

ETHNICITY AND SOCIAL SERVICES: SOME POLICY PERSPECTIVES

By Marvin L. Rosenberg, D.S.W.*

As the United States enters the 1980s, policy makers will confront a burgeoning demand for social services from all segments of American society. The statistical indicators are all around us. The number of divorced families today exceeds the divorce rate at the turn of the century by 700 percent.¹ Four out of ten children born in the last decade will have to cope with growing up in a single parent household.² A recently released Department of Labor report states that during the past decade, the number of American families headed by women has increased from 5.6 million to 8.5 million or one of every seven families.³ In human terms, this means that millions of single parents will need counseling and supportive social programs. Millions of children from broken homes will need child development programs, therapy, and residential treatment. The fact that 5.5 million wives have entered the labor force in the past ten years adds child day care to the growing needs of the changing American family.⁴

A 5-year increase in life expectancy since 1950 will result in an elderly population of about 25 million (about 11%) by 1980.⁵ In many cities, the elderly already constitute between 15 and 16 percent of the total community.⁶ Persons over 75 years of age, who are most likely to need social services, constitute the fastest growing segment of the population.⁷ Thus, there will be millions of older people in need of services to cope with the loss of spouses and friends, help them find new goals after retirement, and provide them with new opportunities to preserve their mental health. For those elderly too frail and impaired to be mobile, there will be a need for long term care services, such as, homemakers, meals on wheels, friendly visitors, and transportation. More institutions will be needed for those too incapacitated to remain at home.

In addition, millions of mentally ill patients have been deinstitutionalized, only to be cast into the community's back wards, such as flop houses and broken down tenements. These people, in addition to the

* Associate Professor, School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University.

¹ Statistical Abstract of the U.S. 1978, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Census.

² *Ibid.*

³ "Dept. of Labor Report," *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, Nov. 1, 1979.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 1978.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ "The Well Being of Old People in Cleveland, Ohio," Report to the Congress, Comptroller General's Office, April 1977.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, Statistical Abstract of the U.S. 1978.

severely mentally retarded and their families, as well as the homebound physically disabled, are largely dependent populations needing multiple social services.

What these statistics signify for social services, particularly with regard to ethnic Euro-Americans, is the central issue of my presentation today.

As a society, our first line of support has, and will continue to be, the family. Despite the rash of books and articles about the "me" society and the "culture of narcissism," the research evidence indicates that the large majority of American families do assume great responsibility for their dependent or incapacitated family members. A recent study of the elderly in Cleveland, conducted by the U.S. General Accounting Office, noted that 80% of all social services are provided by members of the older person's family.⁸ Among early immigrant groups, such as European ethnics, the ethos of self-help and total reliance on the family is especially strong. These findings, however, must be tempered by the statistics mentioned earlier, which indicate the stress on the American family today. In addition, the birth rate is plunging downward, leaving fewer adult children to care for their aging parents or dependent relatives in the future. With the increase in life expectancy, many elderly, who are themselves retired will have an older parent to care for as well, and inflation is causing married women, who have traditionally performed caretaking roles in the family, to enter the job market. Thus, the fact that families are the primary caregivers at present does not mean that they can maintain that role under adverse conditions. Nor should families be expected to shoulder the entire burden of caring for one of their members who is mentally ill, retarded, frail, impaired, or physically handicapped. The costs, the physical demands, and the emotional strain often lead to breakdown of the entire family. Social agencies, both public and voluntary, must provide supplemental and supportive services to such families in times of adversity.

The increasing needs within the American populace require a re-examination of public policies affecting the family and religious and cultural institutions, as well as the importance of the local neighborhood. Consideration must be given to issues that bear directly on the relationship between ethnicity and service delivery. Such a re-examination, however, necessitates a clear understanding of past developments in social policy.

⁸ *Op. cit.*

Legislative Background

Before the late 1960's, the services I have described, which I will call personal social services, were largely neglected by federal government. They were the exclusive province of voluntary agencies and sometimes state and local government. The Federal emphasis, ten years ago, was on income maintenance and fostering a power base for the poor. At that time, an ideological debate pitted economic provisions such as income, jobs, and housing against personal social services such as counseling, day care, and residential treatment. It is now recognized that this is a false dichotomy. While money and jobs may well take priority over personal social services, inadequate services lead to a deteriorating society.

It has also been recognized that a group can be disadvantaged without necessarily suffering poverty or racial discrimination. The elderly, the handicapped, the blind and mentally retarded, along with other disadvantaged groups, are victims of stereotyping and discrimination and are in need of government help. Incapacitated and dependent people are found in every racial, ethnic, and socio-economic group in American society. Certainly, poverty and discrimination compound their suffering.

The growing recognition by government that social services cannot be for the poor alone has led to a series of legislative acts appropriating federal funds for services to different categories of clients. The most prominent of these is Title XX of the Social Security Act, the Older Americans Act and the Community Mental Health Centers Act. For the first time in American history, the federal government was given a central role in the financing of social services. Federal appropriations for personal social services rose from 746 million in 1971 to almost five billion in 1973.⁹

Fragmentation and Lack of Coordination

This rapid expansion in public spending created hundreds of new Federal, state, and local agencies. Each act had its own administrative rules and regulations requiring separate state agencies. The result is that each categorical program had different eligibility criteria, different policy objectives, and different conceptions of service boundaries.

The present system is a fragmented, chaotic, multiplicity of public bureaucracies and voluntary agencies that are often inaccessible, unresponsive, and insensitive to the people who most need help.

Perhaps the most penetrating criticism of the problem was made by Elliott Richardson, in 1973, when he was Secretary of HEW. He stated:

⁹ Paul E. Mott, *Meeting Human Needs: The Social and Political History of Title XX*, National Conference on Social Welfare, Columbus, Ohio, 1976, p. 22.

Since 1961, the number of HEW programs has tripled and now exceeds 300. Fifty four of these programs overlap each other; thirty six overlap programs of other departments. This almost random proliferation has fostered the development of a ridiculous labyrinth of bureaucracies, regulations, and guidelines. . . . The average state now has between 80 and 100 separate service administrations and the average middle-sized city between 400 and 500 human service providers, each of which is more typically organized in relation to a federal program than in relation to a set of human problems. . . . The chances are less than one in five that a client referred from one service to another will ever get there; the present maze encourages fragmentation.¹⁰

The emergence of Title XX in the mid-seventies, while adding to the dollars, also added to the picture of fragmentation.

Compounding the problem is a new governmental emphasis on scientific management and fiscal accountability. While both principles are necessary, their application is often mindless and has led to excessive data reporting requirements and invasions of client confidentiality. Social programs within the bureaucratic maze are carried out with a uniformity that fails to consider how to effectively reach diverse populations who need help.

It is important to differentiate the various types of social welfare policies. Some are clearly universal and therefore need not be sensitive to ethnic differences or neighborhood. Others, which are of a more personal nature, require trust and consumer participation. For example, a universal program which mails a social security check or pays a Medicare claim is far more impersonal than a program to help a discharged mental patient or support a family trying to maintain an elderly person at home. The essence of personal social services hinges on the trusting relationship between the local community and the agency, and between the helper and the client.

The Consequences of Impersonality

Impersonal bureaucracies that are stigmatized because of association with public welfare, that have elaborate intake procedures and means tests, cannot be effective in delivering personal social services. This is particularly true for Americans of Euro-ethnic background. Among earlier immigrant groups, an anti-welfare, self-reliant tradition is strong. Newer European refugees, fleeing tyranny from totalitarian regimes, tend to view governmental bureaucracies with defiance and distrust. Reaching out and serving these client groups requires intimate knowledge of their life styles and value systems.

¹⁰ Cleveland *Plain Dealer*, April 21, 1973.

There is growing concern that excessive standardization and uniformity will alienate ethnic groups from public and voluntary organizations. A casual stroll through the Little Italies, the older Jewish neighborhoods, Hungarian neighborhoods, and other nationality enclaves, immediately reveals local social patterns that are different from those found in the suburbs of other inner city areas. There is also a growing body of research which documents the importance of ethnicity and neighborhood as key factors in the willingness of people to use social services, particularly among working class ethnic populations. (I use Greely's term "ethnicity" to mean, "peoplehood, a sense of commonality or community derived from networks of family relations that have over the generations been the carriers of common experience.")¹¹

By analyzing secondary data, Greely has uncovered fascinating evidence that many present traits of second and third generation immigrant families in the United States resemble ethnic cultural traits found in their ancestral countries of origin.¹²

Giordano has identified several studies which point to ethnic differences in specific areas. Value orientations, definition of family roles, responses to physical and mental illness, utilization rates of mental health facilities, and the incidence of mental disorders vary significantly among different Euro-ethnic populations.¹³

Both researchers reject assimilation or melting pot conceptions as a way of understanding ethnic groups.

Let me briefly highlight selected research findings that offer some perspective on this issue of cultural diversity. In an impressive study of attitudes of Euro-ethnic families toward the elderly, Fandetti found that 82 percent of a random sample of Baltimore's ethnic residents "indicated their feelings that their relatives could not be comfortable in homes for the aged staffed by individuals from different ethnic backgrounds. A key factor was language. The sample included people from different ethnic groups, including Greeks, Italians, Poles, and Germans." The conclusion was that "ethnic staffing of old age homes was important for "'old timers'" with limited language ability." When asked where long-term care services for the elderly should be delivered in the community, the respondents stated their highest preference to be the Catholic Church or local ethnic organizations.¹⁴

¹¹ "Report of the Special Population Subpanel on Mental Health of Americans of European Ethnic Origins," p. 877. (Submitted to the President's Committee on Mental Health, Feb. 1978)

¹² Greely, A., *Why Can't They be Like Us?* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1971).

¹³ Joseph Giordano and Grace Giordano, "The Ethno-Cultural Factor in Mental Health," Institute on Pluralism and Group Identity, American Jewish Committee, New York, 1977.

¹⁴ Donald Fandetti and Donald Gelfand, "Care of the Aged: Attitudes of White Ethnic Families," *The Gerontologist* 16:6, 1976.

Another study, by Fandetti and Gelfand, stresses the importance of family, friends, and local networks in relation to mental health services. The distant or impersonal mental health center is not seen as an acceptable place to seek help among working class Americans of European heritage. Mental health specialists frequently are not perceived as appropriate agents for meeting problems that are beyond the expertise of the family and the local community.¹⁵

My own research with the Jewish community of Cleveland indicates similar patterns. Among elderly Jews, there is enormous resistance to using personal social services not provided under Jewish auspices. It should be noted, that in general, when people are having serious personal or family problems, or need help to cope with a crisis, they tend to shy away from organized services of any kind. There is still considerable stigma attached to the notion of seeking help, whether for alcoholism, a poor marriage, depression, or a disturbed child. When public policy completely standardizes the way in which services must be delivered, the barriers to utilization are further intensified. There is ample evidence that people are more likely to seek and use help if it is available in a local neighborhood and is delivered under auspices that are regarded as friendly and non-bureaucratic. In addition, staff of such agencies must be trained so they are attuned to the variations in values, life style, and help-seeking patterns of the constituencies they serve. For some neighborhoods, this may mean knowledge of Italian, Russian, or Yiddish. In one area, it may mean sensitivity to religious differences; in another, it may be an awareness of differences between rural and urban life styles.

An important caveat to my previous discussion pertains to the importance of social class. Most of the research and experience I have cited is based on samples of lower income, working class populations, where these culturally different characteristics seem to persist into third and fourth generations. Some new research dealing with middle class Italians, not yet published by Fandetti, suggests that ethnic identification largely dissipates when income, occupation, and educational status appreciably increase. This finding must be regarded cautiously since Columbia, Maryland may be very atypical of other American cities. More research is needed to verify such conclusions. In any case, it does not alter our concern, since the bulk of people who use social agencies, public or voluntary, are poor or lower middle class. There is considerable evidence that affluent people, regardless of ethnic origin, prefer to pay for services in the market place rather than seek help from social agencies. They go to private counselors, psychiatrists, homemakers, and other proprietary services. Indeed, this

¹⁵ Donald Fandetti and Donald Gelfand, "Attitudes Toward Symptoms and Services in the Ethnic Family and Neighborhood," *Amer. Journal of Orthopsychiatry* (July 1978).

suggests the plausibility of a policy in which low income people would receive vouchers, so they would have the same freedom of choice as their more affluent counterparts.

In discussing the apparent governmental insensitivity to different ethnic groups and to the concepts of neighborhood and family, it is important *not* to make global generalizations. The fact is that some policies and programs are more sensitive than others, and in some areas of the country, public officials are wiser and more sensitive than in other places. It is the lack of a clear-cut public policy, based on solid research, that allows so much confusion and contradictory policy to prevail. Let me illustrate some of the differences in philosophy and contradictory policies that plague social agencies and confuse clients. Title VII, of the Older Americans Act, provides funds for congregate meals for older people. Under this legislation, a means test is explicitly prohibited. However, this same service is also provided under Title XX and does require a means test. In areas of high poverty, however, individual eligibility can be waived and the principle of group eligibility can be applied. There are many agencies and small churches that have purchase-of-service contracts through Title XX and through Title VII, and they must somehow reconcile these contradictory eligibility requirements. This confusion is only the tip of the iceberg. Each state interprets the federal regulations in its own way. Sometimes this works in favor of Euro-ethnics; sometimes certain of their benefits are lost.

These bureaucratic hurdles add one more obstacle to making services easily accessible and responsive to the people who need them. Furthermore, data reporting and proposal writing procedures are so complex and ambiguous, that small voluntary agencies or neighborhood churches are discouraged from applying for government funding and therefore are unable to deliver vital services.

Pluralism, Civil Rights, and Government Funding

The issue of whether sectarian agencies should receive government funds is also riddled with ambiguity and contradictory civil rights interpretations. Under some legislation, such as the Older Americans Act, contracts for services are often awarded precisely because an agency is sectarian or neighborhood based and under the auspices of an ethnic organization. There is a recognition that this approach to service delivery would facilitate reaching the largest number of people in need, since such an organization would be trusted and accepted by prospective consumers. Obviously, agencies receiving such funds must comply with civil rights law and cannot discriminate against other consumers who seek the services. Thus, a congregate meals

program in a Jewish community center would serve kosher food but would also serve any non-Jewish client willing to eat a kosher meal.

A mental health board, awarding contracts to agencies serving discharged mental patients, provides a contradictory illustration. In a number of cities, such funding bodies have refused grant applications from Catholic, Jewish, or ethnic agencies, because they would not serve an entire catchment area. From a mental health rehabilitation standpoint, this is disturbing. Often, the only remaining link to reality for a mental patient is identification with his ethnic or religious group. Programming in ethnic and sectarian agencies stresses a sense of community, of ethnic tradition, and common cultural heritage. Why should such agencies be refused mental health funding? Throughout the country, funding policies are ambiguous and the interpretation of civil rights laws and regulations varies from place to place. Because of this ambiguity, many of the issues are now being brought before the courts. In effect, public social policy is being decided by judges whose opinions are substitutes for the legislative process.

Legal Dilemmas

To sharpen this dilemma, I would like to pose two partially hypothetical situations to the Commission. One involves an order of nuns who want to provide special social services to unmarried mothers of Mexican-American heritage. The nuns do not want to serve other populations because the effectiveness of their program requires a very special approach. Government funds are being refused because of this selectivity. The local public agency wants the nuns to serve everyone in the area who seeks services, despite the fact that there are other agencies available to serve other young unmarried mothers. My question is, "What is legally right and morally right in such a situation?" A second situation involves a Jewish nursing home that voluntarily admitted two Black residents several years ago. The condition of administration at that time was that the home was Jewish, the programming was Jewish-oriented, and the food was kosher. Now some years later, the two black residents want to sue the home for not serving them food that is more in keeping with their own ethnic traditions. Since this would involve pork products, complying with the request of the two residents would be extremely offensive to the other residents of this institution. Does the home have a right to remain kosher?

These illustrations highlight the central social policy dilemma for the nation: if we are an essentially pluralistic society, can public policy disregard that fact; that is, can we have a culturally and religiously diverse society and still maintain public policy which fails to recognize and support such diversity?

The Broader Issue of Public Social Services

Let me try to place the matter into a broader perspective of social service for all Americans. Clearly, one of the dilemmas, that is faced both federally and locally, is how scarce social service resources should be apportioned. To assert that a sectarian or ethnic group should be permitted to use government funds to exclusively service their own members when at the same time there are not services for others in the community may seem unjust. The voluntary and sectarian sectors cannot be expanded at the expense of a good public system of social services for all. But neither can insensitive public bureaucracies be expected to serve client groups with very special ways of seeking and using services.

In a recent paper on the family, Irving Levine called for an approach to public policy that he labeled, "A Social Conservative Approach."¹⁶ Essentially, it was a recognition that the planning and delivery of social services required a partnership between the public and voluntary sectors and between family, neighborhood, and professionals.

Perhaps some of the most valuable lessons for the United States in applying this social conservative approach are to be found in Great Britain. Britain has a long tradition of caring for people in trouble, and in recent years has developed a very comprehensive personal social service system that has a strong but considerable latitude for voluntary, sectarian, neighborhood based, and self help organizations.

The British Personal Service System

In 1970, Parliament passed a far reaching act which unified previously fragmented social programs and made them more responsive to people who needed help. First, they separated social services from health, housing, and public welfare. Then, they integrated all the existing social service programs to children, families, the handicapped, the mentally ill, and the aged. Local governments have the actual responsibility for the administration and delivery of the social services. Each city and rural government is required to create a single social service department which brings together the heretofore separate agencies serving different client groups. The department is an integral part of city government along with education, housing, and transportation. The front-line staff, in the reorganized department, are social workers operating out of neighborhood offices throughout the city. Their job is to provide direct advice and counseling, but also to be thoroughly knowledgeable about other resources throughout the

¹⁶ Irving Levine, "Bolstering the Family through Informal Support Groups." Presented at the Philadelphia Conference on the American Family, 1978.

community. The social worker, who is a generalist, is the key link to other agencies such as employment, housing, schools, courts, hospitals, and social security. This worker is the bridge between the family, the community, and the institution. Wherever possible, the goal is to keep people out of institutions, by providing them with community-based services. If a hospital or institution becomes necessary, the social worker helps the client with the transition and works with the family. The new system makes this possible. Social workers in the hospitals, nursing homes, sheltered workshops, and children's institutions are all employees of the same municipal social service department. Anyone needing help, no matter what their problem, age, or income can call or go to their local area social service office. The British call this principle "the single door."

To get a first-hand look at the actual workings of the British system, I chose to study the social service department of the city of Birmingham. Birmingham has interesting similarities to some American cities. It is a large industrial center, located in the West Midlands region of Britain. It has a population of over one million and many of the same social problems as our urban centers. The central city is commercial and houses mainly the poor and ethnic minorities from the West Indies and Asia. More affluent residents live in privately owned homes in the surrounding suburbs.

The social service department has responsibility for a wide network of community-based services and institutions. The city is divided into thirteen areas, with a social service office in each area. Every office houses two to three teams of social workers made up of ten to twelve professionals and assistants. Each team is responsible for covering a specific geographic "patch." Attached to each area office is a home help department, where elderly and disabled people can request homemakers, home delivered meals, and a wide range of other services which help them maintain independent living. Many voluntary organizations and associations are linked to the area offices. The essential principle in the British system is that people living in various neighborhoods can go to this "single door" and be connected to any other service or resource that may be required. Backing up the front-line neighborhood offices are hundreds of services and facilities administered or financed by the department. This includes day nurseries for children, luncheon clubs for the elderly, halfway houses for the mentally ill, and hostels for vagrants. Some are public, some voluntary, and others sectarian.

In addition to the well-organized public system of social services, which is accessible to all, there are numerous voluntary, sectarian, and neighborhood organizations which receive considerable support from the local authority. Catholic and Jewish old age homes, sectarian

adoption agencies, and citizen's advisory bureaus all receive grants from the local social service department-with a minimum of bureaucratic paper work. It is an accepted fact of life in Britain that neighborhood and sectarian organizations are trusted by their constituents and should therefore be subsidized to deliver services.

I do not cite the British system as the model that should be adopted for the United States. I point it out because it vividly demonstrates that a service system can be *essentially* public and remain very sensitive to cultural, ethnic, religious, and neighborhood differences.

Finally, in concluding this report, I would like to highlight a number of policy recommendations that would lead to more effective services not only to Americans of Euro-ethnic heritage, but for all Americans.

1. Single door concept.¹⁷ Every neighborhood should have at least one highly visible office staffed by friendly, sensitive professionals who are able to give information, advice, advocacy, and follow-up services. The staff should be trained in the ethnic, neighborhood, religious, or cultural traditions of the area in which it is located.

This office could provide central access to anyone with any problems. Sometimes, it should be directly managed either by a public agency, or by a church, community center, or sectarian institution.

