Chicago metropolitan area. This comparison provides a rough but fair guide for determining whether each group has achieved parity or whether it is underrepresented.⁴

If one compares (Table I) the percentages of officers and directors whose backgrounds are Polish, Italian, Latin, or Black to the percentage distribution of these four groups in the population, it becomes clear that all four groups were grossly underrepresented on the boards of directors and in the executive positions of Chicago's major corporations. Thus, although Poles make up 6.9 per cent of the metropolitan population, only 0.3 per cent of the directors are Polish. Italians make up 4.8 per cent of the population, but only 1.9 per cent of the directors are Italian. Blacks comprise 17.6 per cent of the population yet only 0.4 per cent of the directors are Black. Latins are 4.4 per cent of the population yet only 0.1 per cent of the directors are Latin. The same general pattern holds if one compares the percentages of officers who are Polish, Italian, Latin, or Black to the percentage distribution of these four groups in the population.

As a matter of fact, Poles, Latins, and Blacks were virtually absent from the upper echelons of Chicago's largest corporations. 102 out of the 106 corporations had no directors who were Polish; 97 had no officers who were Polish; Only one corporation had a Black officer and only two had Latin officers. While the Italians were more numerous in

⁴ What should serve as an equitable norm, and how to apply it, is, of course, open to discussion. One can anticipate increasing public discussion of the matter as more groups pursue group gains.

the executive suite than the other three groups. 84 corporations out of 106 still had no directors who were Italian and 75 had no officers who were Italian. Finally, 55 out of the 106 corporations had no Poles, Italians, Latins, or Blacks, either as directors or as officers. (See Table II.)

Other significant patterns emerge from the data. Poles and Italians do better in their representation in executive positions than they do as board members. The opposite is true of Blacks, whose major source of representation comes from appointments to boards of directors rather than from holding top executive positions. No Poles were located among the public utilities and banks reviewed in this study, either as directors or as officers. As for Italians, 16 were associated with banks or savings and loan institutions. However, there were no Italians in the executive suites of the utilities.⁵ On the other hand, three out of the five corporations with Black directors were public utilities. The number of Latins was not large enough to yield any significant pattern.

Hopefully, this study of four ethnic groups in the corporate structure of metropolitan Chicago will be extended to include their representation in major civic groups such as public boards and commissions, influential private agencies and associations, foundations, and social clubs. Similar studies of other ethnic groups such as Czechs, Greeks, Lithuanians, etc. should be conducted in the Chicago area. Given the lack of adequate research on American ethnic groups, similar surveys should be undertaken in other large cities.

As such studies accumulate, the result may be a national profile for each of America's ethnic groups showing precisely the extent to which each of them share in the power

⁵ An Italian, however, does serve as an officer of the two subsidiaries of one of the utilities.

and affluence of the nation. In the process the nation will learn to what extent the American corporation is a "truly public institution bound to the same criteria of selection that today affect government service—freedom from bias, and the requirement at the same time to represent and reflect all parts of the American population."⁶

A Note on Method

Trying to determine ethnic origin is a hazardous enterprise. In order to make this study as accurate as possible, knowledgeable leaders from the Polish, Italian, and Latin communities were asked to identify ethnic names by studying the lists of directors and officers in each annual report. In cases of doubtful ethnic origin the individual's office was contacted directly. Each corporation having no apparent representation from any of the four ethnic communities was informally contacted to double check the preliminary findings. In regard to Blacks, all available studies were utilized and persons familiar with the Black community were consulted. Also helpful were several lawyers and business leaders who were generally knowledgeable about many of the corporations studied. If there are any errors in the final tally for each group, the margin of error would not be sufficiently great to invalidate the findings of this study.

A manual describing in full the method used is being prepared by the author and will be distributed through the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs in Washington and the Institute of Urban Life in Chicago.

⁶ Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, *Beyond the Melting Pot*, 1963, p. 208.

THE 106 CHICAGO-BASED CORPORATIONS

Abbot Laboratories
Admiral
Allied Mills
Allied Van Lines
American Bakeries
American Hospital Supply
American National
Amsted Industries
Baxter Laboratories
Beatrice Foods
Bell Federal
Bell & Howell
Borg-Warner
Brunswick
Bunker Ramo
Carson Pirie Scott
CECO
CENCO
Central National Bank
CFS Continental
Chemetron
Citizens Bank Park Ridge
Chicago Bridge and Iron
Chicago-Milwaukee
Chicago and North Western

Chicago, Rock Island and
Pacific
Combined Insurance
Commonwealth Edison
Consolidated Foods
Continental Illinois
Corporation
CNA Financial
De Soto
Donnelley (R. R.) & Sons
Drovers National Bank
Exchange National Bank
First Chicago
First Federal
FMC
General American
Transportation
Goldblatt Brothers
Gould
Harris Bankcorp
Hart, Schaffner & Marx
Heller (Walter E.)
International
Hilton Hotels
Home Federal
Household Finance

Illinois Bell Telephone
Illinois Central Industries
Illinois Tool Works
Interlake
Inland Steel
International Harvester
International Minerals
& Chemical
Jewel
Kemperco
Krafco
Lakeview Trust
LaSalle National Bank
Libby, McNeill and Libby
Marcor
Maremont
Marleman
Marshall Field
Masonite
McDonald's
McGraw-Edison
Morton-Norwich Products
Motorola
Nalco Chemical
National Boulevard Bank
National Can

National Tea
Northern Illinois Gas
Northern Indiana Public
Service
Nortrust
Northwest Industries
Northwest National
Bank
Outboard Marine
People's Gas
Pioneer Trust
Pullman
Quaker Oats
St. Paul Federal
Santa Fe Industries
Searle (G. D.)
Sears Bank & Trust
Sears, Roebuck
Signode
Spector Industries
Square D
Standard Oil (Indiana)
Sunbeam
Swift
Talman Federal
Trans Union

UAL

U.S. Gypsum

UNICOA

Universal Oil Products

Walgreen

Ward Foods

Washington National

Wieboldt Stores

Wrigley (William) Jr.

Zenith Radio

Comments of Leonard F. Walentynowicz,
Executive Director of the Polish American Congress,
With Respect to S. Res. 431

While S. Res. 431 is a welcome initiative and effort to help promote equal opportunity and recognition in the area of Congressional employment, it is significantly deficient in several respects. We make this observation in light of our experience with similar programs and procedures enacted in the fields of private and other public employment, such as Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Presidential Executive Order #11246, and the regu-

lations and policies and practices of the Civil Service Commission, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Civil Rights Commission. Such experience indicates that these agencies and many others responsible for fair employment policies practice a much different gospel than the one that is given to the American public for belief, and we have detailed our concerns and conclusions in support thereof in comments and testimony given before (1) the Civil Service Commission with respect to the so-called "Sugarman" proposals, (2) the EEOC with respect to their proposed guidelines designed to protect employers from claims of "reverse discrimination" and (3) the Senate Subcommittee on the Constitution with respect to the proposed

extension of the Civil Rights Commission.

Copies of such comments and testimony are enclosed herewith.

In the context of this bill our concerns essentially deal with the parochial preoccupation by the Executive branch of government and many

members of Congress and their staff with only certain forms of prohibited discrimination, namely, race, sex and color, and only certain designated groups, namely, blacks, Hispanics, native Americans and Asian Americans, and women without even bothering to find out whether any other groups that form part of this mosaic called America need similar attention or may be unfairly affected by the attention and in many cases preferences given the favored groups. We want to avoid in the field of congressional employment the uneven and discriminatory application of similar type procedures now found in the field of private and other public employment.

To put it another way we want to be sure that the Board, Office, Director and other employees of the bureaucracy created by this resolution understands absolutely that Congress desires that discrimination based on religion and national origin other than Hispanic gets the same kind of priority and attention as the presently favored types and that such bureaucracy does not use as a convenient excuse the present insensitivity of the already existing government agencies.

In addition it has become overwhelmingly clear to us that the government's failure to collect data on any groups other than on the designated minorities and women is fundamentally unfair and discriminatory. As we stated in our additional comments to the Senate Subcommittee the

present practice of lumping together as a homogeneous unit anyone who is not included as a member of a designated minority defies common sense.

Doing so presumes that anyone in that non-minority unit has the same degree of upward mobility or equal opportunity. This assertion would be immediately proved suspect and even conclusively refuted if data were collected on such groups as Polish Americans, Arab Americans, Italian Americans, etc., as such data is collected and analyzed for the designated minorities. The failure to collect data also creates unfair attitudes among those in power including judges for it gives them a convenient excuse to assert that those groups who are not being counted either have no problem or have no standing to assert their rights. A vivid example of this was a recent decision of Judge

Charles R. Richey of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia in the case of Bachman v. Pertschuk, C.A. 76-0079, wherein he excluded Polish Americans and other white ethnics from the benefits of a stipulation regarding the hiring practices at the Federal Trade Commission even though he included all members of the designated minorities notwithstanding that the action was maintained only by blacks as a class. Another example is the affirmative action program in the case of Bakke v. California, now awaiting decision by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Accordingly, we ask that the Resolution be amended by adding the following language in Title II, Section 202(b) after the conclusion thereof:

The Office shall gather and maintain information on categories of employees and individuals beyond those presently designated as minorities. There shall be as

many categories as the Office receives complaints reflecting the specific type of discrimination.

and the following language in Title III, Part D:

(d) All forms of prohibited discrimination shall be given the same priority and attention especially in formulation and implementation of any affirmative action plan. Whenever data and numbers are used either to establish discrimination or to remedy the

effects thereof such as timetables and goals, comparable data and analyses must be created for all other forms of prohibited discrimination including all of the categories created pursuant to Section 202(b) hereof. In the event numerical remedies are to be used, they must be accompanied by a statement reflecting the impact such remedies will have upon the groups who are not included as the beneficiaries of any such remedy.

We of course would be happy to meet with any committee and the staff thereof to work out other acceptable language if the proposed language is unsuitable.

DISCUSSION

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. My first question would be: The statement has been made that the Polish-American Congress did send the appropriate letter to EEOC. Is there a reason why that has not been responded to?

MR. LEACH. I have no knowledge of the letter. I didn't receive a copy of it. I can't answer that.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. It was directed to the Chairman?

MR. LEACH. I'll be glad to make an inquiry.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Okay, if that could be furnished to Mr. Leach, perhaps if a copy would come back both to you and to the Commission, we would like that as part of the record at this point, as Exhibit B.

EXHIBIT B

To:

Hon. Eleanor Holmes Norton, Chair

Attn:

Executive Secretariat

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

Comments of Leonard F. Walentynowicz,
Executive Director, Polish American Congress,
on Proposed Guidelines Relating to Remedial
and/or Affirmative Action, et al.

We wish to compliment you on the initiative you have displayed in attempting to utilize one of the tools Congress gave you to help do the Commission's job. Faced with uncertainties and vicissitudes and buffeted by competing factors and groups, I am certain that private and governmental employers would welcome guidance from you that would not only indicate the practices they should adopt in implementing *fairly* Congressional and executive policy in this area but would also provide them with a measure of protection from exaggerated and

unfounded claims of discrimination once they adopt such practices. Never-the-less, the proposed guidelines and the commentary issued therewith are illustrative of one of the major reasons why more progress has not been achieved in eliminating prohibited discrimination based on race, color, sex, creed, and national origin without any priority to any one type over any other. The guidelines as well as the Commission's policies, practices, and comments establish priorities and preferences, which in effect create new patterns of discrimination and attack fundamental American values of individual rights and initiative. Essentially this has come about because of the Commission's preoccupation with only certain forms of discrimination and an impatience to remedy these kinds of discrimination without fully considering what impact this preoccupation and the proposed remedies have on other forms of prohibited discrimination and other constitutional rights and values including merit selection and equal protection of the law.

In addition, the Commission preaches the gospel of equality for all but engages in a practice of either outright or de facto preferences for certain groups on the grounds that such is necessary to rectify the effects of past discrimination. Perhaps such a practice can be justified constitutionally but such a decision should be made by Congress and the President and only after a comprehensive survey is made of *all* the discrimination suffered by the groups that make up America and not just a certain select portion thereof.

As a result of these factors much resentment has been created, thereby slowing progress in eliminating prohibited discrimination. Further this resentment against the unfair and uneven application of our laws and executive orders regarding prohibited discrimination and affirmative action programs is all too often indiscriminately and irresponsibly labeled as another form of racism, thus again reducing the teamwork necessary to overcome this major problem in American society.

Having made these observations it would be appropriate to indicate how they relate to the specific proposals under consideration here.

First of all, the language in paragraphs I, II and III of the proposed guidelines, if literally read, expresses a gospel of equal concern for the five prohibited areas of discrimination reflected in Executive Order 11246 and Title VII, namely, race, color, creed, sex, and national origin. Unfortunately, however, the Commission's practices result in the collection of data of only certain groups namely, blacks, Hispanics, Native American, and Asian Americans, and whites or others,

duplicated for males and females. There is no statutory or executive mandate limiting the collection of data only to these groups. The memo from the Office of Management and Budget merely requests that uniform data be collected to facilitate budget purposes, and we have been expressly advised that more categories than those used by the Commission can be used if it is necessary to accomplish legislative and executive mandates. Interestingly enough, data is collected on Hispanics, a group which is considered over 95% white by the U. S. Bureau of Census without any justification why data is not being collected on any other sub-group of the white race, even though it is common knowledge that there are a large substantial number of such sub-groups including Polish Americans, Italian Americans, Arab Americans, Jewish Americans, etc., and that many of such groups are discriminated against in a variety of ways similar to the ones being counted, including such discrimination as defamation and lack of upward mobility.

Accordingly, if an employer wanted to make an analysis as suggested in paragraphs I, II and III of the guidelines, he could not do so, because the data would not be there. This would particularly be so in certain highly ethnic areas such as Chicago, Detroit, New York, Cleveland, or with nationwide employers. Thus the Commission by these guidelines preaches one gospel but practices another. Significantly, President Carter by memorandum dated 7-27-78, requested all departments and agencies to collect data on the racial, sex, and ethnic makeup of his executive appointments and ancillary help along 16 different groups, thus recognizing the need for more categories.

Secondly, the Commission suggests in paragraph IV of the guidelines the use of certain ratios, goals, timetables or other numerical remedies. To the extent that their use is restricted to actual discrimination to be remedied, such use cannot only be justified and sustained as a proper remedy, but also emphasized as being consistent with the public statements of the President. Nevertheless, the language used in the guidelines contemplates their use in a much broader sense and purpose and to the extent they are so to be used, they constitute a de facto quota system and are objectionable not only on constitutional and statutory grounds but are in contradiction of the public statements of the President. In this context, it is suggested that numerical disparity alone is not conclusive evidence of actual discrimination but is simply one possible indicator thereof. Further, the use of numerical remedies as proposed here has the effect of emphasizing group rights over individual rights and initiative, thereby adversely affecting competition by merit.

Another deficiency is the failure of the Commission to articulate what the goals and timetables should represent. Do they mean more

participation in the job force at a sacrifice in merit? How long are they to be used? Until there is absolute numerical parity between the number of the group employed and the number of the group in the relevant work force? If so, how do we allow for nondiscrimination factors such as cultural preferences, incentive, hard work, initiative and natural competition? In any event, if numerical remedies are to be used, regardless how disguised, then in the interest of fairness and equality they should be used for all disadvantaged and discriminated groups and not only for some.

Third, in paragraph VII of the guidelines and in the commentary issued to explain and interpret the guidelines, the Commission indicates a preference for certain forms of discrimination. This is a violation of the mandates given it by statute and executive order. As indicated previously, these mandates require the Commission to overcome prohibited discrimination on an equal and fair basis without any priority or preference for any one type of discrimination. To do otherwise, without allowing for the impact on those kinds of prohibited discrimination not receiving attention is to create new patterns of discrimination. To put it another way, the non-favored ethnic group and individual not only has to compete on the merits but they also have to overcome the de facto preferences given other groups and individuals for discrimination that in many instances the non-favored group and individual was not responsible for.

The Chair's statement that the Commission must protect employers from charges of "reverse discrimination" is simply another manifestation of this uneven and unfair application by the Commission of its mandates. The groups favored by the Chair do not have a special right of protection or preference. Employers should be given guidance and encouraged to make self-analysis and formulate plans to avoid "reverse discrimination" as well as the discrimination sought to be protected by the Chair. In fact, such employers should be given guidance, encouragement and data to make self-analysis and formulate plans to avoid all the forms of prohibited discrimination and to correct past injustices to all groups and not just some.

In conclusion, we suggest that these guidelines be redrawn in light of these comments and their effect delayed until the Commission creates a sufficient data base to carry out its mandate fairly and equally as originally intended and required by legislative and executive mandate. We offer our continued cooperation to this end.

Dated: February 28, 1978, Washington, D.C.

Do my colleagues have any questions of Mr. Leach?

Go ahead. Commissioner Saltzman?

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Obviously, Mr. Leach, the perception of some is that the needs of the ethnic community have been ignored by EEOC. This has fostered bitterness, or at least some sense of hostility toward other communities because of the seeming absence of equal effort by EEOC against ethnic discrimination on a par with efforts to overcome racial discrimination. Has the EEOC undertaken in the past, or does it plan to address the employment needs and discrimination practices against Euro-Americans?

MR. LEACH. Mr. Saltzman, let me answer that a couple of different ways.

One, it may be charged that EEOC has not done enough on behalf of any protected group under Title VII, and depending on which community of interest you're talking with, you're going to receive that charge, and I agree with it. I agree with it, for a lot of different reasons but basically it is because the government has never done enough. Secondly, I think it has to be understood clearly - may I just say that this witness, I think, made a very strong, articulate statement, one that in many respects I agree with and I think he makes a very good case. But at the same time I want to point out that there are certain things that it has no control over.

One, EEOC is a law-enforcement agency. Individuals who are discriminated against in the context of the work place come to EEOC and file charges of discrimination alleging that they've been unlawfully not hired, that they've been unlawfully discharged, that they have been unlawfully not promoted - a host of other infractions. We have to investigate those individual complaints. We don't go out and seek them. They come in our doors.

We have 50 or more offices around the country. We receive about 7,000 charges of discrimination or inquiries every month, 30,000 a year. We have to investigate, make decisions on, and then if the employer refuses voluntarily to conciliate the case, we then go to court and we start the process over again. We have to sue the employer, and we have to get a court to agree *de novo* that the evidence supports the claims of discrimination.

Let me tell you the statistics on who files charges in America with EEOC. Fifty percent of our charges are filed on the basis of black race discrimination. Thirty-five percent of our charges are filed on the basis of discrimination because of sex. That's approximately 85 percent in all. Eleven percent more are filed on the basis of national origin, Hispanic. That leaves about four percent. Three of that four percent

file on the basis of religious discrimination. That leaves one percent of our charges that are filed from the ethnic Americans, which the witness speaks of. To a large extent, this dictates the expenditure of our resources. We have no control. The decision's made for us by those who appear affected. As I say, we're a law-enforcement agency.

On the other hand, we do try to reserve some of our resources to bring systemic pattern and practice types of cases. As I said in my statement, in doing this and in performing this mission, we must in reality and in the sense of perception give the impression and make it stick in reality that we do this fairly, and with equity, and even-handedly in behalf of all citizens who are protected by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act.

We are going to have a review. It's undergoing now with respect to a task force effort of the EEO one through six reporting data, which gives us information on the array of employees that exist in the work force. Every employer having 50 or more employees must file these reports by law, subject to criminal and civil penalty.

Those reports were first issued I believe in approximately 1966, and it's long past due in terms of a judgment, a critical judgment, as to whether or not the information that we're receiving is adequate to support the enforcement of the law.

That's why we've appointed this task force; that's why within the next few months we'll be holding hearings, and I invite this witness to appear at those hearings. I invite all others, and perhaps this Commission as well to give us some help to decide how we better can identify discrimination and better use and marshal our resources to meet it in behalf of everyone who's protected by the law.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Are you suggesting that it is feasible to include, as was requested by the witness, Euro-Americans?

MR. LEACH. Differently than it is now being included? It may be. I don't know. I haven't really focused on it. I'm waiting for the task force report and their recommendations.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. One final question.

In such voluntary Affirmative Action programs as undertaken by the Kaiser Company, do those programs benefit in any way others than merely members of the black community? Are there benefits to the ethnic community, especially those on the lower economic level?

MR. LEACH. The Kaiser case was, as you know, a black case, a race case. It's quite conceivable that - and even in looking at our voluntary guidelines on Affirmative Action that we published in January of this year, they could apply to any under-represented ethnic group in the relevant labor market that surrounds an employer's place of business.

What we tell employers is this. We say take a look at your work force. Take a look at your relevant labor market and your pool of qualified employees in that market and make a judgment. Is there a significant under-representation of any ethnic category protected by Title VII in this work place of yours; and if there is, can it be justified?

That brings up the tests, the selection device, the height requirement, whatever that employer has in the way of a college degree requirement or whatever. Is it job related? Is it justified by a business necessity? If it isn't, then that under-representation cannot be lawfully explained and the statistical inference arises that probably discrimination against that group, whatever it is, has occurred, justifying affirmative or remedial action.

We seek to order those employers to go out and undertake special recruitment efforts, affirmative action, goals and timetables, whatever it takes to correct that imbalance. When it's corrected, perhaps discrimination no longer will be seen in that work place. But until it is, it just may exist.

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. I'd like to comment on a couple points that Mr. Leach made that are very, very important from our perspective, if time permits. If you want me to comment now, I'd be happy -

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Well, if you would like to respond now, I hope that you will.

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. I'd like to do so now in fairness to Mr. Leach.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Right.

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. With respect to the point that the number of complaints was only one percent - my feeling based on my experience with the Government, in the State Department, my presence in Washington for 5 years, and my activity in Polish-American and East European affairs is that the prime reason for such a small number of complaints is the public perception that the Government doesn't seriously entertain them.

You may come here and say a lot of nice things about the way our laws in theory work, but these people are not dumb; they're looking at the practice, and they're looking at reality.

You may talk about a balanced work force, but when you tell the employer that when he makes his survey of his work force to find out its make up and needs, and then your statistical form lumps everybody left in this last category, well, you know what the obvious answer is.

And that's one of the reasons people don't file a complaint, because they know they're not included in the reporting form. In addition, they're told by the Government agencies, such as the State Department, that they're not officially recognized.

When I used the essence of the argument you just made a moment ago with the Office of Management in the State Department, that is, the need to determine the relevant work force nationwide, for foreign service officers, I was told that we don't count.

They said the only ones that count are those listed on the form. They further stated that the Civil Service Commission directed that the first four groups designated are to be the only beneficiaries of affirmative action. When I asked them and the Civil Service Commission for the authority for such direction, they couldn't find it.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Well, that's the point I wanted to pursue, and let me pursue it while Mr. Leach is here. I would be curious personally, Mr. Leach, whether you would favor additional categories on the EEO-6 form.

MR. LEACH. Educational institutions.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Yes.

I mean do you get involved? Are there comparable forms in industry where you ask for the data?

MR. LEACH. Well, I want to see the specifics. As I said, Vice Chairman Horn, we have a task force. Three program offices in Washington in our headquarters are joined together now looking at these issues. They're examining it. When we do make recommendations, we have to have hearings on it. It's a little premature to say in what fashion -

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. When is that supposed to report, that task force?

MR. LEACH. Within the next 2 months, and then we go to hearings after that.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. And do we know yet the way the question will be posed by that task force?

Is it open-ended as to the number of groups?

MR. LEACH. It's going to be open-ended as to what changes will be made in our forms.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. It is open-ended.

MR. LEACH. It's going to be open-ended in terms of the context of all these surveys, all of these reports, all of the information that is gathered by EEOC.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. So then any ethnic group -

MR. LEACH. Theoretically, that's right.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Any ethnic group would have a right to testify, to state their case, and presumably it then gets down to the feasibility in terms of the mechanics. From your testimony, I understood that you had checked with various agencies, and there is no problem on the mechanics.

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. Originally I was told there was. I was advised by the State Department that mechanically we couldn't have more categories - but then when we pressed our case with the Census Bureau, the Census Bureau created for tabulation of its new 1980 Census forms something like 600 different categories, and the Office of Management and Budget, as I stated before, permits the inclusion of any number of other categories.

The capacity and authority for more categories is there. The present five categories evolved basically as a bureaucratic decision. These five categories are not the result of a Congressional decision or even a Presidential decision except to the extent that the Office of Management and Budget reflects the will of the President.

For a while there was a decision that we were to have only five categories, but because of pressure and fairness, as well as existing law, Office of Management and Budget concluded that more categories could be created, except that if more categories are created, they are to be subsumed under the existing five categories.

I question the wisdom as well as the legality of that last proviso, but at least Office of Management and Budget determined that we can have more categories. I see no mechanical difficulties in having 10 or 600 more categories if that's necessary.

MR. LEACH. These aren't our forms. Let me make it clear. What he's talking about are not the EEO-one through six series of survey information, and as to what his experience at the State Department is, I can't talk about that.

EEOC never had jurisdiction over the Federal Government until January of this year. We're just now promulgating our policies, our practices, our procedures on discrimination law in the Federal sector. So what the State Department has done in the past, I also have no knowledge of.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Let me ask along that line: Has EEOC had any input to the Census in the '70's with reference to the 1980 Census categories? Were you consulted on the diversity of those categories?

MR. LEACH. I testified at a meeting of the President's Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics. They in turn were going to make some recommendations with respect to the 1980 Census that would be helpful to us. So I guess in that context, they did get some information from us as to what our specific needs were. As to the details of that testimony, I'd have to refresh my memory. It was well over a year ago.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Well, take it off the top of your head. Do you recall if EEOC advocated then broadening the categories from the four protected -

MR. LEACH. Yes, yes, we needed broader, more specific information. We needed broader and more clearly defined categories.

We needed more information with respect to incomes. There has been a host of specific recommendations.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. I think, to round out this portion of the questioning, I would like your statement, if you wouldn't mind, to file it with the Commission, and we'll put it in the record at this point, as Exhibit C.

EXHIBIT C

REMARKS OF DANIEL E. LEACH
VICE CHAIRMAN, EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COM-
MISSION
BEFORE THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL
RIGHTS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
December 4, 1979

ETHNICITY AND EMPLOYMENT

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was created to enforce Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended. Title VII was enacted to end job discrimination on account of race, sex, color, religion, and national origin. It is designed as well to bring those previously excluded from or kept down in the workplace into the economic mainstream.

At the outset, let me say that this law must be administered fairly. The enforcement agency preeminently responsible - EEOC - must be perceived as being even-handed in its approach to employment discrimination. The observations I make transcend the various bases of discrimination under the Act. The minorities involved reflect the full spectrum of protected groups whose ethnicity has adversely affected them in the workplace. They all suffer employment discrimination.

It would appear, first of all, that employers have constructed specific barriers to the hiring of minorities. They lie mainly in areas of testing, and other screening devices, and in the area of recruitment. My Commission has found a decided increase in total paper and pencil test usage and a marked increase in doubtful testing practices which, based on our experience, tend to have discriminatory effects. The same is true of arbitrary height requirements or weight requirements. In many cases, employers have been relying almost exclusively on these tests as the basis for making the decision to hire, transfer, or promote.

Minority candidates frequently experience disproportionately high rates of rejection by failing to attain score levels or whatever has been established as minimum standards for qualification. This may be a valid and acceptable practice but too often we have found that employers have been using tests that have not been shown to be predictors of job performance. That is a critical issue under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. Even now, paper and pencil tests, height requirements, degree requirements and a host of other filters are used. Some legitimately. Others, as the devices that serve to filter or screen out certain types of people for jobs or promotions.

Recruitment barriers are just as serious. For new hires, employers or incumbent employees are likely to contact only their friends and associates – the buddy-buddy practice that so often served to eliminate minority candidates. And still does. It may well depend on where the hiring net is thrown – be it toward the local high school or college or in the direction of the suburbs. And the discriminatory effect continues on down stream; it does not stop at initial hiring.

It should be noted that job discrimination against minorities often operates in three dimensions: discrimination in hiring and; even if hired, discrimination in the form of segregated or unequal initial job assignments and; after assignment, discrimination in job progression – in the advancement and promotional opportunities that relegate minority workers to less desirable, lower-paid jobs.

Of course, there are pockets of progress. Some minorities are gaining increased skills through education and training. Some employers or industries are endeavoring to respond to the mandate of the law. But by and large, government must continue to press against the barriers, strike them down and prod, push, pull and order industry to undertake remedial and affirmative action. That is my perception of EEOC's work – it is what I have experienced in my three and one-half years with the Commission.

Part of the answer has rested with measures that serve to identify the barriers – measures such as Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection. These are the standards set by government to inform employers as to their legal responsibilities in seeking to gauge individuals and their fitness for hiring and promotion.

It has been the use of tests or other devices or standards that are not properly job related or justified that has so adversely affected the hiring, promotion, and transfer prospects of minorities. The Courts have been generous in finding unlawful discrimination where these tests have not been validated, where they do not evince a high degree of job relatedness. Further, the employer giving or acting upon the results of the particular test must be able to demonstrate that suitable alternative selection procedures are unavailable. While a violation of

the Uniform Selection Guidelines may serve to identify unlawful job discrimination, these guidelines do contain a provision that offers encouragement to employers who have sought to respond. Embraced within the Guidelines is the so-called "bottom-line" clause. It says that even where an employer cannot validate a selection procedure, government will not take action if, in a general sense, it appears that notwithstanding the infraction, those who have been left out or kept down in that employer's work force are being brought in and moved up. In other words, there may be a technical violation of the law, but employers endeavoring to correct the effects of job discrimination ought to be encouraged. That is the message of the "bottom-line."

Beyond employee selection procedures there are other recent developments that this Commission – the Civil Rights Commission – perhaps ought to be looking at. The *Weber, Kaiser Steelworkers* case I think is relevant to this dialogue. There, you will recall, the Supreme Court placed its stamp of approval on voluntary affirmative action programs as a way of bringing blacks into the economic mainstream. It could well apply equally to Hispanics and other protected groups if an appropriate fact pattern exists. To briefly review the facts and holdings of this case, until 1974 Kaiser hired as craft workers for its Gramercy Louisiana plant only persons who already had prior craft experience. As a result there were very few blacks in craft jobs; in part at least – as the Supreme Court opinion specifically noted – because blacks had long been excluded from construction craft unions in that area. In 1974, Kaiser and the Steelworkers entered into a collective bargaining agreement which changed the practice throughout the country with respect to craft jobs. Rather than hiring from the outside, Kaiser established a training program to train its production workers to fill craft positions.

The agreement provided for separate seniority lists, one black and one white, with the proviso that at least 50% of the new trainees would be black until the black percentage of craft workers approximated the percentage of blacks in the SMSA work force. As a result of the agreement, some blacks selected for training had less plant seniority than some of the whites whose bids were rejected. Brian Weber was one of those whites. He brought suit and the rest is history. While Title VII protects whites as well as blacks, the Court ruled that the plan at stake did not violate the Act because it was an affirmative action plan voluntarily adopted by private parties to eliminate traditional patterns of racial segregation in employment. This case should bring to a halt those cries of "reverse" discrimination uttered in the fact of such a long standing and continuing national blight. That is the way our Supreme Court saw it. But the verdict is still out.

The primary concern of Congress in prohibiting job discrimination was the lowly plight of those in our economy who had been riveted to unskilled and semi-skilled positions. The statute was to open up job opportunities; to bring people into the economic mainstream who had previously been barred.

What does *Weber* mean, then, in the context of a response to be fashioned by employers? First of all, it means that employers, without fear of retribution, can train minorities – along with untrained whites – for greater participation in the work force. This could mean the inclusion of minorities in occupations from which they have historically been excluded – perhaps white collar jobs, in management, and in upper economic sales jobs. Government must do everything it can to encourage employers to take advantage of the *Weber* ruling, and I look forward to the views of this Commission on that issue.

Still another potential weapon in government's hands is the EEOC's authority to identify and eliminate patterns and practices of job discrimination. We know from our statistical data that while the old slogan may no longer be visible – “anglo males only” – it still is operating to the detriment of others. Government must better use its power to identify the barriers and strike them down. At EEOC we are seeking to construct a systemic enforcement program that will marshal resources in a fair and logical manner – taking aim, for example, at the very worst practices in order to achieve the greatest results. For this purpose we are just beginning to use this research base of ours as a law enforcement tool – to make more critical and rational judgments about where resource allocations might make their most effective impact – whether it is an industry, an employer, an issue, geographically or however else job discrimination arises.

While the Commission brings numerous actions against employers who perpetuate policies and practices which result in low utilization of available minorities, we have not done enough. Neither have the other elements of the Federal Government who are in this business.

What this all says is that while Congress has given us some tools to fight employment discrimination and to attack it institutionally we are just recently learning how to mount a more effective effort. Government is indeed trying to do better. President Carter's Civil Rights Reorganization Plan says that. Also saying it are those strategies fashioned to encourage voluntary compliance with Title VII; whether it is the “bottom-line” of the Testing Guidelines or Voluntary Affirmative Action as exhibited by the *Weber* ruling or targeting employers on a worst-first priority basis, we must encourage those who seek to comply and scrutinize carefully those who appear not to.

But these are only the seeds that may lead employers in the 1980's to restructure their workplaces to meet the demands of the law and national policy. What about the present?

This is no easy or simple task. To so many questions there appear few, if any, answers.

There is the traditional resistance. There is the political resistance. There is the economy. We appear headed for a period of economic decline. In the past unemployment has been borne disproportionately on the backs of minorities - those who entered the workforce last are the first to go. There are so many obstacles. I look forward to any recommendations that this Commission might offer as to layoffs, work sharing and whatever else may be required to mitigate this period of economic down turn.

Thank you.

* * *

Commissioner Saltzman, did you have any further questions?
Commissioner Ruiz?

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Yes. Let's go back 10 years. The data collection effort by blacks and Hispanics didn't always exist. The blacks and the Spanish a decade ago were relatively in the same position and using arguments that the Polish-Americans are today. Blacks and Hispanics felt locked out of the employment market because they weren't properly identified. Now, I do not know exactly what this ethnic group was doing 10 years ago, but apparently 10 years ago they were happier than they are today. I don't know. But what was available at that time to the blacks with relation to census and to the Hispanics with relation to census was, I surmise available to ethnics as well.

The ethnic community that we are involved with at the present time is probably susceptible to identification, because the big problem at this time is how in the heck are you going to identify yourself?

As I see the picture here, ethnics are not really opposed to affirmative action; they just want to be included in the affirmative action. In the affirmative action ladder, because you speak about the ladder - they too want to have upward mobility, as I notice here on the statistics, to executive suites.

It's not a case of injustice. It's a case of the Government lags. I welcome what is occurring here today because as I see it, from an ethnic point of view, unfortunately, there has been a lag, and it isn't reverse discrimination, because the laws are there.

So I think this hearing is very important for purposes of getting on the ball.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Chairman Fleming?

CHAIRMAN FLEMING. I appreciate very much the dialogue that has just taken place, for this reason. The Vice Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has made it clear that there is a study under way dealing with this basic issue, that there is going to be a public hearing as a result of that study.

This in turn will give the various groups who share this concern the opportunity to make representations based on the study and based on their own study.

I think it is very, very important for Government to make sure that these opportunities are provided, not just in the employment area, but also in some of these other areas that we've had under consideration.

If you were here, you may have noted, I addressed some questions relative to public hearings on certain other regulations, because those did provide an opportunity to raise these issues and get them before the people who have to make decisions, and I think it is very, very important to utilize those channels when they open up. I think this dialogue has been very, very important.

From the standpoint of the *Weber* case, I think there's one thing that sometimes we overlook. The first thing that the agreement did between the management and the steelworkers was to open up opportunities for all current employees of that particular company. In other words, the company had been going to the outside to employ craft workers and was discriminating against all of their own employees. And this agreement opened up an opportunity for all of them, so that the result was that not only did black members of the community have opportunities that they hadn't had before, but members of the white community also had opportunities that they hadn't had before. I think that's an aspect of the *Weber* situation that's interesting.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Mr. Nunez?

STAFF DIRECTOR Louis Nunez. No questions.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. All right.

Mr. White?

ASSISTANT STAFF DIRECTOR WHITE. Just one question, Commissioner Leach. Mr. Walentynowicz indicated in his testimony that he would advocate a connection with Affirmative Action point system. Would you care to comment on that?

