

R1.2.Ew7

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

02



**Thurgood Marshall Law Library
The University of Maryland School of Law**

**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 white working 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 (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 (Komarovskiy 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 Gercens, 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 “backlash.” *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 a 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 BERK experience that is in the body of my paper.

BERK-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, BERC 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. BERC avoided narrowness and divisive ethnocentrism, while it emphasized the richness that regional, cultural, and religious groups have contributed to the American experience.

The BERC 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 BERC 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 BERC. Persons engaged in policy studies can play a catalyzing and developmental role in formulating initiatives which are consonant with the BERC 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 BERC 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 BERC, he was not talking about Edmund Burke, B-u-r-k-e, although there might be an occasional analogy; he was talking about BERC, 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. ALIBERTI. 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 religio-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 Officer, 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 “inharmoonious 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 inharmoonious 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, “inharmoonious 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 inharmoonious 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-low-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 companionate 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 genericem* 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.

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; Wojniesz, 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
	75.0	106	141	100.0	989
		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.
- Lieberson, Stanley. "Ethnic Groups and the Practice of Medicine." *American Sociological Review* 23, No. 5 (October, 1958): 542-549.
- Lieberson, Stanley. *Ethnic Patterns in American Cities*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1963. Press, 1965.
- Lieberson, Stanley. "Life Styles of Elderly Urbanites: Chicago of the 1970's." *The Gerontologist* 5, No. 1 Part 1 (February, 1975): 35-41.
- Lieberson, Stanley. 'Polish Immigration to the United States of America: Problems of Estimation and Parameters.' *The Polish Review* 21, No. 4 (1976a): 85-108.
- Lieberson, Stanley. *Polish Americans: Status, Competition in an Ethnic Community*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1976b.
- Lieberson, 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 prevailing 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. Guttman 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 meritocrats 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 meritocrats, 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 distantiation 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 effects 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* cognitive 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 university 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 implementation 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.
- Gutek, 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

⁷ For 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 Tokyo 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 ethical 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 clear-sightedness 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.]