2. Social care services should get a much higher priority in our planning and budget allocations. Therapy and treatment are essential, but they are only a small part of the kinds of services many people need to maintain themselves. There must be greater emphasis on homemakers, meals on wheels, transportation, chore services, in short, the life support services that effect the daily survival of the mentally ill, handicapped, frail, elderly, and physically disabled.¹⁸

3. Public and voluntary agencies must seek new avenues for integrating their professional services with those provided by members of the family. The hospice movement is an example of how this can be achieved. Respite programs, for those who care for handicapped, frail, or disabled family members, can be expanded greatly. Given what we know about informal networks and the role of family, more attention must be paid to educating professionals with this outlook.¹⁹

Finally, I repeat the central policy dilemma I posed earlier – if the United States is in fact a culturally, religiously, and ethnically diverse society – can public policy be promulgated which fails to support and nurture such diversity?

¹⁷ Alfred Kahn, "Service Delivery at the Neighborhood Level: Experience Theory and Fads," *Social Service Review*, March 1976.

¹⁸ Robert Morris, "Caring For vs. Caring About People," *Social Work*, Sept. 1977.

¹⁹ B. M. Moroney, *The Family and the State: Considerations for Social Policy* (London & N.Y.: Longman, 1976).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abramson, H. "Ethnic Pluralism in the Central City," in D. Feinstein (ed.), *Ethnic Groups in the City*, Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company, 1971.
- Ad Hoc Committee on Advocacy. "The Social Worker as Advocate: Champion of Social Victims." *Social Work*, XIV (April 1969)
- American Jewish Committee. *Consultation on the Jewish Family and Jewish Identity* (Proceedings of April 1972). New York: Jewish Communal Affairs Department, American Jewish Committee, 1972.
- American Public Welfare Association. *Redesigned Social Service Systems for Four Pennsylvania Pilot County Board of Assistance Operations*. September 1969. (Mimeo)
- Anderson, Wayne, Bernard Frieden, and Michael Murphy. *Managing Human Services*. Washington, D.C.: International City Management Association, 1977.
- Andrulis, P. "Ethnicity as a Variable in the Utilization and Referral Patterns of a Comprehensive Mental Health Center," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Ann Arbor: No. 74-5189.
- Axinn, June, and Herman Levin. *Social Welfare: A History of the American Response to Need*. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.
- Bax, James A., "Social Services: Today and Tomorrow." *Public Welfare*, (Winter, 1972) pp. 27-30.
- Bestman, E., Lefley, H. and Scott, C. "Culturally Appropriate Interventions: Paradigms and Pitfalls," paper presented at 53rd Annual Meeting of American Orthopsychiatric Association, Atlanta, March 1976.
- Billingsley, A. "The Family and Cultural Pluralism," address at Baltimore Conference on Ethnicity and Social Welfare. New York: Institute on Pluralism and Group Identity, January 1976.
- Bloedorn, Jack G.; MacLatchie, Elizabeth B.; Friedlander, William; and Wedemeyer, J.M., *Designing Social Service Systems*, Chicago: American Public Welfare Association, 1971.
- Blumberg, R., Greer, S. and Winch, R. "Ethnicity and Extended Familism in an Upper-Middle Class Suburb," *American Sociological Review*, 32, April 1967.
- Borelli, K. "The Implications of the New Ethnicity for American Social Work," *International Social Work*, 4, 1975.
- Booz, Allen and Hamilton. *Purchase of Social Services: A Study of Three States for Social and Rehabilitation Services*, Springfield, Virginia: National Technical Information Service, 1971.
- Borman, L. and Lieberman, M. "Self-Help Groups," special issue of the *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. Arlington, Virginia: N.T.L. Institute, 1976.
- Bott, E. *Family and Social Network*. New York: Free Press, 1972.

- Brody, Ralph, "Purchase of Service: The Challenge of Change," *Bulletin of the Ohio Welfare Conference*, March 1973.
- Caplan, G. "The Family as a Support System," paper presented at Butler Hospital Symposium, Providence, Rhode Island, 1974.
- Caplow, T. and Forman, R. "Neighborhood Interaction in a Homogeneous Community," *American Sociological Review*, 15 (3), June 1950. Center Magazine. *The New Ethnicity*, 7 (4), July/August 1974.
- Covello, L. *The Social Background of the Italian-American School Child*. E. I. Brill, Leiden, 1967.
- Fandetti, D. "Day Care in Working Class Ethnic Neighborhoods: Implications for Policy and Programming," paper presented at the Baltimore Conference on Ethnicity and Social Welfare, New York: Institute on Pluralism and Group Identity, January 1976.
- Fandetti, D. "Sources of Assistance in a White Working Class Ethnic Neighborhood," unpublished dissertation, Ph.D., Columbia University Graduate School of Social Work, 1974.
- Fandetti, D. and Gelfand, D. 1976. "Care of the Aged: Attitudes of White Ethnic Families," *Gerontologist* 16:544-549.
- Freedlander, William. "Some Considerations in the Design of Public Social System Systems," *Public Welfare* XXVIII (Winter 1970), pp. 429-35.
- Gans, H. *The Urban Villagers*. Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1962.
- Gelfand, D. "Ethnicity, Aging and Mental Health," paper presented at the Baltimore Conference on Ethnicity and Social Welfare. New York: Institute on Pluralism and Group Identity, January 1976.
- Giordano, J. 1973, *Ethnicity and Mental Health: Research and Recommendations*. Institute of Human Relations, New York.
- Hansen, M. 1958. "The Third Generation: Search for Continuity." In *Social Perspectives on Behavior*, H. Stein and R. Cloward, eds. Free Press, New York.
- Hansenfeld, Yeheskel, "People Processing Organizations: An Exchange Approach," *American Sociological Review*, XXXVII (June, 1972) pp. 248-58.
- Herman, S. "The Study of an Ethnic Identity," in S. Herman, *Israelis and Jews: The Continuity of an Identity*. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Hoshino, George, "The Public Welfare Worker: Advocate or Adversary," *Public Welfare* XXIX, (January 1971), pp. 35-41.
- Kahn, A. "Explorations in Family Policy." *Social Work*, 1976, 21, 181-187.
- Kahn, Alfred J., "Perspectives on Access to Social Services," *Social Work* XV (February, 1970) pp. 95-101.

- Kahn, Alfred J., "Do Social Services Have a Future in New York?" *City Almanac*, New York: New School for Social Research, V (February 1971).
- Kahn, Alfred J., *Social Policy and Social Services*, New York: Random House, 1973.
- Kammerman, Sheila, and Alfred Kahn. *Social Services in the United States*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976.
- Kramer, Ralph, "Voluntary Agencies and the Use of Public Funds: Some Policy Issues," *Social Service Review* XI (March 1966) pp. 15-26.
- Kramer, S. and Masur, J. *Jewish Grandmothers*. New York: Beacon Press, 1976.
- Kronick, Jane C.; Perlmutter, Felice D. and Gummer, Burton. "The A.P.W.A. Model Social Service Delivery System: A Preliminary Assessment," *Public Welfare*, XXXI, (Fall 1973), pp. 47-53.
- Landy, D. "Problems of People Seeking Help in Our Culture," *Social Welfare Forum*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.
- Lefley, H. "Approaches to Community Mental Health: The Model," *Psychiatric Annals*, 5 (8), August 1975 (a).
- Levy, C. "Toward a Theory of Jewish Communal Service," *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, 50 (1), Fall 1973.
- Lieberman, M. "Adaptable Patterns in Middle-Aged and Elderly: The Role of Ethnicity." Paper presented at meeting of Gerontological Society, Portland, October 1974.
- Lopata, H. *Polish-Americans*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1976.
- Lopreato, J. *Italian-Americans*. Random House, New York, 1970.
- Morris, Robert. *Toward a Caring Society*, New York: Columbia University School of Social Work, 1974.
- Novak, M. A., "Politics of Family and Neighborhood." *Commonwealth*, May 19, 1972, 257.
- O'Donnell, E. J. and Sullivan, M. M. "Service Delivery and Social Action Through the Neighborhood Center: A Review of Research," *Welfare in Review*, November-December, 1969.
- Orlansky, H. "Jewish Personality Traits: A Review of Studies on an Elusive Problem," *Commentary*, October 2, 1946.
- Pauley, Ruth M., "Redesigning a Social Service Delivery System," *Social Work Practice*, National Conference on Social Welfare, New York: Columbia University press, 1971, pp. 139-51.
- Piliavin, Irving, "Restructuring the Provision of Social Services," *Social Work*, XIII (January, 1968), pp. 34-41.
- Rein, Martin, "The Social Service Crisis," *Transaction*, (May, 1964), Reprint, pp. 1-4.

- Richman, Leon H.; Brody, Ralph; Collins, John; Pauley, Ruth M. and Rosenberg, Marvin, *Social Service Delivery Systems*, Cleveland, Ohio: Human Services Design Laboratory of School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University, July 1972.
- Rosenberg, Marvin, and Ralph Brody. *Systems Serving People: A Breakthrough in Service Delivery*, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, 1974.
- Rosenberg, Marvin, and Ralph Brody. "Britain's 'Single Door' and Setup." *The Plain Dealer*, July 1, 1978.
- Rosenberg, Marvin, and Ralph Brody. "A British Way to House Aged." *The Plain Dealer*, August 21, 1978.
- Rosenberg, Marvin L., "New Directions in Social Service Delivery," *Bulletin of the Ohio Welfare Conference*, March 1973.
- Rosenberg, Marvin L., and Ralph Brody. "Accountable Public Social Services: Threat or Challenge," paper presented at the National Conference on Social Welfare, Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 1973, (mimeo)
- Rosenberg, Marvin L., and Ralph Brody. *Service Management in Action, Proceedings of First National Workshop on Integrated Service Delivery*, Cleveland, Ohio: School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University, January 1973, (mimeo)
- Rubins, J. "The Relationship Between the Individual, the Culture and Psychopathology," *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 35 (3), Fall 1975.
- Sanders, I. T. and Morawska, E. "Polish-American Community Life: A Survey of Research." Community Sociology Training Program, Department of Sociology, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts, 1975.
- Szilka, B. "Religion and Mental Disorder." In *Research on Religions Development: A Comprehensive Handbook*, M. Strommen, ed., Hawthorne Books, New York, 1971.
- Stein, H. "A Dialectical Model of Health and Illness Attitudes and Behavior Among Slovak-Americans," *International Journal of Mental Health*, 5, Summer 1976(a).
- Sussman, M. "Relationship of Adult Children with Their Parents in the United States," in E. Shanus and G. Streib (eds.), *Social Structure and the Family: Generational Relations*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- Sussman, M., and Burchinal, L. "Kin Family Network: Unheralded Structure in Current Conceptualizations of Family Functioning." *Marriage and Family Living*, 24, August 1962.
- Tomasi, S. *The Italian-American Family*. New York: Center for Migration Studies, 1972.

- Townsend, P. "The Emergence of the Four Generation Family in Industrial Society." In *Middle-Age and Aging*, B. Neugarten, ed. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1968.
- Traunstein, M. and Steinman, R. "Voluntary Self-Help Organizations: An Exploratory Study," *Journal of Voluntary Action Research*, 2 (4), Fall 1973.
- Turem, J., et al. *The Implementation of Title XX: The First Year's Experience*. Working Paper 0990-08 Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, 1976.
- Utah State Department of Social Services, *Blue Print: Planning the Social Service Delivery System*, Salt Lake City, 1972, (mimeo)
- Weber, Shirley, "From Separation to a 'Turned On' Model of Services," *Social Casework*, (December 1972), pp. 593-603.
- Wolkon, G. et al. "Ethnicity and Social Class in the Delivery of Services: Analysis of a Child Guidance Clinic," *American Journal of Public Health*, 64, July 1974.
- Wrobel, P. "Observations on Organizing the Polish Community," in D. Hartman (ed.), *Immigrants and Migrants: The Detroit Ethnic Experience*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1975.
- Zola, I. "Illness Behavior of the Working Class," in A. Shostak, and W. Gomberg (eds.), *Blue Collar World*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1964.

* * *

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Thank you, Dr. Rosenberg.

David E. Beigel, our first reactor, is the Director of neighborhood and Family Services Project for the University of Southern California's Washington Public Affairs Center.

He has held a variety of organizing, planning, and administrative positions in mental health and human services agencies.

He has written extensively on mental health and neighborhood support systems and is currently an instructor and Doctoral student at the University of Maryland School for Social Work and Community Planning, and he lives in Baltimore.

RESPONSE OF DAVID E. BIEGEL

Thank you, Mr. Saltzman.

I appreciate the opportunity of participating in this consultation. Dr. Rosenberg reviews the major problems that exist in social service delivery today and correctly points out the growing need for social services in this country. I agree with Dr. Rosenberg that among the major issues are fragmentation of services, lack of coordination of services, and services being delivered in an impersonal and culturally

sensitive manner. I would add, however, that lack of accessibility of services is a critical issue, also.

My own view of policy initiatives needed to improve social service delivery, especially the delivery of services to Euro-ethnic Americans, differs in approach from Dr. Rosenberg, however. Dr. Rosenberg discusses the importance of the family in ethnic communities and the need for integrating social services with the services being provided by the family.

I believe our focus should be upon strengthening the entire range of social and community support systems in ethnic communities and then linking these support systems with professional services. Such support systems would include, but not be limited to, the family.

I believe that such an approach is consonant with the thinking of both the recent President's Commission on Mental Health and the National Commission on Neighborhoods. It builds upon the strengths, resources, and positive neighborhood identification of residents in urban ethnic communities.

I'd like to discuss the following three issues today. First, what are community support systems and why are they important?

Second, what are essential principles of a renewed social service delivery system, and third, what policy initiatives are needed to strengthen our social service delivery system?

Our social service system has failed to understand the concept of community and has ignored neighborhoods and their support systems. I believe the answer to these issues is not, as many would have us believe, a program approach involving another new program or another new service. Rather, these issues can best be addressed through a process that utilizes the naturally occurring strengths and resources in ethnic communities.

The elements of community support systems are varied. They include: the woman in her 60's on the block that neighbors turn to for help or support when their welfare checks are late; the bartender the customers talk to about marital problems; the widowed persons group the Church sponsors to provide mutual support and socialization; the neighbor who takes in the 14-year-old girl who has been thrown out of her house by her family; the clergyman that parishioners talk to about family problems; the community organization that helps residents develop the needed community-based hot line; the ethnic organization that help the middle-age parents with the strains caused by value conflicts with their children; and the co-worker who helps with the problems of caring for aged parents.

In a pluralistic society such as ours, people seek help, solve problems, and meet needs in various ways. Thus, family, friends, neighbors, co-workers, clergy, neighborhood organizations, and mutu-

al aid groups can all provide meaningful assistance in times of need. These are all groups that I would include under the rubric of community support systems.

There has been much research concerning the importance of these support systems. Community support systems can serve a preventive function by contributing to an individual's sense of well-being and of competent functioning. They can assist in reducing the negative consequences of life stress.

They can be especially important, for example, with the chronically mentally ill who need assistance in recovering from the isolation of institutional life. Unfortunately, Federal initiatives aimed at helping former mental patients, have been geared solely to the provision of professional services. NIMH has a program called the Community Support Program that attempts to provide a wide range of support services to former mental patients, but this program excludes the non-professional elements of community support systems that I mentioned above.

Community support systems are natural, in that person-to-person caregiving efforts develop without professional support or assistance.

Most organizational forms of community support systems, such as mutual aid groups and neighborhood organizations, similarly develop without professional intervention.

Support systems are also natural in the sense of being ongoing and not formally organized. Some particular forms of support systems develop in response to a specific societal problem.

For example, the problem of divorce leads to support groups for the divorced. Or groups sometimes get organized in response to the lack of professional services to address a particular problem.

Thus community support systems serve all of us in some degree and in different ways. More specifically, however, community support systems serve many population groups that are unable or unwilling to seek professional help or for whom professional services are currently lacking. Included here would be ethnic and racial minorities, women and the aged.

Community support systems offer help in a culturally acceptable manner, without stigma or loss of pride, and I feel this is extremely important in ethnic communities. The individual seeking help does not need to identify themselves as having a problem, being weak, sick, - a client or a patient - as they would in seeking professional help. Community support systems are thus an important component of the strengths and resources often found in neighborhoods.

For the past four years, the University of Southern California has been working on a project that is examining mental health resources

and needs in two urban ethnic neighborhoods, Baltimore and Milwaukee.

Our research there has shown that there are a large number of professional and lay helpers; by lay, I mean family, friends, neighbors, clergy, et cetera, offering services in these communities. Many of these helpers not only live in the neighborhoods they serve, but have done so for years. They express generally positive feelings about these neighborhoods, despite the existence of many community issues and problems that we uncovered.

Our data also show that lay helpers expressed a strong sense of community pride and in turn they are highly regarded and trusted by community residents. Additionally, we found that residents prefer to take care of their own problems, often without seeking professional assistance, but they do so with the support and assistance of lay helpers. One of the most important findings in our study was that professional agencies, social service agencies, mental health agencies, health agencies, are generally unaware of the operation of these networks and support systems, and in fact professional services often tend to be "parachuted" into communities, ignoring the support systems that exist and not linking their services with those support systems.

In sum, I would say that the positive involvement of lay helpers in the neighborhoods, the inclination of community residents towards selfhelp, the large number and availability of helpers, the trust afforded these helpers, and the selective preferences for the services of lay help emphasize the importance of these support systems.

I might add that nothing I'm really saying here, in any way, implies that professional services aren't needed. Rather, quite the opposite is true.

Both professional and community support systems are important, but to be most effective, they need to be linked with each other. This brings us to the second issue I'd like to discuss, which is what are the essential principles of a renewed social service delivery system.

I believe that a renewed social service delivery system, that utilizes the resources of community support systems, should be based on the following six principles:

First, the focus should be upon the promotion of health, not the treatment of illness or pathology.

Second, services should be designed to account for age, sex, class, ethnic, and racial differences.

Third, neighborhoods are a positive resource that can and should be used as a basis for service delivery. Professional services should be designed to complement, augment, and strengthen neighborhood based support systems.

Fourth, the community, and not agencies, needs to take primary responsibility for their own social services. A sense of competency, self-esteem, and power is extremely important to the health of a community and is a critical factor in efforts at prevention and rehabilitation.

Fifth, a neighborhood capacity building process, not a program model, is needed in order to self-define strengths, problems, resources, and services to ensure the community will seek and receive help within a relevant value framework. In that way, people overcome the stigma of problems, seek help earlier, increase utilization of services, and strengthen their neighborhood helping system.

A partnership among service providers, government officials, and neighborhood residents is needed as a precondition to an integrated service system. To ensure full community partnership, however, empowerment of consumers is essential.

I believe if our social service policies were based on these principles, service delivery systems would be able to serve more individuals in a more cost effective manner that would strengthen the nation's communities as well as help individuals in need.

In the research that we've been doing for the last four years, we've collected a lot of information and data that show how support systems are effective, and I have a number of vignettes that indicate these points.

There really isn't time here to go into all of them, so I'd just like to list briefly a number of ways in which we found that a community support systems approach can be effective.

The first is that it can reach populations in need of assistance who would never seek professional help. The second is that it's built upon the strengths of communities. The third, it builds upon the unique ability of community residents to know what will work in their particular community. Professionals oftentimes have a hard time getting a handle on a neighborhood in terms of its needs, strengths, and resources. Community residents who have lived there for a long while, who are familiar with the problems of people in the community, often have a much better sense of what programs will work and what won't work. Fourth, creating linkages between support systems and professional services can also help reduce fragmentation of services and thus provide help in a more effective way. Fifth, community support systems, by creating linkages between community support systems and social service professionals, can help reinforce the work of lay helpers and demystify the role of professionals. In our work we had a conference, bringing together clergy, human service professionals, and neighborhood residents; about a hundred persons attended. After the conference was over a number of lay helpers, from a Catholic church

in the area, remarked to their pastor that they really felt energized about participating in the conference. When the pastor asked why, they said that they found out that professionals didn't have all the answers either.

This might seem self-evident to us, but oftentimes professionals like to give people the impression that they do have all the answers, thus making lay helpers feel somewhat inadequate. Once they get a chance to interact with professionals and see that they don't have all the answers either, they're a lot more willing to go out and help people.

The third major issue I'd like to focus on today is what policy initiatives are needed to enhance community support systems and to link them with the social service delivery system. I want to concentrate on one specific recommendation that we made in our work to both the President's Commission on Mental Health and the National Commission on Neighborhoods; that is, we'd like to see the creation of a federally administered Self-Help Development Fund that would be designed to strengthen community support systems and to enable linkages between these systems and the social service help and mental health service systems.

The area of focus of the Fund would thus be human services. There are a number of precedents for such a Fund, including the Inter-American Foundation, the Co-Op Bank Self-Help Fund for Economic Development, and HUD's Neighborhood Self-Help Development Fund, which focuses on neighborhood revitalization.

The fund, as we see it, would be administered by a board consisting of consumers and professional representatives and have three principal components. The first component would be capacity building of neighborhood-based support systems. Small seed grants could be provided to neighborhood organizations for training and technical assistance in strengthening their support systems and linking them with the professional sector.