MR. LEACH. A point system? I missed that. I -

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. It's in the brief we filed in the *Weber* case. I suggested a point system instead of the kind of quotas, time tables, and goals we have now, which not only are exclusionary in practice but also raise serious questions and problems with other values we hold highly. If the person can show discrimination, then give him a

remedy through a point system. That way you don't exclude everybody else and seriously impair the rights of innocent individuals and groups.

Give him a preference – as the present system is designed to do – but unlike the present system, don't exclude everybody else, and thus deprive innocent groups and individuals of their chance to compete.

MR. LEACH. The law of Title VII is involved, and I must say that is – insofar as I know, it has not been presented in the context of that evolutionary process. It's an interesting consideration, but of course we try to administer the Civil Rights Act, and –

MR. LEACH. I beg your pardon. Title VII does expressly mention Affirmative Action in Section 706.

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. But not in terms of the way it's been conceived –

MR. LEACH. Remedially, as a remedy, yes, it does. The Courts may order Affirmative Action, and –

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Let me ask you, Mr. Leach, assuming the point system concept regardless of the categories for which points might be given, how might an idea like that get into the bloodstream of the EEOC? I mean, are there occasions when the regulations open up for comment and it is appropriate to get a new idea into Government?

MR. LEACH. Oh, certainly. Every time we issue guidelines on any subject, particularly on the issue of Affirmative Action, as in the guidelines issued earlier this year – we have a public hearing or at least we seek public comment. In the course of those comments, I recall no one proposing that this kind of system be adapted. I would have to look at, or my Commission would have to look at other consequences of such a point system. Would it produce polarization? Would it provide devices? I frankly don't know the answer to this; it's certain it could be proposed, and I suppose considered, but I just haven't thought much about that.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. I would like the Staff Director to refer the point system proposal to the EEOC to see what, if any, consideration has been given to it.

Before you leave, Mr. Leach, one thought. You mentioned these categories of complaints, and then you did eventually mention the systemic approach of EEOC. I had thought from our previous discussions with you and Chair Norton that most of the complaint investigation resources of the EEOC were now going into the systemic approach, class actions, if you would, rather than into processing individual complaints. Could you tell me what proportion of those –

MR. LEACH. Well, Vice Chairman Horn, conceptually, that is our goal and always has been, but we don't control the spigot. We have no

discretion. We have to investigate individual cases. We can't turn people away. We can't let them slip through the cracks. The statute won't let us. Therefore, they control - the individual charging parties largely dictate the use of our resources.

We have a backlog. We're trying to get at our backlog. It is diminishing for the first time in history.

As we reduce our backlog and are able to prospectively process charges as they walk in the door on a current basis, we'll be able to devote more and more of our resources to systemic Commission-initiated actions and lawsuits.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. While we're in fiscal 1980 now, could you give the Commission a rough idea in terms of compliance activities what proportion is being spent on processing and resolving the individual complaint versus pursuing the systemic complaint approach?

MR. LEACH. It would be a bad guess.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Over half?

MR. LEACH. Yes, well over half, and I would say -

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. On the individual.

MR. LEACH. Our backlog now, based on current projected resources that are coming in over the next two fiscal years, will be eliminated within the fiscal year 1981, probably by the end of that fiscal year. At that time we should have a fully operating, most effective, systemic enforcement program. But until that backlog is eliminated, that will be -

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Well, I can understand that. Do you have an estimate, after fiscal 1981, as to what proportion of resources will be needed to keep up with the individual complaints versus the systemic approach?

MR. LEACH. Well over half of our resources by that time will be devoted to systemic work.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Well, very good. We thank you both.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Will the four panelists to continue the session on employment and ethnicity come forward?

Professor Frieda Rozen is an instructor in the Department of Labor Studies at Pennsylvania State University.

She has concentrated primarily on the role of the blue and white-collar women workers and union involvement in the labor market, including minority rural young workers, publishing various articles on women and work.

She earned her Master's degree in social work at the University of California at Berkeley, and is now pursuing her Doctorate at Pennsylvania State.

Welcome. You will have about 20 minutes to give us a briefing of the paper which you submitted on employment and ethnicity. That paper will be entered as a part of the record.

**STATEMENT OF FRIEDA SHOENBERG ROSEN,
INSTRUCTOR OF LABOR STUDIES, DEPARTMENT OF LA-
BOR STUDIES,
PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY,
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA**

Thank you. I've been asked to address myself to the question of ethnics and employment, to evaluate the effects in the employment area of ethnicity and now the effect on ethnics of affirmative action programs for other groups, for women and racial minorities, and what's happening to ethnics because of the changes there.

Now, in the light of the rather overt confrontation on those issues this morning, I have a sense that whatever it was I was trying to say was pussy-footing, really, and somewhat evasive. I was going round and round, but they came right out and said it in so many words to each other.

However, on the other hand, I do have a feeling that maybe walking around the edges of the issues and looking at them is also important, even though I think it's very good to start off with the kind of direct confrontation that we had this morning.

All of us have a sense that employment opportunities in the United States are really structured, and that whatever we may say about a simple peanut farmer who got to be President of the United States, we realize that for most people employment opportunities are laid out and limited.

We don't say it in those kinds of words. We also have a distinct sense that there's an ethnic link to these kinds of limits that are set on what people can really do out there in the world of employment.

And, again, you could hear it from the group here - this isn't very explicit. Everyone has a feeling that ethnicity has a pretty close connection with what people can achieve in the way of employment, but no one really likes to say it, and, you know, this morning when Miss Galina Suziedelis jumped on that issue, I think she clarified for the rest of us the conflict that all of us have about that.

But we know Americans tend to know that there is this link and it's built into our stereotypes. All of us know what to expect in some of the older American films about who's going to have what kinds of jobs. We've built stereotypes around the link between occupation and ethnicity or race.

Now, in a way that didn't bother us too much for a long, long time, because we like to think that we were all on kind of an escalator. We

like to think that, yeah, people of my ethnicity or people of my race aren't very far along in terms of jobs and occupations now, but look at what happened to the people who used to have these kinds of jobs two generations ago, and we're well on the way.

Today that doesn't satisfy us any more. In the first place, I think we've begun to realize that we don't all move up the ladder quite as smoothly as we used to think we did. We realize that there are conflicts involved in that move up the ladder, and I think the other thing is we just don't like the idea of being in a particular place on a ladder because of our race or ethnicity.

We like to think that that whole American dream about individual achievement and opportunity is a little more true than it seems to be.

Well, to the extent that we're wanting to question this whole business, we need to find out if it's true that there is this link, and I think the more you listen these last 2 days, the more you realize that we really don't know how close the link is between ethnicity and employment opportunity.

We can tell fairly clearly from the numbers out there what is going on with women. We can tell fairly clearly what's going on with blacks. We can tell what the link is between race and employment opportunity.

But the situation with figures for ethnicity is much more difficult, and I think that's a point that was implied this morning. It's a point that has to be made more clearly. The census only tells us about people of various European and Asian and some Latin stocks in terms of the foreign generation and the children of foreigners and that is it. You are never identified later on in the census in terms of your national background in any way.

The other problem in the census is that the census never identifies people in terms of religion, and this means that when you take some of the East European groups and you're mixing the Jews with the Orthodox or the Catholics, or whoever is the bulk of the population in that particular country, you're getting a very mixed kind of figure, because the occupational mobility seems to have been quite different for Jews from what it has been for the others.

You're getting the same kind of problem even with the Irish where the situation for Protestants and Catholics seems to be very different, but you can't quite sort it out from the census.

So we can't really use the census to get a fix on what happens to people in the third or fourth generation due to their ethnicity. We don't know if it is a problem. Is there discrimination in the United States against people who are of Italian derivation or of Polish derivation?

We've got a pretty clear hunch, but we can't pin it down from the census. We have other figures. Dr. McCreedy works with an organization; he and Andrew Greeley and some of their colleagues have put together a good many statistics, but theirs are limited. They're trying to point out, I think, what the problems are in the census and how great it would be to have better statistics. But I don't think they feel satisfied with what they found. So we're in a bad way as far as really knowing.

The impression we have from looking at the statistics, to the extent that we trust them you know, after that long destructive job I've done on the statistics, I feel foolish saying to you, well, this is what the statistics say.

To the extent that the statistics do reflect something that really is going on out there, it seems that most of the Euro-ethnic groups aren't doing that badly in terms of median income.

They're above the white median you know, the white family income, median family income for the United States. There are variations among them. They're not very far above.

I think the thing that must gall is that where you do sort out the statistics on religion, you find that the Jews are further above over and over again, and so this is what makes the being above, the median of the other groups, but not that far above, a problem.

Now, as to occupational distribution, again, these groups aren't doing that badly. They're different among themselves.

The figures I used from the census were mostly for the children of immigrants, that second generation American from each of these countries, and there the occupational distribution, in most cases, is more attractive than that for the white American in general, but you could compare them too.

You find that people of Italian, Polish, Czech, and Russian extraction tend to show up a lot more in the skilled occupations. They also show up more in factory jobs.

You find that, in the Greeley figures, the Jews and in the census figures, the Greeks, you find them showing up disproportionately in the professions, in managerial occupations and so on.

But, as I said, it's hard to tell what any of this really means. It's hard to tell what happens in the third and fourth generation. It's hard to tell what would happen when you really sort it out by religion and so on.

The thing that struck me the most as I looked at this, and that I'm going to come back to very strongly in a few paragraphs is the fact that you find that most of the "Euro-ethnics" are settled in the Northeastern States and in the North Central States.

You find that 41 percent, if you can judge by the first and second generation, and I'm sure that's a sound way to judge - 41 percent of all

the ethnics of European extraction in this country live in the Northeastern States, and when you include the ones in the North Central States, you've got something like 66 percent of all ethnics of European derivation.

Now, that's kind of an interesting thing to play around with.

I went from looking for these statistics to examining the kinds of explanations, the ones that I've been brought up with. As a late graduate student, I'm familiar with the research of the 1950's and the 1960's and back to the days when I was in college before that.

And I tried to examine some of the explanations for why you find the particular occupational distributions you do among ethnics, to see if they made sense to me in the light of what I thought I was seeing out there now.

And the older explanations, the ones that people are still writing about, that were especially popular in the 1960's and in the early 1970's, tend to go with social-psychological interpretations.

You compare two groups, you compare a group of East European Jews and a group of Southern Italians, and you find that the East European Jews have achievement values and the Southern Italians tend not to have as strong achievement values, and this explains to you why the Jews have ended up with higher incomes and professional and managerial jobs and so on.

Another way to look at that is to say that maybe they didn't get where they did, but the thing sort of went together and not necessarily in a casual sort of way.

Now, there's another kind of explanation that's also been floating around for a while, that I think you're seeing more of and more response to in some of the academic literature now, that I found very interesting.

And this is an explanation that tries to look not only at what happened to people in terms of occupations, why did they end up on the kind of occupational ladder that they seem to be on now, but also what has influenced their sense of ethnicity?

This isn't the purpose of looking at this, but it comes along with it.

Well, this kind of explanation, I think, puts the emphasis on the history, when people came in, what happened where they went, what happened to them afterwards at the places that they went to.

And, I think, if you look at American ethnic groups in those terms, if you look at who came in at a time when the clothing industry was opening up in New York City, and you settled in cities like New York and Philadelphia, and had the kind of opportunity structure that there was, or who came into the United States at a time when you were moving further into the country towards the steel industry that was developing, or the mining industry that was developing, and moved

into the kinds of cities that we have in Pennsylvania today, the smaller cities, the cities where there has been a kind of industrial stability of sorts.

There were jobs, but not a terribly wide kind of opportunity structure.

I think you find that a much more interesting and meaningful way of looking at what has happened to particular ethnic groups in the United States.

It makes more sense to me to understand where Italians are, if the census statistics reflect it in any way, where Polish people are, if you look at it in terms of their links to some of these kinds of communities and some of these kinds of industries.

And the important insight that comes out of that is that a lot of these people are tied today into those areas of our country that are on the verge of having very serious problems, that two-thirds of the people in this country of "Euro-Ethnic" derivation are living in the Northeast and in the North-Central States where you've got the steel industry in serious trouble.

The textile industry went long ago. Shoes went long ago. The clothing industry is leaving those areas. Those are all going into the Sun Belt; they're all going abroad, and you're finding less and less investment in the kind of occupations that our European ethnic groups have been involved in.

Those kinds of occupations may not have moved more than small minorities of them way, way up the status ladder, but those are the occupations that gave them some kind of stability in the past, and those occupations are getting up and walking out on them.

And I think that a lot of the implications of where we are today may grow out of that kind of analysis, rather than looking at a specific group and testing it on its achievement values or something like that.

The essence of what I want to say is that I think we need better data on ethnics. I think we ought to follow them beyond the second generation, if we're at all interested in the effect of ethnicity. I think we need to start sorting out the effect of religion on ethnicity in census data.

I think we need to look at different kinds of American communities to see if the kind of community people lived in was as important in what happens to them as their own particular ethnicity.

I think we need to worry about the problems of the kinds of communities that ethnics are living in more than we need to worry about the particular ethnics. I think maybe if the community they lived in got to be better, their whole situation might get to be better, and I think we need to evaluate the kind of affirmative action programs we're doing, training programs we're doing, and so on, to see if we're

training everyone – women, racial minorities and ethnics when they get into these programs – if we're training for occupations that are leaving the parts of the United States that they live in.

[The complete paper follows.]

EMPLOYMENT AND ETHNICITY

By Frieda Shoenberg Rozen*

The rigidity of the occupational structure is not visible until someone does the unexpected, and jars us into recognizing how firmly we are tied to the expected. Americans have always talked about everyone's chance to get to the top, but when a bright, young person from an ethnic neighborhood drops out of high school, or goes to the Vo-Tech school, no one is surprised. When the son of the smalltown bank president goes to work in the factory right after high school graduation just like his Slavic friends, people wonder, and the whole town buzzes if the doctor's daughter goes to the Vo-Tech school to study cosmetology or secretarial skills or carpentry. Why would youngsters from those kinds of families do that?

In many American communities, these occupational expectations and opportunities are more closely linked to ethnicity than to many other variables, but the link is part of an invisible structure that we all know, take for granted, and do not examine.

How close and how limiting is this link? And what happens when governmental and social pressures break the link for some groups, widening the horizons of possibility, but leave the other groups just where they were, dependent on the usual forces and events? These are the questions we are trying to answer today. They are very important questions, and cannot be answered with reliable data.

Popular culture has always incorporated an acceptance of this link between ethnicity, race, and occupations, for an important part of ethnic stereotyping has to do with jobs. Cartoons and the theater remind us of the pervasiveness of certain assumptions for the first 60 years of the century: the maid was always black, or, on the west coast, Scandinavian, the tailor was always Jewish, the cop was always Irish, the fruit vendor always Italian, and the millworker always Polish. Bit parts were available to those who fit the stereotype, even if the big parts were not. Occupational stereotyping was not totally negative. The immigrant coming into the country found it advantageous to walk into an employment situation that was available because people from

* Department of Labor Studies, Pennsylvania State University

his home village or his country had established a reputation in that kind of work. If landsmen or paisanos or compadres introduced the newly arrived immigrant to the foreman, and he accepted their assurances of the new man's reliability or accepted the proffered bribe, the promise of immigration was on the way to fulfillment. Maybe the immigrant's son also would be introduced to the same foreman when his time came; but to the extent that these processes were examined, it was assumed that the differentiation would disappear after Americanization, that the son could go into any kind of work, that the sons of immigrants would find that they had used separate but equal routes into the land of opportunity.

Now it seems that the differentiation does not disappear and the significance of that differentiation is variously interpreted even by members of this audience, members of ethnic groups, people with professional interests in the concerns of ethnic groups.

Michael Novak, speaking in Philadelphia in 1976, alluded to a "commonsense notion that persons of different groups tend to do better at different jobs" (speaking at *Conference on Affirmative Action: Ethnic Perspectives*, sponsored by the Nationalities Service Center and the Community College of Philadelphia, October 29, 1976, printed proceedings). He pointed out the historical factors that have led some nationalities to cluster in this industry, others in that, and suggested that cultural preferences might operate. He warned that statistics proving variation in occupational distribution do not necessarily prove discrimination or a need for programs like affirmative action aimed at that variation. But included in Novak's own statement was the concept that causes many among us to view these matters in a different light: the idea of stratification. There has been, in Novak's own words, "tremendous ethnic stratification in American Society." The occupations in which different groups cluster are not simply different from each other, they are on different rungs of the ladder. Some are, in the judgement of the total society, better, and some are worse. Some draw greater rewards and some draw lesser rewards. And some are far less secure than others. The "statistical group patterns" linked to ethnicity are also systematically linked to class and opportunity. When variation suggests locked doors, it must be questioned.

No one ever doubted that there was stratification, that it was a ladder on which some people were on the lower rungs. But one of the reasons that for so long Americans accepted the obvious link between ethnicity and occupation, and the equally obvious correlation with stratification, was that people were also aware of a process now called ethnic succession. Even those who did not think that, within a generation, all immigrants would have access to equal places in the society, did believe that all ethnic groups were moving up, that some

groups were farther up the scale because they had arrived several generations earlier. The best way to explain the process of ethnic succession, especially to the typical American male, is to review the history of professional boxing. Members of each group can point to a time when there were no prominent boxers of their ethnicity; then to a time when every little boy in the neighborhood wanted to emulate the current champion, who *was* of the same nationality or race; and then, if that period was in the 1920's, 1930's, or 1940's, a time when fewer and fewer children in the particular ethnic neighborhoods looked to the boxing ring as the ticket out. Boxing, because it is dangerous and difficult, gives way to more attractive routes, less dangerous sports, sports linked to the educational system, increased numbers of skilled jobs, or eventually, entree to the business or professional world and thousands of boys no longer dream of the ring. Boxing almost perfectly indicates the time at which the group is on the threshold – ambitious, but with limited choices, and it vividly illustrates the workings of occupational shifts.

Ethnic succession indicates the move by one whole ethnic group after another from unskilled labor into skilled occupations, then into office, sales or other white-collar work, and later into professions like teaching. In many American cities, it is possible to point to the first Irish, Jewish, or Italian schoolteacher, and a decade or two later, to see that a majority of the teachers in that system are Irish, Jewish, or Italian, and then the time, not many decades later, when the next racial or nationality group is teaching in the schools.

In the past, ethnic stratification was perceived in conjunction with ethnic succession, so it was assumed no group was on a particular rung of the ladder permanently. This expectation implied, of course, that the next rung was available because the group that used to be there had also moved up a rung. If ethnic succession was working, then nobody needed to complain, because everyone's time would eventually come. There were unspoken assumptions in the system that all groups would start in the same place and move in the same order; that by the time Italians arrived on the higher rung, the previous group, maybe Irish, would have moved up a rung, so they would always be ahead of the Italians, but the Italians were higher than they had been, and that was good enough. I think those were the unspoken assumptions when I was growing up.

Today, the flaws in the system are showing. Groups did not all start from the same starting line, so some groups have a very long way to climb. The idea that at the end of the 20th century individuals of Polish or Italian descent should still be held back because their immigrant ancestors were peasants rather than city people is unacceptable. And Americans are less willing than before to tolerate permanent

catchup games. Even if people are moving up the income and status ladder, if they are permanently in a stratified relationship with other groups, and *always* behind other groups, that is no longer right. And some of the unspoken rules of the game do not work, if they ever did. When members of a group moved from ditch digging into good factory jobs, they moved as quickly as they could, and few members of the group retained the group's hold on digging ditches, so those jobs were available to the next group down the line. But when a group has been teaching school, and some of its members start moving up, the group isn't ready to give up schoolteaching, and the tensions build up, as has been obvious in the last decade. Various ethnic groups are in competitive contention for the same occupations, even though one is coming from below, and the other is lingering from above.

So American society is examining the processes of the occupational structure, and reexamining the assumptions that were the bases for so long for unquestioning faith in the "unseen hand of the market."

It is at this point that questions start getting asked and affirmative action programs become part of public policy. Current policies are in existence because the point has been made that employment barriers have been causally linked to race and sex and ethnicity, that they wouldn't change in the normal course of events and with the passage of a little time. However, in the case of race and sex, it is possible to test these contentions. The census, other Government agencies, numerous sources of data within universities, and survey agencies have amassed statistics which can be studied on these questions, and it is possible to evaluate the charge that actual discrimination, rather than pure chance or temporary history, explains occupational patterns for women and racial minorities. Therefore programs have been instituted to overcome the discrimination against women and some racial minorities.

With these programs set in place, it is becoming more important to test the charge that groups other than women and racial minorities have also suffered systematic discrimination. What are the effects of ethnicity on employment? If it is true that people are where they are because of their groups, then we should know that, and decide what to do about it. If it is not true, then we are free to go on to the solution of other problems. The rest of this paper is concerned with examining available data, reporting some explanations of the partial findings, and suggesting problem areas in relation to ethnicity and employment.

Employment data on ethnic groups is in a different condition from that regarding women and racial minorities. It is far less adequate, and subject to misinterpretation. The Bureau of the Census is where most numbers are collected, and it should be the best source for the data we need, but it is not adequate in these areas. The census usually identified

the foreign-born, but through long periods in the 19th century, their children were not identified from other native-born. The process of assimilation was not expected to take more than a generation. After the restrictive immigration laws half a century ago, immigrants were expected to decrease in number and in influence, so for a period in the 20th century, the descendants of immigrants were identified as children of the foreign-born, but not in terms of their country of origin. Some of these census decisions and omissions were based on the belief that immigrants would be so completely integrated into the society that queries about their origins would be offensive intrusions or interpreted as attempts to set them apart. It is becoming apparent that ethnic origins do not disappear after the first generation or even the second, and that they may affect employment opportunities in ways that cannot be accurately gauged with currently available statistics.

Today, the foreign-born and the next generation, the children of the foreign-born, are identified by country of origin, and their schooling, occupation, income and other data are tabulated in relation to these categories. If respondents do not have a foreign-born parent, they are not questioned about foreign origins at all. The only question that identifies later generations in relation to ethnic origins asks what language other than English was spoken in the person's home when he or she was a child. This question has only limited usefulness in identifying third or fourth-generation ethnics, since the employment opportunities of many third generation individuals may be affected by their ethnicity without a foreign language being spoken in the home. In fact, the common American pattern is to retain many of the older marks of ethnicity long after the mother tongue has become inaccessible. Furthermore, the census makes no use of this information about foreign language other than to tabulate it: no cross tabulations as to occupations, education, income, and so on are available in the printed volumes. The raw census data may be available, but scholars have not made use of it, as they can of the published data. (For the Spanish-speaking, no matter what their generation, this situation is being corrected, but not for other ethnic groups.)

So, as to the most likely source of data, there is only information for the foreign-born generation and the children of that generation, but not for the succeeding generations. For these two generations, quite a bit of information is available, but because later generations are not identified, the data on the lingering effects of ethnicity is limited.

These are not the only serious shortcomings of the census data for evaluating the effects of ethnicity on employment. I do not know the legal history of the census, but I assume that for reasons growing out of the separation of church and state, or because of our fear that

religious discrimination could develop, the census does not ask religious identification. This seriously limits the value of census data. When certain ethnic groups, for instance the Irish, have been differentiated by religion in other surveys, there have been significant differences between Catholics and Protestants in education, occupation, income, and other variables. The two religious groups seem to be separate subgroups within the Irish nationality group. (See Andrew Greeley, both *Ethnicity in the United States*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974, and *The American Catholic*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1977.) Catholic-Protestant differences may also be important in relation to other European nationality groups. Available data also suggests that Jewish-Catholic or Jewish-Russian Orthodox distinctions are necessary with the data concerning the Polish, Russian, Lithuanian, Latvian, and other east European groups, if that data is to make sense. The occupational distribution of Jews is very different from that of the other groups from each country. Greeley's studies indicate that trends are seriously muffled when the two religious groups are not differentiated. Some studies have even suggested important income variations among Protestant subgroups in the United States. (Galen Gockel, "Income and Religious Affiliation: A Regression Analysis," *American Journal of Sociology*, 74:632, p. 49).

There are other sources of Government data, but they are hardly more enlightening on later generations or religious differences. The Federal Government has included a question on ethnic origins, rather than the narrower question concerning a foreign language spoken in the home, on some Current Population Survey series reports limited to a few European groups. In the March 1972 survey, about half of the 204.8 million people covered identified themselves with one of these origins. There are then, a lot more people with identifiable ethnic connections than the two-generation census count of "foreign-stock" indicates, and the census would be a source of important information if 102 million, instead of the 33.6 million in the two generations currently identified, could be studied. However, the Census Population Survey figures have very limited value because they do not differentiate between generations at all. Summary information about an immigrant group that is mostly third, fourth, and fifth generation is treated in the same way as information about a group that is mostly first and second generation.

There is some other data on ethnics in addition to census and Census Population Survey data. For this, we can thank Andrew Greeley who has contributed a great deal to the understanding of ethnic differences as they relate to achievement both by drawing attention to the paucity of research and the poor quality of data (see especially, *Ethnicity in the United States*, p. 35-40), and by drawing attention to and reanalyzing

available survey data that was collected for other purposes by major university research organizations. An abbreviated attempt to examine the "facts" about European ethnics and employment will begin with census data and will compare that with some of Greeley's findings, which differentiate religious subgroups within nationality groups. Greeley's data is based on a smaller population, and it gets even smaller seeming by the time he sorts all the categories and subsets. Between his data and the census, definitive answers are not possible, but important questions are suggested.

On what basis do we determine that groups have or have not suffered from discrimination? Even more directly, how do we assess their occupational accomplishments? The income people can earn and the kinds of jobs they hold are measures. The commonly accepted values of this society accept the census occupational categories as a loose sort of ranking: skilled jobs better than unskilled, professional and technical a higher attainment than others. Of course, income and occupation are closely related to questions that have been examined in earlier sessions: to education and to residence, as those two are related to each other as well as to employment. So this examination of ethnicity and employment will only touch on questions that are often antecedent to the ones dealt with here. Since I work closely with union members, I am particularly sensitive to the dangers of jurisdictional intrusion, and I will tread carefully, especially since I will have arrived at some of these conclusions before I have had a chance to hear the comments on education and housing and ethnicity. The figures quoted will be from the 1970 census, which is, in late 1979, as outdated as a census gets before it becomes history, but since the chief interest here is in trends and comparisons, it will suffice.

A quick measure of income is the median income. A selected comparison of the median incomes for families of several European nationalities are listed below. I have arbitrarily selected only certain of the national groups listed in the census. Seventeen European nationality groups are identified, but I have chosen only those most frequently mentioned in discussions of ethnicity, the Irish, Polish, Russian, and Italian, as well as a couple included to suggest comparisons for later studies. Czechoslovakians are included because they are a Slovak group without the large number of Jews that are included in the figures for Russian and Polish immigrants. Likewise, I have included Greeks because they are an identifiable Mediterranean group which might usefully be contrasted to the Italians. The figures I have chosen are for only second-generation natives of foreign or mixed parentage. These were selected because the third generation is not listed, as noted earlier, and because studying the immigrant generation would lead away from a focus on effects of ethnicity to the effects of immigration.

In 1969 median income for all U.S. families was \$9,327, but for all white families, it was \$9,763. For the native families of foreign or mixed parentage from the following countries, it was: Ireland \$11,776, Poland \$12,275, Czechoslovakians \$11,094, Greece \$12,847, U.S.S.R. \$14,281, Italy \$11,857.

The group with the lowest median, Czechoslovakians, is \$1,300 above the median for white Americans, and the other nationality groups are even higher. Does this mean that not only are ethnics not the victims of discrimination, but that they are the most fortunate beneficiaries of the American system? That conclusion cannot be drawn from the figures above because they are for the whole nation, and important regional differences must be considered.

There are wide differences among median incomes for white families in different regions of the country: Total White \$9,763, Northeast White \$10,529, Northcentral White \$10,234, South White \$8,733, West White \$10,464. Why is this relevant to Euro-ethnics? In large part, they are concentrated in those regions with higher median incomes, and least likely to reside in the South, which has the lowest median income:

Total Population in Each Region, and Percentage of that Population Which is Foreign-Born, or Native of Foreign-Born or Mixed Parentage.

	U.S.	N.E.	N.C.	S.	W.
Total population	203,210,158	49,044,015	56,564,917	62,782,882	34,808,344
2nd generation	11.8%	19.9%	11.3%	4.4%	14.4%
1st generation	4.7%	8.4%	3.3%	2.1%	6.6%
Total for 1st and 2nd	16.5%	28.3%	14.6%	6.5%	21.0%

Although these figures only deal with the two generations, they also reflect the settlement of older generations of the same groups, partly because we know from history that immigrants in earlier periods settled in these areas, and because we also know that the usual pattern is for new immigrants to gravitate to areas settled by their earlier compatriots. It should also be noted that the number of Euro-ethnics in the South is even lower than appears from the table, because the figures for foreign derivation in the South include many from the Hispanic countries of this hemisphere. More than 28 percent of the residents of the Northeast are first or second generation Americans of foreign extraction, as compared to only 6.6 percent in the South.

A more important way to evaluate the distributional disparities by region is to note that around 41 percent of the total number of foreign-born and natives of foreign or mixed parentage reside in the Northeast, although that area is the residence of only 24 percent of the total population. The two generations of "foreign-stock" are distributed by region as follows:

Foreign-Born and Native of Foreign or Mixed Parentage (including Hispanic, Asian, and all others)

Total	33,575,232	100%
Northeast	13,901,734	41.40
North Central	8,247,860	24.56
South	4,113,769	12.25
West	7,311,869	21.78

These figures suggest that the economic prospects of “Euro-Ethnics” are closely tied to the prospects of the Northeast and North-Central States. Until now, their median incomes have reflected the

**Percentage Distribution in Occupations, for Native White Males and for Selected "Foreign Stock"
Native of foreign or mixed parentage**

	White male	Irish	Poland	Czech	USSR	Greece	Italy
Total no. Occupation	33,668,902	329,686	685,002	209,483	586,991	84,537	1,231,052
Professional, technical workers	14.70	17.5	15.01	13.70	24.57	21.42	12.48
Managers, administrators (except farm)	11.61	15.08	14.49	9.79	22.74	21.17	13.69
Sales workers	7.34	8.35	7.19	5.08	15.99	10.71	7.49
Clerical workers	7.54	12.49	8.69	8.53	7.54	8.25	9.07
Craft and kindred workers	21.89	17.52	23.58	26.21	12.07	14.68	23.73
Operatives (except transport)	13.29	7.02	16.75	16.17	5.28	7.60	11.88
Transport equipment operatives	5.89	4.88	4.53	4.22	3.47	4.07	6.31
Laborers (except farm)	5.94	3.71	4.51	4.69	1.93	2.47	5.27
Farm and farm managers	3.26		.91	4.01	2.38	.37	.57
Farm laborers and supervisors	1.64		.22	.58	.35	.15	.20
Service workers (except private household)	6.95	12.33	7.11	6.98	3.66	9.10	9.29
Private household workers	.36		.02	.02	.01	.01	.02

advantages of concentration in those areas. However, future prospects are less positive, and that will be discussed below.

The particular ethnic groups we are examining, other than Czechoslovaks, are more highly urbanized than white American families as a whole, and urban incomes are higher than rural. Also, the median age of the groups differs, and this influences income, since it correlates with education differently in various groups.

Greeley had a much smaller sample, of course, than the census (with some of his groups numbering just over one hundred, and others, several hundred) but he did differentiate by religion and by age. He found, as those familiar with the data know, that Jews had higher incomes than other Russian, Polish, or German people, but his most interesting finding was that among Catholic ethnics *over* 40 years of age, only the Irish earn above the national median (Greeley found Irish Catholics more successful than the median, and Irish Protestants less successful. Because religious differences are not listed, the census figures on the Irish are almost as distorted as those on Russians) but among those *under* 40, all but the Spanish speaking earn more than the national median, the Slavs highest above the median (\$1,022), Italians next (\$896), and Poles lowest, but still higher than the median (\$370). (Greeley, *Ethnicity in the United States*, p. 73). This suggests that census figures for the U.S.S.R. and Poland are largely but not totally deceiving through the inclusion of the higher earnings of Jews, although figures quoted by Lopata suggested that a very large proportion of the 1902-1924 immigration from Poland was Jewish. (Helena Znanieski Lopata, "Problems of Estimation and Parameters," *Polish Review*, XXI, No. 4 (1976) p. 102-103).

The occupational distribution is also computed from the census, comparing the native males of foreign or mixed parentage from the selected European countries to white American males. The occupational categories are the standard census classifications. The figures are limited to males for reasons of time and space, and because there seem to be cultural differences among these ethnic groups as to female labor force participation rate and some occupational variation among the females that would distract from a quick overview.

Not only is each of the ethnic groups different from the distribution for the U.S. white male, but there is a large variation among groups. The Russian and Greek groups are more heavily concentrated in professional and technical occupations than the national average. The Russian figures probably reflect the Jewish-Orthodox Church mix. The Irish rate is between the Greek-Russian and the U.S. white male, while the Italian group is just lower than the rate for the U.S. white male. For managers and administrators, the group from Czechoslovakia is the only one below the national average, but the Italian group is

above it by less than the others. The Russian group stands out in terms of the size of the percentage in sales work, the Greek group has fewer in sales than the Russian, but slightly more than the others. The Czech group trails. The Irish are especially high in clerical work, and this may reflect, among other explanations, government employment. The Polish, Czech, and Italian groups are all more likely to be craft workers than the American white male average, while the other groups are less likely than the national average to be "operative excluding transportation," meaning in many cases, a semiskilled or unskilled factory worker, while the other groups reported were are well below the average. The Irish, Greek, and Italians are disproportionately in service occupations, and the Russians (or Russians, including Jews) disproportionately *not* in service occupations.

These figures seem to confirm some of the popular conceptions of Italians. A lot of Italians *are* skilled craftsmen in the building trades, and Italian, Polish and Czechoslovakian men *are* likely to be in the skilled jobs in factories and in other trades, and often in the semiskilled or unskilled factory jobs. The Irish, Russian, and Greek workers are often in the white collar occupations, in a different mix for each, but all heading for the desks.

Greeley's findings suggest an even greater concentration than that reflected in census figures of Polish, Italian, and Slavic men in the crafts and in factories, especially among the "Slavic", a category which includes Russians but not Russian Jews.

None of the statistics quoted, neither the Census Bureau's nor Greeley's, control for the size of cities in which the groups live. In Greeley's sample 81 percent of East European Jews live in metropolitan areas of over two million, while only 44 percent of Italians, 30 percent of Polish, and 28 percent of Slavics do. A case could be made for the differential effect on occupational distribution of size of city. Greeley does *not* control for generation in the secondary data he is analyzing. Since 80 percent of the Irish in his sample are in this country three generations or more, while only 31 percent and 30 percent of the Polish and Slavic respondents are native children of native parents, generation probably relates to important differences in occupational distribution, no matter how imperfectly the American dream operates.

The 1970 census listed each of the nationality groups, including all the European groups, for each of several selected Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, and a cursory examination of the occupational distribution for a particular group in two different cities, as compared with native white Americans, and as compared with the other nationality groups in this discussion, suggests that analysis of aggregate U.S. figures may not be telling us the most important things we want

to know. We really want to know if European-ethnic Americans are finding themselves locked into narrow opportunity structures. Do they have decent jobs and decent incomes, but a sense that they are not going anywhere in terms of status? The aggregate census figures and Greeley's seem to suggest that. But what has locked certain groups in and not others? Why have the Jews moved up the job prestige and income ladder, even though they are subjected to certain kinds of discrimination? Why does it seem as if Italian and Polish groups stay a step behind the others in education, although their income is sometimes higher? If there is something causal in a group's culture, something carried over from generation to generation, then that group should have similar experiences wherever it settles in the United States. If, on the contrary, granting their hereditary values, groups find that their environment is also causal, then they should have different experiences when they settle in various cities or areas under dissimilar circumstances. And these different experiences when they settle in various cities or areas under dissimilar circumstances. And these differences should lead us to an understanding of the group's aggregate experience if many of their settlements were of a particular kind.

The next section summarizes influential social science explanations for the seeming disparities in occupational mobility among ethnic-religious groups. A good deal of attention has been directed to social-psychological explanations. Rosen (B.C. Rosen, "Race, Ethnicity and the Achievement Syndrome," *American Sociological Review* 24 (February 1959): 47-60) suggested that the socioeconomic achievement differences he found between Jewish boys and Southern Italian boys correlated with differences in achievement-related values and achievement motivation. Lenski (G. Lenski, *The Religious Factor*, New York: Anchor, Doubleday) also looked to differences in work-related values. This is to say that some ethnic groups, but not others, place a high value on individual achievement. The groups most likely to achieve are those for whom work has high intrinsic *and* extrinsic value: people who like to work *and* who like to be rewarded for their work. The "values" described in these studies are psychological constructs developed to fit combinations of responses found from sets of questions exploring attitudes. Vecoli (Rudolph Vecoli, "The Italian Americans" *Center Magazine*, July-August 1974, p.31) describes values discernible in people's lives. He points to the importance of the family and the home for Italian-Americans, both which could de-emphasize the importance of occupational achievement in terms of status, although not of achievement in terms of income. In a more recent discussion, Schooler restates similar ideas in terms of culture rather than in terms of psychological syndromes (Carmi Schooler, "Serfdom's Legacy: An Ethnic Continuum," *American Journal of*

Sociology, May 1976). He argues that Southern Italians were peasants in Italy, acquired cultural traits in those roles which made it possible for them to accept subordination, and in the United States, stepped into jobs in which a willingness to accept subordination was also an asset, or even a necessity.

Recently, other sociologists have proposed that it is necessary to look at what happened to groups when they arrived and in the periods that followed, instead of studying their social-psychological characteristics out of context. Assimilationists believe that the differences with which groups come will dilute and become less important, and pluralists believe that the differences will continue in importance. Yancey *et al* (William L. Yancey, Eugene P. Erikson, and Richard N. Juliani, "Emergent Ethnicity - a Review and Reformulation," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 41, June 1976, pp. 391-403.) suggest, instead, that groups find themselves where they do in the United States partly because of the baggage they brought, and largely because of the situations they found when they arrived and with which they had to deal in ensuing periods. This approach suggests that a group's ethnic characteristics or consciousness may be formed, reinforced, revived, or dissipated by the kinds of experiences it has. Its economic and occupational experiences are the most important of all in influencing the total environment, and creating or denying future economic and occupational opportunities. Many Jews had urban skills when they came, but also, they came at a time of rapidly expanding opportunities in the clothing industry which, in the late 19th century and early 20th, was located in the biggest cities offering good prospects for upward mobility. So Jews brought urban skills and had opportunities to improve them. The Slavs and the Poles came when the mines and the steelmills were seeking workers, and they settled in areas that provided stability but few routes for education and mobility. All these groups, including the Italians, settled in communities to which they formed strong ties. Such ties made them reluctant to leave in search of greater opportunities elsewhere, or even to abandon the area during a period of economic decline. The educational and economic achievement of Greeks, if the data in the census is correct, may be due not only to the culture or values they brought, but also to the smaller settlements they formed in many communities, compared to Italians, Poles, and others. Relative marginality prevented the formation of large, secure enclaves, and may have led to the recognition of opportunities for entrepreneurship and an emphasis on pushing the children up and out. Other groups, living in larger ethnic communities, were able to settle, even though poorly, and maintain ties to an industry that offered the promise of future employment without upward mobility. The single Vietnamese and other Oriental families

moving into our towns today may be recreating the patterns of the groups whose experience was related to marginality.

If the occupational distribution of the various Euro-ethnic groups is to be examined in terms of the structure that each group came into, and in terms of the changes in the structure over the years that the group has been settled in the United States, there is a greater need to study societal trends than to speculate about or measure nationality-group psyches. The value placed on individual achievement and education, or, conversely, the value placed on family loyalty and stability, cannot be dismissed. But in some settings, achievement drives, if they are to operate, call for superhuman efforts, and in other settings, they are rewarded and reinforced.

What opportunities are there for the Italian, Polish, Slavic, and other groups to keep moving up in the way that the Irish and the Jews did, and what are the opportunities for all the Euro-Ethnics to break through the final barriers in industry and finance, if they wish? And what effect will the affirmative action programs for women and racial minorities have on these opportunities?

When Euro-ethnic groups are compared in two cities (or, more accurately, in two Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas) (SMSAs) in two different parts of the country, the rankings between the groups may shift: a group that has a lower median income in the East may have one of the higher median incomes in the West. Or a group with an especially low percentage of professional and technical workers in one part of the country may have an especially high percentage in another area. Even educational rankings shift for some of the groups, although they shift little for others. (Some groups have a much higher educational level in west coast SMSAs than in the East, but they still rank below most of the other ethnic groups.)

It is obvious that groups found different opportunities in each region, and that despite ethnic succession, they got locked into occupational roles in certain cities. In some cases, superficial analysis suggests that the group which is the largest ethnic group in one city may be of low status there, while the same nationality group, when it is a smaller group in another city (large, but smaller than some others) is of relatively high status. Of course, when particular ethnics are dispersed or are a very small group, they seldom differ from the other segments of the society. In the past assimilationists would have concluded that ethnic groups should disperse, but neither ethnic nor racial groups will accept that answer today. However, analysis of the mobility processes related to dispersal can lead to an understanding of mobility processes that could operate in large, cohesive, ethnic communities. Despite limitations in census data on ethnics, a serious study rather than a glance at the comparative occupational distribu-

tions in different metropolitan areas should be conducted on recent data. Lieberman developed some of the most interest in theoretical frameworks in the literature using 1950 census data in the early 1960's (Stanley Lieberman, *Ethnic Patterns in American Cities*, NY: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963), and it is time to examine the implications.

Study of the variation for a group from one area to another should be very fruitful for increasing our understanding, but the reality of the near future lies in the Northeast and North Central States, where the Euro-Ethnics are most concentrated. As mentioned earlier, 28 percent of the population in the Northeast is made up of first or second generation immigrants, two-thirds of first and second generation are in the Northeast and North Central States, and we know that most of the older ethnic settlements are also in these areas.

One of the most important phenomena of recent decades has been the shift of industry away from the Northeast. A few decades ago, there was the shift of the textile industry from New England to the South, and in more recent decades, the shift of other industries, not only of the plants, but of the headquarters and other operations to the part of the country we call the Sun Belt. In the last few months, and especially, this week, the newspapers have been filled with stories of steel-companies that are closing plants, threatening to close them, or cutting back in employment. The automobile industry is currently in the midst of some of the most serious layoffs in its history, at the same time that most of the major companies have relatively new plants in other areas or are producing cars abroad. As plants of an earlier era become obsolescent, instead of renovating, reconverting, or reconditioning them, firms take the opportunity to move to currently more attractive areas, within the country or abroad. This means a shift of jobs away from the major ethnic settlements of the Northeastern cities, in particular. Clothing, shoes, autos, steel, the electrical industry, all are industries which drew immigrants to Pittsburgh, Detroit, New York, and New England. When these industries go south or go abroad, it is workers of Polish, Slavic, Portuguese, and Italian descent, as well as blacks, who are left behind.

So as a Pennsylvanian, I think in terms of regional problems, and I suggest that these regional problems are some of the most important that must be considered in a discussion of the problems and prospects of the European ethnics. These regional problems relate to several specific topics which most clearly address the civil rights issues of ethnics in relation to employment. Affirmative action or reverse discrimination, training programs, productivity questions, and executive suite exclusion must be examined in this context.

I am sure that my remarks will elicit disagreement among you. With the statistical evidence as inadequate as it is, no one is sure about the

state of ethnic groups in 1970, and there is even less evidence of what are the results of government programs encouraging the hiring of women and racial minorities. But educated guesses are possible. If people of Polish, Slavic, and Italian extraction are disproportionately employed in the skilled trades and in factories or other production jobs, if the Irish and Italians are disproportionately in clerical jobs, which probably includes government employment, then it is their jobs for which women and racial minorities are competing both through affirmative action programs and in training programs. There are union and employer apprenticeships, jobs with good mobility potential and the highest rates of pay available in particular areas that are going to women and racial minority members in many communities, jobs that might have been filled by young men of the ethnic groups that we are discussing. In certain communities, it is obvious that revised seniority practices, combined with affirmative action hiring, followed by recession-induced layoffs, caused bumping of ethnic white workers and the layoff of some of them. But these are not the greatest threat to the continued improvement of the status of ethnic minorities in these communities. It is, instead, the shift of jobs, of plants, of whole industries away from the groups under discussion. So ethnic Americans are facing a critical period in terms of jobs, but it is because they are settled in the areas from which the jobs are going, rather than because women and racial minorities are not waiting for ethnic succession to proceed at its normal pace. The stereotyped image of the ethnic fighting affirmative action, is of the hardhat or the skilled craftsman in the building trades. Italian, Polish, and Slavic workers are in the skilled trades in high numbers but again, even where affirmative action programs and training programs are instituted with some sincerity, it is not the women and the blacks that are the big problem. It is the serious unemployment in the building industry and the high interest rates that will cause even more unemployment in that unfortunate industry before things get better.

Agreeing with this assessment of the situation will not leave you in a sanguine mood. (Affirmative action may not be the culprit.) But whatever theories of social analysis or race relations we espouse, it is clear that when groups are in competition for limited goods, the situation is more conducive to conflict between these groups than when groups are not in competition but are striving for shared goals. If the country is facing a period not only of a threatening recession, exacerbated by our fuel problems, but, also a period of long-range regional and international readjustments, a period in which jobs are moving to low wage areas of the country and low wage countries, tensions will increase. Women and blacks will be perceived as the villains when really, they are only reaching for a piece of the pie in the

American tradition, but the pie will have gotten smaller, which isn't in the American tradition. Of course, some of the jobs that women get due to affirmative action will go to ethnic women, so not all gains of women are losses of ethnic groups.

If training programs are not to discriminate against ethnics or waste their time or that women and racial minorities, they will have to be focused on the kinds of employment that will be available in the industrial areas of the North, rather than training for occupations that will disappear to Texas or Alabama or Taiwan or Hong Kong. Training programs in shrinking industries offer few openings, so they lead to exclusion, and they are dead end, so they lead to frustrations.

These problems are overwhelming if we think of ethnic groups in terms of occupational distribution of 1970, with disproportionate numbers in the categories of crafts and operative. However, the future is promising if Greeley's findings on education are correct. They indicate that increasing numbers of Italian, Polish, and other Catholic youth from ethnic groups are going to college (Greeley, 1974, p. 78) and one of the advantages of ethnics being concentrated in those areas of the country where they live at present is that there is a great concentration of educational opportunities in the Northeast. The occupations that the Labor Department projections for the eighties (*People and Jobs: A Chartbook of Labor Force, Employment and Occupational Projections*, Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics Regional Report 25, Dec. 1976) forecast are the sort for which many college students, especially those who are first-generation college educated, would prepare. The technical jobs in health care, the engineering jobs, and the professional jobs in financial institutions are the ones that the sons and daughters of craft workers will be ready for.

The connection between productivity and ethnic groups also relates to the regional shifts of the economy. The areas of the country where ethnics settled were historically highly productive. The labor force was skilled, the necessary educational facilities existed, and there was a tradition of hard work and of familiarity with the demands of an industrial society. When employers move, they do not always find the same kind of work force in the new areas. Wages may be lower, but with decreased productivity the gain is illusory. But a real threat to productivity in relation to ethnics lies in the danger that management will fail to maintain its investment in those areas where ethnics are employed. If corporate decision makers let their facilities deteriorate and plan to abandon their factories in the North and build new more modern plants elsewhere later, productivity in the areas where ethnics are working will decrease. Productivity will decrease not because ethnic workers are hostile about having to work with women and blacks, but because productivity is dependent not only on the qualities

of the worker but also on what he or she has to work with in the way of materials and equipment as well. The fearful cycle of decreased productivity reinforcing the desire to move will have started.

What about executive-suite exclusion? What does that mean, and does it affect members of Euro-ethnic groups? Lee Iacocca's frequent appearances on television, urging us to buy his cars, serve also as a reminder of how infrequently Italians, Poles, Jews, Slavs, or Greeks, any east or south Europeans, are found at the highest administrative levels of American industry or finance, though many of them may be moving, as they are, into respectable income and job brackets, and although the educational attainments of many of them are higher than those of nonethnic Americans. Why don't we find them at the top decision making levels? A recent newspaper story ("White Protestant Sues Club on L.I. over Minority Bias," *New York Times*, Nov. 14, 1979, p. B2, col. 1) suggests some of the reasons. "A white, Anglo-Saxon Protestant insurance executive who says he 'fit in like wallpaper' at exclusive Long Island country clubs for twenty years" sued his own club after they cancelled his membership, a cancellation, he says, that was inspired by his urging the club to admit minorities. He argued that people who were denied access to country clubs were denied the opportunity for the business deals and other transactions carried out on the golf course. At the same time that I was reading this story, a young Anglo-Saxon Protestant man I know was hired because, the firm told him, he belonged to the most exclusive club in the city and moved in the kind of social circles the company wants to deal with. He has the requisite professional skills, as well, but they did not seem to be the most decisive consideration.

In a more academic statement of this point, Kanter (Rosebeth Moss Kanter, *Men and Women of the Corporation*, N.Y.: Basic Books, 1977, chapter 3) suggests, "Conformity pressures and the development of exclusive management circles closed to 'outsiders' stem from the degree of uncertainty surrounding managerial positions." If people at the higher reaches of management will have to deal with the unexpected, then top-level management wants to know that they will do it in the same way as current top level management, and promoting people with the same social experience, same social characteristics and background is a way of making sure of that. It does not mean that they will do it best, but they will do it like the people presently on top. People who are "different" might be hard to relate to under pressure, and they are not totally predictable. Kanter suggests that people who don't fit in are found in increasing numbers away from the top, and they are found in staff positions where they serve as technical experts. A few ethnics are showing up at the top within the last few years, and they seem to have come up the "technical" route. One assumes that in

the near future they will seem more familiar to the Anglo-Saxon Protestants at the top. One also assumes that as top management feels the pressure to open the doors to women and racial minorities, white ethnics will look less different than they have. The problem of executive-suite exclusion will be addressed by all the measures we take to make this a more democratic society. Better educational opportunities, fewer restrictions on housing, and some court cases challenging the right of the country clubs to discriminate, (while members are eligible for tax breaks and the clubs are eligible to development assistance from government) : all of these will lead to a decrease in executive-suite exclusion.

Where should we go in the future to deal with the employment-related effects of ethnicity? First, we need the data to answer a lot of questions, and secondly, we need to deal with the grave problems facing society because many of these problems will especially impact on the areas where about two-thirds of the Euro-Ethnic Americans reside.

1. We need better data on ethnics. We need to identify people by ethnicity beyond the second generation, and we need to agree on an appropriate measure so we can trace lingering effects of ethnicity, as well as the effects of immigration.

2. We need to find ways which would allow us to sort out the confounding effects of religion of ethnicity, so that we can do relevant analysis.

3. We need to do comparative studies of American communities to find under what circumstances a particular ethnic group is at the bottom of the job ladder, and under what circumstances the same group can have a respected role occupationally in another community.

4. We need to do comparative studies to find whether ethnic groups can have an occupational distribution that is considered "good", or "high status" without becoming residentially or culturally dispersed, or without being a miniscule group in the community.

5. We need to study those communities where particular ethnic groups have suffered occupational stagnation to determine whether there are communities with problems so pervasive that they need to be revived at the community-wide level, rather than in terms of one or two or three nationality groups.

6. We need to evaluate the training programs which we are emphasizing in affirmative action plans, and study whether these are the ones that will lead to a secure future in those communities, or whether they need to be supplemented with training programs geared to all those who will be obsolescent, as well as the groups which had been previously excluded.

7. We need to study – now before a more serious crisis is upon us – the problems of the older industrial areas of the North. These are not just the problems of the two-thirds of the ethnics or of the blacks in the inner city. They are the problems of the whole American economy. If we let those areas decay, we let the promise of America decay. We will have neither civil rights nor civil liberties nor democracy if we fail to meet the challenge of better and more fulfilling jobs for all Americans, men, women, and those who originally came from Africa, from Asia, from Europe, and now from Latin America.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN Good. Thank you very much. We appreciate having your paper and your summary of it.

Our next panelist will be Russell Barta, Professor of Social Services at Mundelein College in Chicago and a former member of the Human Relations Commission for Evanston, Illinois.

Professor Barta has written and lectured on the ethnicity and the extent of discrimination against black, brown, white ethnics in the executive suite; he received his Doctorate in sociology from Notre Dame.

Professor Barta, you have about 15 minutes to summarize your conclusions .

**RESPONSE OF RUSSELL BARTA,
PROFESSOR OF SOCIAL SERVICES,
MUNDELEIN COLLEGE, CHICAGO**

DR. BARTA. Thank you. I certainly agree with Professor Rozen on the condition of the data now available, and I think all of this was reinforced by that fascinating testimony we had just before the luncheon break.

Therefore, I think my remarks may be more tentative than they will be definitive.

Since Professor Rozen's paper did, in several pages, deal with executive-suite exclusion, I think I'd like to begin my remarks with my own study of the largest 106 corporations in the Chicago area, almost half of which made the Fortune 500 in 1972.

What I sought to determine was the relative presence or absence of Poles, Italians, Hispanics, and blacks in the executive suites of those corporations. As far as I know, it was the first such systematic study and, no credit to me, it was requested by the ethnics in the City of Chicago.

I think that kind of a study was only anticipated by studies done by various Jewish agencies to document the exclusions of Jews from executive positions in banks, insurance companies and other large-scale corporations.

Using my study as a prototype, a similar study was conducted in Detroit, Mich. and essentially came up with the same results.

Poles, Italians, Hispanics, and blacks were grossly under-represented in the executive suites of the largest corporations and grossly underrepresented relative to their size in the population, and relative to their presence on either the board of directors or executive positions.

No one was surprised by these findings, least of all the Poles, Italians, Hispanics, and blacks. This was no new information, especially for the Poles and Italians.

They wanted these studies done in order to legitimate, to document what they already knew. Apparently they had complained for some time about such exclusion, but they could find no one to listen to them, or no one to take their own findings seriously.

I think this underscores the need to develop research on other ethnic groups in America, not only their presence or absence in the corporate structure of American society, but their representation on foundations; major civic groups, such as public boards and commissions; influential private agencies and social clubs.

Could not the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights encourage such studies, because as they accumulate, the result would be a national profile for each of America's groups, white ethnics, black ethnics, thus serving as a moving indicator of how far they've come and how far they have yet to go.

And the emphasis should be not only on the negative, but on the positive, as well. I think our society has a problem with morale if we're constantly reminded about how we have failed and rarely about how we have succeeded.

The Italians and the Poles in Chicago agreed with our suggestion that both blacks and Spanish be included in the survey. Neither group perceived themselves as in conflict with or in competition with blacks and Spanish. And their perception of white and black ethnics sharing common problems was also shared by the blacks in Chicago.

The Chicago Defender, in giving full coverage to the study, headlined their half-page story in this fashion: "Blacks Haven't Made it Yet, but Neither Have the Poles or Italians." As a colleague of mine remarked, that kind of a headline alone justified the study.

And at a time when we tend to stress the negative aspects of intergroup relations, it might behoove us to seek more deeply the positive views on which to build bridges of cultural cooperation and understanding.

Professor Rozen concludes the section on executive-suite exclusion with these words: "Ethnics are showing up at the top within the last few years, and they seem to have come up the technical route. One

assumes that within the near future they will seem more familiar to the Anglo-Saxon Protestants at the top. One also assumes that as management feels the pressure to open the doors to women and racial minorities, white ethnics will look less different than they have. The problem of executive-suite exclusion will be addressed by all the measures we take to make this a more democratic society; better educational opportunities, better restrictions on housing – or fewer restrictions, – some court challenges of country clubs and so on.”

Those concluding sentences raise a number of questions. First of all, isn't coming up the technical route and not the line route a symptom of the very problem we're talking about?

It seems to me it is common knowledge that the way you make it in corporations is going up the line route. For example in Boston, a number of years ago, if you were Irish, Catholic Irish, the only route you had through the corporation was the technical route, and this was perceived as limiting one's ability for mobility to get to the top.

Number two, why should top management feel the pressure to open the doors to women and racial minorities and not feel the same kind of pressure to open the doors not to whites, but to Italians, Poles, Czechs, Serbs?

Thirdly, when Professor Rozen suggests to white ethnics, as I think she does, that they be patient, get a little more education, wait for the social clubs to open their doors, I wonder, why should white ethnics be receptive to such counsel and other minorities not?

How are we going to respond to the white ethnics who, in increasing numbers, point to their exclusion from executive suites not only of private corporations, but the executive suites of foundations, public commissions, certain sectors of Government?

How should the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights respond? Are white ethnics being discriminated against as they claim and thereby excluded from these various executive suites?

I'm not sure that I really know. If I use EEOC norms, they definitely are.

Nathan Glazer and Moynihan had the same problem when they were dealing with discrimination against Italians in New York. They weren't quite sure. They thought that they were.

Andrew Greeley, in an update on Professor Rozen's data says, in commenting on the underrepresentation of Slavic men at the level of managers, if black underrepresentation among managers and sales personnel is to be explained as a form of discrimination, it is at least arguable that discrimination can also be invoked to explain the Slavic-Catholic underrepresentation.

I side with Andrew Greeley, because I'm trying to counter the tendency of always using the past of white ethnics against them, as it were, to explain away their present position.

At the same time, in the case of other minorities, we use their past history to help them, to justify our actions for them.

There is a tendency, often, when white ethnics complain about problems, to turn their attention to their past and say, well, look, you have an Italian father and he didn't push you out into the mainstream – whereas for other minorities, we look to the present structure, the present practices of the system to account for their disabilities.

Social science data can't solve all of these issues. It depends on how we use them, and how we use them depends on our perspective and our values.

Discrimination, as EEOC keeps reminding employers, can be a very subtle process, often occurring despite the best intentions of the employer. We have no studies of the objective consequences of this selection process, not for whites, but for Poles, Italians and other ethnics.

What are the elements that enter into the filtering process, elements that are nonability factors, that have nothing to do with competence.

Certainly, we have nothing comparable to the studies by Robert Quinn and others at the Institute of Social Research on how the selection process of executives discriminates against Jews – I refer you to their book, *The Chosen Few*. I suspect that many employers, conditioned as they are to think in terms of white and black, would have no idea whether or not they are discriminating against white ethnics, and neither would EEOC. They don't have the data.

However, as EEOC has taught us, it is the consequences of employment practices, not the intent, which determine whether discrimination exists.

Professor Rozen, in her paper, seems to be convinced – and here I think, incidentally, she knows more about blue-collar workers than I do – that white ethnics, at least in the trades and in skilled occupations, have not much to fear from affirmative action programs for other minority groups, that a greater threat comes from the long-term economic decline of the geographic areas in which they seem to be concentrated, to live and work.

I share her concern for the impact of economic decline in these industries in which white skilled ethnics may find themselves.

As to the impact of affirmative action programs, I'm not that sure who is or who will monitor the impact of affirmative action programs on nonprotected workers.

Will the United States Civil Rights Commission? Will EEOC?

I do share Professor Rozen's concern for the future of group relations in this country if the national pie from which all groups get their slices shrinks in size.

What worries me, though, is not the conflict that may result as much as the kind of conflict. There has always been and always will be conflict among groups that make up American society, and it seems to me this is only a reflection of the dynamism of the social processes in our society, that they're not frozen, that there is movement taking place.

The genius of the society, why it has survived and perhaps others not, why it has survived up until now the crucible of pluralism, is that we've been able to accommodate and negotiate one another's needs, not through social engineering, but through political sensitivity and know-how.

But our success has also been due to the fact that the various groups have accepted the same rules of the game and consider them basically fair – the major exception, of course, being the black.

Let me summarize this, then, by saying that what I'm concerned about is the growing perception (not just among white ethnics) that somehow the rules of the game have changed. What are the rules exactly?

This bothers me because it seems to me it may be one of the sources of the corrosion of the sense of confidence and legitimacy that we have in our government institutions. It is reflected by recent polls.

I would then only conclude by saying that the rise of ethnic consciousness is not just a U.S. phenomenon; it's worldwide. I think the reason that it's worldwide has something to do with the fact that our societies are modern societies.

It also has something to do with the fact Government increasingly is becoming a major arbiter of economic well-being; and as long as that remains and modernizing processes go on, ethnicity as the basis for economic rights is something that is going to stay with us for a long time.

I think that's the reality. The question is whether we'll catch up with it.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN . Thank you very much.

**RESPONSE OF LYDIO F. TOMASI, DIRECTOR,
CENTER FOR MIGRATION STUDIES OF NEW YORK, INC.**

FATHER TOMASI . I should like to congratulate both the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for courageously attacking the formidable task of the civil rights of "Euro-ethnic Americans" and Ms. Rozen for

equally courageously answering that call in her interesting presentation.

The commissioned topic of analysis was employment and ethnicity, the focus being on patterns and practices of ethnic employment, including 1) executive-suite exclusions, 2) training and career development, 3) quotas and 4) the impact of Title VII and related laws and court decrees on ethnic classes.

These specific points were not part of the main thrust of Ms. Rozen's paper, which dealt mostly with the search for a possible link between ethnicity and occupation.

As Ms. Rozen notes, data on the socioeconomic mobility of the "Euro-ethnic Americans" are remarkably scarce. However, the various sociopsychological and cultural explanations of this phenomenon have been replaced in the past quarter century by a politico-economic approach. That is, there has been a discernible shift from the modification of individual attitudes to the concept of social change.

That ethnic stratification was once perceived (and many times developed) in conjunction with ethnic succession may have often been the case, but that ethnic succession now fails to materialize because of the industrial shift from the Northeast, where "Euro-ethnic Americans" are mostly concentrated, to the Sunbelt cannot wholly explain the relationship of employment to ethnicity. According to the literature of ethnic revival, one would conclude that the whole of ethnic America was contained in the urban north, in communities like South Boston, Kensington, Gage Park, and Hamtramck. "That profile", observed Arthur Mann, "left out millions of families who lived in pleasant small towns, comfortable suburbs, and stable neighborhoods on the outer rims of big cities."¹ Also, unemployment, together with inflation and energy shortage, are hardly the exclusive problems of "Euro-ethnic Americans." "Minority" groups are not exclusively found among the poor. Many Euro-ethnic Americans² would have some difficulty with Ms. Rozen's faith that "within the near future they will seem more familiar to the Anglo-Saxon Protestant at the top" (p. 32).

In dealing with employment and ethnicity in the case of Euro-ethnic Americans, our stratification analysis, in my opinion, must extend the concept of poverty "beyond the narrow limits of income to the qualities of political and personal relations"³ within the history of

¹ Arthur Mann, *The One and the Many: Reflections on the American Identity*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979, p. 43.

² For instance, the National Federation of American Ethnic Groups at the Convention of April 27-29, 1979, adopted a resolution, "requesting that other ethnics be listed under the categories entitled to affirmative action". (*Ethnic Newsletter*, Vol. 1, No. 1, October, 1979).

³ S. M. Miller and Pamela Roby, *The Future of Inequality*. New York: Basic Books, 1970, p. 9.

ambivalence of American immigration policy.⁴ Contrary to the Kerner Report (1968), our nation is not moving toward two societies, separate and unequal, but we have had two, and more than two separate and unequal societies from the beginning which is how it will probably remain for a long time.

While statistical data alone cannot be deemed indicative of discriminatory practices, a strong case can be developed when it is supported by independent evidence of discrimination against individuals. Thus, for instance, Dr. John Nielsen (1 Washington Square, New York City), a Yale graduate, could not find employment until he changed his Slovene name Sesek into Nielsen. Professor Joseph Velikonja of the University of Washington could not obtain the endorsement of the local newspaper to be elected last year to the Board of Education, because he is a Slovene immigrant. Many others like them continue to go through the same experience of the theoretician of cultural pluralism, Horace Meyer Kallen, who was let go by Princeton after learning that he was a Jew. Even in the home of his favorite Harvard professor, Kallen felt that Mrs. William James thought "that somehow a Jew. . . Jews were outsiders, they did not belong."⁵

This year "Attorney John Lucido, represented by Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights Counsel Robert Destro, won the first skirmish in a landmark employment discrimination lawsuit based on religious and ethnic prejudice. Lucido charges his former employer, the prestigious Wall Street law firm, Cravath, Swaine and Moore, with denying him a partnership in the firm because he is a Catholic of Italian descent".⁶ Only 15 out of 912 partners in the 20 largest New York City law firms are Italian Americans according to the plaintiff's brief in the pending law suit.

The 1975 New York Conference on Italian American Agenda stated that "the bio-medical situation at City College suggests that the Italian American is being denied access to the benefit of others who are less qualified."⁷

The New York State Italian American Legislators Caucus reported last year that more than 25 percent of the students at City University of New York are Italian Americans, while the Italian American faculty comprises about 4.5 percent of the entire CUNY faculty: "of

⁴ Charles B. Keely, *U.S. Immigration Policy: A Policy Analysis*. New York: The Population Council, 1979. P. 8-29. The major point of the forty-one volume report of the Dillingham Commission on Immigration was that the new immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe threatened both American society and the American stock. More recently, Michael Kane's book, *Minorities in Textbooks* (1970) shows that American textbooks continue to "present a principally white, Protestant, Anglo-Saxon view of America".

⁵ Arthur Mann, *The One and the Many: Reflections on the American Identity*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979. P. 139.

⁶ *The Novak Report on the New Ethnicity*, 7:1. Oct.-Nov. 1979.

⁷ *The Italian American Agenda*. New York: The National Italian American News, 1975, p. 24.

the approximately 7,400 positions within CUNY's professional ranks, approximately 380 are filled by Italian Americans. Of these positions about 200 are at the lowest level or assistant professor category."⁸ The Italian American Legislators Caucus claims that faculty discrimination has been registered in the areas of appointments, promotions, tenure, and major committees. It is convinced that a pattern of discrimination exists. "The use of 'Waivers' by various college presidents within CUNY is a vehicle used to pass over for promotion Italian American faculty members, who have all the requisite background and qualifications, for those with less background and qualifications. This procedure of issuing 'Waivers' has led to a practice in many cases of 'cronyism' being practiced to the detriment of Italian American faculty members and to the advantage of those in power."⁹ "Approximately 40 Italian American groups have banded together in Chicago to take collective action in this and similar areas of concern."¹⁰ However, a 1974 article in the prestigious journal, *Science*, asserted that Catholic antiintellectualism accounts for a lack of Catholic scientists.

The above cases seem to indicate that "Ethnic affirmation is more than wearing an Afro hair style, attending an Italian opera, or taking a course in Jewish cooking. It permeates our social system in general and our political system specifically, thereby affecting the opportunity structure for all Americans whether or not they choose to identify with a particular ethnic group."¹¹ These "Euro-ethnic Americans have always felt that the real issue that divides them and "other minority groups" is power and position - not bias."¹² The 1972 Equal Employment Opportunity Act included educational institutions that were exempt under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which applies to employers generally and is not based on a contractual relationship with the federal government. The issue under Title VII was the effect of the employment practices on opportunities for the hiring and promotion of minorities, not the employer's state of mind.

Italian-Americans and most of the "Euro-ethnic Americans" were never part of the majority in educational institutions, but they are nevertheless classified with the privileged majority. They may face benign discrimination, but the entire thrust of the civil-rights-enforcement program in regard to employers' policies is not the intent but the effect of the hiring and employment procedure.

⁸ *A History of Italian American Discrimination at CUNY*. A Report by Senator John D. Calandra, Chairman, Italian American Legislators Caucus. Albany, NY: New York State Senate, 1978, p. 2.

⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 40.

¹⁰ Fred Barbaro, "Ethnic Affirmation, Affirmative Action, and the Italian-American", in *Italian/Americana*, 1(1):41-58. Autumn, 1974.

¹¹ *Ibidem*, p. 42.

¹² *Ibidem*, p. 47.

“The alarm expressed by some academicians that ethnic, racial, or sex considerations in the recruitment and employment of faculty members is irrelevant, and even dangerous if standards are to be maintained, is based on assumptions that past and present procedures have resulted in excellence and that subjective considerations (real bias) have never played a significant role in determining faculty choices.”¹³

The Council Against Poverty reminded us that many “Euro-ethnic Americans” are not part of the privileged majority; in fact, they are well represented among “the hidden poor.”¹⁴ Not only the elderly among the Italians, Irish, and those from eastern European countries face serious problems. The needs of these ethnic poor are outlined in community studies,¹⁵ but they are not met by city, State and Federal agencies.

Even outside this neglected segment of Euro-ethnic Americans, other challenges have to be met in dealing with employment and ethnicity. For instance, “through diligence, resourcefulness, and painful struggle”; Jews “have achieved a prominent economic, cultural, and educational position; their professional representation is equal to that of the topmost American religious, ethnic, or racial group. Nonetheless, the old stereotypes and negative prejudgments persist, especially in the social club and to a considerable extent in the ‘executive suite’ – selection and advancement in major American business and industrial corporations.”¹⁶

Elsewhere, I had the opportunity to observe that in our national experience, economic gains are not automatically translated into gains in other important realms of life, that would break down the wall of social and psychological exclusion.¹⁷ Being included in society, which means being accorded respect and accepted in social and political relations with others, has been increasingly an important part of the issue of inequality.

It is on this level that we must remind ourselves that the ultimate aim of social policy is to eliminate various forms of institutionalized

¹³ *Ibidem*, p. 55.

¹⁴ *The Hidden Poor: The Needs of Low Income Ethnic Groups Living Outside Poverty Areas in New York City*. New York: Community Council of Greater New York, 1977.

¹⁵ *A Study of Three White Ethnic Neighborhoods*. New York: Urban Priorities Associates, 1976. *A Portrait of the Italian American Community in New York City*. Josephine Casalena, Congress of Italian American Organizations, 1975. *The Needs of the Growing Greek-American Community in the City of New York*. Hellenic American Neighborhood Action Committee, 1973. *Jewish Poverty Issues*. Rabbi Jack Simcha Cohen, Metropolitan New York Coordinating Council on Jewish Poverty, New York City, 1975.

¹⁶ John Slawson, *Unequal Americans: Practices and Politics of Intergroup Relations*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1979. p. 10.

¹⁷ Lydio F. Tomasi, *The Ethnic Factor in the Future of Inequality*. New York: Center for Migration Studies, 1977.

inequalities and not ethnicity. "Euro-ethnic Americans" must be equally accepted as Americans.

The religious variable seems to have a great deal of weight for "Euro-Ethnic Americans" in not being "included" in American society.

According to a three-part series on anti-Catholicism in America recently published in the *Boston Globe*,¹⁸ a growing number of Catholics, many of whom are the children and grandchildren of immigrants, feel that what is lacking is respect – "respect for their talents, their beliefs and what they feel are legitimate ambitions for their institutions – respect, that is, from other Americans."¹⁹ Among the areas where the effects of prejudice and discrimination are visible are the following:

- a) Under-representation of Catholics in the faculty and administration of American colleges and universities;
- b) Under-representation of Catholics in the corporate boardrooms.

While Catholics as a group are better educated and have higher average family incomes than members of any other Christian denomination (the Irish Catholics are the group with the highest family income among gentile, white, ethnic groups in this country, the Italian Catholics are the second, followed by German, Polish and Slavic Catholics) according to Andrew Greeley, a sociologist of the National Opinion Research Center, they lag behind other groups at the same educational and income levels in what he calls "occupational prestige." That is, while Catholics make as much or more money than other Americans on the average, they are less likely to be found in the boardrooms of the largest corporations or on the faculties of colleges and universities. For example, former Massachusetts Banking Commissioner Carol Greenwald's study showed that Catholics in 1976 held only 28 percent of the senior management posts in banks in Massachusetts, although they were more than half the state's population. The Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, which has grown from 16,000 to 26,000 members in the last year, has collected other figures, detailing the absence of Catholic ethnic groups in the largest Chicago businesses, New York law firms and American universities (only 10% of university teachers several years ago were Catholic, compared with a general population that was 24% Catholic). "I am not prepared. . .to contend that the research explicitly establishes that the underrepresentation is the result of discrimination", Andrew Greeley said in his recent book, *An Ugly Little Secret: Anti-Catholicism in American Life*. But, he said, the problem of underrepresentation has

¹⁸ James L. Franklin, "Anti-Catholicism in America: Does the Old Fire Still Smolder?" *Boston Globe*, February 4, 1979, pp. 1 and 14; February 5, 1979, pp. 1 and 6; February 6, 1979, page 25.

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, *Boston Globe*, February 4, 1979, page 1.

been almost completely ignored and such "inattention. . . is evidence of bigotry".