The second component of the Fund would involve regulatory oversight. There are currently many obstacles - administrative, physical and legal- which inhibit and hinder community support systems. These are many of the same obstacles that also tend to lead to fragmentation, lack of accountability, and lack of accessibility of services. The Fund would be charged with recommending statutory and administrative changes on Federal, State, and local levels to enhance community support systems.

The third component of the Fund would be working through states and local communities to develop standards for assessing the impact of human service programs on community support systems. The goal would be to prevent programs from weakening or undermining local support systems in neighborhoods.

Four years ago when I was working for Associated Catholic Charities, Inc., in Baltimore, and we started a program of providing supports to elderly persons. The program was funded through the State of Maryland to help maintain elderly persons in their homes. The program had a very good goal, to prevent the premature and unnecessary institutionalization of older people, by providing chore services, light house-keeping services, et cetera, to help maintain older persons in their homes.

We did a very good needs assessment and we found out what part of the city was most in need of our services, and we contacted organizations and made sure we didn't duplicate other professional services. One area we really didn't know about or think about, was the hundreds and hundreds of community residents in this particular community, that we were working in, that were already providing those supports to elderly people in their neighborhoods.

What we've basically found, was that rather than seeing a large increase in the number of people being served as a result of our program, our professional services in many ways undermined and replaced some of the services that individuals were providing on a voluntary basis. This is why I think that it's important to look at the impact that professional programs have on the support systems that already exist in communities, so we make sure that we're really strengthening and not weakening what's already there.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Thank you.

Our second reactor will be Dr. William C. McReady.

William McReady has worked with the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago since 1971 and has been the Director of that organization and Center for the Study of American Pluralism for the last two years.

He has written many articles, reports, and books on the ethnic experience in the United States, is the editor of the quarterly journal *Ethnicity* and holds a Doctorate in Sociology from the University of Illinois.

Dr. McCreedy

RESPONSE OF WILLIAM MCCREADY

Thank you.

I'd like to focus my remarks on four issues, which emerge from Professor Rosenberg's paper.

The first are various obstacles for social policy in a pluralistic society.

The second is the role of litigation in the formation of social policy.

The third is a sort of a hidden agenda item, having to do with religious preference, which becomes involved in a lot of the discus-

sions about social policy and Euro-ethnics; and finally, some models for policy formulation, which will expand on the comments that Professor Rosenberg made.

One of the main reasons why I think these issues are important is that people in the policy making forums of our society frequently have conceptions or stereotypes of the society, which simply do not fit the facts.

The data is rather persuasive that we continue to be a pluralistic people; yet policies are either made for a few neglected many, or for the generalized many, none of whom actually exist.

Why this continues to happen will be the focus for the remainder of my comments.

First of all, one serious obstacle to pluralistic social policy making is rather the inherent clash between the ideology of pluralism and the technique of responding to social problems using what I call the deviant case approach.

Take, for example, Professor Rosenberg's hypothetical situation of the social service agency serving kosher food.

The deviant case approach would prohibit such an agency from receiving public funds since it could not serve everyone who came in the door, meaning those who would not care to eat kosher. The policy would be determined by the deviant case, in other words.

On the other hand, ways could be found to keep the agency open while still respecting its heritage, but it would mean that some special arrangements and funds would have to be allocated to deal with special requests; perhaps an occasional meal could be brought in from outside so they would not pass through the agency's food process at all.

Whatever the solution, the prerequisite to formulating it is that those in charge of the funding and policy making have to be cognizant of what they are giving up in order to facilitate things for the deviant case.

It seems all too common today that policy makers see only the infringement of rights, and that they seldom put into their thinking elements of group heritage or community cohesiveness as being of comparable importance, especially when both factors can be accommodated within one policy, if a little imagination is used.

It's usually erroneous to allow the policy discussions to be cast in terms which oppose individual rights and respect for the heritage of the group.

A related obstacle to effective policy making in a pluralistic society stems from the increased use of litigation as an instrument of policy formulation.

Litigation usually results when a question of rights emerges in a conflict situation, and the settlement of the litigation often has policy implications, because it establishes the future parameters in the discussion.

However, the problem occurs because while litigation can be a useful way to resolve questions of rights and obligations, it is not necessarily a useful way to approach questions of trust and respect.

Many policy questions involving Euro-ethnic heritage are best discussed in terms of respect and trust, rather than as a conflict of rights. The prevalence of litigation as an avenue for settling conflicts frequently makes it the easy way out.

The conversational mode of pluralism is compromise and negotiation, and to the extent that issues become cast in terms of unequivocal rights, pluralism tends to suffer.

A corollary to the above statement is the resentment which can brew within a people, when they perceive that their heritage is not being respected, or that it is being abandoned for the sake of what should be, in fact, a policy exception.

For example, most people do not mind when some exception to a long-standing rule is made based on individual need. But they do resent it when the exception then substitutes for policy, and the customary rule is replaced with another which has not withstood the test of time, but has as its sole value the incorporation of the most recent exception.

This method of policy making, by the addition of exceptions, is deleterious to social trust, because it fosters no sense of a return to normal after the exception has been made.

Instead, policy seems to wander all over at the beck and call of whatever voice of litigation can be heard most clearly and compellingly.

The third issue buried in the topic is the problem connected with the fact that Euro-ethnic is something of a code word for factors related to religious preference.

Ethnic has, in some policy-making forms, taken on specific religious connotations, most notably as a substitute for Catholic.

It, in effect, becomes a polite way of talking about religion, whether it be Catholic, Protestant or Jew, at those levels of society where social policy is discussed and where religion is an uncomfortable topic.

There are still enough stereotypes, for example, about Catholics which come to light in policy debates, such as the recent tuition tax credit debates in Congress, to give the impression that anti-Catholic sentiment is still alive and well within our society.

Privately, one still comes across comments from professionals and scholars about the inability of Catholics to do objective research on

social issues, or the inadvisability of funding research on Catholic issues, such as parochial schools or religious behavior.

These stereotypes are also layered on the term “ethnic” and the prejudicial cycle is complete; and all of this persists in the face of solid evidence that Catholics are no longer a predominantly working-class group. They’re not generally social or political conservatives, and they’re not the only people in the society opposed to abortion on demand.

Yet the stereotypes continue. At the National Opinion Research Center, we’ve looked at a lot of data on these things, and these findings support the contention that the stereotypes are out there.

We can only speculate as to how and why that particular strain of anti-religious bias continues in the country. But the fact that it does raise its head once in a while does not seem out of the question.

Finally, with regard to services, I’d like to expand on Professor Rosenberg’s notion of the single-door model, of the delivery of social services, and modify it for a society which may be a bit more pluralistic than Great Britain.

The idea of having a single point of contact for many social services is very efficient. But, if that point cannot be receptive to a great variety of pluralistic styles, then they will be unable to use it.

Perhaps an improvement would be to have social services adopt something of the family medicine model. In this instance, we would have generalists available within various communities who would have access to the single door. These would be people trained in services in general, rather than specialists, and their tasks would be to sort out the requests coming from within their community and direct them to the appropriate service agency using the resources provided by the single door concept.

It may even be possible to use some of the more natural helping networks in the community in this way, thereby reducing the load on the full-time professional and increasing the quality of the contact between the potential clients and the service agencies.

In effect, the above-mentioned generalists become service brokers or middle persons in today’s language, and would, in effect, manage the service deliverers themselves.

They would become advocates for their people in the community and should be able to broker services in such a way as to avoid the conflicts which can lead to litigation, while respecting the heritages of the people they help.

This conception of the general practitioner dovetails with the single-door theory of agency organization to create a service delivery system which is both efficient and amenable to pluralistic differences.

However, before any of these things become a reality, a basic change must take place in the way in which Government, including the Civil Rights Commission, perceives the situation of Euro-ethnics in the country.

Ethnicity is less a lobby group than an identity. It's less a self-conscious collectivity than an internalized heritage.

It's less a social movement than an individual need for respect.

People need to know that their society respects their story, the place from which they came, the people they know, and the valued aspects of their culture.

Social policies which continue to ignore the variegated stories in our country will fail to gather the support they require to succeed, and perhaps more seriously, will disenchant and alienate people needlessly.

Social services do not need to be tailored to every possible ethnic background, but they do need to be structured so that as few people as possible are kept from using them.

As our population grows older, and as older Americans become more numerous and in greater need of services, we may be embarking on the most ironic tragedy of all.

As immigrants, we tried to keep them out. As the "DP's" of the 1940's and 1950's, we tried to ignore them, and they had to make it on their own.

Now, as they grow old and die, we design service programs which either exclude them or simply offend them. This is more than a violation of their civil rights; it's a violation of their most elemental respect and dignity, and it need not happen.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Thank you.

Joseph Giordano is the Director of the American Jewish Committee's Louis Kaplan Center on Group Identity and Mental Health.

In 1977, he was appointed to the President's Commission on Mental Health, and this year was elected Vice Chairman of the Coalition for the White House Conference on Families

He is a university lecturer and writer on the subject of community mental health and holds a Master's degree from Columbia University, where he is pursuing a Doctoral degree on social policy and the family.

Mr. Giordano.

RESPONSE OF JOSEPH GIORDANO

Thank you.

I appreciated, yesterday, many of the comments that I listened to from the Commissioners. Some I agreed with; many I disagreed with.

I think particularly, I appreciated Commissioner Ruiz' comments, particularly where he related to his own Mexican-American background, and I could identify very much with that; because what I felt in his comments was that although we were talking from different perspectives, different kinds of experiences, different value systems, there was a connecting on the feeling of one's own identity and one's own experience.

And I think as we engage in the process to better understand the nature of ethnicity, in particular the significance of it to Americans of European background, we are not only going to be talking about the abstract theories of ethnicity and ethnic groups and the demographics and the numbers, but the very human experiences in behavior of European Americans. We're going to be talking about values, and these values are deeply felt.

They may evolve out of a highly assimilated process and a way of adapting to living in today's society, or have roots that may be modified over time but reach back thousands of years as part of a religious, ethnic or cultural group.

The thing Irv talked about yesterday, that sense of peoplehood that's transmitted to the family over generations, is almost – a lot of it is unconscious behavior, and I think the difficulty in grasping some of this yesterday is that it's difficult to grasp, because a lot of it is not terribly conscious.

We see the festivals; we see the food as we talked about yesterday; but they're only surface manifestations of what lies much deeper.

Let me give you one little example. We take something like urban renewal. We know that the purpose of that is to create new housing in a community, and yet we are totally unaware oftentimes of when the bulldozer goes in it not only destroys the physical buildings there and replaces them, but destroys a very sensitive social fabric of that community – the hallways, the corner candy store, the block, the stoop where people congregate.

Those social aspects of the community almost lie in the unconscious glueing of the communalism of a neighborhood; so when we destroy them, what we found – and this is documented in a lot of research – is that people who experience urban renewal go through a mourning period. They are actually depressed, and there's a sense of mourning for a deep loss, but they are not oftentimes aware of what is happening to them.

So we're talking about some very deep kinds of feelings that are not oftentimes easily articulated or visible.

I think we are all part of this process of values, and we must be aware that our own values and preferences will have strong influences

on how we perceive the question under consideration today, yesterday and today.

In the field of mental health, understanding of ethnicity is particularly important, because in mental health we're basically talking about how a person feels about him or herself, their self-esteem, their relationship to other people, their identity, their ability to pursue their goals with the least amount of emotional pain, their attitudes, their values and their perceptions of society at large.

With that kind of brief introduction, let me state the following up front, and then try to develop some documentation around that.

What I think generally, mental health care in this country has been culturally incompatible with ethnic, racial, and minority groups, and particularly white ethnic groups. Although over recent years there's been some changes, particularly in relationship to minority groups, we still have a very long way to go.

And I think the Commission can be awfully helpful in stimulating that change by just beginning to review, I think, what is already on the books. There are many laws and regulations related to mental health care in this country that are not being enforced, and we need to hold the systems, particularly the Federal Government, accountable to implement those particular laws and regulations, and I will list two or three of them a little later.

Why has there been an avoidance by white ethnic groups to the mental health system?

Well, I think in general that white ethnics have a tremendous feeling of self-reliance - take care of their own, take care of their own problems.

There's a basic untrust of professions and government; there's a sense of protection of privacy. The stigma, of course, of mental illness and mental health services cuts across all groups, and basically, what has been the approach of many white ethnic groups has been the use of their own cultural system, and we heard a lot about support systems.

People turn to their own particular systems first - the family, the extended family, the neighborhood, the sanctioned helpers in that particular community, and those institutions close to them.

If we look at the mental health system and compare that with European-American values, we see that there's a great deal of conflict around this incompatibility.

If you take the basic values of mental health and you just take two, they really represent American core values, the white Anglo-Saxon Protestant value systems.

If you take one value, around individualism, you are an individual; this comes through in treatment. You can make it on your own. We've got to plan for the future. It's that kind of value that's communicated.

And if you look at many European-American groups, that is not their priority – maybe second or third. Maybe their first priority usually is family and group, that they're more concerned about the present than the future. Just help me solve my problem now.

So there's a difference in how the deliverers of service communicate their values and the European-Americans who feel it in their gut, which is different.

The mental health system is operating out of large bureaucracies, powerful expertise, impersonal, rational kind of thinking. You compare that with European-American groups, and you see there's an emphasis on family, irrationality, a lot of face-to-face kind of communications, the emphasis on neighborhood.

The mental health system, if we look at the Community Health Act, defines community along a catchment area, which is geographical boundaries.

Ethnic groups define themselves going beyond neighborhood boundaries. They say they live in an Italian community, which extends outside of a catchment area.

The mental health system is professionally led. Much of the help that goes on in these communities is self-help and mutual help – differences.

There's a different language. The professional language versus the language of the people. An emphasis in mental health has been on racism. In European communities they've often been seen as the racist, which adds to feelings of being left out.

And lastly, in the mental health system, there's an emphasis on pathology. We've heard a lot about support systems. There's an emphasis on the problem; how do we solve the problem. You are ill.

Where in European-American value systems, there's a great emphasis on what little help do I need in order to solve my own problem on health.

So we find there is a great deal of cultural incompatibility between the two systems. The result is that we find there's a lack of access, equal access for European-Americans to the use of the mental health system. And even in cases where the access is there, they come into the agencies so they get the services; they don't stay there too long.

And of course there's an unacceptability of the way the service is provided to them. So you find, for example, in a number of studies, that people come in for one or two sessions and then drop out, so they just don't connect with it.

And this was one of the major items on the President's Commission on Mental Health, that basically mental health services in this country have not adequately related to ethnic minority groups or racial groups in this country.

And this is a very serious problem. Let's have no doubts about that.

The President's Commission talked 15 years ago about 10 percent of the population in need of mental health services. They recently issued a statement of 15 percent and it's very much closer to 20 percent.

So to me there's a rise right across in all groups. The White House Conference on Families is particularly highlighting that families are in trouble, and this very much hits white ethnic communities. The rapid social change, the change from traditional values to new life style values, the changing role of women - tremendous impact on the family.

Inflation, unemployment, the breakdown of families and neighborhoods, and the support systems that are weakening, in some cases, have created a great deal of problems. The statistics are skyrocketing, as you well know.

The problem today is that there's a greater need; there's a greater awareness by white ethnic groups. "Dear Abby" has worked in many cases to break down some of the stigma attached to use of services.

And this comes at a time when we have limited services and limited resources. So that if we look to the 1980's, we're going to find there's going to be a great deal more intergroup tensions, because many groups are aware their needs are greater; their awareness is greater, to use the services, but they're going to find less services and they're going to find less resources, and they're going to be in competition with groups that already laid a beachhead there. And so we may be in for some very difficult problems in communities, particularly around mental health services.

There's significant research that indicates that because of this cultural incompatibility, we find that many white ethnic groups, when they come in for services, individuals and families are misdiagnosed and get inappropriate kinds of treatment. To give you a very quick example: In a community in Brooklyn, a Polish-immigrant woman is brought into the Emergency Room, and she's met by a Filipino doctor.

I mean, the communication is a little difficult to understand in an area where you're talking about feelings and attitudes, very difficult to communicate.

Or Jewish therapists working with an Irish family, or delivering services in a community of discharge patients of establishing and beginning to get a big backlash from the community, because it just does not fit in with their own perception of how services should be delivered.

We find a great deal of variation among how services are used. In a study we did in New York City of five ethnic and racial groups, we find a great deal of variation on perception of services and the utilization of those services by the groups.

There's a high correlation between mental illness and immigration and the settling of refugees. We do a bad job in understanding the cultural context of these groups and helping them to settle in a new country and reducing the stress of being newcomers.

As I indicated, the intergroup tension is an issue which is beginning to show, not only in the communities between groups, but in the large institutions. The way careers have been entering in, in some institutions, the doctors are foreign, the nurses are black, the aide is Hispanic, and there are white supervisors.

And so you have group tensions even within these large state and municipal hospitals related to ethnic and minority differences.

In the policy and delivery of services, well, we can talk about universal services. We find that people use it differently. So while we say, take something like community mental health, which is to serve the total community, we know that the total community is not served, because people perceive it differently.

Let me just highlight two things on the Community Mental Health Act, which I think is already in the legislation, which I don't think has been adequately dealt with.

And this relates to more than just mental health. It's the Health Revenue Sharing Act and applies to community mental health centers, neighborhood health centers, and migrant health centers, and requires that in the case of a center serving a population including a substantial portion of individuals of limited English-speaking ability, the center must develop a plan and make arrangements responsive to the needs of such populations, for providing services to the extent related to language and the cultural context most appropriate to such individuals, and to identify a person on staff who is fluent in both that language and English and whose responsibilities include providing guidance to such individuals and to appropriate staff members, with respect to cultural sensitivities and bridging linguistic and cultural differences.

Now that's on the books, and I don't think that's being applied, particularly in white ethnic communities.

Now the intent of the community mental health services has been to serve the total community, and it has not. And I emphasize that, and I think the great contribution of the Commission can be to see that those laws are implemented.

And I think it would go a long way, because it would stimulate, within the system, that kind of emphasis on serving the community from a pluralistic perspective and would build upon much of the work that many people have done in this country, and I think you can make a vast contribution.

In closing, let me sum up what I think is much of what we have said today, and many of the things we have said today, and some of the

things yesterday, and something we have been operating out of our own shop, which has been developed by Irving Levine, called social conservation, which is a kind of perspective, theoretical model, I think, that harnesses the dynamism of contemporary group identity.

And let me just list those four points, and then I will end.

One, that individuals are strengthened if they can relate positively to their group identity.

Awareness of and respect for one's ethnic group customs, traditions, and family history contribute to one's sense of self and provide psychic energy for managing life.

Two, that the natural and informal systems of family, neighborhood, work, and ethnic group should be an important base for providing human services to individuals in need.

Three, programs should be fine tuned to offer choice of preferred forms of help for different groups of people in different ethnic, social, economic circumstances, and different living arrangements.

And finally, the expertise of professionals and technicians should be meshed with the experience and common sense of the people; a partnership that respects both the training and everyday existence is the best arrangement for providing help for those in need.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Thank you, Mr. Giordano.

DISCUSSION

MR. NUNEZ. I have several questions for Dr. Rosenberg. Current social policy concerning the delivery of human services does not focus on the question of pluralistic society.

Would you advocate that – we're talking about Federal policy and State policy and local policy – would you advocate a turning away from the delivery of human services to the public institutions and turning them over to the Euro-ethnic institutions in our society?

DR. ROSENBERG. You pose the question to me in a very hard way, and I must answer the question the way you posed it. No, because my basic stand is that we need a strong public system and that public system has to contract with ethnic and sectarian and neighborhood groups to do a good deal of the business for them, but under the auspices of a sound public system.

I would not erode the creation of a solid, strong, public system. I think that would be defeating.

MR. NUNEZ. Well, you also indicated all the problems that the current public system has – bureaucracy, it's impersonal – and you pointed out all of the values of the community structure that develops.

The way you describe the public system, I see little benefit of it for any group in our society, aside from the Euro-ethnics. I can't conceive of a group that would want that kind of social service delivery.

DR. ROSENBERG. Yes. Well, the question is: If we had to continue with the same public system as it's organized today, and turn it over to ethnic groups, what we would have is a new system of gaps and overlaps?

What we have now are huge gaps and overlaps, and you'd create new systems of gaps and overlaps.

We don't have to have the present system we have now, even with the existing money that's being spent. I mean we haven't really identified the source of the kind of uniformity and standardization in social service legislation that's coming in. What's the source of this uniformity?

It's not the legislation itself. Where the standardization takes place is in the rules and administrative regulations promulgated by people who take the legislation after the bill is passed.

They write a bunch of boiler plate rules on how that law is going to be administered, and it leaves for so little variation and so little variety, and that is simply not necessary.

MR. NUNEZ. Mr. Giordano, you indicated the dilemma that a public agency faces in having a staff that is not identified with the clientele group, and that is a problem that exists in the delivery of social services for any disadvantaged group in our society - Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, blacks, American Indians.

But it's also a very difficult problem to deal with in the context of the way you pose it. We heard testimony yesterday that in Gary, Indiana there are 59 identifiable Euro-ethnic groups, and I'm sympathetic to the idea of having social service professionals of similar backgrounds to the clients.

But in a society such as ours, this is a very difficult thing to do, and how would you deal with it, given the problems that do exist. For example, having foreign doctors dealing with people who already are difficult to communicate with; a problem that exists in every large American city today.

MR. GIORDANO. Well, I think there are two. I think the foreign doctor is a separate problem related to the particular nature of who they are, but I think both can be answered in a way.

I think the question is not that the community has to be matched exactly, because there's no guarantee that they will be any better. I mean there's enough research that indicates where the same ethnic group helper is serving his or her group in the community, you can have some similar kinds of problems.

I think what we're suggesting here is that it becomes a perspective in the delivery of services, the recognition that you have a pluralistic community out there, whether there are 3 or 59 groups; you need an

approach to deal with them, and a lot of that has to do with training of your staff.

If you have a sensitivity to those differences, then you will, when you run into a problem, you will seek out that kind of help, get that kind of training that will allow you to give the best kind of service to that particular community.

So we're really, in many ways, saying that, that ought to be a given, that the recognition that there are differences, that these differences are important, that people have to be trained in order to recognize the differences – and it's not very difficult.

Irv and I teach a course at Fordham University to Social Workers. We have many Puerto Rican black students who are hungry to understand how to deal with an Italian family.

I mean they're not going to all serve Puerto Rican and black families. They're going to deal with a lot of whites, and there's differences among whites, which they will have to struggle with, as well as many of the Irish and Polish and Italian students have to deal with understanding the diversity in Hispanic communities, because in New York City you just don't have Puerto Ricans now; you have Colombians, lots of people from South America.

And so the understanding of cultural context is frightfully important. So I think that it's really training, and it's an approach that recognizes, policywise, that there are differences and that we must respond to them.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Mrs. Freeman?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Mr. Giordano, I would like to pursue the question that Mr. Nunez made, because in the example which you gave, it came through as a negative when you said that the white ethnic is treated by the Philippine, the Jewish therapist, is treated by somebody else.

And I think it would be – you're not saying, are you, that the white ethnic would have to be treated by a white ethnic?

MR. GIORDANO. Not at all.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Then if you're also saying that there has to be training, that the training and the orientation would also be a two-way street, that the white ethnic or the black or whoever goes in, ought to recognize that the person who is treating them or providing something for them also has the same kind of warmth and desires that they have?

MR. GIORDANO. Much of the research indicates that there are different perceptions on both sides. The helper and the helpee have different perceptions of what that help was and a lot of it comes right through your own cultural value system on both sides of the street.

I don't think it's incumbent - My feeling, if I understand your question - I think the responsibility is on the person who's providing the service to make those kinds of links, to have that kind of background, to be sensitive to those differences.

That helps the person in giving treatment and helps that person who's receiving it to understand those differences.

It's not incumbent upon them to be prepared to come in. They're coming in for help. They're coming in with their problem, and usually a person coming in with their problem is very diffuse in their own sense of who they are, and they almost need to be put back together, and being put back together is also being out back in your cultural context.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Maybe that is not their burden, but would it not also be incumbent upon such organizations as yours to at least help the helpee to understand the value of diversity, and that these people also are somebody?

MR. GIORDANO. Oh, I have no doubt. I think there's nothing that works like success. I mean, with all the resistance in white ethnic communities towards mental health services, when they go in - it works for them. Twenty years ago there was much resistance, as I'm talking about today in the white ethnic communities as there was in black and Hispanic communities.

Then the black and Hispanic communities and other minorities said, "Hey, brother, your services are not connecting with us." And they said, "Look, you know, to come to the hospital for help is not our way of doing it. Maybe it's better to deliver it in the church; maybe it's better to deliver it in a storefront." And now we find, in many studies, within minority and racial communities, that there's a great access to services, because they feel they're more culturally compatible.

What we're saying is that same approach can be applied to many other communities who are not receiving help at this point for that kind of incompatibility.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Yes, I know the organization of black psychologists came into being because they felt that the mental health providers themselves were too racist, that they were distorting the whole picture.

I have a question for - just one question for Dr. Rosenberg.

You suggested a voucher system for social services, and I want to know if you would give some examples of how such a system could be implemented.

DR. ROSENBERG. Well, I wasn't prepared to develop a full-scale program for it, but -

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Well, if you just have some example.

DR. ROSENBERG. Well, let's say assuming that a person is entitled to a social service, and you need some eligibility mechanism for that to take place, rather than dictating to the person where they have to go for that service - they don't have to go to the Welfare Department or they don't have to go to the mental health agency - the voucher is as if it were cash.

I mean middle class people are buying their services in the marketplace. Why can't lower income people have this substitute of money to buy their service in the marketplace as well?

And it is a viable possibility.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Is it similar to the food stamp program?

DR. ROSENBERG. I think it has some parallels to the food stamp program, yes.

But it maximizes choice.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Dr. Flemming?

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. I've been very much interested in the references on the part of a number of the members of the panel to the whole area of age discrimination.

As some of you know, this agency, by direction of the Congress, did make an in-depth study of the question of whether or not persons were being denied access to services, supported in all or in part by the Federal Government, by reason of age, with particular emphasis on older persons.

We found that it was a widespread practice.

Now, as I gather from the discussion this morning, there is a feeling on the part of at least some members of the panel that in addition to older persons in the ethnic communities being discriminated against in the delivery of services on the basis of age, on top of that, there is also a tendency to exclude older persons because, in effect, they are members of ethnic groups.

As you know, there is now on the books an Age Discrimination Act. It was passed in 1975; it became operative on July 1 of this year.

Prior to that time, there were hearings throughout the country on proposed regulations to be issued by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and an opportunity was also given to people to file written comments in addition to participating in the hearing.

I'm wondering whether or not some persons appeared at those hearings and presented the situation from the standpoint of the ethnic groups, and if so, I personally would appreciate having that testimony identified, so that we could have access to it and could make it a part of the record of this consultation, because I assume that if there was such testimony, it dealt very specifically with some proposed regulations that in your judgment would tend to operate in such a way as to discriminate further against members of ethnic groups.

In addition to that, there was issued a few months ago proposed regulations to implement the 1978 amendments of the Older Americans Act, which of course, as you know, is the basis for the delivery of services to older persons. That's another response on the part of Congress to discrimination on the basis of age.

Hearings were held on those proposed regulations. They have not yet been issued; the closing date is past for comment on them.

Here again, I'm wondering if persons concerned about the tendency to discriminate against members of ethnic groups, in the delivery of the services under the Older Americans Act, appear to comment on those proposed regulations and to make specific recommendations for changes in the regulation.

Once again, if you know of such testimony or the filing of such comments, I would appreciate it if you would call it to our attention, so that we would have the opportunity of examining it, and in that way finding out specifically what you feel can and should be done in terms of the regulations under both the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 and the Older Americans Act.

DR. ROSENBERG. I do not know of testimony in relation to discrimination, but if you'd permit me a minute response on the issue of discrimination in relation to services to elderly people, I would appreciate it.

I think the issue of discrimination is less the issue in relation to services to elderly people. The Government Accounting Office of Cleveland indicated that some 70 percent of elderly people do not know of their entitlements under all sorts of programs, including the Older Americans Act.

It meets Mr. Biegel's notions that in neighborhoods where people got lots of information and were friendly places and had support groups that told them of their entitlements, the likelihood that they would take advantage of these entitlements are much, much greater.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Might I just say on that, that is discrimination; the failure to conduct an outreach program and bring to the attention of older persons these services, the most notable area being the area of mental health - that is clearly discrimination against the older person.

DR. ROSENBERG. Okay.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. But again, do you know whether or not any representatives of the ethnic organizations or ethnic groups did go in and comment on the regulations proposed under the Age Discrimination Act and the regulations proposed under the Older Americans Act, because particularly those proposed under the Older Americans Act deal very directly with these issues that have been discussed here on the delivery of services.

And I'm just wondering whether HEW had the benefit of the points of view that have been expressed here before they made up their minds on the Age Discrimination act regulations, and now before they make up their minds on the Older Americans Act regulations.

You do not know -

DR. ROSENBERG. I am not aware of such testimony.

CHARIMAN FLEMMING. Do any other members of the panel know if any persons in the audience or that may be on the panel, who had been on the panel or may be on the panel in the future, know of any such situation? I would appreciate it being called to our attention.

That is all.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Dr. Horn.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. I think my colleagues have adequately covered the subject. In the interest of time, I'll waive.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Mr. Ruiz?

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. With relation to the cash voucher system that you mentioned, would it not really cost more for an individual to get services in the open market if he says, "I have cash here," than services presently available to such a person under the cost system which keeps medical doctors under Social Security from overcharging, and they have formulas, et cetera? Wouldn't there be a danger of the freedom of choice. "I have cash. I'll go to Dr. X. Dr. X says, "Fine, I'll treat this person like the rest of my patients."

DR. ROSENBERG. I think some - and I don't want to say anything to hurt the medical profession - but I think there is a difference between people in the social service professions and the medical professions.

The experience today is that if people go and purchase services from mental health or social service personnel, the unit costs are considerably cheaper than the mounting of the gigantic agencies with large reporting forms and accountability procedures.

I think actually there would be a cost benefit.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. It is controversial then.

DR. ROSENBERG. I think it needs to be researched. I mean I don't think I could just assert that so simply.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Now with respect to any other member of the panel on the following: This question relates to institutionalization and self-help without institutionalization and government policy of when to assist, let us say, a needy aged person with government funds.

Let us say, the need for a psychiatrist or a psychologist.

Assume an aged, mentally ill person, who is not incapacitated physically and can take care of himself with the aid of supplemental income and psychiatric or psychological treatment from Social Security. Assume also, that his children are affluent but would not and

will not give him any support because they want to get rid of the old man and have him institutionalized.

It was stated that support systems may be _preventive_ in nature, to assist mentally ill persons from being institutionalized.

Would there be Social Security supplemental income available to such a person whose mental illness is not incapacitating, but does need treatment by, let us say, a psychiatrist or a psychologist so that such a person might be able to make it on his own without being institutionalized?

MR. GIORDANO. Well, I certainly would think so. I think that there are many services – certainly not enough – that relate to the kind of person you indicated, who does not have those support systems and needs the intervention and the help of outside agencies. And there are many services for the aged that I know of, and I'm speaking out of my own experience in New York City, that reach out into the community with the sole purpose of providing those necessary services which not only involve the high technology of psychologists or psychiatrists, but also the very practical needs that people have in day-to-day living, to give them than those necessary supports.

I think we know a heck of a lot more about that than we do about the support systems that are in the community and how to utilize them and to protect them, which is actually in many ways prevention, to see that that particular person doesn't get into that situation.

I think we need a lot more emphasis, a lot more study, a lot more understanding, and a lot of humility on the part of the professional establishment and government on understanding how people do cope on a day-to-day basis.

We know a lot. In any community you go to, where there are social services, you're dealing mostly with about 20 percent of that community. I'm speaking particularly of mental health services.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Let me interrupt you.

The main point, the bottom situation: Is family backup a necessary ingredient?

MR. GIORDANO. It's most important.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. And if you don't have family backup, do you still get the services?

MR. GIORDANO. Yes.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Okay.

MR. SALTZMAN. I'm going to have to interrupt because we are running a little late.

I want to thank you all for your splendid participation this morning.

Dr. Flemming.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. I also want to express our deep appreciation for these presentations. They raised very relevant issues, it seems to

me, and issues that definitely should be kept in mind by the public sector.

Fifth Session: Ethnic Women

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. We turn now to consideration of ethnic women, and I'm requesting my colleague, Commissioner Freeman, to preside during the presentations that will be made under this heading.
Commissioner Freeman.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. I would like to invite the panelists and the presenter to come forward now.

The topic for this session is ethnic women. The paper which is under consideration is, "Euro-Ethnic Women: Some Observations," by Dr. Kathleen McCourt, who is an Assistant Professor of Sociology at Loyola University.

Prior to that, she was a Senior Study Director at the University of Chicago National Opinion Research Center.

She has written a book entitled *Working Class Women and Grass Roots Politics*, and last year she presented a paper at the National Institute of Education Conference on the educational and occupational needs of white ethnic women.

She holds a doctorate in sociology from the University of Chicago.
Dr. McCourt.

STATEMENT OF DR. KATHLEEN McCOURT, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY, LOYOLA UNIVERSITY

Thank you.

I think in one way that's obvious the relevance of Euro-ethnic women to this Commission and this Conference is especially evident, because ethnic women share in the discrimination and oppression of all women in this country.

Beyond that, most are members of urban working-class families, and consequently they also share in the particular problems of that class, caught between the officially designated poor, who are eligible for special services, and the comfortable middle class, who are able to provide adequately for themselves.

My focus is on women of the working class, because this is the social class first of all which most people who are identified as ethnic or identify themselves as ethnic are located. But also I think this is the group of major concern to us.

There are, of course, middle-class individuals who view themselves as members of an ethnic group and may take great pride in that group's achievements and culture, but we are not, I think, primarily concerned with the situation of the more economically advantaged groups.

Working-class women have never shared in the economic and political decision-making in this country. They number about 40 million; they live in families with incomes above poverty but well below affluence, married to men with blue-collar jobs or low level white-collar jobs. These women seldom made it through college. Many started but dropped out after a semester or two to earn some money, help support the family, or to get married. Generally, they have lived in the large cities of the East and the Midwest, but more and more they are moving now to the suburbs.

The women today are the daughters and granddaughters of immigrant women, who struggled and saved for the survival of their families and a better life for the next generation. They are the next generation, the generation that was frequently able to buy their own homes and have visions of their children graduating from college. They are good citizens, who obey the law and pay their taxes; good wives, who stick by their husbands; good mothers, who raise their children to be obedient and patriotic; good workers, who accept low wages and don't make trouble. In short, they are the kind of Americans who can be ignored.

I think it's essential, when we discuss ethnic women, to keep in mind that members of this group, like those of other groups, are not inhabitants of a self-sufficient community. They live within the wider society. Their marital relationships are influenced by the media. The quality of their community life is affected by national unemployment rates. Their work experience is influenced by the presence of unions, minimum wage laws, and health and safety standards.

But just as it is impossible to understand people's daily lives without understanding what is happening in the wider society, so it is impossible to fully comprehend the impact of national policies and programs without seeing what results at the level of community and family.

For women especially, the way in which they handle various segments of their lives – work, education, child care, friendships – must be adapted to the realities of what the community does or does not offer.

It has been frequently pointed out in the literature of social science that working-class women are a traditional people. They adhere to traditional values, beliefs, and behaviors. They still go to church, although statistics show that's decreasing. The value family life. They like living in the neighborhoods where they grew up. When Lee Rainwater and his fellow sociologists wrote "The Working Man's Wife" 20 years ago, they expressed the belief at that time that they had examined the most conservative members of our society. There is both historical and literary evidence of working-class women's strong

defense of their cultural traditions. Immigrant women and their families made valiant efforts to preserve the ethnic culture in the face of attempts by employers, teachers, and social workers to "Americanize" the immigrants. As well as being traditional keepers of the ethnic culture, immigrant women did whatever they had to do to keep the family together, despite the pressures of an expanding and often brutal industrial system.

Now, I don't wish to unduly romanticize the traditions that ethnic women inherited. Many of those traditions, after all, were designed to keep women in their place, and that was a very subordinate place, indeed. A couple of examples follow: In 19th century Ireland, women walked behind men, ate their meals only after the men had finished, and were expected to help men with work in the fields, but got no help in return for their work, which was also strenuous. Among Irish women of this period, there were, not surprisingly, high rates of poor nutrition, early aging, and early death. During the same period in Eastern European Jewish homes, the birth of a son was cause for celebration; sons were pampered, while daughters were taught to early assume care of the household and care of younger children. In Italy, too, a girl's childhood ended early. Italian women married young, frequently in their early to midteens. They were expected to bear many children, and they were unable to divorce their husbands.

History shows that many Euro-ethnic women improved their lot by coming to the United States where it was often more difficult for the ethnic group to sustain a definition of women as inferior. The absence of many of the institutional structures that supported that definition combined with the practice of women working outside the home, and these together more nearly equalized the position of women.

So the ethnic traditions were a mix of positive and negative desirable and undesirable for the immigrant women, producing, in all probability, the kind of ambivalent feelings that ethnic women today experience when they assess the changed roles that may or may not be available to them. For the most part, ethnic women and ethnic families today have become Americanized. The rhythm of American factories, shops and schools has become the life rhythm of Euro-ethnic women and their families.

Yet ethnic women do not always feel themselves to be in step with middle-class values and behavior. It has been frequently pointed out, for example, that many ethnic, working-class women have not identified with the ideology of the women's movement, because they perceive that movement to be an attack on values they cherish: The nuclear family, child-bearing, monogamy, the role of housewife, male authority and clearly defined sex roles. Despite this negative reaction to the women's movement, working-class women are struggling with

precisely these issues in their own lives. Confusion and uncertainty characterize many working-class families today. Routine family problems are exacerbated by the breaking down of traditional role expectations for women especially, but for men as well. "If I were to get a job tomorrow," one Italian-American woman said to me, "It would break up my marriage. My husband will not have his wife financially independent of him." Both men and women are changing in their own behaviors and how they relate to each other, and the changes expectedly have painful aspects.

As Sennett and Cobb have discussed in *The Hidden Injuries of Class*, the only thing many working-class men have left to feel pride in is their ability to provide adequately for their families. When this begins to erode through unemployment, the impact of inflation, or their wives taking jobs, as more and more women are compelled to do, men may feel stripped of a certain amount of their dignity.

Yet, on the other side of the marriage, working-class women are following national demographic trends, living longer, having fewer children. Like middle-class women, they must face the question of what to do with their lives for the 30 years or so after their children are gone. It is certainly not the case that having a paying job is a new experience for working-class women. On the contrary, most immigrant women had to take jobs to assure the family survival, despite the traditional prohibition against the practice. Today, a clear majority of married women of working-class families work for pay. Clearly, it is not the experience of work itself that is at issue, but for some families at least the issue is the way in which a woman's life is to be defined.

Despite the currently fashionable emphasis of the "me decade" on self-personal fulfillment, and individual goal attainment, ethnic women are still strongly tied to a tradition that encouraged them to submerge their egos and find life satisfaction either in a husband's achievement, or more frequently, since most husbands did not have the kind of jobs that brought reflected glory, in having a nice home, healthy and well-behaved children, and a good family reputation.

In the realm of schooling, for example, ethnic parents frequently assumed that a child's education and individual advancement would pull him or her away from the family. This was threatening both psychologically and financially. For daughters, education not only posed this threat, but was additionally seen as simply irrelevant. Women, after all, were to be wives and mothers, and in many cultures they assumed these adult roles at a young age. There was little space in their lives for self-fulfillment and self-advancement, although there was characteristically self-sacrifice.

Just to relate a little bit to the discussion earlier of social services in the ethnic community, as was mentioned, the family has cared a good

deal for its own elderly, its own sick, its own retarded, but the burden of this care has fallen largely on women. The historical changes the family has gone through have added to the expectation that women must provide emotionally as well as physically for other family members. Eli Zaretsky, in his study of the family, points out that with the development and expansion of industrial capitalism, the family lost its productive function and the realm of work became separated from the realm of personal life. As people found less meaning in their work, the family became the place in which the search for personal happiness, love and fulfillment took place. So while the industrial revolution largely freed women from some traditional patriarchal constraints, the expansion of personal life which accompanied the rise of industry created a new basis for their oppression. To them fell the responsibility for maintaining a private refuge from an impersonal society.

To the extent that the outside world becomes more difficult to deal with, more pressures are placed on the family to provide comfort and support for its members. All family members feel this, of course, but women especially are expected to meet the needs of others, and there are relatively few resources with which to share this burden. Service agencies, as was pointed out, are less available to the working class than to the poor, and professional helpers like doctors, lawyers, and therapists are used less by the working class than the middle class.

One of the things I do want to mention is that I have found in my studies of women and community groups that many don't become involved until someone reaches out and invites them to become involved.

The same thing has been found in reentry programs for ethnic women returning to school. I think this raises for us the reality that for equal opportunity to truly exist – and I'm glad that this was pointed out earlier – we need programs that are – a lesson we've learned – affirmative in terms of their action, not just programs that exist if people are able to find them.

Ethnic women are not used to thinking of themselves first, and this isn't likely to change, and I don't think such a change would be particularly desirable in any case, because the family has played an important role for working-class people. Bill Kornblum in his study of south Chicago families talks about the fact that the personal attachments that parents developed in the community were what they were able to pass on to their children, and this was what assured them that their children would have something.

I want to move quickly to make a couple of points about the community before my time is up. I recently read something that pointed out that the cities that comedians just mention to get a laugh,

like Gary, or Buffalo, or Pittsburgh, are working-class cities, and apparently the joke is that these are cities that are totally lacking in cosmopolitan culture.

Yet, for their residents, these communities have been of extreme importance. If one visits many of the working-class neighborhoods of the old cities, one finds families that have lived there for several generations. It's not a cosmopolitan life. Parents, children, brothers, and sisters may all live nearby; daily life, social events, shopping, perhaps work, are carried on in the neighborhood.