Economic success is not sufficient to extinguish "the old fire" of prejudice and discrimination of "Euro-Ethnic Americans." Nor is their relatively recent political success. Catholics are the largest single religious group in the present 96th Congress with 116 of 435 seats in the House and 13 of 100 seats in the Senate. The *Congressional Quarterly*, however, published an analysis of abortion votes, using an asterisk to identify Catholic members of Congress – something the Catholic critics said would have been unthinkable in the case of Jewish legislators and aid to Israel.

"I regard prejudice against (the Catholic) Church" wrote historian Arthur Schlesinger, Sr. of Harvard University "as the deepest bias in the history of the American people." Much earlier on August 24, 1855, Lincoln wrote to Joshua Speed: "As a nation, we began by declaring that 'all men are created equal'! We now practically read it. . . 'all men are created equal, except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics."

Good statistics on the problem are lacking. Continued inattention to the possibility of anti-Catholic prejudice and discrimination is itself harmful, while it remains one of the major obstacles for "Euro-Ethnic Americans" to an equal redistribution of the power resources among, and availability of these resources for, all the groups of American society.

"Notwithstanding the certitudes of ethnic ideologies" wrote in his recent book *The One and the Many: Reflections on the American Identity*, Arthur Mann, Professor of History at the University of Chicago, "America is not merely a collection of ethnic groups. . . It is easy enough to cite the occasions when that inclusiveness collapsed under one form of bigotry or another. From the Alien and Sedition Acts of the 1790's through the Know-Nothing eruptions of the 1850's, through the triumph of Anglo-Saxonist proscriptions in the 1920's, through the internment of Japanese Americans in the 1940's, there is an ugly legacy of hatred, violence, and dangerous and foolish thinking. But the prescriptive part of the national creed, in every instance thus far, provided a resilient and therefore self-correcting mechanism."²⁰ This consultation hopefully will help to regain this sense of wholeness, pride and confidence by calling attention not only to the fact of employment discrimination of "Euro-Ethnic Americans," but also by pointing out the causes and the remedies, not just by being taught "to be nice to each other." Litigation and legislation, however, will be greatly handicapped without attitudinal or motivational support within the individual and his community.²¹ To produce the desired change in

²⁰ Arthur Mann, op. cit., pp. 177-178.

²¹ John Slawson, op. cit., page 180.

attitude which will assure the elimination of discrimination in the broadest possible fashion in all aspects of employment, more studies in the politicoeconomic area are needed to answer such questions as the following:

“What has happened to the progress made some years ago in eliminating discriminatory practices in the ‘executive suite’? What guidelines are needed for success in this area? Where do we stand today in the matter of ‘social discrimination’, which is tied up closely with the ‘executive suite’? And finally, what is needed to strengthen the basis for its obliterations?”²²

* * *

RESPONSE OF ESTA BIGLER, LABOR ATTORNEY, BUREAU OF LABOR SCIENCES, NEW YORK, NY

Thank you. It's a pleasure to be here.

The past 2 days have certainly opened up a whole new world to me, and I owe a great deal of thanks to all of you.

I would just like to add that I am the child of a mixed marriage, so that you understand my perspective totally, that on one side I am first-generation American and on the other side I am second-generation American. I have been able to observe in my own family, by watching what happens to the children on each side, the effects of immigration and ethnicity.

In addition, I'm also a labor educator, and it's from this vantage point that some of the concerns I will express today have developed.

The students I teach are all trade union members, and they fall into two groups. They are either overwhelmingly Euro-ethnic Americans or black and Hispanic, both men and women.

In reading Professor Rozen's paper, it seems to me that she makes three basic points. One is that ethnic groups are stratified into certain occupations and in relationship to each other.

The question is whether this is discrimination, the unseen hand of fate, or natural selection. I will try to address myself to this shortly.

Second, she states that most ethnics live in the Northeast where jobs are declining. We, everyone in this room, must address this very important question of a shortage of employment opportunities, a shrinking of the pie, so to speak.

²² *Ibidem*, page 180. The American Jewish Committee's executive-suite program which has changed markedly the position of the Jews in the United States, should be used as a model for Euro-Ethnic-Americans. See Edwin Kiescher, Jr., "the Case of the Missing Executive: How Religious Bias Wastes Management Talent. . . and What is Being Done About It", American Jewish Committee, January 1973. Also, some guide to information on employment and ethnicity should be developed on the model of *A Guide to Information on Equal Education Opportunity*. Robert Vivolo, ERIC Clearing House on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1977.

And of course, what we've heard all afternoon, that there is a precious need for more data so that we can in fact analyze what is happening on the American employment scene.

While I agree with all of these points, and I think they're very important, I would like to add some of my own concerns.

I don't believe that we can discuss Euro-ethnic employment without dealing with another question, the question of class.

Immigrants come to this country, and they join the working class. They work with their hands. They work in factories. They dig ditches. They're operators. They work in steel mills.

This has ramifications for where they live, the kind of education the children receive, and what occupations they and their children go into.

It seems to me that our society spends a great deal of time trying to pretend that we are a classless society, that we have no classes; that there are no class distinctions.

I believe very strongly that there are these distinctions, and that we must analyze the experience of Euro-ethnic Americans in these terms.

Professor Rozen, in her paper, at the very beginning of the paper, talks about the son of a small town bank president who goes to work in the factory right after high school, just like his Slavic friends, and people wonder and the whole town buzzes.

I think this is a class question. If you were talking about, to change it for a moment, a Jewish doctor's daughter or son or a Slavic dentist's daughter or son, we'd have some of the same reactions. Thus, class is a very, very important factor that has to be considered throughout this analysis.

In addition, we have to understand what it's like for a worker in our society. The position of a worker at the work place is a passive one. You take orders. You don't give them. You don't challenge. You must be passive at all time.

Euro-ethnic Americans in the working class – they often don't make enough money; but even if they do suffer from the stigma of working with their hands. Our society says that working with our hands is not honorable.

Someone today talked about menial jobs. There are no jobs that are menial as far as I am concerned. It's only the image that people have in their heads, and that must be addressed and changed.

The position of the working class in our society leads to confusion for the children of European immigrants and for the immigrants themselves, since in Europe, being a crafts person, working with your hands, producing something that you could hold was honorable, was something that gave you status within the community.

You come to the United States, and all of a sudden you are no longer performing an honorable job.

While I agree with those who spoke yesterday, that it's important that Greek-Americans, Jewish-Americans, Italian-Americans know about the poets of their group, the philosophers of their group, the writers of their group, the Nobel scientists of their group, we also have to infuse into our educational system information concerning who built this country, who with their hands and their sweat built it and continue to build it and provide large parts of the GNP.

When I was in school, I spent a great deal of time learning about Carnegie and how he helped to build this country. I spent a lot of time learning about Rockefeller. Yes, they taught us about the robber barons, but aside from teaching me who built the Erie Canal, no one ever mentioned American workers. Significantly, they never mentioned the fight of immigrants in this country to build institutions to protect themselves, institutions which were illegal when they started the fight unions.

These institutions have mirrored the economic and the ethnic representation in the employment situation, and for a complete picture we have to look at them as well.

But just to step back, in the development of unions in this country, Euro-ethnic Americans were at the fore-front of the fight. People like Sacco and Vanzetti gave their lives, yet these are names that most school children have never heard.

I ask some of you in here if you know the names Clara Lemich, Eugene Debbs, Bill Heywood, people who were instrumental in building the United States and the American labor movement. Yet, children who go into the labor movement, people who go into jobs, who will someday belong to unions have never heard of these leaders.

At the same time, our schools teach that to be successful means to be middle class. Well, I object strenuously to that. We teach what we call middle-class values, the Anglo American system, as I heard it referred to yesterday. What this does to children of Euro-ethnic Americans is to make them feel that their parents are somehow a failure.

My father is a dress cutter. For the entire time I have been alive, he has worked two jobs to support his family. He believes that he is a failure because American middle-class values tell him that to be a success he should wear a white shirt and a tie and a jacket to work, and he doesn't. So in his eyes, he's a failure, and he has tried desperately to push both my sister and me so that we would not be failures.

This of course affects the children and the way they perceive their parents as well as their own sense of ethnic identification.

I mentioned earlier that unions often mirror the ethnic groups that helped to form them. I think immediately of the dress industry which was predominantly Jewish at the turn of the century, and the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, and the Amalgamated

Clothing Workers Union. You think of transit workers in New York, and I don't think anyone can forget Michael Quill's brogue when he was involved in collective bargaining.

Now some of these unions did not have an impact in terms of who came into the system or who was employed. For example, in the needle trades there have always been Italians, and now the needle trades are becoming overwhelmingly Hispanic and black. I teach a special group of trade union students from the needle trades and my class is predominantly black and Hispanic.

There are other occupations, however, specifically the construction trades, where unions have been intimately involved in who gets into the system, and who is allowed to work. For example, you have George Meaney's Irish Plumbers Union in the Bronx; you have other ethnic groups in control of who gets hired in specific trades.

Many of you may not know that in the construction trades, the way you get sent on job site is through a hiring hall. If the union doesn't send you out, you don't work. At one time many unions, particularly craft unions had restrictive requirements in terms of membership. You could not join if your father didn't belong or if your uncle didn't belong. The purpose of these rules was protective to keep jobs for their families in a hostile world.

Obviously, this kept out women; it also kept out other ethnic groups besides the one that was in control, and it kept out blacks and Hispanics.

I think there's no question that there has been a history of discrimination in employment against ethnics.

Recently I was involved, before I left private practice, in a suit which involved 10,000 women in a major manufacturing operation in New Jersey. When we began to meet the class of 10,000 women, it became clear to me that there were only two ethnic groups that were employed.

I met only Slavic women or Irish women. Investigation revealed that the male work force was Slavic and Irish and that the supervisors themselves were Slavic and Irish. What happened at this plant was a selection process that involved picking your own group to be employed.

And what has been the result of that suit, and what will eventually be a court-ordered affirmative action plan, is that now there must be objective selection criteria so that all ethnic groups and sexes will have a chance to work in that particular facility in all jobs.

No longer are promotions based solely on what the supervisor thinks about you. Now there will be written evaluations with written criteria. Therefore, even though our suit was aimed specifically at

women, the ramifications in terms of ending all kinds of discrimination are clear.

I would just like to mention the unemployment problem. I think we should begin to look at new ways of dealing with the shrinking employment pie. I am very concerned that we don't pit one group against another, rather that we force the pie to be made bigger or that we find a way to share the pie. One group in pursuit of its rights should not be seen as attacking the other group or taking food out of the other's mouth.

Some of the things that I think we should think about are shared work. We should think about a shorter work week. We should think about different layoff procedures in terms of seniority. You know, traditionally, layoffs occur on a first in, the last out/the last in, the first out basis.

We should look to examine the possibilities of changing that; this means we must include unions and worker organizations in any discussion about employment and ending discrimination in employment.

We also have to recognize that discrimination is not a one-dimensional problem. I think that was the thrust of what I was trying to say when I talked about the different ethnic groups in control of different occupations.

In addition, I would just like to make a few suggestions to the Commission of areas to be evaluated.

We heard a lot of discussion this morning about the EEOC and discrimination. As you all know, in discrimination law, we have a theory of private attorneys general. Individuals must prosecute their own suits, unlike discrimination on the basis of union activity. In those cases the National Labor Relations Board prosecutes for the individual without cost.

We should re-evaluate the EEOC, and I suggest that the EEOC be patterned after the National Labor Relations Board.

Another area of concern is the effect of spending in a community for construction, or other Federal programs in which jobs are created. We should think in terms of requiring employment on a community basis. We should evaluate the impact of those jobs on that community.

Finally, the last area I'd like to mention concerns what we have been talking about the last two days, contracting out services to various ethnic groups, to insure social services reach that particular group.

That brings specific problems in terms of equal employment opportunity for everyone else. I have been confronted with one group saying, "I only want to hire Catholics, another, I only want to hire

Jews," but yet they are using public moneys to dispense a nonsectarian service. We should examine this area very, very carefully.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Very good.

I must say, Ms. Bigler, you are somebody after my own heart. I have made a lot of your arguments for 10 years, and I am glad to hear somebody offer them as a witness, because it has been sheer frustration since no one in the civil rights bureaucracy in Washington seems willing to face up to the problems you are talking about, which are those of economic class, among others.

You did mention that you wanted different layoff procedures and seniority, last in, first out, and I'm just curious. What would those be?

MS. BIGLER. Well, I was thinking of the possibility of senior employees agreeing to be the first ones to be laid off instead of the junior employees. These senior employees would in essence be on sabbatical. They would have a specific time off, to pursue their interests at full salary or at three-quarter salary. We don't always have to take the newest worker into the system and then put him or her back out on the street.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Okay. I'll yield now to my colleagues.

DISCUSSION

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. I've been very much interested in the emphasis on the lack of data. Of course, that developed this morning. In fact, it's run all the way through the consultation.

I've also been interested in references to what, in effect, have been some case history in the executive-suite study in Chicago, and you refer to one somewhere in Detroit.

While people are working on getting us in a position where we have better data, should there be more emphasis on case studies, singling out situations in particular areas with particular types of employers and so on, to see if we can get evidence in that particular way?

Right along with that question, I'm also asking the question as to whether or not there has been as much emphasis as there should be on studying the impact of the practices of labor union on this particular issue.

I'm very much interested, and Commissioner Horn was, in the comments that have been made along this line, and I'm just wondering how much attention has been paid in terms of research in this area to that particular aspect of the problem, and if it would warrant more attention than it has received up to the present time.

I guess really what I'm thinking about are case histories on the management side and case histories on the labor side, and whether or

not that in turn would produce some evidence that would be helpful. I just toss that out.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Who would like to be responsive?

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. When I had discussions with counsel for the Steelworkers Union in the *Weber* case, I raised precisely that point.

In answer to your question, Mr. Chairman, when I was preparing our brief on the *Weber* case, I had discussions with counsel for the Steelworkers Union, on precisely that point. I was trying to find out why the Union negotiated the kind of affirmative action plan they did. I wanted to know, what data they had available, and used because the plan in the *Weber* case benefited more than blacks.

While blacks, in fact, have been the chief beneficiaries, the plan benefits women and the other – what I called earlier this morning – favored four categories, and I asked, well, what about other groups?

I asked how can anyone make a decision that these are the only groups that should be receiving this kind of treatment and attention by the union and private industry, if one doesn't have the data that reflects the status of other groups. His answer was and I'll conclude with this that the Government doesn't require us to do it; therefore, we don't do it.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Any other response?

DR. BARTA. As to the suggestion about case studies, I would endorse that very strongly, because otherwise we're left with gross-national figures, and under those gross-national figures, there can be all kinds of things which are hidden.

For example, the income figures hide the lack of status, prestige. We may argue about how important they may be, but nevertheless it hides those.

Besides, what goes on in Chicago may not be what goes on in Los Angeles and what goes on in Los Angeles may not be the same thing as in Miami and so on. The problems are, to some extent, national, but they're also local, and if groups are to get involved in them, they've got to get down to their local areas.

So I would strongly endorse the encouragement of more and more case studies.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Miss Bigler?

MS. BIGLER. I must preface this by the statement that I consider myself to be a labor union attorney, that I have represented labor unions and will in all likelihood do so again.

On the labor side, I think it's very important that we have studies in this area, but I also think it's very important that the people who do these studies don't come in with a middle-class and an antiunion bias. The analyst must understand why the unions were structured the way they were, why they felt it necessary to protect their jobs and to

protect their communities. The studies must not lead to union busting, or labeling the people in those unions as racist.

Ms. ROZEN. I'd like to add something to that, too that is related to what Miss Bigler said, and that is when you start to ask those questions at a time when the economy is tightening up, then you get exactly the kind of effect she's talking about, when we start asking a lot of questions about union discrimination, which certainly all of us know has been there all through the years.

But when we start asking those questions specifically at a time when there is a cutback in the building industry, then it certainly looks like we're part of union busting, and so we have to address ourselves to economic questions at the same time that we're addressing ourselves to questions of patterns of discrimination.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. In other words, you would not preclude asking them and this Commission's been asking them, after great and strenuous urging; this Commission started asking them in the early 1970's, about 10 or 15 years after it should have asked them.

But you're saying solve both problems at the same time.

Ms. ROZEN. Yes, right.

MR. TOMASI. Looking from past experience in collecting data, I would say that litigation and legislation are not enough unless we develop some programs, some educational and motivational programs to prepare the individual and the groups to accept the legislation.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Okay. Any other questions?

Commissioner Saltzman?

Mr. Nunez?

STAFF DIRECTOR NUNEZ. Professor Rozen, I was very impressed by your paper because it was based on hard data contrary to the popular wisdom, it would appear that there is a considerable amount of data that can be analyzed as to the status of Euro-ethnics in our society, and I had a thought, in hearing some of your comments on the limitations of the data, that you indicated very clearly that a lot of this data is computed by looking at the first and second generations.

But would not the assumption be that if you went farther, third, fourth, fifth generation, perhaps the statistics would be better, rather than worse -

Ms. ROZEN. You mean the people would be better off or the statistics would be more meaningful?

STAFF DIRECTOR NUNEZ. Well, obviously the statistics would probably be more meaningful, but perhaps their income would be higher and their occupational status would be given the fact that the longer you remain here, that would be an assumption.

MS. ROZEN. That's an assumption that you and I are making. We don't know, and I think a lot of groups are saying to us, and they may be right, there is a lingering effect.

You and I and, perhaps, they have been assuming that by the second generation, the blight is off, or whatever.

But perhaps some people are trying to say to us maybe it doesn't happen that fast, and unless we know, we can't argue. And I think that was the point you were making this morning. I totally agreed that either Poles and Italians are just doing fine and we ought to drop the question, or they're having problems and we ought to check it out.

But we don't know. And everybody can get up and say whatever they want, because we can't really argue.

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. And then there's a great degree of tension because of that uncertainty.

MS. ROZEN. Yes.

STAFF DIRECTOR NUNEZ. Mr. Walentynowicz, Professor Rozen, we are talking about priorities. There are priorities in public policy in our nation as well as any other society; and when you look at these statistics, and you look at similar statistics for black and Hispanics which range from 60 to 65 percent of national norms, and these statistics would suggest that the groups that are identified are above the national norms, the question of priority and concern does arise.

MS. ROZEN. Okay, and that's, I guess, where my priorities are. I'd like to get the numbers because I think you'll be proven right, but I don't want to take a position on that because I don't know.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. It is obvious that, when you talk about a national norm, there are people above and below the national norm, and the problem - what everybody has been suggesting here for two days - is that we do not know which groups lumped under "white other" might consistently and predominantly be below that national norm.

As I understand your testimony, it is not a question of using the data to deny others clearly below the national norm an opportunity, but rather it is a desire to help clear the air, and, - as you said, - perhaps provide greater understanding if you found that your ethnic group was above the national norm; then maybe the people above the norm would be willing to help others who were clearly below it.

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. Exactly, and that way we get more progress toward what our ultimate goals are. That's the whole point of it, though I also want to point out, that when we think in terms of affirmative action, we tend to average everything out and overlook the possibility of great disparities in particular categories.

Thus to use the present data, without more, don't deny the accuracy of it since I just don't know - is basically unfair.

To take these figures without being certain that they are reliable, and fully reflect the relative status of all the groups that make up America, and then immediately conclude that such data gives us a sense of priority or permits us to draw priorities, is grossly unjust, and is another form of discrimination. I suggest that the effort to collect the additional data we're talking about would take so little in extra resources and so little extra time if we set our minds down to do it, that the issue of priority that you referred to, Mr. Nunez, could become either obvious or irrelevant. If we do need to determine priorities, then we would have an accurate and full data base that would support a system of priorities which everyone would be in a position to readily accept.

STAFF DIRECTOR NUNEZ. Just one last comment, Mr. Walentynowicz.

As an individual who spent a good 10 years helping to include the Hispanic component in the census, it is a very difficult process to change the way we bureaucrats deal with issues once we set our minds to it.

The change in agencies' thinking, like the Bureau of Census, is not that easy.

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. Don't I know it.

STAFF DIRECTOR NUNEZ. It took 10 years of testimony and studies to get where they're at so that I think it's a difficult process. It's not just a conceptual process. It's the ingrained desire to stay with what you have in any kind of organizational mechanism.

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. I recognize the difficulties. But they must be overcome to secure true equality and justice.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. As a witness said yesterday, I will use the term Euro-ethnic for the first time in my life. I've read it before this - and that is if you want to solve the problem, more Euro-ethnics have to get into the census and the civil rights bureaucracies of the Federal Government.

Commissioner Ruiz?

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. The Government doesn't require us to do it, so we don't do it was the response given to Attorney Walentynowicz in the identification of categories in the *Weber* case.

Now, this is the point which was made earlier. If the Government doesn't require us to do it, who will require the Government to do it in this democracy?

Isn't the power with us? Isn't the power with the ethnics?

Now the major impact upon me by this panel is a feeling that our work and social environment is changing very rapidly, so fast that we cannot collect data on it.

Yet it's taking place before our very eyes. We're probing into taking a position but fast, insisting on census for information – a little bit of pessimism, but I think you can move the unmovable if you get organized; otherwise, you're going to be a species that disappeared, like certain species of animals disappeared from Earth because they could not adjust with the changing environment.

We observed this afternoon that one final arbiter is Government, whether it be the Supreme Court or such agencies as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Ethnics have apparently not adjusted with the changing environment as they should.

Attorney Walentynowicz seemed to agree that rather than to just fight, he's been a warrior tht's gone through the mill, I can see –

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. I have an empathy for a lawyer that does, and if you can't beat them, you've got to join them by making Government adjust to your needs.

Change the rules of Government to include ethnics in upward mobility ladders.

Our ethnics may be 10 years late, but I think we should adjust; I don't think we should miss the boat again.

This strategy that has been used and of help to blacks and Hispanics during the last 10 years should be adopted. There is more going for everybody by uniting forces for an evenhanded justice for all segments of our body politic.

And this is what has been evolving in these hearings, and it's making me feel real good.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Thank you.

May I express to each member of the panel our gratitude and appreciation for the contributions that you have made.

Seventh Session: Communications, Media and Ethnicity

We now turn to the area of communications media, and I'm going to ask Commissioner Ruiz to preside while these presentations are made, and I'm going to say now so that no one will misunderstand, as we move along, that I know that we've got to adjourn at 5:30 p.m., and I want to make sure that those who are coming on near the end of this consultation have the opportunity of presenting their views.

So, Commissioner Ruiz, it's going to be important to keep this particular panel on schedule, just as it will be important to keep the next panel on schedule.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Mr. Richard Gambino is a Professor of Education and Philosophy and a founder and Director of the Italian Studies Program at Queens College.

He has served as adviser on ethnic studies to the New York State Department of Education, the New York City Board of Education, and numerous colleges and universities.

A prolific writer and frequent speaker on the impact of public policies and perceptions on ethnic Americans, he was host and coproducer of 10 NBC programs on the contemporary problem of Italian Americans.

He holds Bachelor, Master's and Doctoral degrees in Philosophy.
Mr. Richard Gambino.

**STATEMENT OF RICHARD GAMBINO,
PROFESSOR OF EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY,
QUEENS' COLLEGE, NEW YORK**

Thank you very much.

Mindful of the need to keep the schedule, I will summarize the first, major portion of my paper, and then read only the last two pages or so.

In the first part of my paper, I talk about the major accomplishments that have been made since the 1950's in the area of civil rights for certain racial minorities and for women.

And without underestimating what still needs to be done in that area, few would deny that a great deal of progress has been made.

I also wrote about the great progress that has been made in combating anti-Semitism in the United States, using the historical perspective of the past to the turn of the century, and I said this is, in my opinion, largely because of the very laudable efforts of Jewish organizations.

However, these were not the only biases which were dominant in American society not very long ago. There were other biases, other than racial; namely, they were ethnic ones, and I think that these biases are still very strong in the United States for a number of reasons, which I will speak of in a moment, and that perhaps the groups hit hardest by the ethnic biases are eastern and southern European background groups.

• Why are these biases still around? Since the 1950's the biases against racial minorities and women have been under frontal assaults on all fronts, from the mass media and governmental power to the marshalling of schools, universities and textbooks, etc.

American Jews took the initiative on their own years ago, and established antidefamation leagues and have been, in my opinion, very successful in that endeavor.

However, the old nativist biases against southern and eastern Europeans have never been frontally assaulted in our society, on any level. The schools have not done it; Government has not done it; mass media have not done it; no one has done it.

I went on to write about and summarize what nativism was in the United States because I think it's important to realize tht it was not just a backwater movement.

It included, at the turn of the century, up through the 1930's, the best and the brightest in the United States, and I give examples of outrageous statements from Woodrow Wilson, U.S. Grant, etc., and I could multiply these statements.

I also wrote it was not limited to the top strata of society, but it was reflected right down to the very bottom and introduced all kinds of popular stereotypes into the American folklore.

I think the result of nativism from the 1840's to the 1930's was to establish in the American mind something that is instantly recognizable to most Americans when they hear it, but which they are only semiconscious of until they hear it.

And that is a hierarchy or racial and ethnic groups in the United States. One is considered "most American", according to this hierarchy, and one might say "most human" and "least human".

As I see the hierarchy, it's as follows. At the very top, of course, are Anglo-Saxon Protestants. They have - in popular mythology, which we all imbibe with our milk in this country - a proprietary hold on our country as it is presented, on its traditions and its founding, on its major accomplishments, etc.

Next in the hierarchy are other Northern European Protestant groups, then Western European Catholics, then southern and eastern Europeans and Jews, Latin Americans, Asians, American Indians, and blacks.

That's the hierarchy as I see it. It's not rigid, of course, but I think in general terms, a case can be made out that it does exist in virtually all levels and all compartments of American society.

Then I go on to discuss examples, contemporary examples in the various media, and I took the media in a very wide sense to include textbooks, and what the publishing media calls trade books, nonfiction, newspapers, movies, television, and magazines.

Starting with textbooks, they are among the earliest influences upon Americans. As children in schools, we are captive to them for years, during a most formative time of life.

Last summer, I researched how widely used textbooks treat American ethnic groups. All of them were printed in 1979, and used in American grade schools. The results were monotonously uniform.

Southern and eastern European groups were either neglected or negatively stereotyped.

I choose these examples not to make my point – the examples are chosen at random. I could just as easily have chosen any of the books I looked at.

For example, a 1979 fifth grade text called *Understanding the United States*, published by McGraw-Hill, proclaims on its front page that it is concerned with “the themes of cultural pluralism, equality and social justice.”

But the basic message of the text is laid down early in its pages. I quote again from the book: “The *dominant* or major cultural group in the United States is British American. The minor culture groups are called *subcultures*. Among them are Italian Americans, Japanese Americans, Navaho and Cuban Americans.”

The book does not explain how British Americans, some 15 to 30 percent of the U.S. population, are the major or dominant group. Is it because English is our *lingua franca* ? Because our governmental system is heavily British in derivation? There is immeasurably more to culture than these two components.

In all other areas, other ethnic groups have contributed enormously, in many instances more than British Americans. Yet, in the text’s 303 pages of American history, these other groups are reduced to one chapter each for the Amish and Spanish speaking, and three chapters on Native Americans.

A blanket species, labelled “immigrant groups,” is given six pages – that’s pages, not chapters – three of which are headed “Problems of Immigrants.”

Another 1979 text on the United States, designed for third graders, uses typical American families and individuals as illustrations for conveying the flavor of American life. The surnames of the families in the book are – and I include all of them – Mitchell, Dunlop, Maynard, Wilson, Everson, Cooley, Wachtel, Elliott, Virgil, Ortega, Dohan, Cheng, Sloan and Sheehan.

In the text or photos, some of these are identified as black, Oriental or Hispanic.

The book gives the impression that there is no one in the United States from Eastern or Southern Europe.

Bigotry through neglect and condescension marks another 1979 textbook, a history-geography book meant for grades four through six.

Of the book’s six chapters on Europe, *three* are on the United Kingdom. Eastern and southern Europeans are either ignored or barely mentioned.

For example, in the 427-page book, Italy is given 11 lines – not chapters or pages, but *lines*. These inform the students that Italy is

divided into north and south; that the north is industrial, the south agricultural, and that “from here many people depart for other countries.”

Examples from today’s textbooks, on all levels of education, can be multiplied endlessly.

An examination of them shows the veracity of a conclusion by Professor Mildred Dickerman, chairperson of the Department of Anthropology at Sonoma State College, CA.

In a 1973 study of school curricula, she found that “American schools are racist by design. Their racism is part of a larger philosophy, an ethnocentric dedication to the remodeling of citizens to conform to a single homogeneous acceptable model” made up of “Anglo-Saxon and North European groups.”

Negative stereotypes of southern and eastern European groups is a staple also of popular books for adults or trade books. Members of these ethnic groups serve as conventional, short-hand ways to evoke such qualities as criminality, stolidity, stupidity, vengeance, anti-intellectualism, clannishness, working-class primitivism, racism, over-sexuality, corruption, right wing neofascism, and social and cultural backwardness.

Here are two examples from a bounty – and I choose two because they are very popular books, both made into movies, one for television and one for distribution in theaters.

Two examples: The character “Falconetti” in Irwin Shaw’s *Rich Man, Poor Man* is dragged into the story at a convenient point – he has nothing to do with the story – from nowhere to move the plot along by committing murder and homosexual rape of a black man.

Similarly, Kurt Vonnegut, in *Slaughterhouse Five*, conveniently uses an Italian American as a *deus ex machina* of irrational vengeance to kill – that is murder – his WASP protagonist, whose name, incidentally, is Billy Pilgrim.

Newspapers usually drink from the same bigoted well in dealing with southern and eastern Europeans. In addition to the standard use of stereotypes, newspeople have a conventional code all their own.

For example, the words “boss” and “machine” never refer to Protestant individuals or groups.

Richard Nixon was called many things, but not a “boss.” Franklin D. Roosevelt occupied the White House for almost 4 terms and held the Democratic Party in his hip pocket. Yet even his most vehement enemies never used the word “machine” to describe his power, unique as it is in American history.

These are code words for a Catholic and, on some occasions, Jewish politicians.

Television and films are the major kingdom of ethnic stereotyping. Poles, in their characters, usually represent walking Polish jokes. To drive home the point, stand up comics and sit-coms actually tell real Polish jokes.

Greeks, when they are portrayed on television, are walking symbols of clannishness and emotionalism. Italians are buffoons, criminals, or both.

A whole new generation of Americans is learning the latest evolution of the "dumb" stereotype from "Fonzie," "Laverne and Shirley," "Angie," and "Roseanne Roseannadanna." And a plethora of mafia dramas have branded an ethnic group with a mark of Cain that none of us will ever live to see erased.

Ethnic caricatures are sometimes funny and sometimes dramatic, but I quote Quintilian, who wrote 2,000 years ago, "That laughter costs too much which is purchased by the sacrifice of decency."

In the last couple of decades, the television industry and movie industry have begun to implement that moral with regard to certain racial minorities. They have yet to show that they are even sensitive about it with regard to eastern and southern European minorities.

Anyone committed to the proposition that such treatment of southern and eastern European groups does not reflect, perpetuate, and aggravate social injustice against these groups must also be committed to the position that racist and sexist treatment in the communications media did no harm to blacks' and women's civil rights. Corrective courses of action suggest themselves: Organized inquiry into the treatment of ethnics by the various media; employment of ethnics and ethnic consultants by the media; and all appropriate corrective measures pushed through moral persuasion, legal coercion, and governmental pressure.

To deny the conclusion is to affirm that the old nativist injustices are not wrong or important. Unfortunately, the present state of affairs in the communications industries does mostly just that.

Thank you.

[The complete paper follows.]

THE COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA AND SOUTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPEAN ETHNIC GROUPS

By Richard Gambino *

In the 1950's, 1960's and 1970's injustices based on race and gender were attacked in massive frontal assaults in the United States. Without underestimating what still needs to be done to overcome race and sex biases, few would deny that great progress has been made in these areas in the last decades. Great strides have also been made in opposing anti-Semitism since the turn of the century, mainly by antidefamation efforts of Jewish organizations. Yet, these were not the only unjust prejudices prevalent in American life. Old biases against other groups - ethnic ones as distinct from racial ones - run through American history, and exist today. They reached their most overt expression during the heyday of the anti-foreign nativist movement, roughly from 1850 to the 1930's. Fact is, because these biases have *not* been frontally attacked, they remain firmly embedded in our minds and society, albeit often despite our being unconscious of them - just as millions of Americans were unconscious about race and sex prejudice 25 years ago. Perhaps chief among the still vital and mostly unchallenged nativist bigotries are those against people of southern and eastern European background. These include Poles, Italians, Greeks, and Slavs, people Michael Novak has labelled, in satirical protest, "P.I.G.S." Of course, they also include many others, e.g., Slovaks, Ukrainians and Hungarians.

In essence, nativism was against all people who weren't of northern European, Protestant background, preferably British. It began as a major current in America in reaction to the great immigration from Ireland that began in the 1840's. For the Irish were the first non-Protestant group to migrate to our shores in large numbers. (Excluding, of course, Africans, who were "kept in line" first by slavery, then by Jim Crow repression.) Nativism organized itself in 1843 into the American, or "Know-Nothing," Party. Its planks were the drastic restriction of non-Protestant immigration, a 25 year residency requirement for voting, and limiting all political offices to the American-born. By 1850, the Party was credited with delivering 25 percent of the vote for Millard Fillmore, whose only other claim to fame is the false legend that he was the first President to introduce the

* Professor of Education and Philosophy and Director of Italian American Studies, Queens College, New York, New York.

bathtub to the White House. The nativists split briefly over the Civil War, but after that distraction, they turned their attention to the large numbers of “undesirables” who were immigrating – Poles, Italians, Jews, Hungarians and others. (Remember that “honky” is but a bastardized version of “hunky,” a nativist term of less than endearment for Hungarians.) The political pressure was led by the “best” people; e.g. Henry Cabot Lodge, whose 31 years in the U.S. Senate (1893-34) resulted in a rich output of bigoted anti-immigrant speeches and articles; U.S. Grant, who in 1875 reflected on the Civil War with the thought: “If we are to have another contest in the near future of our national existence, I predict the dividing line will not be Mason and Dixon’s, but between “ ‘Protestant’ ” patriotism and intelligence on one side, and “ ‘Catholic’ ” superstition, ambition, and ignorance on the other; U.S. Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer, who in 1919-21 forcibly rounded up immigrants and deported them to Europe without burdening them with a trial, or even a hearing or specific charges; Woodrow Wilson, who wrote that the turn-of-the-century immigrants were “men of the lowest class from the south of Italy and men of the meaner sort out of Hungary and Poland, men out of the ranks with neither skill nor energy nor any initiative of quick intelligence.” Vice President Calvin Coolidge, a man of celebrated few words, who managed a 1921 burst of loquacity in *Good Housekeeping Magazine*, writing that “biological laws show us that Nordics deteriorate when mixed with other races” (i.e., ethnic groups); Herbert Hoover, who before pronouncing the economy “basically sound” after October 29, 1929, noted that “immigrants now live in the United States on sufferance. . .and will be tolerated only if they behave.” Hoover’s generosity was topped by James J. Davis, Secretary of Labor under Presidents Harding and Coolidge. Mr. Davis commented that earlier Protestant immigrants to America were the “beaver type” that built up America, whereas the newer immigrants are “rat-men” trying to tear it down.

However, nativist expression wasn’t limited to such a lofty plane. By the time immigration from southern and eastern Europe was all but cut off by the “Emergency” Quotas Act in 1924, nativism had found widespread, grassroots, American-as-apple-pie expression among ordinary citizens. In fact, the popular expressions had graduated to the status of American lore, much more resplendent in malice even than nativist American law. The American vocabulary had been enriched by such words as “mick,” “dago,” “wop,” “guinea,” “pollack,” “hunky,” “kike,” “yid,” and “greaser.” All of American culture, from the melting-pot public schools to the employment office, from universities to the vaudeville stage, sang of a human hierarchy, in which southern and eastern Europeans were not the lowest to be sure,

but not fully “American” (read “human”) either. A glance at that hierarchy reveals two things. First, most Americans immediately recognize it, although they usually admit they had only a semiconscious awareness of it before it was made explicit. And second, the hierarchy conforms exactly with the traditional prejudices in Britain about the rest of the world’s peoples. It is a British import dating from before the American War of Independence and surviving it and America’s history to this day. From top to bottom, here are the strata, from most to least “American-human:”

- Anglo-Saxon Protestants
- Other Protestant British
- Western European Catholics
- Southern and Eastern Europeans and Jews
- Latin Americans
- Asians
- American Indians
- Blacks

Ancient history? Overstatement? An oversensitive ethnic riding his particular hobbyhorse? Consider, for example, the current scene in the communications media – print and electronic. Starting with the former, textbooks are among the earliest influences upon Americans. As children in schools, we are captive to them for years, during a most formative time of life. Last summer, I researched how widely used school texts treat American ethnic groups. The results were monotonously uniform. Southern and eastern European groups were either neglected or negatively stereotyped.