So for women especially, to lose this neighborhood can be a source of real trauma. Working-class communities have been lost to their residents in a number of ways: urban renewal, highway construction programs, the current, quote, "gentrification" of the inner city, the threats of racial and ethnic change; and also, in more benign ways, through upward mobility and success when families move out.

The community is especially important to women because they have traditionally chosen their friends from the parish, from the block. As a result, their social networks in the community are often well developed. They are made up of family, friends, neighbors who feel affection for one another and who can be called upon in times of crisis. And this is frequently the substitute for the formal service agencies.

So, under these circumstances, the loss of community, the breakdown of networks, can be quite traumatizing, and there is a good deal of social science research that substantiates the psychological and somatic reactions that women have to the loss of their community.

Working-class women have more problems and get less help with those problems than either working-class men or middle-class women. When the network breaks down, the women are often left in a state of severe isolation, and I will just reinforce what was said earlier, that this is especially the case with elderly women. So the importance of the community to the ethnic working-class women who inhabit it helps to explain, I think, why we have seen not only historically, but in recent years, women stepping out of traditional roles to take whatever steps they may see as necessary for the survival of their community.

Let me just end by calling to mind something that I just recently read. It illustrated the old truth, "Powerlessness corrupts." When people feel powerless over any length of time, they begin to accept aspects of the world and of themselves that they know to be contrary to their own best interests.

The neighborhood or community action movement, which I have discussed at more length in the paper, but I don't want to go into it here, can be an important antidote to this powerlessness.

As members of active community groups, women and men have had the experience of feeling that they have a voice in decision-making, an

experience that many of them did not have before. One of the major tasks now, of course, confronting organizers and political leaders is the yoking of this activist tradition with a vision that transcends a narrowly defined self-interest, whether it's ethnic or otherwise, and looks to the good of the wider political collectivity.

I just want to end this paper by saying what I really believe cannot be emphasized enough in this context. And that is that the problems of Euro-ethnic women are the problems of all women. They are exacerbated by the conditions of class, and they are shaped by a particular historical tradition. But Euro-ethnic women are far more like other minority women than they are different. The passage of an equal rights amendment, the elimination of discrimination and harassment at the workplace, a government and community commitment to quality day care for the young and the elderly would help ease the burdens of ethnic women, as they would all women.

And finally, the problems of individuals will not be resolved until the wider community in which they live becomes a place that offers security and enhances the quality of daily life. And this, I think, will not happen until there is some reordering of national priorities. The working-class community would have a better chance of remaining viable if banks and insurance companies were not able to take finances from the residents and refuse to re-invest them in the community. The working-class community would have a better future if corporations could not simply close up shop and move a factory or plant to a locale offering lower taxes.

Okay. I will end it there, but I do want to end on the emphasis that the problems of ethnic women are the problems that are shared by men of their class and by women of other groups as well.

[The complete paper follows.]

EURO-ETHNIC WOMEN: SOME OBSERVATIONS

By Kathleen McCourt *

By now it is presumably clear to those gathered at this consultation what is meant by Euro-ethnics. Which European origins, for which generations, constitutes the basis of something of concern to the Commission on Civil Rights and is probably less clear. My task here is to discuss the condition of Euro-ethnic women. In one obvious way,

* Assistant Professor of Sociology Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois

the relevance of this group to the Commission is more evident. These are women; as such, they share in the discrimination and oppression of all women in this country. Beyond that, most of those whom we refer to as "ethnic" are members of urban, working-class families; thus, they share in the particular problems of a class caught between the officially designated poor, who are eligible for special services, and the comfortable middle class, who are able to provide quite adequately for themselves. In addition, women of some ethnic groups are victims of further discrimination because of their religion or their ethnic background.

It is difficult to generalize about Euro-ethnic women. Irish, Italian and German-American women have histories, traditions, and cultural values that differ from each other. Even more strikingly, groups such as these who were the earlier immigrants had experiences in this country in many ways unlike those of the later immigrants from eastern and southern European countries such as Greece, Poland, and Russia. Additionally, while some class, sex or ethnic based problems persist over time, the condition of third generation American women is quite different from the condition of first generation Americans. How, then, to approach these many aspects in one paper?

I will discuss some of the situations that I think are or have been major concerns or sources of tension in ethnic women's lives. I will sometimes have empirical data to back me up, sometimes only literary or impressionistic data. Wherever possible I will draw on historical experience and point out the differences between ethnic groups.

My focus is on women of the working class. This is the social class in which most people who identify themselves or are identified by others as ethnic are located. Also, this is the group of real concern to us. While some middle or upper-middle class individuals may view themselves as members of an ethnic group and may take pride in that group's culture and achievements, we are not, I think, primarily concerned with the situation of the more economically advantaged groups.

Working-class women – "the subordinate partners in subordinate families", to use Robert Lane's terminology – have never shared in the economic and political decision-making in this country. And the recent movements of middle-class women, blacks, and other minorities have little touched working-class women. They remain, 40 minorities or so, living in families with incomes above poverty but well below affluence, married to men with blue-collar jobs or low level white-collar jobs. These women never made it through college; some began but dropped out after a semester or two to earn some money or to get married. Generally, they live in the large cities of the East and the Midwest, but more and more they are moving to the suburbs. They are

the daughters and grand-daughters of immigrant women who struggled and saved for the survival of their families and a better life for the next generation. They *are* the next generation, the generation that was able to buy their own homes and have visions of their children graduating from college. They are good citizens, who obey the law and pay their taxes; good wives, who stick by their husbands; good mothers, who raise their children to be obedient and patriotic; good workers, who accept low wages and don't make trouble. In short, they are the kind of Americans who can be ignored.

They have been ignored and invisible in the past; they have been, in the words of Nancy Siefer, "absent from the majority." Recently, though, we have begun to hear and read a little more about them. A few academics have focused attention on working-class women (Rubin; Sidel; Siefer; McCourt). Some segments of the women's movement have attempted to involve them by appealing to concerns they share with middle class women – concerns like equal pay, child care facilities, and good health services. The media have begun to portray working-class women, not only Edith Bunker and Laverne and Shirley, but sometimes even sensitive and well developed characters like Norma Rae in the recent film of that title.

Primarily though working-class women are less invisible today because they are demanding attention. In cities throughout the northeast and midwest, when community residents organize and struggle for a voice, women are in the forefront. In the fights for better housing and schools, in the organized citizen resistance to highway construction, neighborhood demolition, and racial blockbusting, working-class women are leaders.

In the workplace, too, there is more organizing of those in "female" occupations. Sometimes women are organized into traditional union locals; frequently now, clerical workers are joining the new working women's organizations like 9 to 5 in Boston or Women Employed in Chicago. Still, the community seems to be where the ethnic women are becoming most visible – and it is in the community that many of the women's important struggles are being played out.

It is essential to keep in mind that ethnic women, like any other group, are not inhabitants of a self-sufficient community. They live within the wider society; their marital relationships are influenced by the media; the quality of their community life is affected by national unemployment rates; their work experience is influenced by the presence of unions, minimum wage laws and health and safety standards; the kind and quality of the education they receive is shaped by national policy, academic trends, and the allocation of State and Federal resources.

But just as it is impossible to understand people's daily lives without understanding what is happening in the wider society, so it is impossible to fully comprehend the impact of national policies and programs without seeing what results at the level of community and family. For women, especially, the ways in which they handle various segments of their lives – work, education, child care, friendships – must be adapted to the realities of what the community does or does not offer.

I would like to approach this discussion of Euro-ethnic women using three themes that help me conceptualize what I see as sources of strain or tension in the lives of working-class women today. These are as follows: First, the general theme of “tradition versus change,” and the only slightly more specific themes of “the individual and the family” and “the community and its loss.”

Tradition and Change

Working-class women, it has been frequently pointed out in the literature of social science, are a traditional people. They adhere to traditional beliefs, values, and behaviors; they still go to church (although in decreasing numbers); they value family life; they like living in the neighborhoods where they grew up. When Rainwater and his fellow sociologists wrote *The Workingman's Wife* twenty years ago, they expressed the belief that they “had examined the most conservative members of our society.” They wrote, “Within these women are imbedded the deep and enduring values of our culture.” (p.vii)

Working-class women historically have been strong defenders of their cultural traditions. You may recall the Jewish immigrant woman in the film *Hester Street*, who countered the wishes of her husband by resisting assimilation, keeping alive as best she could the old language and religious rituals. Ethnic women often were more reluctant than men to assimilate, perhaps because they tended to stay closer to home, perhaps because they had prime responsibility for the socializing of children and so had to more consciously deal with the values which were to be transmitted.

(More recent studies, by the way, have suggested that ethnic or working-class women are more likely than their husbands to accept middle-class attitudes and standards of behavior, the contemporary equivalent of assimilation.)

In any case, immigrant women and their families made valiant efforts to preserve the ethnic culture in the face of attempts by employers, teachers, and social workers to “Americanize” the immigrants. The historian Herb Gutman tells us how the pressures of the factory system, the time clock, the dawn-to-dark work day and a

rational system of production threatened to destroy the ethnic subcultures which had a different rhythm. For example, a Polish wedding in a Pennsylvania mining or mill town would last, as in the old country, between three and five days. Practices such as this were an annoyance to many employers and, eventually, the immigrants had to give way. While Jews in Eastern Europe held a festival of celebration the eighth day after the birth of a son, in America such events were not allowed to interfere with the work week. In the face of massive attempts to break down indigenous culture, it is of little wonder that stubborn and loyal immigrant women frequently dug in their heels, clung to their own values, and did their best to transmit these to the next generation.

As well as being keepers of the ethnic traditions, immigrant women did whatever they had to do to keep the family together despite the pressures of an expanding and often brutal industrial system. In 1895, Charles Zeublin wrote in *The Hull House Maps and Papers*: "It must of course be recognized that it is almost impossible to maintain the old family life in the environment of the factory system. . . with its long hours, and employment of women. The astonishing fact is the preservation of so much of the tradition of the family in the face of modern social disintegration." Zeublin wrote specifically of the Jewish immigrant family, but what he says applied to other ethnic groups as well. And family preservation was largely the result of incredible efforts on the part of women.

I do not wish to unduly romanticize the traditions that ethnic women inherited. Many of those traditions after all were designed to keep women in their place, a very subordinate place indeed. In nineteenth century Ireland, for example, women walked behind males, ate their meals only after the men had finished, and were expected to help men with work in the fields but got no help in return for their heavy domestic chores. Among Irish women of this period there were, not surprisingly, high rates of poor nutrition, early aging, and early death. (Kennedy)

During the same period, in Eastern European Jewish homes, the birth of a son was cause for celebration since "a male child would not only ultimately assume all the religious responsibilities of Judaism. . . he might even bring renown to his family as a scholar." (Baum, Human and Michel) So sons were pampered while daughters early assumed housework and the care of younger children.

In Italy, too, a girl's childhood ended early. "From the age of 7, girls were apprenticed in learning household skills, developing the qualities of womanhood under constant supervision." (Femminella and Quadagna) Italian women married young, frequently in their early to mid-

teens, were expected to bear many children, and were unable to divorce their husbands.

History shows that many Euro-ethnic women improved their lot by coming to the United States, where it was more difficult for the ethnic group to sustain a cultural definition of women as inferior. The absence of many of the institutional structures that supported that definition combined with the practice of women in the United States working outside the home to more nearly equalize the position of the ethnic woman.

So the ethnic traditions were a mixture of positive and negative, desirable and undesirable, for immigrant women, producing, in all probability, ambivalent feelings similar to what ethnic women today feel, when they assess the changed roles that may or may not be available to them.

I do not think that most working-class women today attach a great deal of importance to maintaining the traditions of their particular ethnic group. The ethnic traits of language, ritual, custom, and food are nice and interesting – indeed, ethnic crafts and ethnic restaurants are quite in vogue in the mainstream society – but they are seldom central to the lives of third or fourth generation Americans. (Religion is the one area where traditional values continue to be very important for many ethnic women.) For the most part, the rhythm of American factories, shops, and schools has become the life rhythm of Euro-ethnic women and their families.

Yet ethnic women do not always feel themselves to be in step with the middle class values and behaviors. It has been pointed out that many ethnic working-class women do not identify with the ideology of the women's movement because they perceive that movement as an attack on what they cherish: the nuclear family, child-bearing, monogamy, the role of housewife, male authority, and clearly defined sex roles. Despite their resistance, working-class women are struggling with precisely these issues.

Confusion and uncertainty characterize many working-class families today. Routine family problems are exacerbated by the breaking down of traditional role expectations and new role options, for women especially but for men as well. As indicated earlier, some studies suggest that working-class women are more likely to develop middle-class values and attitudes than are their husbands. They share in aspects of middle-class female culture through women's magazines, and they are further exposed to that culture in their office jobs. This exposure to middle class values, to some of the ideas of the women's movement, and to the possibilities of expanded role options appears to be putting increasing pressure on blue-collar husbands, who fear they may not "measure up" to their wives' new expectations. Sometimes

the men attempt through force or intimidation to keep things the way they have been. "If I were to get a job tomorrow," says one Italian American woman, who is married to a blue-collar worker, "it would break up my marriage. My husband will not have his wife financially independent of him." Both men and women are changing in their own behaviors and how they relate to each other and the changes, expectedly, often have a painful aspect. As Sennett and Cobb have discussed in *The Hidden Injuries of Class*, the only thing many working-class men have left to feel pride in is their ability to provide adequately for their families. When this begins to erode through unemployment, the impact of inflation, or their wives' taking jobs - as more and more working-class women are compelled to do - they feel stripped of a certain amount of their dignity and manhood.

Yet, on the other side of the marriage, working-class women are following national demographic trends, living longer and having fewer children. Like middle-class women, they must face the question of what to do with their lives for the 30 years or so after their children are gone. Most women faced with this problem of what to do with their lives do not "go crazy" like the leading character in the film *A Woman Under the Influence*. (Although many do; neighborhood mental health centers, I am told, cannot begin to keep up with the number of people - largely women - coming to them for counseling.) But there are increasing incidences of alcoholism, depression, and conflict in working-class families. These problems, of course, are due not only to the pressures exerted when familiar worlds break down; they are also heightened and in some cases created by an economic system whose inflation and unemployment hit hardest at working-class families.

Having a paying job is not a new experience for working-class women. On the contrary, most immigrant women had to take jobs to assure the family's survival despite the traditional prohibitions against the practice. Today a clear majority of married women in working-class families work for pay. So, clearly, it is not the experience of work itself that is at issue but, for some families at least, the issue is the way in which a woman's life is to be defined.

Nineteenth century immigrant women found jobs that did not remove them from the family whenever they could. They took in boarders or did piece work or laundry at home. Many women even denied that what they were doing was really a job; they would not report themselves to census takers as wage earners. (Yans-McLaughlin) This was done at least in part to protect the family's definitions of the male as provider and worker and the female as the house and family keeper. This practice of defining situations in a way that builds

up and reinforces a certain view of the family – even at the expense of the individual – is at the heart of the concern I wish to address next.

The Family and the Individual

The media blare forth the messages of the “me decade” with television models justifying the purchase of products that “cost a lot” because “I’m worth it,” and the current cultural heroines are individuals who have achieved executive status by single-mindedly pursuing their dreams and ambitions. While this emphasis on self, personal fulfillment, and individual goal attainment is all around them, the ethnic women are still strongly tied to a tradition that encouraged them to submerge their egos and find life’s satisfactions in a husband’s achievements or – more frequently, since most husbands did not have the kind of jobs that brought reflected glory – in having a nice home, healthy and well behaved children, and a good family reputation.

In the realm of schooling, for example, in many ethnic groups education for self-advancement was seen to be far less valuable and commendable than working for the well-being of the entire family unit. Italian families took their children out of school as soon as possible that they might contribute to the family’s earnings. Parents correctly assumed that a child’s individual advancement would pull him or her away from the family and this was threatening both psychologically and financially.

For daughters, education not only posed the threat of pulling them away from the family but was, additionally, seen as simply irrelevant. Women, after all, were to be wives and mothers and in many cultures they assumed those adult roles at a young age, frequently in their mid-teens. Michael Novak tells of his grandmother, who was mother to seven at the age of 22. There was little space in such lives for self-fulfillment and self-advancement; there was, characteristically, self-sacrifice. Indeed, the cultural and religious model for women in both the Catholic and Jewish traditions was one of self-sacrifice.

Cultural experiences varied of course. Among Jews, even of the immigrant generation, education and individual advancement were more than tolerated; they were strongly encouraged. But while this was typically the case with male children, it was less frequently the case with female children. Indeed, it was not uncommon for young Jewish women to go to work in order that their brothers might be able to continue school.

Among Irish women there is some sign of independence and attempts at personal advancement if one views the emigration figures. Many unmarried Irish young women came by themselves to the new country to find a life better than that promised in Ireland. Single women appear to have emigrated at least as frequently as men; census

data show that in some years women were more than 50 percent of the immigrants. (Groneman) Women chose to leave Ireland because prospects for marriage were slim, since only one son in a family would inherit the small plot of land and be able to support a wife and children. Even with marriage, little more than a subsistent existence was likely. The alternative for the unmarried female in Ireland was to remain on the land of parents and brother as an unpaid servant. Given the sex ratio of Irish emigration and the very strong tendency for immigrants to be endogamous, women leaving the old country were in no way assuring themselves of future marriage partners. The women appeared to be emigrating for other reasons, including the chance for independence and the opportunity to improve their personal standard of living. But many of these women did nothing for themselves with the money they earned; they scrimped and saved that they might send enough back home so that a younger sibling, a parent, or cousin could come over. One observer of the times noted how important this was for the young women, an "imperative duty which they do not and cannot think of disobeying. . . One by one, she has brought them all across the ocean, to become members of a new community." (Magurie) Between 1848 and 1900, the money sent home by settlers in America paid for at least three-fourths of all Irish emigration.

There is a long and strong tradition in ethnic families of women's denying their own pleasures in order to make life better for husbands, children, or parents. One author looks back at her Slavic community and says: ". . . the strong took care of the weak. The retarded, the mad, the deformed, the illegitimate. . . none of them were sent away. Families cared for their own, accepting these burdens as fatalistically as rain and thunder. The drunken, the desperate, the stupid - these, too, fit into the community. . ." (Prosen) In the ethnic community, the family cared for its own elderly, sick, and slow. And the burden of care fell largely on women.

The historical changes the family has gone through added to the expectations that women provide emotionally as well as physically for other family members. As Eli Zaretsky points out, with the development and expansion of industrial capitalism, the family lost its productive function. The realm of work became separated from the realm of personal life. As people found less meaning in their work, the family became "the primary institution in which the search for personal happiness, love, and fulfillment takes place." So, Zaretsky says, as the industrial revolution largely freed women from traditional patriarchal constraints, the expansion of personal life, which accompanied the rise of industry, created a new basis for their oppression. To them fell the responsibility for maintaining a private refuge from an impersonal society.

The family, the home, continues today to be the refuge for those who cope daily in the wider society. It has become, in the words of Christopher Lasch, "a haven in a heartless world." To the extent that the world outside becomes more difficult to deal with, more pressures are placed on the family to provide comfort and support for its members. All members of a family feel some of this pressure, but women especially are expected to meet the needs of others—husbands, children, and aging parents. And there are few resources with which to share the burden.

Service agencies are available less frequently to the working class than to the poor. And professional "helpers," like doctors, therapists, and lawyers, are used less by the working class than by the middle class.

Having played such central family roles themselves and having seen and lived with the sacrifices of mothers and grandmothers, today's ethnic women are not particularly comfortable with the idea that a top priority for them should be personal fulfillment, self-actualization, or their own advancement or pleasure. Nor, I might add, are their husbands and families always pleased with the possibilities of such a scenario.

The commitment to self-sacrifice is deep and has not disappeared over the generations. Mary Gordon's recent novel, *Final Payments*, depicts a contemporary situation where a Catholic woman sacrifices her years of young adulthood to devote herself to the care of her invalid father. She wanted, of course, to do other things with those years; but she wanted, too, to do as she did. Her behavior fit with her sense of moral obligation, her culturally and religiously formed definitions of love, respect, and gratitude. She did, simply, what one did.

A few years back a film called *A Woman Under the Influence* gave insight into this dilemma between self and family for one ethnic woman. Mabel Longhetti, the Italian American leading character is dedicated to her husband and children and has over the years grown more and more "crazy." Desiring only to be whatever her family needs – "Tell me what you want," she says desperately to her husband, Nick; "I'll be whatever you want" – she is never able to figure out who she is or what she needs herself. There is no room in her life for herself. She is married to a man who loves her but is incapable of giving her the support and acceptance she needs. Yet, he might have been able to give her more if she had had more insight into her own needs and been able to communicate these to her husband.