For example, a 1979 fifth grade text, *Understanding the United States* (McGraw-Hill), proclaims on its front page that it is concerned “with the themes of cultural pluralism, equality, and social justice.” But the basic message of the text is laid down early in its pages. (The italics are the book’s): “The *dominant*, or major culture group in the United States is British American. The minor culture groups are called *subcultures*. Among them are Italian Americans, Japanese Americans, Navaho and Cuban Americans.” The book does not explain how British Americans, some 15 to 30 percent of the U.S. population are the major “dominant” group. Is it because English is our *lingua franca*? Because our governmental system is heavily British in derivation? There is immeasurably more to culture than these two components. In all other areas, other ethnic groups have contributed enormously, in many instances more than British Americans. Yet, in the text’s 303 pages of American history, these other groups are reduced to one chapter each for the Amish and Spanish speaking, and three chapters on Native Americans. A blanket species, labelled “immigrant groups,”

is given six *pages*, three of which are headed "Problems of Immigrants."

Another 1979 text on the United States, designed for third graders, uses "typical" American families and individuals as illustrations for conveying the flavor of American life. Their surnames are Mitchell, Dunlop, Maynard, Wilson, Everson, Cooley, Wachtel, Elliott, Virgil, Ortega, Dohan, Cheng, Sloan, and Sheehan. In the text or photos, some of these are identified as black, Oriental, or Hispanic. The book gives the impression that there is no one in the United States from eastern or southern Europe.

Bigotry through neglect and condescension marks another 1979 textbook, a history-geography book meant for grades four through six. Of the book's six chapters on Europe, three are on the United Kingdom. Eastern and southern Europeans are either ignored or barely mentioned. For example, in the 427-page book, Italy is given 11 *lines*. These inform the student that Italy is divided into North and South; that the North is industrial, the South agricultural, and that "from here many people depart for other countries."

Examples from today's textbooks, on all levels of education, can be multiplied endlessly. An examination of them shows the veracity of a conclusion by Professor Mildred Dickerman, chairperson of the Department of Anthropology at Sonoma State College, CA. In a 1973 study of school curricula, she found that "American schools are racist by design. Their racism is part of a larger philosophy, an ethnocentric dedication to the remodeling of citizens to conform to a single homogeneous acceptable model" – made up of "Anglo-Saxon and north European groups."

Negative stereotypes of southern and eastern European groups is a staple also of popular books for adults ("trade books"). Members of these ethnic groups serve as conventional, short-hand ways to evoke such qualities as criminality, stolidity, stupidity, vengeance, anti-intellectualism, clannishness, working-class primitivism, racism, oversexuality, corruption, right wing neofascism, and social and cultural backwardness. Two examples from a bounty: "Falconetti" in Irwin Shaw's *Rich Man, Poor Man* is dragged into the story from nowhere to move the plot along by committing murder and homosexual rape of a black man. Similarly, Kurt Vonnegut, in *Slaughterhouse Five*, conveniently uses an Italian American as a *deus ex machina* or irrational vengeance to kill off (murder) his WASP protagonist.

Newspapers usually drink from the same bigoted well in dealing with southern and eastern Europeans. In addition to the standard use of stereotypes, newspeople have a conventional code all their own. For example, "boss" and "machine" never refer to Protestant individuals or groups. Richard Nixon was called many things, but not

a “boss.” Franklin D. Roosevelt occupied the White House for almost four terms and held the Democratic Party in his hip pocket. Yet even his most vehement enemies never used the word “machine” to describe his power, unique as it is in American history.

Even when newspeople attempt favorable coverage of southern and eastern European groups, their treatment is steeped in condescension. There is more to cover than people munching pizza, kielbasi and souvlaki. But you seldom know it from the American press. Even their selective use of words “ethnics” betrays the nativist bias. We may say to the Fourth Estate, “Yes, Virginia, even WASPs are an ethnic group.”

The supreme instrument of the updated nativist bigotries, however, is composed of the electronic media – television and movies. Supreme because, I am convinced for reasons I argued at length elsewhere,¹ that these media have an unmatched, great influence on the minds and behavior of Americans. Television and films are the major kingdom of negative ethnic stereotyping of Southern and Eastern European groups. Poles usually represent “Polish jokes.” To drive home the point, stand up comics and sit-coms still tell actual Polish jokes. Greeks are walking symbols of clannishness and emotionalism. Italians are buffoons, criminals, or both. A whole new generation of Americans is learning the latest evolution of the “dumb,” stereotype from “Fonzi,” “Laverne and Shirley,” “Angie,” and “Roseanne Roeanadanna.” And a plethora of Mafia dramas have branded an ethnic group with a mark of Cain that none of us will live to see erased.

Yes, ethnic caricatures are often funny or dramatic. But with regard to racial groups, television and movies have at last heeded, in the two decades, the truth that Quintilian penned almost two thousand years ago: “That laughter costs too much which is purchased by the sacrifice of decency.” But the media have yet to begin to apply the moral to southern and eastern European ethnic groups.

Anyone committed to the proposition that such treatment of southern and eastern European groups does not reflect, perpetuate, and aggravate social injustice against these groups must also be committed to the position that racist and sexist treatment in the communications media did no harm to blacks’ and women’s civil rights. Corrective courses of action suggest themselves: organized inquiry into the treatment of ethnics by the various media; employment of ethnics and ethnic consultants by the media; and all appropriate corrective measures pushed through moral persuasion, legal coercion, and governmental pressure. To deny the conclusion is to affirm that the old nativist injustices are not wrong, or important.

¹ “Television: One-Eyed Sorcerer,” Richard Gambino, *Freedom at Issue*, May-June, 1978.

Unfortunately, the present state of affairs in the communications industries mostly does just that.

* * *

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. I notice that Miss Noschese was having a lot of fun listening to the stereotypes conjured by the media, so I'm going to ask her to speak next.

Miss Noschese is the Executive Director of the National Congress of Neighborhood Women; an independent television and video producer and director. She is personally working on two films about ethnic women.

Her written work includes the article: "Ethnic Women and the Media," published in the fall of 1978 issue of this Commission's Civil Rights Digest.

She also holds a Master of Arts degree in communications. She is the chairperson of the Ethnic Caucus for the Continuing Committee for the International Women's Year.

She is a member of the Advisory Committee for WNET.

Miss Christine Noschese.

RESPONSE OF CHRISTINE NOCHESE

Yes, I was enjoying Mr. Gambino's statements on ethnic stereotypes, and a lot of that stuff is what I'd like to elaborate on, because I feel that my own personal experience, what looking at the media has meant to me in terms of being an ethnic, working-class woman myself, has really had a lot of detrimental effects on myself and other people I know of similar class and ethnic background.

I know the Commission has done a lot of work on the media and on race and minority groups in the media.

One of the things that I think that we should not overlook is the internalization of what these media images do to the individual.

One, constantly - and in the case of ethnics, we see no images like ourselves. We see all the values we hold dear, our family, our religion, our community and our work life, made fun of, put down, seen as pathological, seen as criminal.

I mean one of the interesting things to me is that the ethnic community is supposed to deal with - be very profamily. Yet when we look at television, when we look at the movies, all we see is the WASP, upper middle-class ethnics as having healthy families, right from "The Hardy Boys" to "Father Knows Best" to the series on the family on major television.

When we look at public television, all we see is upper middle-class conflicts, stories, and mostly British dramas at this time.

Now we look at what the film and the media have done to the working-class ethnic family. We even can say that the family – and it has been our own ethnics that have done this to the family – is seen as pathological. It is never seen as healthy.

The ethnic family is always leading to criminality, neurotic, oppressive of their children, closeminded and reactionary.

The women are hardly seen in any positive role-models at all, even in that media. The women are usually seen as passive, inarticulate, and never saying anything about the moral integrity of what their sons-in-action do.

In the “Godfather,” I don’t think very many of us who have had ethnic mothers would think that our mothers would sit there and send their children off to kill people. I don’t think that in the Irish family the strong mother is always there with James Cagney. I think that that kind of image of women and of mothers has been so detrimental to making the ethnic woman feel strong about herself.

I feel, also, that our religion is always made fun of. It’s either seen as a coverup for crime; it’s seen as something to joke about. It’s seen as something that’s never positive.

The media has played our issues, as always, the negative parts of the issues. If it’s community issues, it’s reactionary statements that are community, not positive statements about ethnic’s concern for community.

I think that in terms of our class and our work, the working-class person is seen as stupid, reactionary, closeminded, pathologically criminal, and never openminded, never progressive, never radical, and never for social change.

I also feel that the – that somehow this has all influenced a sense of who we are, that this kind of constant barrage of not seeing ourselves anywhere, looking at the media and just seeing no reflection, looking at commercials and seeing no positive reflection – I think what’s happened to “Euro-ethnics” is very similar to what’s happened to blacks in the media, and I don’t think that could be really underestimated.

I think that we grow up thinking that the only way to make it is to be a WASP, to be blonde, to be tall, to be thin, as Laura said, to talk – not to talk a certain way, not to have certain dialogues, not to use our hands, not to be emotional, and not to be expressive, and I don’t think this only affects women; it affects men.

I think the position of ethnic men is seen to brutalize women; they’re seen as gangsters; they’re seen as oppressive of women. They’re never seen in any positive family context. They’re never seen as making a living to support their families in a healthy way, but they’re seen as brutal and violent towards their women.

And I think that women are seen as not having any power in the family. They're Edith Bunkers; they're listening to the man; they're doing all this kind of stuff. They're not powerful, and this goes against even our own stereotypes.

It's just constantly happening over and over again.

I think we have to make some recommendations, and I think that because Hollywood and commercial television is set up to reinforce these kind of violent dramatic actions, we can't depend on them for our answers.

I think that's what we have to do, and our ethnic directors have sold us down the river, as far as I'm concerned. They haven't had the power to make films that have been positive towards our families, except for John Silver in *Hester Steel*, I must say.

I think that what we have to do is take another approach. We have to look at the public media and look at curriculum for schools, because we have no other choice.

We can't do it in terms of the commercial media. We have to start looking at granting films that are dramatic in terms of progressive issues, and films – we have to just have Government policies that are going to develop commercial films, and Government policy that is going to produce things that counteract the Hollywood industry, because I don't see that we can do anything about any of that stuff.

I feel that we have to have media and publications that have a realistic view of "Euro-ethnics", their historical contributions, and I feel that another thing that public television does – and I am on the Advisory Board of NET – there is no screen time. We have absolutely no screen time. The blacks want programming, the Latins want programming, and we don't have enough time to show all of these ethnic groups to the media.

Well, I suggest another approach. Maybe if we took the approach of what people were saying for the last 2 days and start relooking at our history and relooking at how many there are of us in this population, we could just be in all the media. We could be in the music, the cultural, and the arts programs. We could be in the dramatic programs. We could be in the theater programs. We could be in the documentaries, all of us together. We don't have to be in these specialized slots where there's not going to be any room, and there'll be an ethnic error every night.

I think that that is one thing that we have to look at in terms of public television, and I also think that we have to look in terms of more cable stuff and more – I also think that one of the things that's really missing is what happens to the ethnic person in terms of making their own products and developing their own art forms, and that's been brought up by Georgia and it was also brought up by Dr. Scalon.

And we have to look using a very holistic approach, because unless we start encouraging this type of production from ethnics themselves, we're not going to get the material we want in a positive way.

And there should be grants and people in positions of power in the National Academy of Arts, in the National Academy of the Humanities, and in the State councils.

Because unless we do this, and unless "Euro-ethnics" are represented in those divisions, it's just not going to happen, and I think a lot of the material will be biased.

And basically, I think that one of the things that we did do was we presented a whole panel on – at that point it was called White Ethnic Women for the National Institute of Education, and practically every person who did research, whether it was in education, whether it was in community planning or neighborhood policy, recommended that they needed media materials on ethnics, and they were talking about film, and they were talking about video.

This, however, hasn't been published yet, so I don't know when it's coming out. I guess they're not interested in publishing it, even though there is research work that can be used by the Commission from about 10 women.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. I appreciated the enthusiasm of your delivery.

Our next panelist, Thaddeus Kowalski, is chief of Chicago's Office of the Public Defender where he has worked since 1964. And he is a member of the Illinois Commission on Human Relations.

He was National Chairman of the Polish-American Congress Anti-Defamation committee, and was president of that organization's Illinois division.

He had discussed defamation problems frequently on radio and television, and has filed a test case against a major network, alleging ethnic defamation.

I hope you make reference to that case in your delivery.

Go ahead.

RESPONSE OF THADDEUS L. KOWALSKI

I intend to confine my paper to the area that I am particularly interested in and knowledgeable, that is defamation on television. Southern and Eastern Europeans have been shown in an unfavorable image, i.e., stereotyped negatively by the television media, in movies, but primarily by television. Television is extremely important because it enters everyone's home. Unannounced, it is there. Historically, I think beginning in 1968, Vice President Agnew, while campaigning, used a term, "Polack," on television, which is a slanderous term. His statement was picked up by the newspapers, and Bob Hope began using the term "Polack" on television. It just sort of became acceptable

from that point on, historically. We have come to know that as “the dumb Polish jokes” from that point on. So from 1968 on, over ten years now, Eastern and Southern Europeans, especially Polish-Americans, have been ridiculed on TV in a most defamatory way. Certainly, the years from 1972 to 1975 were the worst. Each network had these jokes. They portrayed Polish-Americans in a negative image. The names of the comedians in situation comedies are numerous, some of them are: “All in the Family,” Bob Hope, Redd Foxx, Carol Burnett, Monty Python, Dick Cavett, “Don Rickles Show,” Steve Allen, and numerous others. Professor Gambino describes the nativist philosophy in his excellent paper. The nativist philosophy is the motivating force behind these jokes, and expresses the prejudices of the nativists on prime-time TV.

In 1972, I became so disgusted with the ethnic genocide being thrust upon the Polish-American community in the name of humor, I reacted by becoming the national chairman of the Anti-Defamation Committee of the Polish-American Congress. I was not in the Polish-American organized community prior to these jokes being aired on TV. As a lawyer, I saw the hypocrisy that was being perpetrated by our three networks, ABC, CBS, and NBC. As the national chairman, I wrote an anti-defamation guide; it had four printings between the years of 1971 and 1975, and was distributed throughout the United States to Polish-Americans. The sense of degradation felt by the Polish-American community at that time and now are very deep and are very divisive. There is a basic difference at laughing at someone and with someone. The Polish joke and the Italian jokes are jokes against ethnic groups. I don't laugh with them. They are degrading and humiliating. They result in ethnic genocide. These jokes on TV enter everyone's home, and that is a basic difference between them and a social joke that is confined to a small social group.

What effect have these jokes had on the Polish-Americans especially younger children? Psychological trauma, a feeling of inferiority, second class citizenship. Their classmates also see the Polish-Americans or the Italian-Americans as inferior as a result of these jokes. I took a survey of the sophomores at Glenbrook West High School, in Glenview, a suburb of Chicago and of a high school in Miami, Florida. In a series of questions, and with written responses, I asked these students what effect television had in creating a strong negative image of their Polish-American classmates? The result was the TV was the primary instrument in forming their negative opinion.

I am a lawyer and not a sociologist, and I am angry. Why should this ethnic genocide of Polish-Americans and Italian-Americans, and the Mafia stereotype, continue to be perpetrated upon us, and why should we be made, as a result, second-class citizens? Are the three

networks the primary perpetrators of this ethnic genocide? Yes, there is no question of it. They are aware of what they have done and are doing. The networks are unwilling to change. I personally have spoken to the representatives of every network from 1972 on. I have talked to producers, directors, vice presidents of programming, and legal counsel, in Chicago as well as in New York and Los Angeles. Very little sensitivity was shown by the networks. In fact after a particularly bad program in 1972 on an ABC TV network against Polish-Americans, I flew to New York, and I spoke to a vice president of ABC TV. After we discussed the program at length, I had a promise from him, that ABC TV would never do it again. A month later Steve Allen hosting the Dick Cavett Show had 15 minutes of the most degrading and humiliating Polish jokes. I filed suit shortly thereafter against ABC Television requesting "reply time", under the FCC regulations. We did not get our reply time for technical reasons, but we did go as far as the U.S. Supreme Court. But the suit conclusively showed the FCC as unwilling to assist in any way the Polish-American community. I requested the FCC to use their moral influence, which I thought would be important, because as a lawyer, I could see the problems of censorship under our freedom of speech. There is no legal way that the jokes can be stopped, but the moral influence of the FCC against these jokes would be great.

The U.S. Civil Rights Commission may consider the area of negative stereotyping in the media as a small issue compared to all the other areas of interest. But in TV stereotyping, the Commission can act immediately. It can commission a study to research the type, the extent, and the character of ethnic defamation on television, and the impact on the ethnic community and especially the psychological damage that these ten years of negative stereotyping has had on children. Children are especially prone to deep psychological trauma, negative self-image from the jokes. As a result of this study, the Commission can recommend actions to the President and Congress. I was particularly distressed when the 1977 Commission report on stereotyping in the media totally omitted the ethnic stereotyping of Polish-Americans or Italian-Americans who have been for more than 10 years the primary targets of stereotyping by the networks.

I hope the Commission will undertake this study and make the proper, legally feasible recommendations.

DISCUSSION

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Well, I would like to comment. I don't think I have a question, particularly, because I followed these presentations with great interest and have been very much impressed by them, and I don't have any doubt at all in my mind but that you

have put your finger on a very serious and important issue, because I increasingly am impressed with what the media, particularly the television media, can do in terms of what it can do to people, to persons who are members of certain groups.

I think the basic paper that has been prepared for us, and I think, the comments on the part of the two panelists will be very helpful to us in dealing with this particular issue, and, I think, it is one that cannot be – I just want express appreciation.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Vice Chairman Horn?

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. You mentioned, Mr. Kowalski, that your filing was, I assume dismissed for technical reasons?

MR. KOWALSKI. It was dismissed on technical reasons because the FCC and then the Appellate Court here in Chicago found that there was certain preconditions in order to get reply time, and that they found that the ethnic community was not, in essence, stereotyped, under their legal reasoning, we were not stereotyped.

Technically, under the FCC regulations, we were not stereotyped. You and I would look upon the stereotyping in another way, but under the legalese, it was not stereotyping; therefore, we were not entitled to reply time.

I wanted reply time because I realize that the freedom of speech and the Constitution was overwhelming. I certainly did not use censorship for that reason.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. That's been one of the arguments we have had with the FCC, and as you suggest in your own comments, it is obviously a very sensitive area that can be counterproductive to any group in society, if Government does intrude on program control and the degree to which it intrudes.

The argument has been over the degree to which the Federal Government should interfere with programming decisions that are made by networks in a free society, if we do not want to go down the road toward a propaganda ministry and having everything else being controlled out of Washington.

How do you and the people in the Polish American Anti-Defamation League deal with that question of the degree to which Government intrusion should come in the communications media through the Government's power to regulate the air waves?

MR. KOWALSKI. Well, I think we're very sensitive to that issue because of the fact that we do realize that you cannot – we cannot, have censorship in America. At the same time, we have this problem, which I think we all consider an issue – negative stereotyping.

So how do we react with it? I think perhaps the ways I mentioned before – is the moral climate. If we can change, increase the sensitivity of Americans to this issue – just as the sensitivity of the Americans of

the problems of the black, the Hispanic and the Asian community has changed over these many years – has it not – so, too, we hope that the moral influence of many Governmental agencies, as well as others, will change the atmosphere, so this will not occur anymore, because censorship is not the answer, of course.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Some have suggested that the election of a Polish Pope did more good to solve the problem than almost anything else.

Do you have any perception about that?

MR. KOWALSKI. My perception is, I think, that's the only positive thing I've seen on television, the positive image, as Christine spoke of. You never see any positive image of any sort.

Do you remember the time when you saw an Italian-American or Polish-American in a positive image lately, within the last 10 years on television? I don't remember one. I watch some television, not too much. It just isn't there.

But now it also brought up another issue. The Pope visiting the black community, visiting the Hispanic community, and other communities, he showed the tremendous pluralism and diversity of Americans, especially among Catholics, and this brings an issue of which we are all addressing ourselves to at this moment.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. If you could file with the Commission, if it would not be inconvenient, the actual brief in which you did raise this issue, I think it would be appreciated. We would like to include it as part of the consultation.

MR. KOWALSKI. I certainly will do that. May I just mention just one thing.

The television code, I don't know if you have seen that code, it has beautiful pronouncements in there, but they're all useless, because in them they say very clearly there should be no ethnic defamation and all that. In fact, the code, back in 1972 and 1973 was even stronger. I could show you how it began to be watered down year after year.

I have all these. It's totally useless. We cannot look to the television networks to do this.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. In your comments you referred to a possible leadership role on the part of the Federal Communications Commission.

MR. KOWALSKI. Well, not of the FCC – of this Commission.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Well, I thought, though, in your comments that you also associated the Federal Communications Commission with the possibility of a leadership role.

I would like to make that as a suggestion. In our last report, we bore down very heavily on the fact that the Federal Communications Commission has at various times found ways and means of exercising

leadership without imposing any regulatory decision on the networks, and we, of course, had to follow or walk a rather narrow line here, also, as between our concern about the stereotyping on the part of the networks, for example, and the First Amendment, because we're likewise very much concerned about protection of rights under the First Amendment; but the FCC, from time to time, has held hearings, for example, for the purpose of getting certain situations on top of the table without having in mind any possibility of following up with the issuance of an order, but for the purpose of getting the information on top of the table, and, I think, the children's -

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. I think you do face that delicate line with the FCC since it has regulatory power, which we do not have.

It is one thing for us to moralize on issues; it is quite another thing for an agency that controls whether or not you get a license to moralize with all the implications that might be drawn in the industry that "Unless we do what they say or imply, be it one commissioner or the whole Commission, then there goes our licence."

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. I appreciate that, and of course I'm reflecting a little bias that I have in the direction of people in public office or government agencies from time to time exercising leadership on particular issues, even though they may not be in a position where they can issue regulations, and I appreciate -

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. If "leadership" is a euphemism for "censorship," then I'm against it.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Well, so am I, but if it's that; but on the other hand, I think it's possible to exercise that leadership without getting over into the realm of censorship.

Too often, I think public officials will back away from that kind of an opportunity.

DR. GAMBINO. I would like to suggest that freedom of speech and freedom of inquiry are also rights enjoyed by this Commission.

You are perfectly free to inquire into the practices of textbook publishers and the television and movie industries. You are perfectly free to issue results of those inquiries. You are perfectly free to make moral judgments and political judgments, if you will, on those inquiries.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Commissioner Horn and I are not discussing what this Commission could do at all. Our dialogue related to the Federal Communications.

You summed up very effectively what we can do.

DR. GAMBINO. I understand, but the same red herring will be raised if you do it, that you are bridging the First Amendment rights.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. But we're Governmentally approved gadflies, so we have the sanction of Congress to do the things we do.

DR. GAMBINO. I'm suggesting that you increase your sting.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Well, the situation is not unique. We do it all the time.

A Mexican ruffian bandit as descriptive of Mexican Americans was eliminated from the TV screen as a negative stereotype. I think they were advertising a Mexican food product some years ago.

Everybody thought it was real funny, excepting the Mexican Americans, so what they did was boycotted the product, boycotted and organized, and this Frito Bandito disappeared from the market, and later on, apparently it was effective, because they attempted to introduce other matters of that type, and there was already an organization existing which was effective.

Mr. White?

ASSISTANT STAFF DIRECTOR WHITE. Mr. Kowalski, I have another question that I wanted to ask you.

First, when you talked with the agency officials, as a lawyer, did it occur to you to get that promise in writing?

MR. KOWALSKI. Yes, it did occur to me. The vice president would put nothing in writing. He would put nothing in writing, and as a result, it was just more a statement from him to me and my associates that he wouldn't do that, and unfortunately, of course, it happened.

We have to look upon what are the basic premises of what the networks work for.

If they work - if their basic thrust is that of profit, then it's profit motivation, whichever - which motivates them, and if they get the best in this ethnic stereotyping, they'll continue that. They will continue to do that.

ASSISTANT STAFF DIRECTOR WHITE. The question I did want to ask you is whether in your talks with the networks officials, ABC, CBS, NBC, whether you discussed the employment patterns with them.

MR. KOWALSKI. Oh, yes, we certainly did, and the answers we got were very similar to the answers that the blacks and the Hispanics and the Asians received just before us; namely, you don't have any qualified people. I know that was told to the blacks and Hispanics, because I've spoken to their members.

And the same thing was raised again. You'd think by then that networks would learn a new line, but they didn't.

When we came in there, they told us the same thing all over again, and that's still their official pronouncement to this day, that we have no qualified people.

All of a sudden, in Chicago, they found qualified people. They found qualified blacks when they had to. They found qualified Hispanics and Asians - all of a sudden, out of the woodwork, as if miraculously, they appeared.

It was their own ineptitude and insensitivity which was their handicap and remains still.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. I'll have to interrupt at this time because our time is passing.

For our eighth panel, on intergovernmental relations and ethnicity, I'll return the chair back to the Chairman.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Just before the panel breaks up, I'd just like to kind of – the dialogue I was having with Mr. Gambino on the role of this Commission, because, as I indicated to you, I felt that you very accurately summarized the role of this Commission and the role that the Commission has played down through the years.

I happened to be serving in the Cabinet in 1956 when the Cabinet, along with President Eisenhower, was considering making a recommendation to the Congress for a creation of a Commission on Civil Rights.

The late President was very much interested in seeing such a Commission come into existence.

Some of my colleagues said to him, "You could do this by Executive Order. You don't need to ask for legislation."

His reply was, "I think the time has come to bring into existence a body that could get the facts on top of the table." He said, "If they're going to be able to do that, there will be times when they'll need the right to subpoena witness and put them under oath, and the only way we can confer that right is by going to the Congress."

But he kept reiterating the time has come to get the facts on top of the table, and then on the basis of getting them on top of the table, arrive at findings and recommendations which are made to the President and to Congress.

So I just want to say to you that we share your summary. It is the role of the Commission and has been in the 22-odd years that the Commission has been functioning.

Thank you all very, very much, all three of you, for your contributions.

Eight Session: Intergovernmental Relations and Ethnicity

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. I now – our last subject matter of discussion, particular subject matter area, deals with intergovernmental relations and I've asked Commissioner Saltzman to preside during that discussion.

Commissioner Saltzman.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Myron B. Kuropas will be our presenter. He is presently principal of the Rosette Middle School in Dekalb, IL.

During the last year of the Ford Administration, he served as special assistant to the President for Ethnic Affairs. His efforts there resulted in a series of ethnic White House conferences, the creation of Presidential and multiagency policy-review boards and increased emphasis on ethnic priorities in several Federal agencies.

For three years prior to that appointment, he was the Chicago regional director for ACTION, the Federal umbrella agency for numerous volunteer efforts.

He holds B.A. and M.A. degrees in Psychology and a Ph.D. in Education.

Dr. Kuropas, it's nice to have you.

**STATEMENT OF MYRON B. KUROPAS,
SUPREME VICE-PRESIDENT,
UKRAINIAN NATIONAL ASSOCIATION**

Thank you very much, Rabbi.

The purpose of my remarks this afternoon will be: one, to identify those factors which have had an influence and continue to influence government policies and programs related to ethnic and immigrant groups in America during the past 100 years; two, to describe briefly a relatively successful intergovernmental communication model which improved Federal relationships with American ethnic groups during the 1970's; and three, to define those issues which I believe will be of significance to Euro-ethnic Americans during the 1980's, focusing on the significance of the 1980 census in helping to determine what the governmental responses will be to these various issues.

For the first 200 years of American history, three conceptual models or ideologies, namely, Anglo-conformity, the melting pot, and cultural pluralism, have competed with each other in American thinking to explain the way a nation, which started out largely white, Anglo-Saxon, and of the Protestant faith, has absorbed 42 million immigrants and their descendants.

One might say that on the whole, and by what seems to be long established custom, public policy has tended to define ethnic diversity as a "problem," that is, an impediment to the maintenance of a cohesive social order.

The focus of much of Government policy has been on what Joshua A. Fishman has termed the "disappearance phenomenon," that is, the process by which ethnic groups have become assimilated into American core society and the rapidity with which various governmental intervention programs have helped these groups in becoming culturally indistinguishable.

To a great degree, of course, Government policy has been a reflection of American public opinion.

When, in the late 1800's, the so-called new immigrants, that is, those who came to these shores from southern and eastern Europe, demonstrated resistance to the melting pot process, the Government addressed the problem at its source.

The Federal establishment simply passed a series of exclusionary immigration laws which began with the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and culminated with the Johnson-Reed Act of 1924.

When certain ethnic groups already living in America continued to preserve their heritage, their language, and their values, public opinion demanded an affirmation of loyalty to the United States.

"There is no room in this country for hyphenated Americanism," declared former President Theodore Roosevelt in 1915.

"America for Americans," echoed a host of citizens who supported instant amalgamation.

And as the drum beats of the Americanization movement became more strident, there were certain excesses and certain attacks upon the foreign element.

Some of the more nefarious results of this melting pot mind-set were the persecutions of German-Americans during World War I, the various abominations of the Ku Klux Klan during the 1920's, the investigations of foreigners by the House Un-American Activities Committee of Congressman Dies in the 1930's, and of course, the internment of Japanese-Americans during the 1940's.

Two generations of young ethnic Americans, meanwhile, were educated in American public schools where they were made to feel less than American if they spoke a foreign language or ate foreign foods, or sang foreign-language songs, or responded to ethnic values and customs.

There was a public policy shift during the 1960's when the so-called ethnic problem was redefined for the visible minorities.

There was an argument that stated that some ethnic groups could not disappear because they were "culturally" deprived and "suffered" from certain racial characteristics which resulted in economic discrimination.

The Federal establishment began to devise new strategies which would enable the melting pot to function more effectively for these particular groups.

At the root of the problem, the policy makers decided, was racism and poverty, and what was needed, they concluded, was an all-out, two-pronged Government effort that would eliminate both in the shortest period of time.

There was a new era of Government involvement with ethnicity, with the great society programs of the 1960's. Ethnic assimilation was now to be accomplished through greater economic and educational opportunities, through improved housing, and through more efficient social delivery systems.

When, in the late 1960's, the expectations and promises of the Federal establishment proved to be unrealistic, frustrated blacks took to the streets to accentuate their rights.

Studying the causes of the civil disorders which rocked the United States during this period of time, the Kerner Commission concluded that America was rapidly approaching two separate societies, one white and one black.

The solution, the Commission suggested, was to be found in an expansion of higher education opportunities for minorities, the elimination of *de facto* segregation, the increase of funds for low-interest loans in the inner city, and the expansion of minority job opportunities in the private and public sectors through the elimination of racial discrimination.

The Commission cited the Coleman Report, which, it reasoned, called for an intensification of efforts to bring about truly integrated and, therefore, superior education for inner-city children.

Bringing minorities into the mainstream was the general thrust of both the Kerner and Coleman reports, and both were in the best melting pot tradition: the elimination of an ethnic problem through assimilation. During the 1970's, busing and affirmative action became the major means for achieving this end.

But there was a second ethnic phenomenon which occurred during the 1960's which, although precipitated by rising black awareness, evolved along significantly different ideological lines.

This ethnic stream came to be identified as the new pluralism, and it was anti-melting pot in both spirit and orientation. And in contrast to the assimilationists, the new pluralists viewed ethnicity as a resource, rather than a problem.

A turning point for ethnic Americans and the single most significant accomplishment of the new pluralists during this early phase of their activity was the passage of the Ethnic Heritage Studies Act of 1971.

For the first time in our history, the Federal establishment was willing to fund educational programs which perpetuated and developed America's rich ethno-cultural legacy.

Welcomed as a cool rain after a very long and a very hot dry spell, this Act was perceived by many Euro-ethnics as an event which signaled the demise of the melting pot as an American societal idea.

They believed that cultural pluralism would soon become the standard by which all public policy would be evaluated.

So confident were some pluralists of their perception that they predicted the 1970's would go down in American history as the decade of the ethnic. They were exuberant over the success of the other minorities, and some of them began to dream of new and natural coalitions of ethnics and minorities which would lead America into a new era of brotherhood and understanding.

The 1970's, of course, never lived up to pluralist expectations. For some people they are now viewed as an era of reversal. Some ethnics believe it was they and not the Anglo-Saxon power structure that had to pay the price for America's past policies of racial discrimination.

Euro-ethnics have watched their lovingly preserved neighborhoods destroyed by very ill-conceived and poorly managed Government housing programs. They have watched their children bused to schools in communities that really didn't want them.

Supreme Court rulings notwithstanding, many Euro-ethnics still believe affirmative action programs are a form of reverse discrimination which penalizes those who are least able to absorb the socio-economic loss.

After 20 years of attempting to sensitize the Federal establishment to the values of the pluralistic model, the pleas of Euro-ethnics to the Government are either politely ignored or dismissed as racist in effect. The melting pot lives on.

There is, of course, at least one other way of going about the Government's business, and it was tried with mixed success in the White House during the Ford Administration.

This approach is based on two important premises: number one, that every significant segment of the American polity has a right to be heard when Government policies and programs which affect their lives are being considered; and two, bureaucratic arrogance and indifference can be best addressed in an authoritative and, if necessary, an authoritarian manner when it becomes insensitive to group needs.

In dealing with ethnic Americans, the White House made certain assumptions with reference to the way communication was going to be established: The first assumption was that most self-conscious ethnics belong to some type of religious, social, fraternal, political, or other organization in their ethnic community. The second assumption was that the articulated goals and objectives of various ethnic organizations are reflections of the goals and objectives of its members. The third assumption was that the elected officers of the various ethnic organizations are people who are most in tune with the needs and sentiments of the membership. And four, that in listening to elected ethnic leaders, one can begin to understand and to appreciate ethnic concerns.

Once the significant ethnic organizations were identified, their leaders were invited to the White House and they were asked to identify the major issues of 1976 for ethnic communities. They were, in order of their priority: number one, neighborhood revitalization; number two, education and ethnicity; number three, the 1980 census; and number four, Federal social service delivery systems.

Dealing with the issues involved a well-defined process which included the following steps: Step No. 1: The particular issue was defined and a position paper was prepared by a representative of the ethnic community who was believed to be qualified to deal with the concern; every effort was made to have the paper include specific recommendations which the Federal Government would be able to follow in developing a solution. Step No. 2: The position paper was circulated among those Federal agencies which were or could be involved in the solution. The paper was usually delivered to the ranking person in the agency and it was made clear that the President was interested in their response. Step No. 3: Federal responses were monitored and, if necessary, negotiated to make certain that the problem or need was being addressed in a proper manner. Step No. 4: The President was briefed regarding the concern and the proposed Federal response. Step No. 5: Ethnic leaders most involved with the problem were invited to the White House where the position paper was read, where agency heads had an opportunity to respond, and where invitees had an opportunity to react. The President, of course, usually met all participants to inform them of his intentions to assure that all recommendations were acted upon at the earliest opportunity.

The Special Assistant for Ethnic Affairs monitored the Federal agencies involved with the solutions to see if further Federal assistance was required.

One of the conferences, as I have mentioned, dealt with the 1980 census, and the person who developed the paper for that conclave was Dr. Michael Novak.

He stated that it was necessary to have much better data on America's ethnic groups for the following reasons:

No. 1. - Serious understanding, public comprehension, and a meaningful Government policy require an accurate profile of the American people; No. 2 - for better or for worse, statistical profiles of group characteristics are being used by the courts and by Federal agencies to award various entitlements and to develop social programs. Inaccurate data can lead to certain penalties; and the designations "foreign stock," "country of birth," and "mother tongue" used to identify ethnics in 1970 were inadequate to include America's many diverse groups.

We had a response from the Bureau of the Census, and one of the respondents in 1976, Mrs. McKenney, is here with us. I shall not dwell on the other points made by Dr. Novak. Mrs. McKenney has had access to my paper, and, in order to save time, I will skip over this section and allow her to address the various issues dealing with the 1980 census and with the various ethnic groups in the United States.