Many ethnic women today are in touch with what they want. They may want to go back to school to complete a high school degree or get started on a college program; many want to take advantage of some of

the more challenging jobs that are becoming available to women. And many are eager to get involved in all sorts of activities in their communities. Many, women, of course, already do some or even all of these things. But personal needs and desires are frequently in opposition to family demands or wishes. This tension is found in the woman who wants to get a paying job but will not go against her husband's wishes that she stay at home; it is found in the woman who returns to school but is filled with guilt at the time away from her family that her studies demand; it is found in the woman who is the victim of physical abuse but will not seek help for fear of besmirching the family's reputation; and it is found in the young woman who wants to explore all sorts of new avenues of life but feels she must "marry and settle down" in order to make her parents happy.

The absence of personal life was made concrete for immigrant women by the minimal amounts of privacy their circumstances allowed. A 1911 *American Journal of Sociology* article on Chicago's housing conditions notes the case of a West Side family of two adults and three children, living in four rooms, who had taken in seven boarders. Records indicate this was not an unusually crowded situation.

Those women today who do act to find their space, either physical or psychic, find frequently that the move is accompanied by doubts, feelings of guilt, and the pressures that accompany the playing of many roles. A woman, active in her community and respected for her work and energy, told me: "I'm always home in time to have dinner on the table when my husband gets home from work. I've never missed in 24 years of marriage." The strains produced by such demands are real, the result of mixed values, old and new, the result of patterns of social organization in family and work that burden more than they free people.

One of the things I found in my studies of women in community organizations was that many did not join until someone invited them to. When they began finally to believe that not only was it all right for them to get involved in this new activity, but they were needed, then they joined. Re-entry programs for ethnic women returning to school have found something similar: potential students must often be located and invited, assured that it is all right for them to take classes and indeed that they are wanted.

Ethnic women are not used to thinking of themselves first or only. This is not likely to change. And I do not think such a change would be particularly desirable. For those in the working class, families have offered something more than individuals are able to secure on their own. Bill Kornblum speaks of South Chicago parents' realization that even if their children do a little better, they "will continue to need the

security of the local community and its network of primary relations.” The steel workers and their wives that Kornblum talked with believe that what children attain in life will largely depend on the personal attachments their families have established over the generations. Holding the family together, then, remaining “decent and respectable,” and adhering to the community’s shared values becomes not a clinging to tradition for its own sake but the way the family of the next generation will survive.

Not even the impact of the “me decade” will change this. The emphasis on the family as the important social unit is not just a survival mechanism; it is a continuing emphasis on the only institution that seems able to meet some basic needs. Yet submerged somewhere in that collectivity are many ethnic women struggling to emerge as the individuals they would like to be.

The ethnic woman and her family, I think, are caught somewhere in the middle of social change. We are living in a time when more and more of people’s needs are being met outside of the primary groups of family, friends, and neighbors. One analyst puts it: “With few exceptions (people) must go to market and only to market, not only for food, clothing, and shelter but also for recreation, amusement, security, for the care of the young, the old, the sick, the handicapped.” (Braverman, p. 276)

Yet what happens to those families that are largely priced out of the market? The members continue to turn each other for as much as possible – not only because of tradition, not only because of pride, but also because alternatives are few.

Still, ethnic families have not been *completely* on their own; the immediate community sometimes offers help today as it did in earlier times. The statement, “I can turn to my neighbors,” carries a great deal of genuine meaning and importance in the ethnic community. And this leads me to a third theme I would like to address: the importance of the ethnic community to its inhabitants, especially women.

The Community: Its Importance and Its Loss

Something I read recently pointed out that the “joke cities” for comedians, the cities that get a laugh just by being mentioned, cities like Gary, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, are all working-class cities. The joke is, apparently, that everyone knows that such cities are lacking in any kind of cosmopolitan culture. (Robinson)

Yet to their residents, working-class communities have been of extreme importance. They have been more than just a place to live.

Today, these neighborhoods are, by and large, not ethnically homogeneous. Indeed, historians tell us they were seldom homogeneous in the past. Now descendants of Irish, Italian, Lithuanian, Polish and

German settlers share neighborhoods with each other and with more recently arrived Greeks, Koreans, and Russians. Indeed, statistics show that a sizeable number of white urban dwellers share neighborhoods with black families as well (Greeley).

Despite their lack of ethnic homogeneity, if one visits the working-class neighborhoods of America's old cities, one finds families that have lived there for two or three generations, often in the same house. Frequently, parents, married children, or brothers and sisters and their families live nearby. It is not a cosmopolitan life. Daily life, social events, shopping, and frequently work are carried on in the confines of the neighborhood.

Despite strong ties to the neighborhood though, there is often some conflict in residents' feelings about their community. There is, on the one hand, the warmth, familiarity, and sense of belonging that is comforting. Simultaneously, though, there is often a sense of isolation, or stagnation, and of narrowness that oppresses. Working-class people wish for success, upward mobility, and the fulfillment of the American dream for themselves and their children, but at the same time they may long for old, familiar neighborhood. "To stay down here, where he grew up," said one woman of her husband, "would be a sign of failure." Yet when this woman and her family moved up and out, they moved to a community inhabited by dozens of other families who had made the same move from the old neighborhood. A community both new and familiar had been created.

Sennett and Cobb talk of the need they found in their working-class respondents to feel that they are people worthy of respect. Often this was seen as attainable only with movement to a higher social class, which would entail leaving behind the extended family and the old neighborhood. Respect and success were seen to carry a high price tag.

However, the community is not always lost to its residents through such favorable events as upward mobility and good fortune. Over the last few decades it has frequently been lost in less benign ways. In the late 1950's and early 1960's urban renewal was the culprit. Neighborhoods, sometimes quite comfortable for their ethnic residents, were designated "slums" by government agencies and destroyed in order that new housing might be built. The housing almost invariably turned out to be too expensive for the displaced working-class residents (Gans; Suttles). Later in the 1960's, highway construction programs destroyed ethnic communities in Boston, New York, Baltimore, and Chicago in order that middle-class commuters might complete their runs in shorter time. Today it is the "gentrification" of the inner city that is displacing the working class. With remodeling and an infusion of funds, the old houses in the old neighborhoods provide homes both

more substantial and more attractive than anything being built in the suburbs. Finally, in addition to all these physical changes that threaten the working-class neighborhoods, there is racial and ethnic change, typically felt as the greatest threat to the community.

The neighborhood has been especially important to women. Like children and the elderly, women, especially mothers of young children, have little physical mobility and consequently are bound to the community. One author painted an appealing picture of female culture in the Italian immigrant community of years ago:

Grandmothers sitting on front stoops, gossiping, knitting, praying, and scolding and minding grandchildren along with general neighborhood business were a common feature of Little Italy's landscape. If they did not share their daughters' homes, many lived nearby. (Yans-McLaughlin, p. 51)

Although the presence of extended family is much less common today than it was in the past, still, in many cases, relatives do live nearby and help fill some of those functions that for others are filled in the marketplace.

Even if family does not live nearby, women of the working class will choose their friends from the parish and the block more frequently than anywhere else. As a result, in stable, ethnic neighborhoods, social networks are often well developed. They are made up of friends, family, and neighbors who feel affection for one another and who can be counted on for help and support in times of crisis.

Under such circumstances, the loss of community and the concomitant breakdown of social networks can be a traumatizing experience, one which produces extreme loneliness and leaves the women with literally nowhere to turn with their problems. Parish priests do not for most women play an adequate counseling role; professional help is not available to families on working-class salaries and, as indicated earlier, would in any case be viewed as a shameful need. Husbands have often not been able to serve as primary confidants for working-class women (Kormarovsky); this role has more often been filled by a mother, sister, other female relative or close friend who lives nearby.

Working-class women have been found to have more problems and to get less help with those problems than working-class men or middle-class women (Warren). What help they do get comes from relatives or neighbors. When the network breaks down, through geographic mobility, whether desired by the family or not, the women are often left in a state of severe isolation.

Some take serious measures to combat this. I talked with a woman who said that for a year after she moved, she got on the bus every

morning and went back to her mother's house in the old neighborhood.

The reaction to the loss of home and community can be profound, producing somatic symptoms that are akin to those that accompany the grieving process when a loved one dies (Fried). The isolation such a move produces can have further negative consequences. With the loss of their close network of friends and family, some women begin to place additional demands and expectations on their husbands. The marital relationship is then expected to meet all the needs that were formerly met by a range of relationships. One researcher found this produced such a strain on marriages that a higher than expected percentage of marital separations occurred within a year after the move from city to suburb (Tallman).

Movement from the old neighborhood can be particularly hard on elderly women. Whether it is they or their children who are doing the moving "disruption of the close proximity between aging parents and their married children presents the threat of isolation, loneliness, and insecurity, conditions which familistic neighborhood organizations developed to prevent." (Kornblum)

The importance of the community to the ethnic, working-class women who inhabit it helps to explain why women who see that community to be in jeopardy have stepped out of traditional roles in the past and taken whatever steps were necessary for communal survival. In 1902, for example, a mass demonstration against meat prices on the Lower East Side of New York was led by Jewish women. "The nation's financial metropolis saw angry immigrant women engage in seemingly archaic traditional protest," says historian Gutman. "Outsiders could not understand its internal logic and order. These women did not loot. . . they punished. Custom and tradition that reached far back in historical time gave a coherence to their rage." Tenants associations were formed and rent strikes were carried out by Irish, Italian, and Jewish women (Seller). In 1910, Buffalo's Italian women, supporting their striking husbands, led protest delegations to the offices of the mayor and the chief of police. "The women's goal was bread, not power. . . The political goal of the strike, a closed shop, did not concern them; their children did." (Yans-McLaughlin, p. 250) More recently, the role of women in the Chicago stockyards strike of 1921 and the housing riots after World War II has been examined (Hirsch and Pacyga). Women were prominent in both actions. In the 1921 strike, they battled the police in the streets of their neighborhood and were blamed as the instigators of the violence. On Chicago's South and West Sides after World War II, white ethnic women played a major role in attacking the black families who were the first to integrate the public housing projects. Housing officials who

believed they would circumvent resistance by moving the black families in during the day when the men were at work were taken by surprise by the women's behavior.

There is, then, evidence that ethnic women have on numerous occasions been political activists. Their activities, like men's, have taken on different political directions, sometimes espousing progressive causes, sometimes reactionary; sometimes it has been purposeful and organized; sometimes it has been a spontaneous reaction based on fear, anger, or powerless rage.

Examples of ethnic women's activism in the community are not easy to come by. Two Chicago historians suggest that the reason history has recorded so little of ethnic women's community activism is precisely because those actions were taken in defense of neighborhoods and families. They were communal rather than individualistic actions; consequently, specific participants in those actions were not especially visible (Hirsch and Pacyga).

So there is historical precedent for the community action of ethnic women in recent years. In Chicago, New York, Boston, Baltimore and other cities of the east and midwest, community groups (not always, but frequently from ethnic neighborhoods) have been active on a number of fronts. They have been instrumental in getting utility companies to act more fairly when setting rates or terminating service; they have been participants in the movements that have kept urban renewal projects from destroying neighborhoods of solid housing, have exposed some of the more flagrant abuses by insurance companies, and have reversed the process of urban disinvestment by lending institutions. Congresswoman Barbara Mikulski has referred to these citizen action groups as "one of the bright hopes of this country." And, in most of these efforts women are central and crucial actors (McCourt). As Tillie Tarentino of the National Congress of Neighborhood Women says, "women are the fighters, the ones who really care about the community." (Brightman)

One analyst has recently called attention once again to an old truth, "powerlessness corrupts." "When people feel powerless over any length of time they begin to accept aspects of the world and of themselves that they know to be contrary to their own best interests." (Lerner) The neighborhood or community action movement can be an important antidote to powerlessness. As members of active community groups, some citizens have the experience of being a voice in decision-making, an experience many had feared was lost in a system many had feared was no longer democratic.

Now, one of the major tasks confronting organizers and political and community leaders is the yoking of the activist politics of

grassroots people with a vision that transcends a narrowly defined self-interest and looks to the good of the wider political collectivity.

Conclusion

I must end this paper by saying what I believe cannot be emphasized enough. The problems of Euro-ethnic women are the problems of *all* women, exacerbated by the conditions of class and shaped by a particular historical tradition. Euro-ethnic women are far more like the women of other minority groups than they are different. The passage of an Equal Rights Amendment, the elimination of discrimination and harassment at the workplace, a government and community commitment to quality day care for the young and the elderly would help ease the burdens of ethnic women as they would help all women.

But the problems of individuals will not be resolved until the wider community in which they live becomes a place that offers security and enhances the quality of daily life. And this will not happen until there is some reordering of national priorities. The working-class community would have a better chance of remaining viable if banks and insurance companies could not take finances from the residents and refuse to reinvest them in the community. The working-class community would have a more auspicious future if corporations could not simply close up shop and move a factory or plant to a locale offering lower taxes and cheaper labor.

We noted that ethnic women have played a role in shaping their communities and in maintaining the strength and integrity of their families. But women's lives are not led in isolation. More so than in the middle class the fate of the ethnic working-class woman is bound up with the fate of her neighbors in the community, her co-workers at the workplace, and the other members of her family. Both the history of women and the history of the working class show that there is little individual advancement; progress is made when many members of the collectivity act together to reach shared goals.

REFERENCES

- Baum, C., P. Hyman and S. Micheal. *The Jewish Woman in American*. New York: New American Library, 1977.
- Braverman, Harry. *Labor and Monopoly Capital*. New York: The Monthly Review Press, 1975.
- Brightman, Carol. "The Women of Williamsburg", *Working Papers for a New Society*, Jan-Feb, 1978.
- Femminella, F.S. and J.S. Quadagna, "The Italian American Family" in *Ethnic Families in America* (ed. C. Mindel and R. Habenstein). Elsevier Press, 1976.
- Gans, Herbert. *The Urban Villagers*. New York: Free Press, 1962.

- Greeley, Andrew. *Ethnicity in the United States*. Academic Press, 1974.
- Groneman, Carol. "Working-Class Immigrant Women in Mid-Nineteenth Century New York: The Irish Woman's Experience". *Journal of Urban History*, May 1978.
- Gutman, Herb. *Work, Culture and Society in Industrializing America*, 1976.
- Hirsch, A.R. and D.A. Pacyga, "Defending the Community: The Ethnic Woman as Activist". Paper presented at Conference on the History of Women, The College of St. Catherine, St. Paul, Minn., October 22, 1977.
- Kennedy, R.E., Jr. *The Irish: Emigration, Marriage and Fertility*. University of California Press, 1973.
- Komarovsky, Mirra. *Blue-Collar Marriage*. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.
- Kornblum, William. *Blue-Collar Community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Lerner, Michael. "Surplus Powerlessness," *Social Policy*, Jan-Feb, 1979.
- Maguire, J.F., *The Irish in America, 1868*. Quoted in S. Feldstein and L. Costello, *The Ordeal of Assimilation*. New York: Anchor Books, 1974.
- McCourt, Kathleen. *Working-Class Women and Grassroots Politicians*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977.
- Mikulski, Barbara. "The Ethnic Neighborhood: Leave Room for a Boccie Ball" in *Pieces of a Dream* (M. Wenk, S. Tomasi and G. Baroni, eds.), 1972.
- Novak, Michael, "Confessions of a White Ethnic" in *White Ethnics: Their Life in Working-Class America* (Joseph Ryan, ed). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
- Prosen, Rose Mary, "Looking Back" in *Ethnic Women*. Elsevier Press, 1979.
- Rainwater, Lee, Richard P. Coleman and Gerald Handel. *Workingman's Wife: Her Personality, World and Life Style*. New York: Oceana Publications, 1959.
- Robinson, Lillian S. *Sex, Class and Culture*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978.
- Rubin, Lillian. *Worlds of Pain: Life in the Working-Class Family* 1976.
- Sennett, Richard and Jonathon Cobb. *The Hidden Injuries of Class*. New York: Vintage Books, 1973.
- Sidel, Ruth. *Urban Survival: The World of Working-Class Women*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1978.
- Seifer, Nancy. *Absent from the Majority: Working-Class Women in America*. New York: American Jewish Committee, 1973.

- Seifer, Nancy. *Nobody Speaks for Me: Self-Portraits of American Working Class Women*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976.
- Suttles, Gerald. *The Social Order of the Slum*. — Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Tallman, Irving. "Working-Class Wives in Suburbia: Fulfillment or Crisis?" *J. of Marriage and the Family*, Feb., 1969.
- Warren, Rachelle. "The Work Role and Problem Coping: Sex Differentials in the Use of Helping Systems in Urban Communities" Paper presented at American Sociological Assoc. meeting, 1975.
- Yans-McLaughlin, Virginia. *Family and Community*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- Zaretsky, Eli. *Capitalism, the Family and Personal Life*. New York: Harper and Row, 1976.
- Zeublin, Charles. "The Chicago Ghetto" in *Hull House Maps and Papers*. New York: Arno Press Reprint, 1970.

* * *

COMMISSIONER FREEMEN. Thank you very much.

We will now have the reponding panel. The first panelist is Galina Suziedelis, a Research Associate at the Center for the Study for PreRetirement and Aging at Catholic University.

In 1978, she served on the President's Commission on Mental Health, working with a panel for the European American subpopulation.

She has participated in numerous panels and forums on women's rights, specializing in issues of Euro-ethnic women, and has written many articles on Euro-ethnic populations and the elderly.

RESPONSE OF GALINA SUZIEDELIS

I thank the Commissioners for the opportunity to sound off.

I wish to respond to two concepts contained in Dr. McCourt's paper.

First, I agree with her that the problems and concerns of ethnic women unfortunately reflect those of all women in general. These problems can be summarized by the following anecdote, if I may be permitted a little bit of levity: It has been said that from cradle to age 20, a woman needs good parents; from age 20 to 40, she needs good looks; from age 40 to 60, she needs a good personality; but from age 60 on, what a woman needs is good money.

In matters of exploitation in the working place, the ethnic woman stands only a notch above the black woman. Evidence shows that the sweatshops of yesterday, even if dealing with space age products, are still very much with us.

Immigrants were, and still are, a good source of cheap labor, and from their ranks the immigrant ethnic woman is the cheapest of them all.

To be a female even in today's society is still often a mixed blessing at best; but research shows that to allow oneself to become an aged female immigrant is not only risky, but downright a mistake. It is a kind of precariousness of existence compounded three times, a case of triple jeopardy. I am referring here to some of the findings regarding women 60 years of age and older from a study we did at Catholic University on eight ethnic groups in the Washington-Baltimore area. ("Informal and Formal Support Systems and Their Effect on the Lives of the Elderly in Selected Ethnic Groups," AOA Grant No 90-A-100, January, 1979.)

They involved the Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Greeks, Italians, Jews, Poles, and Hungarians.

In spite of inner-group supports and close life-long connections, because of longevity, there were more widowed women, more women than men with incomes below \$500 a month, and consequently more women than men stating that they "cannot make it."

There were more women than men with low education, more women living alone, more women unable to assist others not because of lack of desire or generosity, but rather for lack of funds, know-how, and transportation; and, last but not least, we found that more women than men had a low degree of life satisfaction, and that their self-image was largely shaped by their achievements in the area of the family and child-bearing ability. This was sharply and pointedly illustrated by one ethnic woman, who answered the question in regard to her greatest achievement this way: "I guess I have none, since I have no children." And this came from a woman who had had 2 years of college education.

My second response is to the term "ethnic" itself - both the word and the concept.

I strenuously oppose the equation that has been steadily employed throughout this consultation in general and in many individual presentations in particular, namely, the equation between "ethnic" and "working class." Perhaps this is the reason we are experiencing some confusion.

Let us remember again that a culturally bonded group become "ethnic" only when it is outside its original native country. Therefore, just as the members of each country are dispersed along all socio-economic levels at home and still share the same ethnos, so are they represented in the same way in the host country, while still united by the same ethnos, even if separated by dissimilar economic and educational resources.

By now, however, "ethnic" has become a derogatory term, indicating not so much a separate cultural derivation, but more often than not a low-brow mentality, crudeness, ignorance, bigotry, and outright stupidity. This, to me, is the grossest distortion of what we are talking about here.

Ethnicity is not where we go slumming. It is not just exotica, Old World charm. It is not a quaint, old cobblestone street where we occasionally go to partake of some unusual dish, or to hear a strange, but moving song by a costumed balladier.

Ethnicity is an extra dimension of being. And not only that. It is a whole hierarchy of shared meanings, symbols, and values, a hierarchy that exists in reality even after we leave that cobblestone street.

So far, once a person steps up the economic ladder, he or she ceases to be referred to as "ethnic," public opinion presumably being that that person automatically and readily discards all the culture-specific orientations. This is a false presumption. A case in point might be the new immigrants, the so-called refugees, the DP's (I am one myself) who arrived here after World War II as a result of a political absorption of their native lands by a certain foreign power, which shall remain unnamed here. Mostly highly educated, but no longer able to continue their original careers due to language difficulties, these newcomers worked years at menial jobs, and all of them provided their children with higher education; and these same children now are in important, responsible, and creative positions in the larger society, vitally involved and contributing citizens of this country, while at the same time continuing to transmit all of the essential meanings of their particular cultural group to their own offspring.

When I was working on my Master's degree in sociology quite some time ago, I surveyed my own Lithuanian group through a nationwide questionnaire. I found that those who measured high on both pattern maintenance (identification with ethnic group patterns) and adaptation (identification with the host) indices were neither fence straddlers nor fence builders. They were the people who could march in Selma one day, and the next day teach the beauties and complexities of the Lithuanian language to the smallest members of their cultural group.

Why then, you might ask, do they need to belong to a particular group, if they are doing so well? I am convinced that it is because there is an inherent value in such bondings, and the value lies in the function of such groups. In a very important way, they do act as an extended family for its members, and they do perform that very important task of socializing their young for the larger society.

I would like to go on by mentioning some of the some acutely felt needs of these ethnic groups, mainly those that are particular to the elderly women of Euro-cultural background.

Specifically, since they do outlive their mates and as they approach the final cycle of their lives themselves, they experience an urgent need to spend such time in the kind of surroundings that are culturally close and meaningful to them.

I am speaking here particularly of ethnic group nursing homes. In our study a large percentage of men and women stated that they would certainly prefer to have an ethnic staff if they *had to* enter a nursing home.

As I have learned from personal experience, it is a strange and interesting fact that no matter how many languages one acquires, one does eventually revert to the beginnings, that is, one's original mother tongue. My mother could speak Russian, Lithuanian, English, and some French. When she contracted cancer and entered the hospital the first time, she was quite alert and conversed quite ably in English with the nurses. Then, after she became terminally ill, she started talking to them in Lithuanian and was very perturbed when they didn't understand her. Thus the English language ability left her.

When she began to approach the comatose stage but was still conscious, she forgot to speak in Lithuanian and reverted back to her own mother tongue, which was Russian. That is how she died with her last words spoken in Russian.

Therefore I maintain that especially the newcomers, perhaps, when they approach old age and/or become quite old, do not retain the English language, which after all was only an adopted one. When this happens, they really do need the warmth, the close connection, and the security of their own ethnic nursing home or at least ethnic staff who could relate to the needs of these people.

There is also a very great need for research that would substantiate what we are stating here: either new research or a replication of already existing studies in all the major communities containing large culturally diverse groupings. To accomplish this, I urge the Commission to utilize ethnic researchers who are not only well prepared professionally to carry out such research in a most reliable, scientific manner, but enjoy intimate access to their own cultural group as well. This latter qualification is important in order to elicit the greatest cooperation from that group, as well as to ensure the correct interpretation of some of the meanings that might be misconstrued, or undervalued, by researchers outside of the group.

I would like to end my remarks by mentioning a few researchable questions, such as looking into the "desired life versus the actual life" of older Euro-culturally oriented women and perhaps into the impact of raised aspirations of women on the ethnic group itself.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Thank you.

Our second panelist is Dr. Laura Scanlon, a member of the faculty of the New York City Community College, who is also the Director of Project Sister School, a neighborhood based college program for ethnic women.

She is President of the Board of Directors of the National Congress of Neighborhood Women, a member of the Continuing Committee of International Women's Year, a member of the New York City Commission on the Status of Women, and holds a Doctoral degree in curriculum development and women's status.

Dr. Scanlon.

RESPONSE OF LAURA POLLA SCANLON

Thank you. I'm honored to be able to speak to the Commission.

I would like to address myself to Dr. McCourt's paper first by saying that I found it rich and evocative and well written, and to us English teachers, that means a lot.

I would like to focus on one aspect of being an ethnic woman that I feel has been touched on, but perhaps not enough, and that is the dramatic changes that Euro-ethnic women must be going through at this point in time, as are all the rest of the women in this country.

I think the changes are more dramatic for ethnic women because of their intense identification with the family, a role which is being changed even as we utter the words. There's a new dimension to it. We don't know what the future will be for us as women.

If I could be personal, a couple of years ago I went back to Italy, which is where my mother and father came from, and I am the youngest of many children. My mother is now 82-years-old, and I am the only one to return to the homeland.

When I got to that town in the mountains and saw the well that my mother drew water from and watched the other people still tending the sheep on those hillsides, I realized why I have a lot of trouble adjusting to 20th century American society, as an ethnic woman. It is not natural for a human being, I think, to undergo that degree of culture shock.

All right. I am also an ethnic woman who went through other kinds of culture shock, one of them being going to college. Now in my ethnic heritage, going to college for a girl was a bit of an embarrassment. My mother, even though she thought it was a good idea, said things like, "You do it so that you will be able to give your children a fine education. You will be able to raise your children in the right way. You will teach them good things."

Later on, I found myself in the position that I am now in, working with ethnic women who are returning to work and to school. These are predominately Italian-American women like myself who have

been away from school for many, many years, many of them having to leave high school when their parents needed them in the work force, many of them going to work right after high school and then getting married and having their own children, and now confronting the same kinds of changes in role expectation and economic demands that all the rest of the women in 20th century are confronting.

The program that I am directing is located in the community. It is a neighborhood-based college program, which attempts to serve women with a curriculum which is ethnically sensitive to them, which is sensitive to them as women, which is sensitive to their strong commitment to the family, and attempts to make an impact on the neighborhood in which it functions.

When I started working with these women and we discussed why the women went to college, the reasons ranged from "I want to be able to help my children with their homework" to "I want to be smart enough to talk to my husband," and "I want to be smart enough to talk to my children."

No one said, "I want to go because I think it will be a wonderful thing for me." Dr. McCourt touched on just this point: That we do need to find ways for ethnic women to not feel guilty about doing things for their own growth. If we are going to see women, ethnic women, progress and become part of the mainstream, they must have access to education, and one way to do this is to increase the kind of small college idea, whether in the community or in the institution. I happen to prefer the concept of community-based programs for ethnic women. I find that it reduces the alienation and the culture shock that they feel in going into the larger - as Dr. Femminella said yesterday - Anglo-oriented colleges.

There are other areas that need to be attended to, but I wanted to emphasize particularly higher education for ethnic women because, while education for ethnics was mentioned, not enough was mentioned about specific needs of women. Unfortunately, they are not included enough in either ethnic studies or women studies. What we have found is that exploration into the immigration and labors of one's own family history helps to a great extent in building the kind of ego identification that was discussed yesterday, and ought to be introduced into the mainstream of the educational system. We've done it in our college program at the college level for our returning women.

Tilly Olson, an author who wrote after her five children were grown and she could find time to stop working in the factory, speaks eloquently about the silence of the working-class ethnic woman, who just doesn't have time because of the pressures of her life to produce art. We don't yet know what might become of those women. Maybe one thing we might consider are sabbaticals for workers, so that they

would have time to create works of art and literature and music that are at this point excluded from their purview.

In going to college, I opposed not only my mother, but my guidance counselor, who thought I should be a receptionist because I had a nice smile. Today counselors are still apt to steer young women towards traditionally held female jobs, many of them into the pink-collar ghettos, many of them into low-echelon, secretarial, low-skill, dead-end jobs, many of them into, if they are professions, professions which we all know are shrinking, and where there will probably not be jobs. A lot of other needs of ethnic women need to be looked at in terms of how financial aid guidelines, especially with regards to day care and higher education, are drawn by the Federal Government. These are two very specific areas that need to be looked at, because they do exclude working-class women and working-family women. In addition, the Commission might check out the degree to which the CETA funding guidelines are being adhered to in our urban cities, and whether or not in fact they are serving women to the degree that they are intended to by legislation.

Finally, I think that if we could build an ideal society, it would be again a society where we could all feel like we did fit in; and I'm reminded - I'm going to make this quick - reminded of Tilly Olson's story, "I Stand Here Ironing," where she is talking about her daughter and how sad she feels for her daughter, who is not blonde-haired, blue-eyed, tall and thin, but is small and dark and a little foreign-looking. Hopefully we are moving toward a diversity in the culture, that enjoys the darkness, the exotic, the foreign as well as the tall, the thin and the blonde.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Thank you.

Our final panelist is Ms. Jan Peterson, the founder and National Project Director for the National Congress of Neighborhood Women. She is now working as a psychotherapist and is developing community programs for preschool children and senior citizens.

She has previously worked in the White House Office of Public Liaison and in policy and planning at the Federal agency, ACTION. Ms. Peterson.

RESPONSE OF JAN PETERSON

What I want to address my remarks today to is the role of women in community. As I said when I started the National Congress of Neighborhood Women some years back, I really did it with my mother in mind, a second generation Scandinavian woman from Minnesota. When the women's movement hit this country and we began to hear about the fact that somehow women were now moving away from the

family and raising children, I heard my mother one day say, "Gee, if I had it to do all over, I guess I shouldn't have done what I did." And I looked at her and I thought, if that's what the women's movement in this country is about or at least the way the media were presenting the women's movement in this country, it's beginning to make women like my mother feel they're needed to be something else.

Here's a movement in one sense that was denouncing the everyday labors of the working-class ethnic women. Indeed, the work that they were doing in their families was often invisible. Even though we have a Mother's Day once a year, a lot of what women do within the home has not been exactly visible.

The fact is over the last number of years women have been itemizing spending time, doing consciousness-raising, itemizing the skills they get out of running a house and then beginning to figure out how to transfer those skills from their home into the job market.

I think what we are seeing is that for most working-class ethnic women, the major parts of their life are their family and their community.

Yet those roles have not been represented by the media, if you think about this and look at the media today. Even though we're now beginning to get some new images of ethnic women in the media, I don't ever see - I have not seen on the media - working-class ethnic women that are involved in their communities. That whole image of what women do in the community is not there, so that a lot of what women are doing every day, doesn't seem fundamentally important. Therefore, as Kathleen McCourt was saying, women are now searching for equal opportunity within the society.

They're going to look for power some place, shape or form for the working-class ethnic woman. One of the places that women are beginning to search for power is within their communities.

We know that women are now playing major roles in keeping their communities alive, in providing the social services within their community and for raising the money for schools, political clubs, and most of the social services. The money is raised by women's fund-raising efforts within those communities because they don't have Government subsidies, and women have been playing major roles in doing all of this.

Yet there is very little support for such unpaid volunteer community services now that women are beginning to look for support for themselves. Also, they're hearing the women's movement again say, well, don't be a volunteer, because being a volunteer means you're getting ripped off, because one has not talked about the fact that obviously there's tremendous satisfaction that one can get in taking on

leadership within one's community and developing programs and raising money if we begin to see that that's what we're doing.

And we have just finished a very interesting research piece that I wanted to mention today to the Commission. In many of the neighborhood movements and the ethnic movements and the women's movement, we begin to see that women are playing these major roles in the community, but we're not beginning to understand what's happening to the women that are doing that.

And we've just finished a research paper that was done by Wendy Sherman and Barbara Spence showing that even though women had played major roles in the communities, the more Federal dollars had gone into a community and the longer the Federal dollars had flowed into the community, the more women lost power. And we itemize out that what's happening is that they lose power in very definable ways. Before the Federal dollars went in, the women may have chaired organizations, mediated a task force, done a certain kind of organizing, and done a whole bunch of empowering activities. As the Federal dollars flowed in over time, women began to do those activities less. And why I said I wanted to concentrate on this role of women in neighborhoods – if we're saying that we want to begin to validate new roles for women which is saying that it's all right to stay within the home and in the community – we have to talk about how do you support women being able to choose that, which means that we have to begin to understand that even if those women are choosing that and they're being undermined there, we have to figure out what we're going to do about that.

The fact is that where Federal dollars are flowing the women's roles are being undermined. By the way, this shouldn't be too astounding, because of our aid in State Department monies that flowed abroad to developing countries. We had to develop the Percy Amendment because we found out that as we put our money abroad, we didn't see the economic roles that women were playing in other societies because of our male biases and that we totally were eroding the roles that women were playing there.

We learned that from abroad; it's obviously true for our developing neighborhoods in this country.

But we also found that out that when we analyzed, asked women within organizations, in communities; and we're talking about male and female organizations that are involved in improving their communities.

What their priorities are versus the priorities of the organization were different. Women's needs are not being addressed in our neighborhoods.

And again, it's partly due to what Kathleen and Laura talked about: Women don't put their own selves first. Not only don't they put their own selves first, but they hardly put themselves forth at all. This can be seen in many women's organizations. I've sat in on many meetings – that's what I do all the time is organizing with women who are leaders in communities – and they talk about playgrounds and they talk about senior citizens and they talk about themselves, because they almost culturally have been conditioned not to look at themselves. It takes tremendous push and effort to get the women to say, "Hey, what I really like to do. . ."

But if you talk long enough, there are several things that come up almost all the time. One is women are saying they just need basic information – basic information. They feel totally cut off from getting just clear information about what other women are doing. They don't know what's available for them to do. They're out of the mainstream flow of information. Women are less mobile. They're tied. When we talk about being tied to your family and community, it means you don't get around; you don't get into the flow of information.

Education comes up second. They want a chance to learn. That doesn't mean that they have to have degrees, but they want a chance to learn. They want a chance to learn in a way that doesn't have to be totally threatening to them, which is why we developed the college motto that we did. Should they have to leave their homes and communities in order to go to college? We want a chance to learn in our own environment and to be able to be part of that.

And three is that they obviously are looking at the issues of violence against women in neighborhoods, which comes up over and over and over. We need to deal with the hidden issues that we can't talk about for all the reasons that Kathleen made out in her paper.

So one of the – and the third point is that if women begin programs in communities, that they do it differently than if men begin programs, that they always have a social service component, and if we're understanding, and I think one of the things – the things that we're beginning to understand and talk about – most of the people in this room have talked about it in their papers and been saying it – is that the Government no longer knows how to operate programs that work.

So all of a sudden, since there's no money, they're saying, okay, you out there in the neighborhoods, can participate. It's about time that the people in the communities run their own things – of course, but we don't have any money.

Why is it that women have been doing social service in the communities all along, and they have had tremendous networks, but we've never built on those networks that the women have? Take for instance the day care programs, a big failure. We came up with a

model, and we said this is now going to be the day care program for the country, and we've put it in the neighborhood. We said here it is, and you can't get jobs in it even if you're the most wonderful day care provider in the community, because you don't have an MFW and you don't have an early childhood education diploma, and besides, we're not going to allow you the educational opportunities so you can get it so you can work in it, and even though you developed it and organized it and got the money and wrote the funds and did all this, you can't be in it when it comes. So a lot of people in the day care programs were educated but lacking in the sensitivity and personal concern that would have evolved had women within their own communities become involved.

I'm suggesting that the women's movement must begin to be more sensitive to class and ethnicity. We've got to begin to look at how we empower women where they're at, which means to begin to allow them to design their own programs in their own community, especially middle age women on up in ethnic communities.

I'm supporting Kathleen McCourt's outlook on working class women in ethnic neighborhoods. We must look at those women and how we can provide support. Jobs aren't available for most middle-aged and older women, besides the fact that they're tied to their family community and are not mobile, because the family comes first. Most jobs are just not available to them, which is why a lot of women work in the sweatshops with non-unionized salaries, so they can go home and see how their kids are at noon and stuff like that.

One of the ways we can move is to give women the power to build their own institutions and their communities, which they're beginning to do. Also we can begin education services so that the women can begin to get the necessary training and educational support so they can build on the skills they already have. But first we have to recognize that the wealth of the skills the women have out in those communities have been keeping them alive and going, and we need to let them know that we know what they're doing, so that there's some kind of national sanction and view so that they can begin some self-appreciation.

So that's just one thing.

I think that we need to look for a Federal impact. We need to have a Federal impact statement on all Federal dollars that flow through communities and we have to begin to look at what role women do play in the staffing of those organizations, on the board of those organizations, and how is the program designed in terms of how it will have an impact on women, because I don't think anybody thinks about how they design their programs in relationship to women.

I think that we need to change the guidelines in terms of CETA, day care, education, scholarships. Right now, if you're married, and your husband works, you cannot get to become a CETA worker; you cannot get the college scholarship, and you can't get your child in the day care center unless you lie and say your husband is gone. And the fact is that the guidelines that we now have work against women being able to find their own power and to get jobs and to be able to get the services that they need.

I would say that my mother, now a volunteer in a nursing home, would be the most marvelous organizer you ever saw if we began to have a world that began to perceive her skills and many of the skills of women in those neighborhoods, and that was really what I mainly wanted to address myself to, but I think there's a new women's movement beginning, that will work towards helping women integrate their work for the community and their home life.

Thank you.

DISCUSSION

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN. Thank you.

This has been a very provocative panel.

Unfortunately, during these last two days, we have not had an opportunity to have enough interaction because of time limitations.

I'd like to just comment on the statement that was made concerning the media. The Civil Rights Commission has released or did two studies on window dressing on the set, and especially highlighting the stereotyping of minorities and women in television. We did an update, and we pointed out the lack—that one of the major problems is the lack of minorities and women in decision-making positions. In other words, the show is produced, but if there are no women who have an opportunity to determine what is produced, then that is itself a factor.

I would just like to make one request concerning those guidelines in need of change. The guidelines are published in the Federal Register, as you know with the respect to CETA and day care centers. Would the members of the organizations that are represented here today, make specific recommendations for the changing of the guidelines and submit copies of such comments for the Commission.

And if you'd just make a quick comment—

Ms. PETERSON. Well, I think one is that we're talking about changing either the income requirements and broadening the amount

of income that a person can have or beginning to look at women as unemployed people if they don't have their own income.

I mean it certainly was true – by the way, we just had a big visit of a group from China, women from China, and they said that the number one factor for eliminating battering and rape within the home in China was women having their own economic base, and I think that comes up all the time.

So somehow, we have to look at women differently if they're – they're all working, but not being paid for the work they do.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Let me say, number one, I think you're a most impressive panel. I think the points you have made are long overdue, and I have been disturbed for years that the women's movements seem to be primarily an upper-class movement and an upper-middle-class movement but some of the letters that I have received when the Commission had endorsed the ERA, came from working women, who correctly said, "What are you doing for us when we're down here in the ranks lifting things in factories and everything else?" So I'm delighted with what all of you are doing in your respective roles.

What I'd like the Staff Director to do to round out this testimony it to secure from the Office of Education the actual guidelines that exist with reference to the various Federal financial aid programs, – grant, loan, work-study – that relate to part-time students, working women, etcetera. I think that is a tremendously important point if we are going to provide access to educational opportunities at the community college level and the senior college level.

Number two, on your point, Miss Scanlon, on working-class sabbaticals, is a very interesting idea, which has been utilized in Germany, France and Scandinavia, primarily for workers undergoing retraining for new jobs before they appear, but when people know what the jobs they are now in are being phased out.

It came up with the Common Market, et cetera.

A number of us have advocated that idea. I think 1970 was when I first advocated it. A number of us met on it. We hoped to pay those entitlements out of the Unemployment Trust Fund; then the nation hit a junior grade depression in the early 1970's that scotched that idea, but I think the concept of an entitlement for a citizen to a certain amount of education and training in certain ways, anytime in their lifetime, a one-time entitlement, whether you have four years or whatever, and you can cash it in anytime, is an idea that is definitely worth pursuing and long overdue.

My only query to all of you, based on your experience in working with working women, would be what have you found to be their educational patterns after the community college level? Is there any

study you have done or any tracking, or personal experience and insight, which you could share with the Commission as to how many working women have gone on from community college into senior institutions of higher education?

Ms. SCANLON. May I respond?

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Sure.

Ms. SCANLON. From our college program that the National Congress of Neighborhood Women has been running now for 4 years, about 200 students by this point or by January will have graduated. Approximately half of them, I would say, go into 4 year institutions, and those that don't tend to go into jobs in the community. Many of them in social service work. Lots of them, also, are older women who do not wish to work but who then go into other kinds of community involvement and community activities and volunteer work.

Ms. PETERSON. The purpose of our program was geared toward helping women become more effective in their neighborhood activities more than it was geared toward work, so they have now built their own institutions and are working.

That was not our original plan, but they're doing it.

Ms. SCANLON. And many of them do create their own institutions in the sense of writing grants and developing projects and working in them.

I do want to just add one more thing, though, and that is that one of the things that our students do experience is peer support since our college model is based upon this. It's totally peer counseling, peer tutoring, peer everything. The women form study groups and work together. They support each other, because they're very intimidated by the idea of formal education. So this gets them through.

Some of the students going into the 4-year schools with that base of support feel that they can handle it, but they are not happy in those institutions, I might say.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. May I join with my colleagues, Commissioner Freeman and Commissioner Horn in expressing to you our gratitude for the kind of presentation that has been made here.

And I agree with Commissioner Horn that you have identified the issues that definitely need to be identified and certainly issues that will be given very careful consideration by the Commission.

Thank you, very, very much.

Sixth Session: Employment and Ethnicity

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Mr. Daniel E. Leach is presently the Vice Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. He has

appeared as a witness before this Commission on a number of occasions. Prior to joining the EEOC, he was General Counsel to the Majority Party in the United States Senate. He has been a trial attorney with the Department of Justice, Professor of Law and in private practice.

Welcome again.

**STATEMENT OF DANIEL E. LEACH,
VICE CHAIRMAN, EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYMENT,
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

MR. LEACH. Thanks, Vice Chairman Horn.