What about the importance of the 1980 census? In my mind, the importance of the census upon the direction of American public policy development cannot be overestimated. If the census is conducted and analyzed from a pluralistic perspective, that is, in an effort to truly determine the full scope of cultural and social diversity in this country, then the results should demonstrate, quite conclusively, I believe, that many ethnic Americans did not melt into mainstream American life but retained, instead, a certain degree of cultural and behavioral identification with their ethnic heritage.

If the 1980 census demonstrates that the United States is, indeed, not a melting pot for all Americans, the implications for public policy could be enormous.

The acceptance of a pluralistic ideal may mean a re-evaluation of our approach to a number of issues.

The term "minority" may have to be either eliminated as a functionally meaningless term – all of us are minorities in the United States, even Anglo-Saxons – or expanded to include all groups who have been, for a variety of discriminatory reasons, denied an opportunity to attain equal status and representation in our society.

Another real issue that may emerge as a result of the 1980 census will be something that many of us have realized, and that is that the Federal Government – that is, the Federal establishment, the Federal bureaucracy – is not representative of the population it is intended to serve.

If the 1980 census suggests that national percentages for ethnic groups are higher than they are in the Federal bureaucracy, then it may be necessary to institute a recruiting campaign which would enable our Government to become more representative of and, hopefully, more sensitive to diverse group needs.

There may have to be a need, as the result of the 1980 census, to change the Government decision-making models that have been functioning up until this time. One of these models has already been suggested.

Utilizing the particular approach or the model – and there are many variations of it – would guarantee the inclusion of all groups affected by Government programs in the process.

In a pluralistic society, no single group should dominate the focus of Government social programs. The major objective should be consen-

sus among blacks, Hispanic Americans, women, youth, ethnics, and other major constituencies directly affected.

There might also be a need for a greater decentralization of the Federal bureaucracy. Another of the frequent complaints of almost all segments of our society has been the frequent inability of our Washington-based bureaucracy to make programmatic allowances for local variance.

The problem with uniform, rational, comprehensive solutions is that they are biased towards the unitary answer. But ours is a diverse society with differing local needs and resources.

The decentralization of the Federal bureaucracy may have to be part of the answer derived from the 1980 census.

And finally, in the area of public policy development, once the Government agency personnel have become more representative and tolerant of diversity, once a consensus model has been developed, once local variation has been taken care of through decentralization, then the next and final step would be to develop a clear rationale for the actual development of public policy.

During the 1980's, many issues will emerge to compete for the attention of governmental agencies. But if I were to select a single philosophy that would best serve the nation during this period, it would be one that was based on an ideological commitment to the strengthening of local institutions such as the family, the neighborhood, the Church, and the voluntary organization.

The age of big Government and Federal entitlements, I'm afraid, is here to stay. But in a society which is predicated on a melting pot rationale, as we have seen, bureaucrats tend to be biased towards unitary solutions and final answers.

The challenge of pluralistic public policy development, on the other hand, is to search for alternative local service delivery systems, to take steps to strengthen them, and to embrace the multitude of particular interests which constitute our particular polity.

The family, as we know, has been discussed. Much has been written about it. The Federal Government is presently involved with it. If you have any doubts that the American family is in trouble, then the recent decision by President Carter to establish an office for families in the Department of Health and Human Resources should serve to remove all doubt.

I'm very fearful of the department that's going to address the family. Given the totalitarian approach of the Federal Government up until now – the Government's melting pot mind-set – this particular bureau, if not monitored properly, could do more damage to the family than all the other actions that have been taken against the family within recent years.

The neighborhood, of course, has been already mentioned. Much has been said about it, I shall not dwell on this subject.

Religious institutions are also worthy of our concern in a pluralistic society. My fear in this regard is not that the Church will take over the functions of the State. My concern is that the State, in dictating standardized beliefs and values, will take over the functions of the Church. Our personal sense of identity, our values, our customs, and our perceptions of the meaning of life in an increasingly materialistic, uncaring, and narcissistic society are enhanced by a belief in a Supreme Being.

Voluntary associations are also beginning to erode in a society where the Government is willing to take on more and more of the responsibility for the social ills which beset us. Individual initiative is being destroyed in the process. Ethnic groups are especially concerned by this turn of events because the voluntary association has played such an important role in their lives. Voluntary associations represent the bedrock of ethnic communal life.

Today, America is faced with a crisis of will. Most Government programs which have been directed at ethnic groups have failed.

The poor are still with us, but we no longer wish to discuss poverty, let alone fight it.

Discrimination still exists, and we are closer than ever to two, some say three, separate societies.

We are disillusioned with the past. We have little faith in the future. The 1980's do not seem very promising. And yet, there is hope.

We can learn from the mistakes of the past. We can adopt a pluralistic ideology in our approach to social policy development. We can develop a disposition to preserve those institutions which stood the test of time and which still have much to offer in a pluralistic society.

We can learn to avoid totalitarian solutions. Decision-making models do exist. It is not too late. Next time, we can do it right.

Thank you.

[The complete paper follows.]

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS AND ETHNICITY

By Myron B. Kuropas, Ph.D.*

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to:

1. Identify those factors which have influenced and continue to influence Government policies and programs related to ethnic and immigrant groups in America during the past 100 years, and to analyze the attitudes and behaviors of those who are presently involved in their implementation.
2. Briefly describe a relatively successful inter-governmental communication model which improved Federal relationships with American ethnic groups during the 1970's and discuss how it was used to clarify ethnic concerns regarding the 1980 census.
3. Define issues which the author believes will be of significance to ethnic Americans during the 1980's, focusing on the significance of the 1980 census in determining governmental responses to these issues.

Factors

For the first 200 years of American history three conceptual models or ideologies – namely Anglo-conformity, the melting pot, and cultural pluralism – have competed with each other in American thinking to explain the way a nation, in the beginning largely white, Anglo-Saxon, and Protestant, has absorbed 42 million immigrants and their descendants.¹ On the whole, and by what seems to be long established custom, public policy has tended to define ethnic diversity as a “problem,” an impediment if you will, to the maintenance of a cohesive social order. The focus has been on what Joshua A. Fishman has termed the “disappearance phenomenon.”² that is, the process by which ethnic groups become assimilated into American core society and the rapidity with which Governmental intervention can assist these groups in becoming culturally indistinguishable.

To a great degree, of course, Government policy has been a reflection of public opinion. When, in the late 1800's, the so-called

* Supreme Vice-President, Ukrainian National Association and Former Special Assistant to the President for Ethnic Affairs

¹ Milton M. Gordon, “Assimilation in America: Theory and Reality”, *Daedalus* 90, No. 2 (1960), p. 263.

² Joshua A. Fishman, “The Historical and Social Contexts of an Inquiry Into Language Maintenance Efforts”, *Language Loyalty in the United States*, ed. Joshua A. Fishman (The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1966), p. 21.

“new immigrants,” that is, those who came to these shores from Asia as well as from southern and eastern Europe, demonstrated a resistance to the melting pot process, the government addressed the “problem” at its source. The Federal establishment simply passed a series of exclusionary immigration laws which began with the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and culminated with the Johnson-Reed Act of 1924.³ When certain ethnic groups living in America continued to preserve their heritage, their language, and their values, public opinion demanded a reaffirmation of loyalty to the United States. “There is no room in this country for hyphenated Americanism” declared President Theodore Roosevelt in 1915.⁴ “America for Americans” echoes a host of citizens who demanded instant amalgamation. As the drum-beats of the Americanization movement became more strident, excesses against the so-called “foreign element” became more common. The more nefarious results of this melting pot mind-set were the persecutions of German-Americans during World War I, the abominations of the Ku Klux Klan during the 1920’s, the investigations of “foreigners” by the Dies House Un-American Activities Committee during the 1930’s, and the internment of Japanese-Americans during the 1940’s.⁵ Two generations of young ethnic Americans, meanwhile, were educated in public schools where they were made to feel “less than American” if they spoke a foreign language, ate foreign foods, sang foreign language songs, or responded to ethnic values and customs.

Past acceptance of the melting pot ideal by America’s academic community helped confirm its ideological legitimacy. Concentrating their attention on the disruptive effects of successive immigrations on American societal cohesion, historians praised the early frontier as the “crucible” of fusion and liberation⁶ and argued that the melting pot served a similar purpose in that its major function was to “spiritually transform” new immigrants.⁷ Following a similar line of reasoning, sociologists focused on the debilitating aspects of culture conflict between first generation immigrants and their children, demonstrating little interest in the social benefits of cultural diversity.⁸ Psychologists adopted the concept of “conflicting role orientations” as their frame of reference for the study of the ethnic phenomenon, ignoring the psychic value which could accrue to those whose self-concept was based on a strong cultural identity.⁹ Educators, concerned with both

³ Edward G. Hartmann, *American Immigration* (Minneapolis: Lerner Publications Co., 1979), pp. 90-107.

⁴ Arthur Mann, *Immigrants in American Life* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1974), p. 180.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 147-168.

⁶ Frederick Jackson Turner, *The Frontier in American History* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1920), pp. 22-23.

⁷ Hans Kohn, *American Nationalism* (New York: Collier Books, 1961), pp. 22-23.

⁸ See Robert Ezra Park, *Race and Culture* (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1950).

⁹ See Irvin Child, *Italian or American?* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943), pp. 87-187.

the maintenance of a cohesive social order and the elimination of culture conflict, also became involved with the disappearance phenomenon. For scholars such as Professor Elwood P. Cubberly, "to Americanize" meant "to assimilate and amalgamate" immigrants "as part of our American race and to implant in their children, so far as can be done, the Anglo-Saxon conception of righteousness, law and order, and popular government, and to awaken in them a reverence for our democratic institutions and for those things in our national life which we as a people hold to be of abiding worth."¹⁰ In practice, the ultimate success of the American public school came to be defined in terms of its ability to maintain Anglo-Saxon cultural dominance.

The direction of public policy development began to shift during the 1960's when it became increasingly obvious that some ethnic groups – most notably the visible minorities – could not "disappear" into the Anglo-Saxon mainstream. Adopting an approach that was ostensibly more sensitive to individual group differences, the Federal establishment reviewed the status of certain minorities in America and concluded that direct Federal involvement was necessary if assimilation was ever to be fully achieved. Accelerating a program of racial liberalization which began in the 1930's with efforts by Federal administrators to include blacks in at least some of the benefits of the New Deal¹¹ and culminating in the 1954 Supreme Court decision declaring *de jure* school segregation unconstitutional, the Federal establishment became more intensely involved with the future economic well-being of America's visible minorities. The intent was laudatory. Believing that racism and poverty were at the root of the minority "problem," the Federal Government focused on actions which would permit minorities to become economically indistinguishable as the first step in the assimilation process. To make the melting pot work for these groups, a plethora of Great Society programs were initiated and implemented. The high points of this monumental effort were the creation of the Office of Economic Opportunity in 1964 and the passage of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Act of 1966. The emphasis was on the amalgamation of minorities through greater economic and educational opportunities, improved housing, and more efficient social delivery systems. As welfare rights became a national issue, new bureaucracies came into existence to deal with the burgeoning number of welfare recipients.¹² When, in the late 1960's, the expectations and promises of Federal social engineers proved unrealistic, blacks took to the streets to accentuate their rights.

¹⁰ Cited in Lawrence Cremin, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education* (New York: Random House, 1961), p. 68.

¹¹ Francis Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward, *Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1971), p. 232.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 242-282.

Studying the causes of the civil disorders which rocked the United States during this period, The Kerner Commission concluded that America was rapidly approaching two increasingly separate societies – one white, the other black. The solution, the Commission suggested, was to be found in an expansion of higher education opportunities for minorities, the elimination of *de facto* segregation, an increase of funds for low interest loans in the inner city, and an expansion of minority job opportunities in the private and public sectors through the elimination of racial discrimination. The Commission cited the Coleman Report which, it reasoned, called for an intensification of efforts to bring about truly integrated – and therefore superior – education for inner-city children.¹³ Bringing minorities into the mainstream was the general thrust of both the Kerner and Coleman reports and both were in the best melting-pot tradition – the elimination of an ethnic “problem” through assimilation. During the 1970’s, busing and affirmative action became the major means for achieving this same objective.

But there was a second ethnic phenomenon which occurred during the 1960’s which, although precipitated by rising black awareness, evolved along significantly different ideological lines. *This* ethnic stream came to be identified as the “new pluralism” and it was anti-melting pot in both orientation and spirit. In its initial phases, it was essentially cultural in focus and concentrated on the need of ethnic minorities to achieve a sense of the legitimacy of their ethnic diversity. The new pluralists were not interested in assimilation or amalgamation. On the contrary, their major concern was with the perpetuation of their unique heritage. As the 1960’s came to an end, certain other ethnic groups, following the lead of the visible minorities, began to demand a greater sensitivity and responsiveness from the Federal Government.

A turning point for ethnic Americans, and the single most important accomplishment of the new pluralists during this early phase of their activity, was the passage of the Ethnic Heritage Studies Act of 1971 which provided, for the first time in our history, a federally funded program for the preservation and development of America’s rich ethno-cultural legacy. Welcomed as a cool rain after a long and hot dry spell, this act was perceived by many ethnic leaders as an event which signaled the demise of the melting pot as an American societal ideal. Cultural pluralism, they concluded, was now to be the standard for social policy development within the Federal establishment. So confident were some pluralists of this belief that they predicted that the 1970’s would go down in American history as the “Decade of the Ethnic.” Exuberant over the success of other minorities in gaining

¹³ *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* (New York: Bantam Books, 1968), pp. 410-482.

their rights, many pluralist leaders began to dream of new and natural coalitions of ethnics and minorities which would lead America into a new era of brotherhood and understanding.

The 1970's, of course, never lived up to pluralist expectations. If anything, they are now viewed as an era of reversal by some ethnics who believe it was they – and not the Anglo-Saxon power structure – who had to pay the greatest price for America's past policies of racial discrimination. This perception is especially difficult to accept in light of the fact that discrimination because of national origin does not appear to have changed substantially during the past 20 years. Some American ethnic groups have watched their lovingly preserved neighborhoods destroyed by ill-conceived and poorly administered Government housing programs. They have been forced to permit the busing of their children to schools located in communities that really didn't want them. Supreme Court decisions notwithstanding, they still believe affirmative-action programs are really a form of reverse discrimination which penalizes those who are least able to absorb the socio-economic penalty. And yet, despite two decades of efforts to sensitize the Federal bureaucracy to the values of the pluralistic model, their pleas to their Government are either politely ignored or dismissed as racist in origin.

In concentrating on the evolution and nature of the Federal establishment's involvement with this Nation's ethnic minorities during the past twenty years, I wish to make it clear that it has not been my purpose to criticize depolarization, one of the major intents of that involvement. Discriminatory attitudes and behaviors among certain segments of our society were and continue to be a major obstacle to equal opportunity for all. Programs designed to reduce racial and ethnic animosities are laudatory and need to be continued. Not all federally directed or inspired programs have achieved this noble aim, however. Some, unfortunately, have resulted in greater polarization, less opportunity for some, and greater ethnic alienation. What is even more disconcerting is that blacks and other minorities still feel left out of the mainstream. Urban schools still fail to provide a quality education for all. The poor are still with us. Whites are still fleeing the cities and we appear to be nearer the reality of two – some argue three – separate societies than ever before.

If the intent of federal intervention is not the cause of the present state of affairs, then what is? Part of the answer, I believe, can be found in the Federal approach, the philosophical frame of reference of the Federal establishment which makes it difficult, if not impossible, to view our nation as a social order built on local institutions – the family, the neighborhood, the Church, the voluntary association, the ethnic group – which form the basis of personal identity and communal

involvement. At best, the Federal decision-makers have merely failed to consider some of these institutions as resources in the strengthening and enrichment of our society. At worst, the federal establishment has engaged in actions which have weakened these institutions making it that much more difficult to effect cohesion and stability.

Attitudes and Behaviors

Today America is suffering from a crisis of will. We are disillusioned with Federal intervention and its ability to solve problems in a meaningful way. We are weary of social change. We have little faith in the future.

As far as some ethnics are concerned, one reason for this state of anomie can be traced to an attitude and a behavior on the part of Federal bureaucrats which can be best described as arrogance. It is an arrogance, they believe, which reflects a lack of familiarity with and sensitivity to the basic tenets of pluralism. While it has been possible to change the thinking of some American academics and other national opinion-makers, and even to get some of them to reject the melting pot as a viable American model, it has not been possible to change the attitudes and behaviors of the majority of Federal bureaucrats who have been and apparently still are firmly committed to ethnic disappearance. Most – and this includes blacks who have recently achieved a modicum of influence within the Federal system – continue to maintain and nurture an ethnocentric perception of the American polity which eschews cultural diversity. The present thrust towards socio-economic assimilation is based on an ideology which views ethnic differences as obstacles which must be overcome.

Diversity of all types – especially in Washington – appears to be outside of the daily experience of the Federal bureaucracy. Because of their relatively high pay and almost total economic security, most Federal decision-makers enjoy similar standards of living. Many have attended the same universities, live in similar non-ethnic neighborhoods, read the same newspapers and journals, travel in the same social circles, and adhere to the same social mores. What is more, they have a tendency to reproduce in a manner which virtually guarantees the perpetuation of the species. Every governmental bureaucracy subjects its recruits to an intensive socialization process aimed at the elimination of differences. To be successful, and to achieve tenure, recruits must become intimately familiar with the agency's mission, with the myriad procedures designed to fulfill that mission, with the importance of garnering Congressional support for the mission, and with the lexicon of "buzz words" which distinguish the bureaucrat from ordinary mortals. Dissidence is tolerated, but only to a degree. If one wishes to merely survive, one can afford to disagree on occasion.

If one wishes to get ahead, however, one plays the game. Even those who come into the agency with a clearly defined purpose are more often than not absorbed by the process of bureaucratization. Some delude themselves into believing that they must play the game until they can make it up the ranks – presumably to a more significant decision-making level. In far too many instances, however, by the time these well-intentioned bureaucrats attain greater status, both the desire and the ability to go against the tide has been severely diminished. Those who start at the top – usually as a result of an outside appointment – are quickly eaten up by the system. Small wonder that the average tenure for high-level Government appointees is approximately eighteen months. The bureaucracy and its need to maintain ideological homeostasis remains unchanged.

A Model For Pluralistic Decision Making In The Federal Government

There is, of course, at least one other way of going about the Government's business, and it was tried, albeit with mixed success, in the White House during the Ford administration. This approach is based on two important premises:

1. Every significant segment of the American polity has a right to be heard when Government and programs which affect their lives are being considered.
2. Bureaucratic arrogance can be best addressed in an authoritative – and, if necessary, an authoritarian – manner when it becomes insensitive to group needs.

The White House model of which I speak was developed by William J. Baroody, Jr. during his tenure as Director of the White House Office of Public Liaison (OPL). The Office consisted of special assistants to the President, each of whom was charged with liaison activities with one of the following groups: women, minorities or blacks, Hispanic-Americans, and ethnics. In addition, there were also individuals who dealt with youth, business and professional groups, and other special interest coalitions that were functioning at that time. It was understood that all OPL contact was to be developed without regard for politically partisan affiliations.

The objectives of each liaison person were to:

1. Serve as a direct two-way communication link between the White House and significant constituencies.
2. Keep the President informed of major issues and concerns within their respective constituencies.
3. Participate in the development of Government strategies which addressed major constituent concerns.

4. Sensitize governmental agencies to the existence of various constituencies, their concerns, and the need to develop strategies which address them.

In dealing with ethnic Americans, certain assumptions were made concerning the manner in which communication was established:

Assumption 1. Most self-conscious ethnics belong to some type of religious, social, fraternal, political, or other organization in their ethnic community.

Assumption 2. The articulated goals and objectives of various ethnic organizations are reflections of the goals and objectives of its members.

Assumption 3. The elected officers of ethnic organizations are people who are most in tune with the needs and sentiments of the membership.

Assumption 4. In listening to elected ethnic leaders, one can begin to understand and appreciate ethnic concerns.

Once the significant ethnic organizations were identified, their leaders were invited to the White House to meet President Ford and, more importantly, to identify their major concerns. During 1976, four domestic and three foreign policy issues were identified by a majority of ethnic leaders, and each was addressed by means of a conference either in the White House or the State Department. In order of priority, the domestic concerns included:

1. Neighborhood revitalization
2. Education
3. The 1980 census
4. Federal social service delivery systems

Dealing with the issues involved a well-defined process which included the following steps:

Step 1. The issue was defined and a position paper was prepared by a representative of the ethnic community who was believed to be qualified to deal with the concern. Every effort was made to have the paper include specific recommendations which the Federal Government could follow in developing a solution.

Step 2. The position paper was circulated among those Federal agencies which were or could be involved in the solution. The paper was usually delivered to the ranking person in the agency – either Cabinet Secretary or the Director – and it was made clear that the *President* was interested in a response.

Step 3. Federal responses were monitored and, if necessary, negotiated to make certain that the problem or need was being addressed adequately.

Step 4. The President was briefed regarding the concern and the proposed Federal response.

Step 5. Ethnic leaders most involved with the problem were invited to the White House where the position paper was read, agency heads responded, and the invitees reacted. The President usually met all participants to inform them of his intentions to make certain all recommendations were acted upon at the earliest opportunity.

Step 6. The Office of Public Liaison monitored the Federal agencies involved with solutions to see if further assistance was required.

Reflecting back on our successes and failures, I believe our successes – and they were by no means overwhelming – were due to our use of a pluralistic, non-confrontation model which identified the problems and suggested solutions in a dispassionate, organized, and well-documented manner, permitted Federal officials to respond in a similar fashion, and, perhaps most important of all, made full use of the power of the Presidency to overcome bureaucratic arrogance which existed, we learned to our dismay, within both the Federal establishment and the White House itself. Our failures, as one might suspect, were due mainly to our inability to overcome bureaucratic resistance even with the assistance of whatever power was perceived as residing in the Oval Office.

The OPL Model And The 1980 Census

The Office of Public Liaison began to address the 1980 census issue early in June of 1976. A position paper was prepared and read by Dr. Michael Novak¹⁴ who emphasized that the census was important to America's ethnic groups for the following reasons:

1. Scientific understanding, public comprehension, and meaningful government policy development require an accurate profile of the American people. "Ours is a complex population," stated Dr. Novak, "not accurately grasped by simple slogans. There are many mythical views of the population and many popular misconceptions." We may imagine "a mainstream that doesn't exist, for example, or have a misleading image of how large or small one part of the population is." An example one could cite in this regard is the feeling that most of us have that our society is dominated by Anglo-Saxons when, in reality, they are in the minority.

2. For better or for worse, statistical profiles of group characteristics are being used by courts and Federal agencies to award various "entitlements" and to develop social programs. Inaccurate data can lead to penalties. An example one could cite here is the perception that during the 1970 census, certain minority groups were undercounted, resulting in a loss of Federal funding. According to data presented to the House Subcommittee on Census and Population in 1976, it was

¹⁴ Remarks of Dr. Michael Novak, White House Conference on Ethnicity and the 1980 Census, Washington, D.C., June 1, 1976.

estimated that the State of Illinois was undercounted by some 300,000 persons in 1970. Chicago accounted for 131,337 of that total, of which approximately 88,000 were racial minorities. The "loss" in revenue sharing funds was an estimated \$2 1/2 million.¹⁵

3. The designations "foreign stock," "country of birth," and "mother tongue" used to identify ethnics in 1970 were inadequate to include America's many diverse ethnic groups. The "foreign stock" designation did not include third- and fourth- generation ethnic Americans who still consciously identified with their ethnic community. The term "country of birth" usually referred to nation-states in existence in 1970. Interpreting the designation U.S.S.R. to mean "Russian," for example, one well-known urban sociologist in Chicago developed an ethnic map of the city which totally excluded some 60,000 Ukrainians living there, and located a large "Russian" population residing in the Rogers Park area. As any Chicagoan knows, Rogers Park was a predominantly Jewish area in 1970!

To remedy the situation, Dr. Novak offered the following proposals:

1. a) Expand the category "foreign stock" so as to gain an accurate count of third, fourth, and later-generation descendants of immigrants. b) When "foreign stock" alone is listed, supply a warning with the table, pointing out the exclusion of later generations.

2. Recognize the difference between the subjective and objective components of cultural belonging. a) Objectively, it might ask for the identification of the ethnic background of each respondent's grandparents or ancestors. b) Subjectively, it might ask each respondent to identify his or her own cultural heritage or heritages, as he or she believes these to be significant to his or her own life.

Dr. Novak suggested the following wording for the two types of questions: a) Name the culture or nation in which your four grandparents were born. If they were born in the United States, from which nations of origin did their ancestors come? b) In your mind, with which cultural heritage, or heritages, do you identify through family ties?

3. In listing the categories of self-identification the Census Bureau should assist respondents by demonstrating sensitivity to name changes during different historical eras. The modern nation of Yugoslavia should be admitted, for example, but so should its earlier component nations - Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, etc.

4. In asking about culturo-religious matters, the Census Bureau should couch its questions in appropriately nonreligious terms. The questions would not concern present religious belief or church affiliation. Rather, they would concern cultural influences. They

¹⁵ *Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Census and Population of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service*, June 1 and 2, 1976 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976), pp. 94-96.

would not ask about the individual commitment of the respondent. The question for eastern Europeans, for example, might be worded as follows: "Whatever your present commitment, would you consider that the strongest cultural influence within your family and yourself was from a culture that was. . . Catholic, Lutheran, Calvinist, Jewish, Orthodox, Anglican, secular, other?"

5. The Census Bureau might ask respondents to locate themselves on a scale of cultural identification that would allow for major combinations or degrees. The question might be worded as follows: "When you think about your own identity, would you describe it in any of the following terms?"

- (a) Present citizenship
- (b) Religion or world view
- (c) Own cultural background
- (d) Ancestral, cultural background
- (e) Mixed, ancestry unknown
- (f) Mixed, ancestry known but a matter of indifference
- (g) Mixed, but one or two heritages more significant to me than others as follows:

6. The Census Bureau might include a question asking whether respondents changed their names to those of a different nationality, either in this or in preceding generations.

Responding on behalf of the Bureau of Census at the White House conference were Robert L. Hagan, Deputy Director, Meyer Zitter, Chief of the Population Division, Alfred Tella, Special Advisor to the Director, and Nampeo McKinney, who at the time was Assistant Chief of the Population Division. I am pleased that Nampeo McKinney is with us this afternoon with a new title, Chief of the Ethnic and Racial Statistics Staff.

Unable to work directly with the Director of the Bureau, who, I learned later, was preparing to leave, I continued to press the Deputy Director to take further action once our conference was concluded. Soon after becoming acting director, Mr. Hagan did follow through by inviting Mr. Novak and twenty ethnic experts to a conference at the Bureau of Census to discuss a different approach to the ethnic origins question. Admitting that the previous focus on first and second-generation ethnics was inadequate, Mr. Hagan professed an interest in extending the scope of the data. The Bureau of Census meeting, held in October of 1976, was billed as an effort of the Bureau to adopt the broader concept of " 'origin or descent.' " I am anxious to learn whether this meeting, and the White House conference which preceded it, had any impact on how the 1980 census addresses the ethnic factor in American life.

1980 Ethnic Issues

The importance of the 1980 census upon the direction of American public policy development cannot be overestimated. If the census is conducted and analyzed from a pluralistic perspective, i.e., in an effort to determine the full scope of cultural and social diversity in this country, then the results should demonstrate, quite conclusively, I believe, that many ethnic Americans did not “melt” into mainstream American life but retained, instead, a certain degree of cultural and behavioral identification with their ethnic heritage. If the 1980 census demonstrates that the United States is not a melting pot for all Americans, then the implications for public policy could be enormous. The acceptance of a pluralistic ideal may mean a re-evaluation of our approach to a number of issues.

A. Minorities

The term “minority” may have to be either eliminated as a functionally meaningless term – all of us are minorities in the United States, even Anglo-Saxons – or expanded to include all groups who have been, for a variety of discriminatory reasons, denied an opportunity to attain equal status and representation in our society. “It is not the specific characteristics, whether racial or ethnic, that mark a people as minority,” wrote sociologist Louis Wirth in 1945, “but the relationship of their group to some other group in the society in which they live.”¹⁶ To offer the benefits of affirmative action to a third-generation Chinese-American whose parents have achieved middle-class status and to deny these same benefits to a Polish-American whose parents are struggling to remain above the level of poverty is simply not an equitable way to go about the Government’s business. Such actions tend to exacerbate racial and ethnic polarization rather than eliminate it.

B. Government Recruitment

The 1980 census will confirm, I believe, that the Federal Government is not representative of the population it is intended to serve. In a study entitled “Making It in America: Differences Between Eminent Blacks and White Ethnic Groups,” a comparison was made between the 1924 and 1974 editions of Marquis *Who’s Who* focusing on the ethnic affiliations of noted Americans in nine separate areas of endeavor. As might be expected, black listings in the area of Government and politics increased from 1 percent to 13 percent. Italians dropped from 8 percent in 1924 to 6 percent in 1974, Jews

¹⁶ Louis Wirth, “The Problem of Minority Groups”, *Theories of Society*, ed. Talcott Parsons, et al. (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961), Volume I, p. 311.

declined from 8 percent to 4 percent during the same fifty-year period, while Slavs declined from 12 percent to 7 percent.¹⁷ If the 1980 census suggests that national percentages for ethnic groups are higher than they are in the Federal bureaucracy, then it may be necessary to institute a recruiting campaign which would enable our Government to become more representative of – and, hopefully, more sensitive to – diverse group needs.

C. Government Decision-Making Models

Another approach to the sensitization of Government officials to pluralism may be through the adoption of a decision-making paradigm patterned after the White House model mentioned earlier. Utilizing that approach would guarantee the inclusion of all groups affected by Government programs in the developmental process. In a pluralistic society, no single group should dominate the focus of Government programs. The major objective should be consensus among blacks, Hispanic-Americans, women, youth, ethnics, and other major constituencies directly affected. It takes time, patience, and high tolerance for frustration to develop a consensus model, but the end product of such an effort is usually far more acceptable than programs which have been designed by a small group of people who are out of touch with America's diversity.

D. Decentralization of the Federal Bureaucracy

Another frequent complaint of almost all segments of our society has been with the inability of our Washington-based bureaucracy to make programmatic allowances for local variation. The problem with uniform, rational, comprehensive solutions is that they are biased towards the unitary solution. In this approach to social planning, pluralism is viewed as an enemy because it is often a source of diversified solutions to problems that are diversely defined and diversely caused. But ours is a diverse society with differing local needs and resources. Neighborhood revitalization in Seattle, for example, may need to be developed in a way that is substantially different from the neighborhood revitalization process in Chicago or Cleveland. Assigning Federal bureaucrats to various locales will help them identify the problem more precisely, enable them to locate local resources more readily, and, most important of all, make them more accountable to their constituencies. As long as program design, budget, and day-to-day operations are determined in Washington, diversity will not be served. Effectiveness and efficiency will also suffer because of overlapping and duplicated functions, a lack of harmony with local needs, and higher administrative and program costs.

¹⁷ Stanley Lieberson and Donna K. Carter, "Making It in America: Differences Between Eminent Blacks and White Ethnic Groups", *American Sociological Review* (June, 1979).

Decentralization of Federal decision-making will not be easy to achieve. The Federal bureaucracy has traditionally resisted all such moves with a tenacity that is awesome to behold. Most of us who have been involved in such a move, however, can testify to the fact that while it was painful, the benefits were worth it.

E. Public Policy Development

Once Government agency personnel have become more representative and tolerant of diversity, once a consensus model has been put into place, once local variation has been taken care of through decentralization, the next and final step is to develop a succinct rationale for the actual development of public policy. During the 1980's, many issues will emerge to compete for the attention of Government agencies. If I were to select a single philosophy that would best serve the Nation during this period, it would be one that was based on an ideological commitment to the strengthening of what Peter L. Berger and Richard John Neuhaus have termed "mediating structures" defined by them as "those institutions which stand between the individual in his private life and the large institutions."¹⁸ Four such institutions are the neighborhood, the family, the Church, and the voluntary associations, all of which are an integral part of ethnic group life in America.

The age of big Government and Federal entitlements is here to stay. In a society which is predicated on a melting pot rationale, as we have seen, bureaucrats tend to be biased towards unitary solutions and neat answers. The challenge of pluralistic public policy development, on the other hand, is to search for alternative social service delivery systems, take steps to strengthen them, and embrace the multitude of particular interests which constitute our polity. The future viability of the family, the neighborhood, the Church, and the voluntary associations will constitute, in my opinion, the major focus of concern for America's ethnic groups during the 1980's. Some of these issues have already been discussed by others during this two-day consultation, so I shall dwell, albeit briefly because of time constraints, on those which need further exposition.

The Family

"The family" wrote Berger and Neuhaus in 1977, "may be in crisis but there is little evidence that it is in decline."¹⁹ As heartening as that conclusion may be, the perception of American ethnics is otherwise. The ethnic reality is that slowly and imperceptibly, the seven basic functions of the traditional family – economic, education, status and prestige, protection, religion, recreation, and affection – are being eroded by emerging norms which suggest that family functions can be

¹⁸ Peter Berger and Richard John Neuhaus, *To Empower People: The Role of Mediating Structures in Public Policy* (Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1977), p. 2.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

better performed by other agencies, namely the factory or office, the school, media created status symbols, the police department, the clergy, as well as social clubs, the film and television industry, and the myriad of other nonfamily oriented recreational options that are presently available for those who want to live life with gusto. Even the affection function of the family is being replaced by some with membership in various pseudo-religious cults and groups which offer a sense of family-belonging to their faithful. While the demands of our present industrial society mandate a certain familial dependence upon other agencies, the danger lies in the trend towards total dependence and more unitary and comprehensive need fulfillment by other agencies.

In a pluralistic society, family structures should be related to the life styles of its members, be they Amish, Afro-American, Ukrainian, Jewish, Catholic, urban, or rural. Public policy should be designed to accommodate this diversity allowing, at the same time, for greater independence through the recognition of the significant affective functions performed by family units. The criterion for all families – nuclear, extended, multiparent, single parent – should be their ability to perform those functions in an environment which encourages the personal growth of all of its members.

If anyone doubts that the American family is in trouble, then the recent decision by President Carter to establish an Office for Families in the Department of Health and Human Resources should serve to remove all doubt. Given the Federal establishment's past record of social totalitarianism, however, this development makes me very nervous. If the action is merely to respond to current American anxiety with a politically motivated ploy, then we can relax after November of 1980. If, on the other hand, the President's action is viewed as a green light for the Federal bureaucracy to expand its ranks and to develop still another set of regulatory social policies, then we're really in trouble.

The Neighborhood

"The neighborhood," stated Geno Baroni at the 1976 White House Conference on Neighborhood Revitalization, "is a neglected unit of American urban life."²⁰ "A sense of neighborhood, a sense of belonging, or cultural identification, are threatened," declared President Ford at the same conference. "Increasingly," concluded the President, "centralized government in Washington, which has grown more powerful and very impersonal, is part of the problem."²¹

²⁰ Remarks of Msgr. Geno Baroni, White House Conference on Ethnicity and Neighborhood Revitalization, Washington, D.C., May 5, 1976.

²¹ Remarks of Gerald R. Ford, *ibid.*

Monsignor Baroni and President Ford were both right. Neighborhoods have been neglected in some instances, but in other instances they have been destroyed by Government programs which were ill-conceived and poorly administered. Neighborhoods are a key to public policy development in pluralistic society, but the answer is not *more* government but *less*. The emphasis should be on concern and not control.

The Church

Institutions of religion are important in a pluralistic society because they represent a vital dimension in the lives of millions of Americans who voluntarily support almost 500,000 churches and synagogues in this country. Church attendance is beginning to increase, but the danger today is not that churches – or any one church – will take over the State. The threat to pluralism lies in the possibility that the State will take over certain functions of the Church and, as in totalitarian societies, begin to dictate values, ideals, and moral standards. Religious diversity is a powerful deterrent to that eventuality. Current concerns with the abominations of certain so-called religious cults should not blind us to the great benefits which our religious institutions have brought to our nation. Our personal sense of identity, our values, our customs, and our perceptions of the meaning of life in an increasingly materialistic, uncaring, and narcissistic society are enhanced by a belief in a Supreme Being.

The Voluntary Association

Finally, the voluntary association, that unique American phenomenon which has traditionally enabled us to become, in a very direct way, our brothers' keepers, should not be allowed to wither because of competing Government programs. Public policy should be designed to encourage local initiative in responding to recognized public responsibilities.

For the American ethnic community, the voluntary association is crucial to its well being. Present Government policy which confuses integration with assimilation and affirmative action with equal opportunity runs counter to the principle of pluralism. What mindless bureaucrat, one wonders, decided that an old people's home for Italian-Americans must be racially integrated in order to receive Government funding? What possible social benefit can be derived from recent efforts on the part of the Federal establishment to remove the tax exempt status from privately-controlled charitable, fraternal, and other voluntary associations? What right does anyone have in a pluralistic society to decide – as have some labor and feminist groups – that volunteerism is a form of exploitation? Like the other mediating structures already discussed, voluntary associations encourage individual freedom, initiative, and social diversity. Not all Government

programs need to be governmentally controlled. Not everyone needs to be a dependent client of the State.

Conclusion

Given the level of ethnic anomie which presently exists in the United States, it should be clear that the Federal establishment's attempts to define ethnicity as a problem and to deal with it from a melting-pot perspective have failed. The end result of much of the Federal Government's intervention in America's ethnic communities has been the rise of a new and increasingly arrogant brand of social totalitarianism in Washington, D. C. which has weakened those very institutions – the family, the neighborhood, the Church, and the voluntary associations – which have enabled American ethnic groups to retain a modicum of control over their collective destinies. For some minorities, many of whom are still dependent wards of the Federal bureaucracy, equality of respect for ethnic diversity has not matched the equality of opportunity which the Federal establishment has attempted to provide. For other ethnic minorities, recent Federal intervention has resulted in a sense of growing powerlessness and animosity towards a system which they believe has not only failed to recognize their communities as worthy of attention, but has unfairly discriminated against many of their numbers as well.

No better example of Federal arrogance and lack of recognition towards certain ethnic groups can be found than that which presently appears to exist within the U.S. Census Bureau. Despite many and varied attempts by ethnic communal leaders to be “counted” in 1980, the Bureau hasn't even acknowledged the existence of some groups. The recent comment of one Bureau official that they still weren't sure whether it was appropriate to list Ukrainians and Byelorussians as “Russians” is symptomatic of the problem we face. If we can't even get the Federal establishment to formally recognize our *presence* in the United States, then how can we ever hope for any meaningful effort from our Government to understand our needs?

As we look towards the 1980's, America's ethnic leaders are not overly optimistic. And yet, we are not totally without hope. This conference is a definite indication that not all members of the Federal establishment are oblivious to the pluralistic perspective. Decision-making models do exist. There is still time to develop a Federal disposition towards the preservation of those institutions that have stood the test of time and that still have much to offer in a culturally diverse society. We can learn to avoid totalitarian solutions. It is not too late. Next time, we can do it right. And *you*, the members of this Commission, can help make it right!

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Thank you Dr. Kuropas.

Marcia Kaptur, our respondent, is currently the Director of Policy at the National Consumer Cooperative Bank in Washington, D.C.

She has recently held positions on the White House Domestic Policy Staff where she specialized in community development, land use, housing and neighborhood revitalization.

She holds a Master's degree in urban planning, has authored several articles on that subject, and is a former Director of Planning and Design with the National Center for Urban and Ethnic Affairs.

RESPONSE OF MARCIA C. KAPTUR

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you very much. It's a great pleasure to be invited to appear before you today, and I want to begin by quoting from the original paper I received from Myron Kuropas. He says that the average tenure for high-level government appointees is approximately 18 months.

My tenure, however, was 32 months. I would like to suggest that this is perhaps because, when an ethnic American reaches that level of decision-making he or she stays twice as long.

I also want to say that I feel some discomfiture in appearing on a panel that is entitled "Euro-Ethnic". I think that I have a much broader concept of ethnicity, and I would certainly include in my definition of ethnicity Chinese-Americans in San Francisco, Afro-Americans in Detroit, Greek-Americans in Cleveland, et cetera.

I happen to be second generation Polish-American. For myself and for people like myself, I hope that in the decades ahead there will come to be an appreciation and a greater understanding of the dual heritage that we hold and of what implications this has for American life.

In addition I hope that people like myself will have increased access to decision-making at the very highest levels of Government and in the private sector.

Finally, my hope in appearing before you today is that the Civil Rights Commission, one of the few entities which has a broad legislative mandate, can explore the various dimensions of ethnicity that cut across the range of domestic concerns.

Now, I have heard no definition of ethnicity offered during the past two days. I would encourage you to create one for purposes of further discussion. But, in spite of there not being one, I would like to focus my discussion on three concerns in response to Myron's paper.

First of all, I am very concerned not only about discrimination based on national origin, but also on heritage. Second-generation Americans

really don't fit into the national origin category, and we have no way of knowing if discrimination based on heritage is a problem.

Second, I question the *representation of various ethnic groups in policy level decision-making environments*, both in the public and private sectors.

And, third I am concerned about how the recommendations that will flow from this particular convocation will be institutionalized.

On this final point I worry very much about – and caution myself against institutionalizing anything, especially at the national level. If you look back to when, for example, the Bureau of Indian Affairs was created or even the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, it will be seen that we tend to freeze into law at a particular time certain ideas, values, and approaches, and then issue regulations. Often the mere act of institutionalizing fixes a management structure and a behavior pattern, which over time becomes obsolete. I worry that if we freeze into law or regulate on ethnicity in the early 1980's, it will cause problems 20 years down the road. So I am very cautious about any changes that we recommend here.

I am also concerned about how one takes the political and the cultural agenda of ethnicity into the policy arena of Government. I'm not quite sure how to do that.

My observation is that people make policies. The individuals that serve at very high levels, and the values they hold, become the real linchpins during critical discussions of new initiatives at the national level.

I don't think Myron Kuropas said this in his remarks here; however, his paper mentions that, “. . . because of their relatively high pay and almost total economic security, most Federal decision-makers enjoy similar standards of living. Many have attended the same universities, live in similar non-ethnic neighborhoods, read the same newspapers and journals, travel in the same social circles and adhere to the same social mores.”

From my own personal experience, I feel I was an exception to this standard rule. It was wonderful to be at the White House for three years, but I think that the particular mind-set that exists in many circles at the national level, and the people who sit there making policy, do not represent the worlds I have known in other places, including the City of Chicago. I became a part of a world most Euro-ethnic Americans have not known.

I want to express doubt about how one can best handle ethnic issues while on the White House Staff.

The staff that I served on, the Domestic Policy Staff, which, in the former Administration, was headed by John Ehrlichman and in The Carter Administration, by Stuart Eisenstat, is divided into functional

categories. There are specialists, mostly non-Euro-ethnics, who are attorneys, in justice, education, housing, finance and urban affairs, agricultural and rural affairs, transportation, arts and humanities, health, human resources, and employment, energy and environment, regulatory reform, taxation, civil service and Government affairs. Congressional committees are similarly focused and, of course, the Congress has special committees in such areas as small business and aging. There is no category called ethnic affairs.

Thus, what has tended to happen is that ethnicity is treated as a political category with separate people in political liaison relating to ethnic constituencies that are organized on the outside. The linkage between the political constituencies and the policy makers, let's say, or the people who deal in policy, is very tenuous, if it exists at all.

We need to tighten that linkage. For the constituencies on the outside, there is a real need to organize in a way that can affect policymakers, because they are, in fact, different warm bodies sitting in the same building with political operatives, but looking at the issues in different ways.

I would like to suggest also that the problem of different people in this country affecting policy is not a problem just for the Euro-ethnics, but for all groups that traditionally have been excluded from the highest levels of decision making.

Who gets included in discussions; in which discussions are they included; are they included in a ceremonial fashion or in a substantive fashion? Who gets invited back? Who gets the informal phone calls that matter so very much when you're strapped for time?

Many of the people who have testified today have never been consulted across the broad range of policy areas that I have outlined.

Now, in order to give you some specific recommendations in reference to Myron's paper, and in terms of your own authority, I was wondering what the possibilities would be to modify the law and to add the word "heritage" to the language in your mandate which prohibits discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

I would like to endorse the suggestion of others that the Commission select a discrete number of issues resulting from this meeting for more specialized research, and I'd like to just tick off a couple of those.

One would be an indepth study of the ethnic composition - not just Euro-Americans - of political appointments and high-level government career positions, as well the high-level positions in the corporate sector, including the media, which was discussed in the last session.

I think that is extremely important. In terms of the White House staff itself, whether it be the Carter Administration, the Ford Administration, or future Administrations. I think we need a back-

ground study of policy makers – who these people are. Separate them from the political people, because they are different and their influence is different.

In this regard, I would like to refer to an article that was in the *Washington Post* a couple of weeks ago that described the preponderance of white males in staff directorship positions in the Congress. Similarly a recent *Wall Street Journal* article presented the fact that the corporate boardrooms have been much more up-to-date in representing different groups than, in fact, the Government itself. There was documentation that the private sector has been much more responsive than the Government.

And then finally, there is some original research that I would like to refer to your staff. This was done by a professor from York University in Toronto. His name is Colin Campbell and he has written three books: one on Canada, one on the United States, and one, I believe, on West Germany. They are all entitled *Superbureaucrats* and concern the people who occupy the very highest levels of decision-making in the governments. While on assignment with the Brookings Institute, he interviewed me and over 200 other people in the White House, the Office of Management and Budget, and at high levels in the agencies. He has taken that work back to Toronto and will be publishing it there.

The raw data that he obtained were indepth on background, ethnicity, religion, occupation of father, et cetera. It could be very useful to this Commission, and I would commend it to your attention.

Next, I would suggest that in a separate study you explore why culturally and place-sensitive educational programs to build cross-cultural understanding are the exception rather than the rule in the educational system of this country.

When I was working as a neighborhood planner in a multi-ethnic area here in Chicago I couldn't understand why children with Puerto Rican, Polish, and Italian heritages couldn't learn more about one another's "histories" in their regular educational curriculum. It was impossible for me to effect that, being a community development person rather than an educator. Nonetheless, I saw it as a great weakness. Such education would have helped greatly in stabilizing and improving that particular community.

I would also like to suggest that staff be directed to work with other agencies on a demonstration basis perhaps, to explore how community development and social services can be decentralized to be more sensitive to group diversity in this country.

The President's Commission on Mental Health recently made some suggestions about how mental health services might be decentralized. I

think we need to look at decentralization across the broad range of Federal programs.

To summarize, I want to stress the importance of appointments of persons sensitive to ethnic issues at all levels, both in and out of Government.

Second, focussed research should be directed to key ethnic concerns, not so much on how Government can compartmentalize people, but rather how Government can redefine its relationship to community institutions to strengthen them in conditions of diversity rather than to weaken them.

I would also like to encourage you to define broadly the term "ethnicity" so that it becomes a new paradigm for describing the social undercurrents – in reality, social history – of the United States.

And finally, I would like you to help me identify how we can help initiate a continuing institutionalized national capacity to examine these issues in the future.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Thank you.

Paul J. Ascioffa is the Federal Agency Liaison Officer with the National Endowment of the Arts, responsible for coordinating the policies and programs of that Federal agency with other agencies.

He has been the Executive Director of the National Italian-American Foundation and the Director of Communications for the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs.

He holds a Master's degree from Northwestern University's School of Speech and has extensive experience with both print and electronic media.

Mr. Ascioffa.

RESPONSE OF PAUL J. ASCIOLLA

Introduction

Good afternoon. My name is Paul J. Ascioffa and I am Director of Federal Agency Relations for the National Endowment for the Arts, a Federal Agency advised by the National Council on the Arts in Washington, D.C. I am also privileged to be Honorary Chair of the Illinois Consultation on Ethnicity in Education which I helped found together with some of my colleagues here in Chicago under the leadership of David G. Roth, Midwest Director of the Institute on Pluralism and Group Identity of the American Jewish Committee.

I am pleased to be able to respond to Dr. Myron Kuropas' paper and to be able to give some of my own reactions and observations to which he has alluded.

It is opportune that this Commission is focussing on issues which face Euro-ethnic Americans and the entire American society. This consultation in a small way begins to respond to the Commission's mandate to investigate discrimination on the basis of "national origin." It is my hope that one day the Commission would consider the addition of the words "and ethnic identity" to its mandate, thereby including both native-born Americans as well as newer immigrants. American ethnicity is a genre all its own, indeed a whole new culture within the American experiment, which is dynamic and living, not a thing of the past.

In preparing for this consultation and this panel, I came across a file containing much correspondence about a proposed consultation on the representation of ethnics by mass media. In fact, in 1973 we sponsored an all-day workshop on the subject with Chicago area ethnic groups. The consultation was never held and nothing more was heard about the subject until the Commission's report issued on August 15, 1977, four years later. That report devoted only 62 lines of a 181-page report to *Ethnic Situation Comedies*. Hardly a penetrating analysis of the state of art!

But enough of the past. This consultation comes at an opportune time when the issues dealing with the quality of group life in America, the questions surrounding the concept of unity in diversity, and a searching for the richness and strengths which make America what it is, are coming under close scrutiny. I believe that the richness and strengths of ethnicity, properly understood, have a role in redefining American life and in providing coping mechanisms for individuals and groups in a diverse and complex American culture.

If America is a mosaic, I believe that ethnicity can be part of that cement which holds the Nation together.

Since I have this luxury, I should like to state my personal philosophy about ethnicity and it is incorporated into what I call the *Paul Principle*: You cannot organize ethnicity, but in organizing, if you ignore ethnicity, you are doomed to fail.

I also believe that ethnicity cannot be segregated from the larger issues of American society and must never be used by one group or individual as a lever against another group. I reject selective moral outrage when it comes to human and civil rights. These rights are indivisible and inviolable.

I also subscribe to the theory that has been voiced by such a distinguished historian as Arthur Mann of the University of Chicago, that there is a distinction between being an American either by birth or naturalization and how one is an American. The former means citizenship and says nothing about how individuals or groups relate to James Madison's concept of Federalism. What makes us Americans is

the subscription to the truths of American democracy: acceptance of equal access to opportunity, adherence to the tri-cameral form of government, and allegiance to the Constitution. That's all. How we are Americans is totally up to us. Age, sex, religion, race, cultural background, physical ability, language, geographic residence, class – nothing makes us more or less American. When that distinction is blurred, and there is a tendency to homogenize in order to unify, then we are in real trouble and values become politicized, very confused. One of the beauties of ethnicity is that it gives people options to move in and out of this set of values which impacts on their identities.

Specific Reactions To Dr. Kuropas' Paper

Now permit me to react to and suggest some areas of discussion about the subject at hand: attitudes toward immigrant and ethnic groups and defining social policy in the 1980's in reference to Euro-ethnic Americans. I will not deal specifically with the issue of the census which I know Ms. McKinney will explore thoroughly.

Attitudes Toward Immigrants And Ethnics

American society has accepted diversity and pluralism as basic aspects of its national life in the United States Constitution. James Madison was the foremost advocate of Federalism and his *Federalist papers* testify to his precious legacy to constitutional literature. The judicial and legislative traditions of this Nation offer consistent evidence of more than two centuries of co-existence not without occasional outbursts of conflict – of groups and peoples with diverse religious beliefs, cultural traditions, and economic status. A mosaic of values and diverse groups, our society has embodied perhaps better than any society in modern history, the ability of people and groups to live together, accept, and eventually come to enjoy each other's differences.

No matter how ingenious we have been in dealing with groups (and we still have much to learn about how groups and individuals interact) we still have managed, somewhere along the line, to develop theories on how to get rid of differences in order to achieve a cultural-unity – the monolith of the American dream – in which all nations are melted into a new race of men (Jean de Crevecoeur, *Letters from an American Farmer, Let. iii, 1788*).

It is the very presence of immigrant groups in our midst and the continuing immigration, whether by choice or force, which gives renewed meaning to the words of Emma Lazarus, "Give me your tired, your poor. . ." Ethnicity is here to stay.

Because the charter group of Americans did not understand the nature of the American Republic and the complexities of building a

community around citizenship rather than religious, cultural, geographical, or sexual values, and because some never accepted the wisdom of unity in diversity (*E pluribus unum*), there have come forth a succession of theories of accommodation:

1. *Disappearance*. This theory maintained that the people would vanish and so would their differences when welded together in the New World and its admittedly egalitarian society. There are some prominent sociologists today who still maintain this basic philosophy of acculturation.
2. *Melting Pot*. This phrase was devised with all good intentions in a play by the same title (*The Melting Pot*, Act i) by an English Jew, Israel Zangwill. He came to America to try to understand how Jews maintained their identity in such a complex society. Zangwill's words were quickly taken by assimilationists and nativists to mean unity of culture rather than the maintenance of cultural identity in the midst of a broadly complex society.
3. *Cultural Pluralism*. This theory came about shortly after World War II but in the columnar sense, providing no movement from one identity to another, and freezing people and groups into irreversible common identities.
4. *New Pluralism and Pluralistic Integration (Higham)*. This system has emerged as the most sensitive and sophisticated system to explain both the richness and strengths of ethnicity and the dangers of ethnicity when espoused by chauvinists.

In short, immigrants become the ethnics of our society, bringing with them into many generations. cultural, religious, and psychological baggage which has a direct bearing on how individuals and groups cope in a quickly changing society.

Culture, however, is not just the celebration of Columbus Day or Polish Constitution Day or Chinese New Year, or eating paella in a Mexican-American restaurant or clam chowder in New England.

If I may borrow from the poignant words of the Old Chief of the Digger Indians, as Ruth Benedict quotes:

In the beginning God gave a cup,
a cup of clay.
And from this cup
they drank their life.
They all dipped in the water,
but their cups were different. Then he added in sorrow:
Our cup is now broken.

It has passed away.

The things which gave significance to the life of his people, the domestic rituals of eating, the succession of ceremonials in the villages, the standards of right and wrong – these were gone – and with them the shape and meaning of their lives. . . their identity.

Culture is the sum total of the ways of thinking, acting, believing, reacting, feeling, loving, and being which makes a person Polish rather than Italian, American rather than Ukrainian. It helps define the things that mean reverence, faithfulness, devotion, respect, femininity and masculinity, loyalty and fidelity, one's identity and expectations.

When people begin to understand that culture is changing, they have the impression that their identity is disappearing, when actually, if we understand pluralism correctly, it is the cultural expressions and the symbols which are in the state of rapid – almost uncontrollable – change. This phenomenon is more accentuated and noticeable in a vast and complex culture which is made up of many cultures.

At present our American culture is undergoing a violent and substantial cultural trauma and reshaping of cultural symbols which meant for some an anchor of security. Things are in transition. New immigrants are constantly coming into the American scene, the more to add richness to our culture, but bringing with this phenomenon the constant reality of change and adaptation.

The older ethnic neighborhoods with their sights, sounds, smells, colors, and contacts are slowly disappearing or reappearing in the form of grotesque imitations urged on by commercially enterprising entrepreneurs. In many instances neighborhood residents have become so enthralled by this ersatz world that they are the first ones to opt for a radical change from the "old ways" and traditions.

Frequently the intermediary institutions like governments, churches, and schools as well as the less formalized social-fraternal organizations which once catered to particular ethnic groups have either failed to adapt to the change or cling to the old ways prompted by nostalgia and residual ethnic comfort and security and can no longer meet the needs of any group within the community setting. They become relics. The peasants and the poets transplanted from Europe, the neat world of faith and culture, in many instances have disappeared.

Urban planners and the acculturation process espoused by institutions of power and policy, the Church and State, educational and social service agencies and their delivery systems are taking care of scattering the broken pieces of the cup.

No common style of American life reappears. Not that there ever was one culture, nor should there be, outside of the common cluster of values which make us American citizens. Policy-makers must under-

stand the intimate connection between culture and identity, attitudes and values, and must not opt for clean and neat choices which unnecessarily label diversity as "cultural cacophony." A blurred perception of the dynamics of cultural change has seduced policy-makers into believing that ethnicity is Balkanization and that the divisions are so great and the options are so few that being an American is confused with American citizenship. This has happened all too frequently to Euro-ethnics who suffer the absence of color differentiation. What has happened to persons of color differentiation in society is a clear record of discrimination and negligence.

How deeply imbedded this cultural nativism became is evident in the stated and public opinions of leaders and policy-makers. I would like to submit for the record of these proceedings. some quotes about *America: The Melting Pot* (The Home Book of Quotations, 10th edition, 1967, p. 55) to show how some attitudes have penetrated the American official mentality at the highest levels. I take the liberty of giving you one sample of this attitude:

America is not to be made a polyglot boarding house for money hunters of twenty different nationalities who have changed their former country only as farmyard beasts change one feeding-trough for another.

Theodore Roosevelt, Speech

Bridgeport, Connecticut

As you can see, even Government agencies, Presidents, former Presidents, and prospective Presidents react rather than act when it comes to dealing with the realities of immigration and ethnicity. Ethnic, racial, cultural, and religious discrimination is not a thing of the past but a gaping and festering sore on our communal soul. The xenophobia which afflicted our policy-makers during the era of the Know Nothings, the discriminatory immigration legislation of 1891, 1924, and 1952, the Presidential Executive Order 9066 which led to the detention of 110,000 Japanese Americans in 1942, the hysteria which took Italian-American and German-American programs off the air and closed down community foreign language newspapers in the 1940's, the *America Love it or Leave it* banners held high in the 1950's, the blanket hatred aimed toward Vietnamese in the 1960's, the sweeping slurs aimed at Iranians even today and all the political opportunism which panders to that type of mentality, is not a thing of the past.

Defining Social Policy And Ethnicity In The 1980's

Permit me now to deal with public policy-making in the Federal Government in general and then as far as it deals with Euro-ethnic

III—America: The Melting Pot

3

Here [in America] individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men.

MICHEL GUILLAUME JEAN DE CREVECOEUR; *Letters from an American Farmer*. Let. III. (1782)

America is God's Crucible, the great Melting-Pot where all the races of Europe are melting and reforming! . . . God is making the American.

ISRAEL ZANGWILL. *The Melting-Pot*. Act i. Produced in New York City, Oct., 1908.

There is here a great melting pot in which we must compound a precious metal. That metal is the metal of nationality.

WOODROW WILSON, *Address*, Washington, 19 April, 1915.

We Americans are children of the crucible.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT, *Speech*, 9 Sept., 1917.

4

Americal half brother of the world!

With something good and bad of every land.

P. J. BAILEY, *Festus: The Surface*, 1. 340.

5

There's freedom at thy gates and rest

For Earth's down-trodden and oppressed,

A shelter for the hunted head,
For the starved laborer toil and bread.

BRYANT, *Oh Mother of a Mighty Race*.

Asylum of the oppressed of every nation.

UNKNOWN, *Democratic Platform*, 1856.

6

She of the open soul and open

door,

With room about her hearth for all mankind!

J. R. LOWELL, *Commemoration Ode*.

8

I do not think that you can do better than to fix here for a while, till you can become again Americanized.

THOMAS JEFFERSON, *Letter to Barlow*, 20 April, 1802.

We go to Europe to be Americanized.

EMERSON, *Conduct of Life: Culture*.

9

We have room in this country for but one flag, the Stars and Stripes. . . . We have room for but one loyalty, loyalty to the United States. . . . We have room for but one language, the English language.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT, *The Great Adventure*. Also last message to the American Defense Society, 3 Jan., 1919, two days before his death.

America is not to be made a polyglot boarding-house for money hunters of twenty different nationalities who have changed their former country for this country only as farmyard beasts change one feeding-trough for another.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT, *Speech*, Bridgeport, Conn.

There can be no fifty-fifty Americanism in this country. There is room here for only 100 percent Americanism, only for those who are Americans and nothing else.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT, *Speech*, Republican Convention, Saratoga. Also in *Foes of Our Own Household*.

10

I will put in my poems that with you is heroism upon land and sea,

And I will report all heroism from an American point of view.

WALT WHITMAN, *Starting from Paumanok*.

11

Some Americans need hyphens in their names because only part of them has come over.

WOODROW WILSON, *Address*, Washington, 16 May, 1914.

There are a great many hyphens left in America. For my part, I think the most un-American thing in the world is a hyphen.

WOODROW WILSON, *Speech*, St. Paul, Minn., 9 Sept., 1919.

Hyphenated Americans.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT, *Metropolitan Magazine*, Oct., 1915.

When two flags are hoisted on the same pole, one is always hoisted undermost. The hyphenated American always hoists the American flag undermost.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT, *Fear God and Take Your Own Part*. Ch. v.

12

O Liberty, white Goddess! is it well

To leave the gates unguarded?
On thy breast

Fold Sorrow's children, soothe the hurts of Fate,

Lift the down-trodden, but with hand of steel

Stay those who to thy sacred portals come

To waste the gifts of Freedom.
T. B. ALDRICH, *Unguarded Gates*.

Americans. I cannot predict what will happen to change the ways decisions are made in Washington, but I can speak of how difficult it is to make ethnicity an integral part of the decision-making process. Remember *Paul's Principle* if I may be self-serving: you cannot organize or make policy only according to ethnicity, but in making policy, if you ignore ethnicity you are doomed to fail.

In my own agency, the National Endowment for the Arts, there has been a real effort to deal with the pluralism of the American population and accessibility to the arts for all Americans. The pluralism of arts policy is based on the simple fact that art is an expression of peoples' culture and if culture is diverse so should the funding patterns be which are part of a Government agency which is ultimately accountable to the public through the Congressional process.

We have been accused by elitists of diluting the quality of artistic endeavors because our Chairman, Livingston L. Biddle, believes in community arts and in making the arts accessible to all groups. The initiatives we have undertaken with other Federal Agencies such as the Department of the Interior, the Department of Education, Small Business Administration, Housing and Urban Development, Department of Commerce and Labor have been maligned by special interest groups. We have seen the establishment of the Office of Minority Concerns which houses the office for Hispanic Affairs. The Community Arts Task Force which was convoked and has presented its report after one year's work had cultural pluralism and diversity as a top priority in its recommendations. Likewise, the Expansion Arts program has intensified its efforts in policy and planning geared toward ethnic diversity in its funding. The Five Year Plan approved by the National Council on the Arts, composed of 26 presidentially appointed advisors to the Chairman of the Arts Endowment, speaks eloquently in both its Statement of Goals, and Plan, to the development of ethnic and cultural diversity in its funding. Ours is one of the few agencies I know that openly acknowledges the richness of ethnic diversity and is doing something about it.

The efforts of the Arts Endowment have only begun and we can see an intensification of these efforts in the 13 programs. This is one of the agendas my office of Federal Agency Relations has with it when it approaches other Federal agencies for joint projects. But most important, the National Council on the Arts, the Chairman and his Deputies, as well as the Program Directors are all convinced that diversity at all levels is the only real mechanism through which to effect change.

The role of policy-making in the Federal establishment as well as in the private sector - and here I speak from experience in both the

private foundation world and the Federal Government – is known to be a difficult task. One of the reasons for this is that there are so many actors with so many apparently divergent agendas. Another reason is that most of us like neat answers to very complex issues.

Viable public policy must be flexible and ever conscious of the differences in American cultures. No monolithic public policy will serve the diverse needs of a varied population. This may seem a tautology, but there are those technocrats both in and out of Government who refuse to acknowledge the fact. The raising of important and sensitive issues in this context and in an “anonymous bureaucracy” can be a very discouraging task. Being an honest broker can be very unrewarding.

However, a slow, methodical, and compassionate, as well as informed, approach is essential to the policy broker. A knowledge of how government works, how people work together, and a comprehensive grasp of the matters to be discussed, may actually work. I have tremendous respect for the political process though not necessarily for all of the actors in that process. One must refuse to become cynical or to be brutalized by the process which can ultimately wear you down. Keeping one’s ideals consonant with the goals of the agency to which one is committed is a most difficult task. But it can be done.

In any case, the Federal policy-making establishment is no different from the rest of the world – just a bit more concentrated. There is cynicism and skepticism, ignorance and intransigence, turf-protection and just plain laziness and all that goes with bureaucracy. All these and other maladies infect the public policy-making machinery and the people who make it work. . . or don’t make it work. Indeed, the newcomer to Washington may suffer cultural trauma in the crazed world of numerals and initials and hyphens. All this may debilitate even the most zealous of policy idealists and purists.

I would advocate to people within the Federal establishment and elsewhere that before they venture into the making of public policy they follow the advice of an Asian proverb:

Go to the people

Live among them

Learn from them

Love them

Serve them

Plan with them

Start with what they know

Build on what they have.

Also:

Citizenship may be defined by law but what gives meaning to it is participation.

(Citizens Participation Development Group Ottawa, 1971)

It is my conviction that the issues we have spoken about during this consultation must be INSTITUTIONALIZED. This requires leadership within the Federal Government and its agencies as well as unselfish leadership in the private sector. People within Government respond to advocacy and pressure. The pressure must be sophisticated, focused, united, and persistent. Lack of consistency on both sides is the greatest obstacle to INSTITUTIONALIZATION.

Issues once raised must be pursued. Advocacy must be persistent and directed toward the proper agency head, staff, and policy-makers. This calls for consistency and perseverance. Otherwise the issues will fall into the hands of opportunists who will utilize legitimate issues for their own aggrandisement.

Frankly, I believe, and this is my personal opinion, that on the issues of Euro-ethnic Americans and their civil rights, the so-called leaders both inside and outside of Government still don't have it together and they don't know what they want, or they have become so culturally compromised that the real issues are accommodated to less noble ideals. They have the malaise!

The issues are real. The needs of the communities out there are real. The needs must be met but there is only a ghost of a network of true believers solid enough to effect the changes needed for institutionalization.

The concept of ethnicity as a factor in American culture has always been an uphill battle to wage. Unless it is kept alive consciously, it will diminish or indeed vanish. Part of the reason, in my opinion, why ethnicity has made such small gains in Federal public policy-making is that strange things have happened to ethnicity. Ethnicity has been:

1. *Romanticized and glamorized* by novels, articles, readers, lectures, radio, television and film, newspaper columns and newsletters, and personal born-again ethnic apologias where the thrill of ethnicity and the process of raising the issues is more important than the product and policies which result.
2. *Commercialized* by ethnic entrepreneurs from T-shirts to topless bars.
3. *Politicized* by offering it as a commodity to be bartered for votes, political appointments, contracts, and grants.

4. *Plagiarized* in sundry ways such as ethnic food-fun-famous people, films-television-media, festivals, and television situation comedies.
5. *Polarized* by using it as a wedge to get a piece of the pie without respect for the rights of other individuals or groups.
6. *Mythologized* by separating it from real life, and giving it exorbitant transcendental meaning. By the way, don't be surprised if you see two new books on the bookstands: *The Joy of Ethnicity* and *Inner Ethnicity*.
7. *Homogenized or Balkanized* by editorial writers and columnists, it depends on the time of the year or the crisis.
8. *Criticized* as the root cause of social strife and intergroup conflict.
9. *Memorialized* following a coup de grace from a *Time* magazine essay or some scholarly journal. . . .or as just the special demon of another Washington-based special interest group.
10. *Canonized* by chauvinists who would make ethnicity the snake oil for all of society's ills and the miracle cure for all our troubles.
11. *Guerilla-ized* in a jungle-type warfare search and destroy mission making a journey up the river like the travellers of Joseph Conrad's *Heart Of darkness* and Francis Coppola's *Apocalypse Now!* searching for Colonel Kurtz.
12. *Capitalized* by compensatory grants and contracts and other drippings from the table of the Federal coffers.

We have been able to do almost everything except institutionalize ethnicity and the self-evident reality: monocultural social policy cannot satisfy the needs of a pluralistic society!

A WORD OF CAUTION. I advocate institutionalizing ethnicity and all that it means; but I realize that we are dealing here with a double-edged sword. I just don't want words written into laws and never implemented. . . .or written into guidelines and regulations and never acknowledged. Ethnicity then dies a death by status quo and ennui. I do not mean that ethnicity should be such a sacrosanct concept that reasonable compromises are forbidden. I do not mean that this important issue should be placed into the hands of the inexperienced and those who would treat it as a joke and in a cavalier manner.

By institutionalization I mean the integration of ethnicity, its richnesses and strengths, into relevant policies, and the accessibility of these policies to policy-makers. We want to be taken seriously and want to be able to compete in the realm of ideas and policy.

I should like to complete this statement by asking two questions and providing two answers:

1. How far have we come as a national community in acknowledging Euro-ethnicity in public policy? A short way. A small step. While progress has been made in the private sector, Government is still fundamentally interested in a social service delivery system and policies which are clean, neat, and easy. What we propose seem messy and incoherent to those who are guided by regulations which clearly define competencies and leave no room for flexibility. In fact, for many, what we propose is incomprehensible. Outside of those who are culpably ignorant, there is abroad an invincible ignorance which is difficult to penetrate. We have a long way to go.
2. How far have we come on the intergovernmental level and how will it be in the 1980's? What can we do? We have not come far. Again, while there has been some progress (only fools or ideologues would disagree,) but we have a long way to go.

My recommendations, which I offer for your consideration, are as follows:

1. As far as possible, ethnic issues should be de-politicized. By this I mean, ethnicity should be taken out of partisan politics both on the National and local levels. On the Federal level, the Executive Branch and its agencies, the Congress and its committees and subcommittees, should become aware of the human issues and cultural value systems which adorn the American electorate. The issues which have become political footballs have led to inter- and intra-ethnic conflict and have left scars on both sides, although both sides should be natural allies. Bad cases make bad laws, my counsellor friends tell me:

For my part, I would target the following agencies through which to bring the issues to a head through thorough investigation and research of the issues:

- a) The United States Commission on Civil Rights
- b) The Equal Employment Opportunities Commission
- c) The Office of Federal Contract Compliance (Labor)
- d) Small Business Administration
- e) Office of Minority Business Enterprise (Commerce)
- f) Economic Development Administration (Commerce)
- g) The National Endowment for the Arts
- h) The National Endowment for the Humanities
- i) The National Science Foundation
- j) Administration on the Aging
- k) President's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women
- l) The National Institute on Mental Health

- m) The White House Conference on Families
 - n) The Department of Education
 - o) The Department of Health and Human Services
 - p) The Department of Justice
 - q) The Department of Housing and Urban Development
 - r) The Corporation for Public Broadcasting and Public Broadcasting System
 - s) The Federal Communications Commission
 - t) The Federal Trade Commission
 - u) The Bureau of the Census (Commerce)
 - v) The Department of State/International Communications Agency
 - w) The Department of the Interior
 - x) The Department of Labor
 - y) Community Services Administration
 - z) Internal Revenue Service
 - aa) Federal Bureau of Investigation
 - bb) Federal Home Loan Bank and many others too numerous to mention here. Systematic reasearch must be done, relating to needs and public policy.
2. The full force of an Executive Order of the President and other assistance from the domestic arm of the White House should be engaged in this effort.
 3. The establishment of a White House Office for Ethnic and Community Affairs with a rank of Senior Assistant to the President of the United States and with accessibility to him. Through that Office, the establishment of an Interagency Task Force on Ethnic and Community Affairs. In order to change policy, bureaucrats at all levels have to be identified and sensitized to this high priority item which should be integrated into their policy-making apparatus. I know that what I suggest is not easy to accomplish. But movement toward such a process should be taken seriously at this opportune time. Otherwise we are engaged again in what one frustrated Federal official some time back called an "arid exercise."

What I am suggesting is a real, authentic, and consistent accessibility to policy-making and policy-makers, making these and other issues part of mainstream policy, yet de-politicizing the issues as far as possible from the partisan system in which we operate. The ideas must compete with others, and not be set aside.

Conclusion

These reactions are a result of a long career of dealing with these issues, both in and out of Government. Some are personal and some

reflect the position of the agency I represent. I have suggested that some progress has been made, but not nearly enough. I am eager for the Federal Government to take the leadership role, and that we intensify the outside of Government advocacy in an organized and sophisticated way and deal realistically with the options at hand.

It is my hope that this consultation and the recommendations which this Commission will report will be a giant step in the right direction.

I would be pleased to respond to any questions you or my colleagues may have.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Thank you.

Nampeo McKenney is the Chief of the Ethnic and Racial Statistic Staffs within the Population Division of the Bureau of Census.

She has authored several papers on ethnic and racial minorities in the United States and had major responsibility for the minority group sections of the 1970 Census Reports.

She holds a Master's degree in sociology from American University.

RESPONSE OF NAMPEO MCKENNEY

Thank you.

I'm very pleased to be on the panel today.

I will discuss fully the ethnic data which will be available from the 1980 census, since this has been raised as an issue several times today.

The Census Bureau is keenly aware of the interest and the need for data on the ethnicity of the population beyond the identification of the first- and second-generation Americans.

We now have *two* major efforts which should meet data needs. The 1980 census will include a question on ethnicity (ancestry) which will be asked on the sample questionnaire. The question is open-ended and asks persons to write in their ancestry. The ethnic or ancestry question is based upon self-identification; that is, we ask respondents to report the ethnic group with which they identify. (The terms "ethnic" and "ancestry" are used interchangeably in this presentation.)

This ancestry item will not only provide counts for a large number of ethnic groups, but, also, the social and economic characteristics of these groups. As currently planned, information will be available from printed reports or tape files for the nation as a whole, States, metropolitan areas, and cities.

These data will be used for community planning and development, implementation of the Federal Ethnic Heritage Program, planning State programs, etc.

Analysts will be able to cross-classify ethnic information by relevant social and economic variables, such as education, family relationship, and income.

Our second major effort involves a special supplement to the Current Population Survey covering the general areas of ethnicity, literacy, and language. This supplement, which was conducted in November 1979, recognized both objective and subjective aspects of ethnicity.

The intent of this survey is twofold: one, to provide a basic data set on ethnicity and related areas which will be a bridge between the 1980 census question on ancestry and the 1970 census question on country of birth of parents; and two, to provide a means for evaluating and interpreting the results of our 1980 census question on ethnicity. The results of this ethnic supplement will help analysts to make decisions about the format and content of an ethnic question to be included in future censuses or surveys conducted by other Governmental agencies.

The survey, which is a national sample of the population, will provide information on ethnic groups at the national level. The expected date for advance publication is mid-1980.

In this presentation, I should like to review the Bureau's experience in the area of ethnicity which will provide an understanding of how the approach to be used in 1980 has evolved.

As a result of the public's interest in immigration, the Census Bureau began to collect information on ethnicity in the middle of the 19th century. From that time until this most recent decade, the questions were objective and referred to place of birth of the person, place of birth of the parents and mother tongue. Since a large proportion of the American population was first- and second-generation in those decades, this set of questions proved to be fairly adequate in identifying ethnic Americans.

Since the proportion of first- and second-generation Americans diminished in recent decades and there has been a rise in ethnic consciousness, the need for a more inclusive approach covering all generations became apparent. Therefore, shortly before the 1970 census, the Bureau asked a question on ethnic origin in its November 1969 Current Population Survey. For the first time, the ethnic item was subjective. The format consisted of a listing approach, with about 13 ethnic origins listed with a check box, and an *other* category. A report from this survey was published.

Again, in the March 1971 Current Population Survey, and March of each year thereafter, a question on ethnic origin was included. A report which presented social and economic characteristics from the March 1971 and 1972 surveys was published. Counts of ethnic groups from the March 1972 surveys are as follows:

English, Scottish, and Welsh - 29.5 million
German - 25.5 million

Irish – 16.4 million

Italian – 8.8 million

Polish – 5.1 million

Subsequent to 1972, data from the Bureau's surveys have not been published, primarily because of difficulties of collecting reliable information on ethnic origin.

Let me cite some of the problems. A study conducted on the ethnicity reported for identical persons in both the March 1971 and 1972 surveys, showed that overall, about two-thirds of the people reported the same specific ethnic group in both years, e.g., German, Polish, etc.

However, this proportion varied substantially by ethnic groups. Some groups, like Polish, Italian and Mexican, were very consistent. For example, about 80 percent of persons who reported Polish in 1971 reported that origin in the subsequent year.

But, on the other hand, consistency was very low for some groups, such as English and Irish, where one-half of the respondents gave the same response in both surveys. For instance, persons reported English in 1971, but reported "other" in 1972.

A second problem is that counts of the various groups fluctuated from survey to survey. A part of the fluctuation was due to changes made in our procedures, but a portion was unexplained. This inconsistency in the counts may be related to inconsistencies in reporting.

The foregoing are just two of the problems that had to be considered in planning for an ethnic question in the 1980 census. In the early stages of testing for 1980, we used a modification of the basic listing approach used in our surveys. However, it soon became apparent that such modifications did not resolve the problems cited above. Also, other concerns became apparent.

The identification of all the ethnic groups for which data have been requested would have required a listing of a large number of groups, more than could be accommodated on the census questionnaire.

Also, since the boundaries of countries in Europe have changed over time, it was very difficult for us to determine the most appropriate categories to list. For example, should Ukrainian or Russian be included in a listing of ethnic groups?

Because of these concerns, the Bureau began to explore other approaches. As Myron has mentioned in his presentation, the Bureau held a meeting in October 1976 with a number of experts on ethnicity. One of the recommendations resulting from the meeting was that the Bureau consider using an open-ended approach to obtain information on ethnicity in the 1980 census.

In 1977, we began testing a format which required most respondents to write in their ethnic origin; the results of this test led to the ancestry question which will be used for 1980, and also in the November 1979 survey.

Our testing has shown that most people who do give a response to the ancestry item are able to provide a codable response. Also, the majority provide a single response. Through our coding and tabulation plans, a large number of ethnic groups will be identified in the 1980 census. Our coding procedure allows for the separate identification of about 500 groups.

However, counts will probably be tabulated for about 200 groups for States and large metropolitan areas and will be made available in some printed form.

Counts for 16 ancestry groups will be published in Chapter C of our Volume I reports. This chapter will also carry social and economic characteristics at the State level for six groups which will remain constant from State to State.

We recognize that the concentrations vary from State to State; therefore, characteristics will be shown for an additional four groups which will reflect the most numerous groups reported in each State.

A subject report on ancestry groups, which will be in our Volume II series, is also being planned. It will provide detailed analytical tables at the national level, and possibly some data for selected States and metropolitan areas.

I have briefly outlined our 1980 census plans. A number of ethnic experts have been consulted on our tabulation, coding and publication plans for 1980; we invite persons here today to provide us with their views on the types of data which should be presented in the subject report to meet their needs.

Thank you.

DISCUSSION

MR. SALTZMAN. Thank you.

Dr. Horn?

DR. HORN. Let me ask you, Ms. McKenney. You're a familiar figure with this Commission; you've testified very well before us on a number of occasions.

On that self-identification question, we take the example - we heard it in some of the testimony - of Yugoslavian, Serbian, Croatian, et cetera. I take it, when the Census compiles it, they would take whatever former independent country was involved as well as the current country, and there would be what - both a common coding on that or would there be subsets that identify those that say "Croatian," "Serbia," so forth?

Ms. MCKENNEY. There will be subsets for the coding of the ancestry question. We will have separate codes for Serbian, Croatian, and Yugoslavian groups, and we would expect to have counts of each of these separately.

Mr. HORN. And then you could also aggregate them under Yugoslavian.

Ms. MCKENNEY. That is correct.

Mr. HORN. Okay. To what extent has the Bureau of the Census considered the question of religion in terms of ever asking a question?

I noticed in some of our testimony here we had the report of some of the suggestions Dr. Novak and others had made and one proposed question to the Census several years ago was: "Whatever your present commitment, would you consider that the strongest cultural influence within your family and yourself was from a culture that was Catholic, Lutheran, Calvinist, Jewish, Orthodox, Anglican, secular or other?"

Has that ever been given serious consideration within the Bureau of the Census?

Ms. MCKENNEY. Yes, the question on religion was given serious consideration but was excluded. Also, since Mr. Novak had provided those comments, the Title XIII was revised and now forbids the asking of a question on religion in a mandatory census; this means that a question on religion could only be asked in future surveys which are not mandatory. However, the inclusion of a question on religion in a survey is *not* under active consideration by the Bureau at this time.

Mr. HORN. Just to clarify for me, do you mean the decennial census is mandatory?

Ms. MCKENNEY. That is correct.

Mr. HORN. Therefore, you could not ask that, even if it were a voluntary response and not a mandated response?

Ms. MCKENNEY. That is correct; the law requires that respondents answer all of the questions to the best of their ability.

Mr. HORN. So you're saying that you can ask a question about religion only in a random sample population survey, because you certainly can't in a total census.

What do we mean by the survey when you can ask?

Ms. MCKENNEY. A sample survey of the population is taken each month to collect employment statistics. It is possible to add supplemental questions to the surveys.

We did ask a question on religion in the 1957 sample survey. However, there was a great deal of concern expressed by some of the public about the resulting information; the Bureau has not asked a question on religion in a survey since that time.

Mr. HORN. Okay, you're thinking of the current population survey; is this what we're talking about?

Ms. MCKENNEY. Yes.

Mr. HORN. Okay. One last query. In his formal statement Mr. Walentynowicz said this – and I'd like to read it to you and get your response.

“For example, we wonder about the wisdom and fairness of including a question relating to race and national origin or descent for such groups as Spanish, Hispanic, Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Korean, Vietnamese, Guamanian, Samoan, Eskimo, and Aleut on every census form but limiting identification of Polish-American and other like groups to only the long census form which will be sent to only 21 percent of America's households.

We have been advised by the Census Bureau that such groups as Samoan, Eskimo, Aleut, Filipino, Korean, and Vietnamese are estimated to be so small in number and so dispersed, that an accurate count can only occur if the question is asked on all forms.”

What's your reaction to that concern?

Ms. MCKENNEY. For the geographical areas for which data are required, that statement is correct. I would like to provide some background information on this area. The racial groups were included on the 100 percent questionnaire for several reasons. Statistical Directive No. 15, issued by the Department of Commerce, indicated that data should be collected for certain groups – white, black, Asian and Pacific Islander, the American Indian and Alaskan Native, and the Hispanic; and test results showed that listing the Asian and Pacific Islander groups separately was the best approach for identifying and getting a count of the total Asian and Pacific Islander population and the specific groups.

In addition, several Federal agencies and State governments indicated that counts and characteristics of specific groups for States and small geographic areas were needed for implementation of laws and programs. Inclusion of these groups on a 100 percent basis was the most feasible procedure for obtaining the information required for the small geographic area.

Examples: Alaska and Federal agencies needed information on Aleuts and Eskimos, and Hawaii and Federal agencies requested data on Hawaiians, Samoans, etc.

Mr. HORN. That statistical directive comes from the Reorganization Act, which takes the old office of Statistical Standards out of OMB and puts it in Commerce.

Ms. MCKENNEY. That is correct.

Mr. HORN. To what degree did the Bureau of the Census help prepare that directive or is that statistical directive merely responding to affirmative action requests from the traditional enforcement

agencies of the Federal Government who have really seen only four categories broadly construed, Asian-American, American Indian, black, Hispanic, as those about which they should be concerned?

I mean, did you help prepare that and just send it back to yourself through the Department of Commerce, or did the enforcement agencies do it, or is it just responding to political pressure, et cetera?

Ms. MCKENNEY. I think that directive developed over a period of two or three years with participation from a rather broad group of Federal agencies. There was Census Bureau involvement in it.

However, it started out as a directive primarily concerning educational statistics, and then later expanded to statistical reporting of all Federal agencies.

MR. HORN. Okay. Thank you.

I think the message of all of this is, if somebody else wants themselves on these forms, organize and put pressure on the Government establishment; isn't that about it?

MR. SALTZMAN. I wonder, in terms of the various nomenclature that you suggested - ancestry, national origin, ethnic identification, heritage - what is the differentiation as you see it between these four terms?

Would we be confusing by using national origin and ethnic identification and heritage? That might just overcomplicate.

Can anyone on the panel give us some suggestions about that kind of category?

Ms. MCKENNEY. Ethnicity is perhaps the broadest term. In the academic area, the term ethnicity can encompass race, national origin, and religion. The Census Bureau uses ethnicity in a more narrow sense, differentiating it from race.

One of the reasons why we had not used the term "ethnicity" on the questionnaire is because some people in the communities do not understand it. In fact, we have found that it has been confused quite often with other words; for instance, some people think that we are talking about ethics. That's a problem that we have with using the word "ethnicity."

National origin would be more restrictive, referring primarily to country of origin.

The Bureau has used ancestry interchangeably with ethnicity; again, our experience suggests that people understand "ancestry" better than any other term, i.e., "ethnicity," "origin," or "heritage."

CHAIRMAN FLEMING. I'd like to say to Ms. McKenney, as Commissioner Horn did, that we do appreciate your being a witness again in connection with some of our explorations. As always, you provided us with a very clear statement as to just what the facts are relative to the current situation.

The suggestion has been made that we monitor what goes on in the Bureau of the Census. I think Ms. McKenney knows that we keep in rather close touch with the Bureau of the Census in connection with quite a number of issues, and undoubtedly that monitoring will continue.

The discussion that has taken place relative to terminology, again, illustrates how important it is. And my own experience in government has been that so often we're inclined to get impatient over discussions of this kind, and kind of dismiss them, and then also a point has been made here that I think is very important, that once an issue of this nature has been resolved, it's very, very important to carry forward an educational process, because even though those who participate in the resolution of the discussion may be in agreement, it does not follow that a lot of people out in the country will understand what has happened.

And also, I'm very appreciative of some of the insights that we have been given relative to the development of the decision-making process within the White House under two administrations. I think that this is very, very helpful to us, and I'm sure it is helpful to others.

Our time is over on this.

MR. RUIZ. I just have one question. Very briefly, why couldn't we just use "Polish ancestry" and "Italian ancestry," in a block?

CHAIRMAN FLEMING. What did you say?

MR. RUIZ. "Polish ancestry" or "Italian ancestry" in a block. Why couldn't we use that in the census?

MS. MCKENNEY. That approach would have required a listing of categories in the item, and while "Polish" and "Italian" would have been acceptable, there are other groups for which the most appropriate term to use would not have been clear.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. I appreciate your participation. This was very informative. Thank you so much, Dr. Flemming.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Yes. We are very, very grateful to you for the paper and for the discussion. It's been very helpful to us.

Ninth Session: Wrap-Up

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. By request, I'm changing the order here. Mr. Marciniak will be our first participant in the wrap-up session.

Mr. Marciniak is the President of the Institute of Urban Life and a Professor of Urban Studies at Loyola University in Chicago.

Hé is also Chairman of the Board of the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, has served the City of Chicago as Deputy Commission-

er of the Department of Development and Planning, and as Director of the Commission on Human Relations.

Author of two books and a frequent contributor of articles for national periodicals, he holds Bachelor's and Master's degrees from Loyola University.

We're delighted to have you with us.

MR. MARCINIAK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. We look forward to hearing from you.

**STATEMENT OF EDWARD A MARCINIAK
PROFESSOR OF URBAN STUDIES,
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY, CHICAGO**

In preparing this wrap-up, I asked a baker's dozen friends of mine who are university scholars, officials of human rights agencies, editors, public opinion specialists, and others to appraise your interest in the ethnic agenda – your interest in developing future directions and policy initiatives.

In addition, I talked to several of your presenters from yesterday and heard some of the presentations today. Four conclusions stand out for me.

The first is that the U.S. Civil Rights Commission has earned the respect of most Americans. There isn't any doubt about that. You've taken unpopular positions at unpopular times. You've backed up your policy initiatives with solid research; and on many occasions, you've voiced the moral conscience of America.

Last week a former Chairman of yours was quoted in the press as saying that "Being involved in the civil rights movement was something in which we really accomplished something. We changed this country more in one decade in the the 1960's than any movement has every changed anything."

There is no doubt that the Commission has had a distinguished past. The questions today are whether it has a future, whether the Commission's current agenda is relevant, whether the Commission's day-to-day strategies respond to real moral concerns in America.

The second conclusion is that the Commission is being asked to recognize the unique political character of today's thrust for equal rights and equal justice.

When an employment door is locked to someone because of his or her race, religion, or nationality, when a public accommodation is denied, it's a matter of simple justice – clear, unequivocal, simple justice.

The philosopher calls it commutative justice, exchange justice; equals are being treated unequally under the law, the U.S. law or God's law.

But when the thrust, as it has in the last decade or two, shifts to numerical counts of the number of people by race, religion, sex, or ethnic background in a given occupation, in a profession, or in a graduate school, when we start dealing with representation of these various groups in industry and government, justice is still involved. But it's a different kind.

The philosopher calls it distributive justice. What is a fair share? What is the entitlement of each group? How is the Nation's bounty to be distributed?

In a democratic society, all groups are directly affected by such allocations. All racial, all religious, and all ethnic groups not only have a vital stake in these allocations, but they also have a voice, because we do live in a democratic society; and so, to deny any group a voice in the distribution, in setting the fair share, is the denial of a civil right.

One of the many reasons that was repeated to me over the last three months as to why your interest in this subject was important was because of the declining allegiance to, the alienation from, and the continuing and growing disaffection with Government. People were being left out, the Government wasn't paying attention to them, to their needs, and so on. Your interest in them was very important because perhaps there was some contribution that the U.S. Civil Rights Commission could make in the way in which it approached the question of leveling off some of this growing disaffection.

The third conclusion was that not one of the people I consulted thought it inappropriate for the U.S. Civil Rights Commission to focus on the ethnic agenda and to deal with it as forthrightly as it has with other agendas.

The fourth conclusion is that the Commission is being asked, I think, and I've heard it already, to identify common agendas and unifying strategies. In so doing, the Commission's own agenda, its research and publications, the work of its staff, the role of State Advisory Commissions, will need to take some new directions aimed at coalition building in support of what the statute creating the Commission sought to achieve.

Let me cite a few examples of what I heard. There is considerable evidence that the Ku Klux Klan is growing and becoming openly militant. Historically, the Klan has been racist, anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic.

Now why shouldn't the Civil Rights Commission examine the similarities and differences in these three forms of group oppression? Identifying the consequences of this prejudice and discrimination for the victims and for the U.S. society as a whole - that's a bridge building effort.

Another study, another public hearing, or another report, could deal with the role of ethnic communities and ethnic institutions in managing racial diversity and enhancing cultural pluralism in the major cities of the United States.

I think we don't know what's being done in this area at all. There is some work being done in the suburbs, but in terms of the way in which this has been handled and in the way in which it could be handled in the future this could be an extremely important bridge building effort.

As part of this inquiry, the Commission might look at the amazing experience of inner city, Catholic and other private schools: how small schools, how strong leadership from principals, how student discipline have created excellent schools for children of the poor, regardless of race or religion.

Another item: Nowhere is the failure of public policy which ignores ethnicity in cultural pluralism so evident as it is in public education. Nowhere.

The lack of sensitivity by the courts and public agencies, Federal and local, to such cultural, heritage, and language needs is clearly evident among students of Hispanic origins. There is notable evidence that the Hispanic student is not being served well by the existing educational system.

It is difficult. You'd have to be blind to ignore the alarming statistics of low reading scores, high drop-out rates, and the ensuing unemployment and under-employment.

I know that the U.S. Civil Rights Commission has held public hearings, sponsored its Mexican-American education study in the early 1970's, but the deplorable situation prevails.

Here, I think, the responsiveness of Catholic and other private, inner-city schools to the specific needs of ethnic groups, including Hispanics and blacks, has a lot to tell public educators. The Commission could be the vehicle for transmitting that experience and knowledge.

Another item in the 1979 report, "Insurance Redlining, Fact, Not Fiction" issued jointly by the Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin Advisory Committees to the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, is a small step in a new direction. A small step.

The major finding of this investigation was that property insurance was more difficult to obtain in neighborhoods with a concentration of minority or lower income residents or older homes than in other communities.

Then the report inched toward, but finally ducked, the ethnic agenda. Every observer of the urban scene knows well that inner-city ethnic neighborhoods have as terrible a time getting insurance

coverage at moderate rates as the ones that were talked about there. Why not say that, in addition – not in place of – but in addition?

Another item: To the best of my knowledge, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission ignored one of the pioneering attempts in this country to build such bridges and establish common agendas among ethnic, racial, and religious groups.

Dr. Russell Barta, who appeared here earlier, published his minority report entitled “The Representation of Poles, Italians, Latins, and Blacks in the Executive Suites of Chicago’s Largest Corporations.” This was taken from his research in 1974.

That study was ecumenically designed for the precise reasons that you’re having this two-day consultation. While some university centers and other institutions around the country replicated this study for a handful of cities, no effort was made to undertake a national study by any Government agency. What a tragedy!

With your resources, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission could undertake a similar study of *Fortune’s* 500 lists of industrial and nonindustrial giants.

A final suggestion. I think you’ve heard it in several different ways today, but I’d like to tell it to you my way.

The most recent issue of *Civil Rights Update* attempts to justify the expression “Euro-ethnic Americans” by saying that it “is a term preferred by descendants of eastern and southern immigrants.”

I have searched high and low for a study or report which indicated such a preference. I have talked to several dozen scholars of ethnicity and found not even one who would express such a preference.

Now, your choice of expression reminds me of Mrs. Ladonna Harris’ experience as a commencement speaker at an eastern college. As you know, she is the wife of that distinguished Oklahoman, former Senator Fred Harris, and in her commencement address she said, “You’ve made me an Indian; I happen to be a Comanche.”

“There are Cree, Sioux, Apache, Cherokee, Navajo, and others, but you have turned them into Indians,” and I think that’s what everybody’s afraid of; you’re going to turn them into Euro-ethnics.

In conclusion, may I remind you that what I propose here and what others have proposed is not a new idea. John Kromkowski, President of the National Center, described to you yesterday the successes and rebuffs of the Bicentennial Ethnic Racial Coalition in the 1970’s.

There are other experiences of this kind. You don’t have to start from scratch here on this point. You will find experiences all over. Paul Ascioilla mentioned some here in Chicago.

If you look around, you will find that there have been remarkable experiences in this country in the 1970’s, on which you could build.

That would give you the opportunity for exercising the leadership – a renewed leadership – in the 1980's.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Thank you very much.

It's now my privilege to recognize a veteran in this area, a long-time friend of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Monsignor Geno Baroni. As most of you here know, Geno Baroni has served in the Department of Housing and Urban Development as the Assistant Secretary for Neighborhoods, voluntary associations, and consumer protection for the past 2 1/2 years.

He has long been a national leader in urban neighborhood affairs, and has worked extensively with neighborhood groups to form coalitions on convergent issues.

He has had leadership roles in four White House conferences: Youth, civil rights, hunger-nutrition, ethnicity and neighborhood revitalization.

He was appointed by President Carter to be the Administration's liaison to the National Commission on Neighborhoods, a commission which he helped to bring into existence.

Monsignor Baroni, we're delighted to have you with us and look forward to your summing up.

**STATEMENT OF FATHER GENO BARONI
ASSISTANT SECRETARY, OFFICE OF NEIGHBORHOODS,
VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS AND CONSUMER PROTECTION
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

Thank you very much, Dr. Flemming and members of the Commission. I have to say that I admire your patience. I've been before many Senate and House hearings, and they don't have your kind of stamina to stick it out.

I must say that over the years you've provided distinguished leadership in so many areas and I'm pleased to support the remarks that Marciniak has made here; and I guess what I want to share with you are some of my ideas of where to go from here. I mean you have specifics, you have generalities, even the name and so on, as Ed Marciniak is saying.

So I feel like I've been to an alumni meeting here. In one sense or another everything seems to be very much connected.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. I kind of had that feeling.

FATHER BARONI. It's my own experience, and two things come to mind. One is that many of my friends in here say, "Well, you left the ethnic agenda when you were co-opted by the Government, especially when you went to the Department of Housing and Urban Development."

Well, that's not necessarily true, because there I continue to see the problem. I can't find integrated schools; we can't put housing in certain neighborhoods. At a meeting this morning in Chicago, we can't find anybody in Chicago who knows how to start from scratch – how to integrate a project before we build. Nobody has that state-of-the-art.

A black group in a black neighborhood wants to integrate a project with black, Hispanic, and white in a neighborhood right near the University of Chicago.

That expertise, that state-of-the-art, hardly exists. But we have these experiences every day.

Last week the President of Aetna, one of the largest corporations, finally sat down with six neighborhood groups to try to resolve some of the problems of insurance redlining, black groups, Hispanic groups, mixed neighborhoods, changing neighborhoods, older neighborhoods and so on.

All these things indicate something, that if we want to look at where we go and what the future is and some of things that people have been saying here, and my own experience and I think what's happened in our society – when I approached the Civil Rights Commission 10 years ago to discuss this question, we did not get any kind of response.

In one way, that's sad; in the other way, maybe it's just as well. But you would not have had the experience and the talent and the in-depth kind of presentation as you've had here; and also, the perspective that most of the people that testified here have, a perspective of being concerned about ethnic issues, the understanding, the moral agenda, as Ed said, that created the Commission, and particularly in terms of civil rights and particularly in terms of race and where the country was headed and the white supremacy of the past and all those kinds of issues, that there is hardly a person here that doesn't understand that somehow and some way, in a democracy, in a free and open society, we may be the only place in the world where we have a chance to accommodate people of all kinds of diversity; and, whereas many of us were taught to melt or get off the pot, as I would say, many of us were raised to grow and to imitate or to become an all-American or to become whatever, and so on; and yet to recognize – you know, my friends here are very anxious about my quotations because we keep passing them on to one or the other – that I'm very, very sensitive to the fact, okay, we have these value variations in this common humanity.

But what we don't have and what the Commission might help us to do and what our American society needs – because what happens in our American society very much is going to foretell what happens in our foreign policy and what's happening in the world.

When I started the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, coming out of 10 years of street civil rights experiences and all that, half of my friends told me I was crazy. Americans are scared silly of the word "ethnic."

But it was never legitimate; it was never kosher; we never thought of ourselves as a pluralistic society. We never thought of ourselves in terms of unity and diversity, in terms of how to preserve the one in order to take care of the many.

And what's happening around the world – and I recommend to the Commission the classic study by Harold Isaacs on power and identity in foreign policy – and what's even happening in Iran.

Only a few months ago, in the *New York Times*, December, 1978, the CIA told a *New York Times* reporter that there were no fears of this person, Ayatollah Khomeini. He had no support at all. Six months later, the American Government ordered a massive study of Moslem institutions in the Moslem religious world.

We have no idea why people are so afraid of the word "ethnic." How many people have been killed; how many societies have fallen apart? Whereas, we're a global society, technological. Our society is fragmented. No other place in the world, no other countries in the world, have the mechanism to deal with diversity, whether it's religious or racial or ethnic.

American society is one of the few mechanisms that's left, and one of the reasons many American ethnics are so sensitive, so ambivalent, so anxious to be American, is that we don't want to question whatever we've been taught, and so, you know, we don't learn the language of our father and mother. The teacher said not to.

Okay. The teacher said that because we wanted to be, quote, "American." Somewhere, there was this automatic idea of "Americans" but we don't know who they are or where they are.

One of the points that I want to make about something that we have to deal with goes with what Ed Marciniak said. (I keep wanting to call him Doctor.) We desperately need to legitimize the fact that we're not a melting pot. We're the most ethnically, racially, religiously, pluralistic country in the world.

Let's learn to deal with that. Dr. Rene DuBois talks about tolerance. Diversity is necessary for survival and for the accommodation of a free and open society. So our democratic form of government gives us a common bond. The Declaration, the Bill of Rights, the Constitution, and the kinds of things that the Civil Rights Commission has raised to remind us of that, are very appropriate vehicles.

What we don't have at the day-to-day working level in our communities in our neighborhoods, is somebody in the Department of Housing and Urban Development who knows or understands what

we're talking about here today in the context of race and ethnicity or of blacks or Hispanics or whites or class or regions or different parts of the country.

I was in Alaska recently, and we built some housing there. It was terribly expensive – \$125,000 a unit for two little rooms. Then we built a community center. Of course they have to have a community center.

Well, we went back in the spring and found that eight of the houses were missing. What happened? The native group all moved into the community center. They tore down the eight houses and used them for firewood. Nobody had asked them how to build the houses. Nobody had offered them the options.

We are not a culture of democracy. We've never understood the importance of culture in democracy. I wish I could elaborate on why we're so scared of the word "ethnic" and "diversity". Between 1945 and 1967, 7,480,000 people were killed in over a hundred different ethnic, racial, and religious battles in the world, whether it was Hindus and Moslems in India, whether it's Indian and Moslems in Pakistan, tribal wars in Nigeria, Chad, Sudan, Arabs and Israelis, Indonesians killing Chinese in Indonesia, Chinese killing Tibetans in Tibet, Malays killing Chinese in Malaysia, Indians killing Nagas in Assam and so on, Protestants and Catholics in Ulster, Moslems and Christians in Lebanon, Buddhists and Zengalese and Hindutamalese in Ceylon and Greeks in Cyprus and Kurds and Iraqis and Iranians and Ethiopians, Eritreans and Somalis and on and on and on, Christian-Filipinos and Moslems, on and on and on.

Nowhere in the world is there a mechanism to deal with this thing that keeps coming up. This soft fact of life.

We can talk about the hard facts: America's energy, America's size, America's resources, America's technology and all of that. But the soft facts are those things that are related to ethnicity: race, culture, and diversity.

And I wanted to sum up with an analysis of that: why the Commission, in terms of what it can do and where it's going to go, and what we desperately need if we're going to learn how to live together in our cities and society, and how this affects international policy as well, is summed up in this analysis when we talk about this crucial fact.

Many things, the issues of power and economics, the issue of new technologies, life-creating as well as life-destroying, that will govern the kind of America that will exist and what kind of world in the time to come.

But if our behavior in world affairs is to have more for its object than our sheer brute survival, it has to be based on the maintenance of the democratic and open society that we're trying to create.

Sixty percent of the American people voted when I went to inner city Washington in 1960. In the last few years, 60 percent of the American people have not voted. Somebody mentioned alienation toward government. Why is that so? I don't know if that comes under your mandate or not; you do voting issues as well, I know.

But here is the most crucial soft American fact of all. The model of the democratic open society is what we counterpoise with the assorted models of the closed and increasingly closing societies that now rule most of the world.

The model of inclusiveness and shared rights of accommodation of differences of race, origin, religion, is a model that we counterpoise in deeply bloody we-they tribal, racial, ethnic, religious, and national conflicts that are now tearing the globe into many pieces at a time when it needs, more than anything else, to exist as some kind of tolerably functioning whole.

With the decline and change of national empires, we have 90 new governments and 50-odd older governments, all of them having problems internally on these issues.

Most of the politics created by this fragmentation around the world may be inaccessible to the direct impact of American policy abroad.

But the best that we can hope to do is to be aware enough of its particulars not to stumble over them as we have been doing and to take them into account as we pursue our own interests.

We made the mistake in Indochina; we talked about nationalism. The Chinese and the Vietnamese and the Cambodians were all fighting each other, communist or otherwise, because the nationalist thing is stronger. It reminds me of Tasio Paz' quotation in terms of this. Past epics never vanish completely, and blood still drips from their wounds, even most ancient.

In a global society, there are no deserts; there are no islands. We see the body counts on TV, by our technology, in a fragmented world. There's not any rain forest far enough away to keep these collisions – racial, ethnic, religious, national origin – isolated from international politics.

The best that we can hope for, in terms of stumbling around in our international politics, is to look at our situation here at home. In a far more ineffable way, this world condition is accessible to the impact of our American behavior here.

It's the only existing model in the world. We should cease stumbling as we begin to legitimize some of the kinds of facts and concerns that have been expressed today. The Rabbi asked a very important kind of question. In our American society there is no journalism; there is no forum; there is no political language; there is no newspaper language;

there is no educational language – to deal with the intercultural imperative of American life.

We argue about terminology – even the name of this meeting. We're very uncomfortable. The word "ethnic" drives people crazy, "first-generation", "heritage" and so on. We don't have the language to describe ourselves, and America has no national sense of identity, no national sense of purpose. America is in the business, like everywhere else in the world, of redefining itself. Who am I and who are we as Americans? What has been our experience?

Taking the documents that we have – the Constitution and Declaration, Bill of Rights – and finding those experiences, can help us to accommodate the diversity.

But much isn't there. There's no commission, nobody in Government, nobody in the media showing us the state of the art. They want to exacerbate the fights between group, but nobody is giving us examples of how to deal with them. I met with Filer of Aetna, and he says, "My people in the insurance company don't know how to talk to neighborhood people, be they black, be they Hispanic, be they ethnic, be they Indian, be they whatever."

We talk different languages. We have no mechanisms to talk to each other. We have no kinds of forums to assure all people who are Americans the equality of status and opportunity which in theory all are supposed to enjoy.

We're engaged in trying to see whether the common holdings shared by Americans in all our diversity can provide a setting in which different kinds of people can coexist with decent mutual respect and acceptance, instead of tearing each other from limb to limb. In short, we're trying to see whether we can finally create a "one" that will preserve "the many."

Now, it is one of our greatest soft assets, that the goals and the values of our society - modern, egalitarian, humane - are to pacify almost everyone who comes here and who still looks to the future rather than to the past for human betterment.

The totalitarians keep calling themselves "democratic." I watched even Khomeini claim that he's ruling, "in the name of the people," and it looks like another Jimmy Jones.

But, anyway, as limited and qualified as our achievement might be, the American society has come closer to realizing these goals than any other society.

Now the question is: Where do we go from here? Where do we go? What are the kinds of things in our soft quality of American life that we'll take along with the hard stuff, i.e., our size, our strength, and our energy to shape the American position in terms of dealing with our diversity? I think that is the most important single thing that will shape

the American position in world affairs, and that the shape of much of the rest of the world's politics will be influenced in critical measure by what we make of our own.

So we're at a critical point – the melting pot is gone; the myth lingers. I was at a meeting at Harvard this weekend with people from the Kennedy School. There were many young people and many people from neighborhoods – black, Hispanic, white, and other. All kinds of people were trying to struggle with ways in which people can deal with each other.

This Commission should take up some of the suggestions that Mr. Marciniak and others made and take a look at America. Or do we need a new Commission to answer the questions about the cultural dimension of American life? What is the meaning of diversity and pluralism in American life? What is the meaning of the intercultural imperative of American life, and what is the meaning of America's racial, ethnic, cultural, and religious life-style diversity? What are those implications in terms of the Constitution, Bill of Rights, Declaration of Independence? That's a new kind of agenda in terms that will serve the purpose and mandate of the Commission from its beginning.

One of the things that we felt many times as ethnics is that many "liberal friends" would be dumping on us although perhaps they live next to blacks and Hispanics in older neighborhoods; and that's how many of us got into this.

We got into this because we saw what the Kerner Report said. The inevitable group conflict between rising aspirations of minorities and others, and the anxious fears of many lower middle-class Americans who happen to be white.

What's an alternative to that inevitable group conflict? What's an alternative to that? What mechanisms do we have? What kind of coping do we have, and why don't people in Government look at this? I think the reason is that we have not legitimately defined our society in a way that includes all people and in a way that legitimizes those of us who want to respect the cultural and racial diversity of others and who want to deal with equality and justice for all.

I think underneath all of these complaints and all of our concerns and all of our anxieties about being blamed or put down is that fundamental belief that the American system and its mechanisms and its institutions can be the model. If the Commission can't take the lead, then who can? Do we need to ask for a new vehicle in the 1980's to look at this kind of question?

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING: Thank you very, very much.

I'm sure that I express the views of my colleagues when I say to both of those who have provided us with this roundup that we're deeply grateful to you for the issues you've identified.

We definitely will keep them in mind as we review the record of this hearing and decide our next steps.

I like the emphasis that has recurred time and time again – Monsignor Baroni has underlined it a good many times – mainly, that we are a pluralistic society and that we must work out ways and means of carrying on our life with that fact in mind and do it within the framework of the Constitution of the United States.

There is no question at all in my mind but that this is a very relevant subject for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, and we will see just where we go from here.

I do want to express for all of those who are still here and who participated in this consultation my – our very deep appreciation for the contributions that you have made.

My colleague writes me a note; he says he has a word to substitute for Euro-ethnics.

Mr. Ruiz, what is it?

COMMISSIONER RUIZ . Every day new words to characterize an event or a situation are being coined within our constantly growing vocabulary. The Department of Census is at a loss to identify ethnics.

It has been stated that none of the experts can idle up to the word "Euro-ethnics." For example, the words "United Nations" never existed until recently. We can see that if we look back just a few years.

If we can include a thousand languages under the umbrella of "United Nations," why could we not characterize what we are groping for as "United Ethnics of America?"

We are looking for a category, for unity within American ethnics. I believe that that probably merits some consideration.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. For all of us, certainly the Commission, this has been a very stimulating and challenging experience, and we're indebted to all of you.

Thank you very, very much. This consultation is adjourned.

U. S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20425

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE \$300

FOURTH CLASS MAIL
POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
PERMIT NO. G73