It's a pleasure again to appear before the United States Commission on Civil Rights.

I am here to discuss the question of ethnicity and employment, and of course EEOC must address this issue in the context of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act enacted back in 1964, amended in 1972 and again in 1978, a statute that is designed to end job discrimination based upon race, color, sex, religion, national origin, and to bring those previously excluded from the work place hopefully into the mainstream of the economy, and seeking to administer this law, I think it is most important that the Government do so, that EEOC does so, both with the reality and the perception that it is being done with an even-handed and fair approach to all victims of discrimination.

I have some observations to make on the issues that this Commission is presently addressing, and I would say at the outset that by and large, these issues, as they affect the various bases of discrimination that emerge under Title VII, transcend the Act in a way that makes them general principles, so to speak, in terms of their impact on the various protected groups who fall within our mandate.

It would appear that in the first place, employers have constructed some specific barriers to the hiring of minorities – and as I use it, that term should apply to all ethnic divisions affected by discrimination. The barriers apply mainly in areas of testing and other screening devices and in the area of recruitment as well.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has found a decided increase in recent years in total paper and pencil test usage and a marked increase in doubtful testing practices, which based on our experience tend to have discriminatory effects.

The same is true of arbitrary height requirements or weight requirements which may affect specific ethnic groups to one extent or another.

In many cases, employers have been relying almost exclusively on these tests as the basis for making the decision to hire, to transfer or to promote.

Candidates frequently experience disproportionately high rates of rejection by failing to attain score levels or whatever has been established as minimum standards for qualification.

This may be a valid and acceptable practice, but too often we've found that employers have been using tests that have not been shown to be predictors of job performance.

This is a critical issue under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. Even now, paper and pencil tests, height requirements, degree requirements and a host of other filters are used. Some are used legitimately; others are used as the devices that continue to serve to filter or screen out certain "types" of people for jobs or for promotions.

Recruitment barriers are just as serious. For new hires, employers or incumbent employees are likely to contact only their friends and associates, the buddy-buddy practice that so often serves to eliminate many "types" of candidates of whatever the ethnic background happen to be.

This still occurs and it may well depend on where the hiring net is thrown, be it toward the local high school or college, or in the direction of a particular suburb or a particular part of the city.

And the discriminatory effect continues on downstream. It doesn't stop with initial hiring.

It should be noted that job discrimination on account of ethnic stereotypes often operates in three dimensions: discrimination in hiring; and even if hired, discrimination in the form of segregated or unequal initial job assignments; and after assignment, discrimination in job progression, in the advancement and promotional opportunities that relegate minority workers too often to less desirable and lower paid positions.

Of course, there are pockets of progress. Some ethnic minorities are gaining increased skills through education and training. And some employers or industries are endeavoring to respond to the mandate of Title VII.

But by and large government must continue to press against these barriers, strike them down and prod and push and pull and at times order industry to undertake remedial and affirmative action.

That is my perception of EEOC's work; it is what I have experienced in 3 1/2 years with the Commission.

Part of the answer, I suppose, rests with measures that serve to identify the barriers, measures such as our uniform guidelines on employee selection. These are the standards set by Government, all agencies in this business, to inform employers as to their legal responsibilities in seeking to gauge individuals and their fitness for hiring or promotion.

It has been the use of tests or other devices or standards that are not properly job related or justified that has so adversely affected the hiring, promotion and transfer prospects of all categories of minorities.

The courts have been generous in finding unlawful discrimination where these tests have not been validated, where they don't evince a high degree of job relatedness. Further, the employer giving or acting upon the results of the particular tests must be able to demonstrate that suitable alternative selection procedures are unavailable. While a violation of the uniform selection guidelines may serve to identify unlawful job discrimination, these guidelines do contain a provision that offers encouragement to employers who have sought to respond voluntarily.

Embraced within the guidelines is the so-called bottom-line clause that says that even where an employer can't validate a selection procedure, government will not take action if, in a general sense, it appears that notwithstanding the infraction, those who have been left out or kept down in that employer's work force are being brought in and moved up. In other words there may be a technical violation of the law, but employers endeavoring to correct the effects of job discrimination ought to be encouraged. That's the message of the "bottom line."

Beyond employee selection procedures there are other recent developments that your Commission, the Civil Rights Commission, ought to be looking at. The Weber, Kaiser, Steelworkers case, I think, is relevant to this dialogue. There, you will recall, the Supreme Court placed its stamp of approval on voluntary affirmative action programs as a way of bringing blacks into the economic mainstream, but that decision probably applies to Hispanics and to any others who as a group or class can demonstrate a pattern of discrimination against them.

To briefly review those facts and that holding, let me say that until 1974, the Kaiser Aluminum Company hired, as craft workers, for its Gramercy, Louisiana plant, only persons who already had prior craft experience. As a result, there were, in that particular environment, very few blacks in craft jobs, in part, at least, as the Supreme Court Opinion specifically noted, because blacks had long been excluded from construction craft unions in that area. Perhaps in other parts of the nation it could be another group that been barred. In 1974, Kaiser and the Steelworkers entered into a collective bargaining agreement which changed the practice throughout the country with respect to craft jobs.

Rather than hiring from the outside, Kaiser established a training program to train its production workers to fill craft positions. The agreement provided for separate seniority lists – one black, one white –

with the provision that at least 50 percent of the new trainees would be black until the black percentage of craft workers approximated the percentage of blacks in the SMSA work force. As a result of the agreement, some blacks selected for training had less plant seniority than some of the whites whose bids were rejected.

Brian Weber was one of those whites. He brought suit; the rest is history. While Title VII protects whites as well as blacks, the Court ruled that the plan at stake did not violate the Act because it was an affirmative action plan voluntarily adopted by private parties to eliminate – and I underscore these words – traditional patterns of segregation in employment. While this case should bring to a halt those cries of so-called reverse discrimination uttered in the face of such a long-standing and continuing national blight, that's the way the Supreme Court saw it.

But on this score, I think the verdict is still out. The primary concern of Congress in prohibiting job discrimination was the lowly plight of those in our economy who had been riveted to unskilled and semi-skilled positions – whether it was because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin. The statute was to open up job opportunities, to bring people into the economic mainstream.

What does *Weber* mean in the context of a response to be fashioned by employers? I think it means that employers, without fear of retribution, can train minorities, all minorities, all categories of people for greater participation in the work force. This could mean the inclusion of minorities in occupations from which they have historically been excluded, and perhaps some white-collar jobs, in management, particularly in the upper echelons of management and in upper economic sales jobs.

Government, I think, must do everything it can to encourage employers to take advantage of the *Weber* ruling, and I look forward to the views of this Commission on this issue as it deals in the context of this particular dialogue.

Still another potential weapon that the Government has in its hands is our authority to identify and eliminate patterns and practices of job discrimination. We know from the statistical data that while the old slogan may no longer be visible; “Anglo-Males Only Need Apply,” it still is operating to the detriment of others, many others. Government must better use its power to identify these barriers, which I spoke of earlier, and strike them down.

At EEOC, we are seeking to construct a systemic enforcement program that will help to marshal our resources in a fair and logical manner, taking aim, for example, at the very worst practices in our economy and in our society, in order to achieve the greatest results.

For this purpose, we're just beginning to use this research base of ours as a law enforcement tool, to make more critical and rational judgments about where our resource allocations might make their most effective impact, whether it's in a particular industry, with regard to a given employer, or on a given issue, or geographically, or however job discrimination arises and against whom.

While the Commission brings numerous actions against employers who perpetuate policies and practices that result in low utilization of all available minorities, we have not done enough. Neither have the other elements of the Federal Government who are in this same business. And I guess what this all says is that while Congress has given us some tools to fight employment discrimination, and to attack it institutionally, we are just recently learning how to mount a more effective effort.

Government is trying to do better. I think President Carter's civil rights reorganization plan says that. Also saying it are those strategies fashioned to encourage voluntary compliance with Title VII, whether it's the "bottom line" of the testing guidelines or voluntary affirmative action, as exhibited by the *Weber* ruling, or targeting employers on a worst-first priority basis.

I think we must encourage those who seek to comply and begin to scrutinize more carefully those who appear not to. But these are only the seeds that may lead employers in the 1980's to restructure their work places to meet the demands of the law and national policy.

More immediate is the present, and this is no simple task. There are many questions. There appear few, if any answers. There is traditional resistance. There is political resistance. There is the economy. We appear headed for a period of economic decline. In the past, unemployment has been borne disproportionately on the backs of minorities. Those that entered the work force last are the first to go.

Balance and equity must be struck and to that end, there are many obstacles. I look forward to any recommendations that this Commission might offer as a result of this dialogue, and particularly on the question of layoffs, work sharing, whatever else might be required to mitigate this apparent period of economic downturn.

Thank you very much.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Thank you, Mr. Leach.

We will now move to our next panelist, Mr. Leonard F. Walenty-nowicz, who is the National Executive Director of the American Polish Congress.

He has been a practicing trial attorney for a quarter of a century, a Professor of Law for a decade. He filed briefs in both the *Bakke* and the *Weber* cases on behalf of the Polish-American Congress and the National Advocate Congress and the National Advocate Society,

which is an organization of Polish-American attorneys. He served in the administration of President Ford for two years as Administrator of the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.

**STATEMENT OF LEONARD F. WALENTYNOWICZ,
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, POLISH AMERICAN
CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D.C.**

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. Fine. I'd like to summarize that material, and I'd also like to give you some observations I've made while sitting listening to what was going on here yesterday and today.

It's my first appearance before the Commission, and I want to especially thank Mr. White and other members of the Commission, in particular the Chairman, Mr. Flemming, for their efforts to make my appearance a reality.

The first thought that I'd like to express to the audience and the Commission is the belief that the most important thing the Commission can do to help solve a lot of these problem areas, whether it's housing, women's social needs and so forth, is to seriously address this problem of employment and ethnicity. To the extent that we get the groups that we're talking about here today, Euro-ethnics, and more specifically Americans of South European or East European origin - involved in the decision-making process, the better the results will be in the areas we have been discussing. This especially includes employment, not only employment in blue-collar work, which we have been traditionally identified with, but also employment in all job categories.

This is why I differ with Mr. Leach. I think Title VII addresses itself to all job categories, not only to lower income job categories.

To the extent we get people from the grounds affected and involved in the nursing industry, and to the extent that we get Judges of East European and South European background involved in such issues as busing, the better the results will be. That's the question that was asked by you, sir, Mr. Horn, yesterday: - How do you get the community to accept, cooperate, and respond? Well, I think decisions can not only be made a lot more acceptable, but you'll find a lot better solutions to many of the difficult and sometimes almost insoluble problems facing us today, if you stop disregarding the grounds we are discussing today.

We will do better if we receive inputs from these groups, what I call, the new classes of left-outs.

And with those preliminary comments, let me paraphrase my statement here.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, speaking for the Polish-American Congress and reflecting what I believe are the sentiments of many Americans of Euro-ethnic origins, I wish to

express our sincere appreciation for this opportunity to present our concerns and views with respect to the subject matter of this hearing.

As we previously indicated, civil rights have long been dear to the hearts and minds of people of Polish and other Euro-ethnic background and tradition, and if anything, are more so with those who are or who will become United States citizens.

We claim no special privilege to speak out on human rights, including civil rights, but we believe that a full and fair examination of our history, both here in America and where our roots originated, will confirm that we also know of the suffering as well as the other devastating effects that discrimination, defamation, and denial of other civil and human rights cause .

What is somewhat unique is that much of this discrimination that we suffered, and still do suffer, has occurred within the context of one race, while this Commission's attention, and including the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's attention, has at least up to now been focused primarily, if not entirely, on discrimination between races, sexes, and people of differing color.

This preoccupation, however, is not unique to this Commission, for it pervades much of the Federal bureaucracy as well as the judicial, executive and legislative branches of government, generally.

What is most unfortunate is that such preoccupation creates mixed feelings of cynicism, neglect, resentment, and alienation, resulting from a belief that our Government is paying lip service to a declared policy of prohibiting without favor and priority discrimination based on race, color, creed, sex, and national origin, but our Government is only acting to overcome and remedy discrimination based on race, color and sex. This feeling is further compounded by the manner in which the concept of affirmative action has evolved and the fashion in which data is being collected and analyzed. This feeling is further exacerbated by the difficult economic circumstances America is presently facing and the failure of many of our institutions to allow for other significant American values and groups in our effort to fight discrimination and the effects thereof.

Thus, we welcome heartily the recent enactment to the Civil Rights Act of 1957 of Section 104(G), known legislatively as Senate 721, which in substance directs this Commission to study policies and practices regarding discrimination and affirmative action and how they affect Americans of East European and South European origin. We wish to thank Senator Jesse Helms and Congresspersons Barbara Mikulski and Donald Edwards for their help in having this legislation passed. We similarly welcome this consultation and we hope that this is just the beginning of a nationwide effort to ensure that our nation's commitment to civil and human rights is fairly and evenly applied and

is not distorted by claims of priority and lack of resources. To repeat, we hope this consultation doesn't finish your interest; instead we hope this is just the beginning.

It is not the responsibility of this paper to cover the broad spectrum of civil and human rights to which all Americans are entitled to, but I make general observations so that my comments on employment and ethnicity may be better understood. Employment and ethnicity can be approached from a number of directions. But given the brief amount of time available for me, because of the nature of this consultation, I think it is best to start from the viewpoint of data collection and the use such data is put to.

For mixed reasons, not all sensible and acceptable, the Federal Government presently collects data regarding employment policies and practices in five categories: black, Hispanic, native American, Asian American and white, other than Hispanic, categories which are repeated for both sexes.

The best examples are the EEOC reporting forms, and – if I may digress for a moment – the importance of these forms is that they reflect Government standards for data collection and analysis. The Federal Government says this is what we are going to do, and everybody naturally follows. Not that one has to follow; perhaps one can independently create other categories, but one follows because not to do so would cost more money, cause a variety of other problems including the possible denial of Federal funds, or what have you. So what developed is a mentality that only five categories count in America. To put in another way, the only categories that we use in deciding who gets jobs and who doesn't get jobs, or who gets Federal monies and who doesn't get Federal monies, who gets educational opportunities and who doesn't get educational opportunities are just those five categories.

And that problem is further confounded and compounded by the use of the term "minorities." I've never found – I've been searching the law for a long time – where the word "minority" is clearly defined. I've also been searching the regulations for a clear definition of the word "minority," and I can't find it. So the word "minority" is used as a code word. It's used to mask different things, depending on how a person wants to use it and what groups he wants to please.

Nevertheless in practice and reality, these are the five categories that count. Over the years, in the efforts to fight discrimination and promote affirmative action, there has occurred a belief that persons in the first four categories have been the victims of discrimination and deserve the benefits of affirmative action, regardless of personal circumstances, and that everyone in the last category either was guilty of discrimination or had to suffer the consequences of providing the

benefits of affirmative action for the persons in the first four categories – and guess in which of those categories we ethnics are?

As we pointed out in the briefs we filed in the United States Supreme Court in the Bakke and Weber cases, such restricted data collection and the use, and the beliefs, and practices resulting therefrom are fundamentally unfair and violate the civil rights of a good many Americans, including a good number of Euro-ethnics, especially those in the last category.

I make the last qualification so that you don't misunderstand my remarks in light of your use of the term Euro-ethnics. I would consider such term equally applicable to people from Spain. People from Spain, of course, are included in a separate category called Hispanic.

Such limited data collection is harmful in a number of respects. For example, a person in any of the four favored categories claiming job discrimination can readily fortify his case by data indicating disparity between the number of persons of his category actually employed in the job by the employer and the number available for employment. That is the SMSA statistic that Mr. Leach referred to. However, a Polish-American, Italian-American, or Slavic-American doesn't have this data available to him. In other words, if he wants to prove a case of discrimination, he doesn't have a ready body of data supplied by the government without expense to him to fortify his case of discrimination. Yet the people in the first four categories have that. So it's much more difficult for a person in this type of situation to prove his case of discrimination, and that's without addressing the impact of Affirmative Action. I'm just talking about a typical case of discrimination.

How absurd some of this preoccupation can get is the recent enactment by Congress of the Small Business Administration Section 8 minority program. There, blacks, Hispanics are definitely established as beneficiaries of the Section 8 program. Then apparently for constitutional and political reasons there is a clause that says in effect, "Well, if you can prove that you're a member of a different group that is socially, culturally, or economically disadvantaged, you can also get the benefit of Section 8 programs." But how can a small businessman, such as an Italian, Ukrainian or what have you, spend money he doesn't have to collect the data to provide it? So it's a Catch-22. It's an absurdity, an illusion. It says others can have the benefits of the program so as to ameliorate for political reasons the fact that really only two groups have been given the benefits of the program. It creates the illusion for the person who is non-black or non-Hispanic that he can have benefits immediately, if he can prove the need and then ironically and cruelly the Government doesn't make the data available for him to prove it. It says, "You go out there and find it yourself." How can the small businessman who's looking for a 60 or 70

thousand dollar loan spend an equal amount of money to prove that he's being discriminated and needs the benefits under a Section 8 program? It becomes even more absurd when one considers that the government concentrates its data collection on the two groups that automatically qualify for Section 8 benefits.

Another example of gross unfairness involves Affirmative Action. There has developed over the years a belief that numerical disparity alone requires Affirmative Action to lock each of the favored groups into almost every job category, particularly those jobs reflecting upward mobility. One prime example is the appointment of Federal judges, where a tremendous effort has and is being made to appoint blacks, Hispanics, and women. Yet no effort is being made to appoint Polish-Americans and other like ethnic Americans, even though a cursory examination of the judicial lists will reveal a dearth of individuals from these groups.

There was a young lady or perhaps professor that talked earlier about litigation. Well, part of the reason that litigation doesn't achieve satisfactory results many times is because the judges that are deciding the cases don't reflect the values or don't have any appreciation or feel for what's going on out there in the community. And that's why I compliment the black community and Hispanic community and women for attempting to get more judges, especially Federal judges. I take no umbrage at that effort, but while we're making that effort, I say we should make an equal effort to see about the other groups. As we have repeatedly stated, we take no offense, and we generally support members of the favored groups trying to improve themselves, provided we are also treated fairly and given the same consideration.

Essentially, our problem is in the area of employment. We are not being treated fairly; nor are we being given the same considerations. A mind set that has been created, that only those in the favored category should benefit from Affirmative Action and cannot be guilty of discrimination, however that term from time to time may be defined, while those in the last category must suffer the consequences of this type of Affirmative Action, regardless of whether they discriminated or were the victims of discrimination themselves. And this, from a Euro-ethnic point of view and my point of view violates an equally important principle of American justice, namely - If there is a harm done, then the people who have caused the harm should be the ones that should provide the remedy. Why should people who have fought like the devil for the civil rights of other Americans, black, Hispanic and others - and still do fight for such rights - be asked now to accept present concepts of Affirmative Action, that in effect says, "Well, you can't have this job simply because the Government doesn't care

enough to count you or doesn't even care enough to take a look at what your conditions of employment are."

Perhaps what is most amazing is that these categories were established without any concern as to the status of groups such as Polish-Americans in American society. As a result, job opportunities and the upward mobility of such groups has been seriously and adversely affected.

Accordingly, and as a first step, we recommend that the Government direct that additional separate categories be created for groups such as Polish-Americans, Italian-Americans and so forth. Much of the authority for such action is already available such as Circular No. 846 issued by the Office of Management and Budget on May 12, 1977, even though such circular is being disregarded in practice. I know about that circular. For it was issued after a long consultation with mid-level Government employees at OMB after I left government service. But to get the rest of the bureaucracy to respond to it - my God, it's like pulling teeth.

The Census Bureau has advised us that the Government has developed the computer capability of handling several hundred different categories so that the persistent claim that it would be unwieldy to create and handle more than the five categories that are currently fashionable can be dismissed as pure obstructionism and just another form of discrimination.

Let me again digress for a moment. If we did create additional categories and if the information showed that groups such as Polish-Americans and Italian-Americans are not doing so bad but instead are doing pretty good, don't you think that that perception would help secure the kind of consensus we need to help those groups that are not doing too good?

This alienation and unfairness is part of the tension. When I heard people talk about tensions and intergroup conflict earlier, I felt that's part of it.

Polish-Americans and other like ethnics condemn as hypocrisy and insult Government policies and proclamations that encourage them to take pride in their roots and preserve their separate identity when it comes to culture - or, as some other person put it here, the three F's - you know, food, festivals and famous heroes. And yet, at the same time, when it comes to employment, educational opportunities, and Federal funds, we are lumped into a category originally labeled as "other." I take offense to that. I'm not an "other." Or a "none of the above." Do you want to be called a "none of the above?"

And then finally, because of the insulting nature of those labels - and I say this without any offense, because the Census Bureau considers the Hispanic community 95 percent white - we were then lumped into

the category labeled "White, other than Hispanic." Is this really an improvement or just another insult? I mean, how do I get my identity by reference to someone else's identity?

We also wonder about the equanimity of Government policies that permit Hispanics to identify themselves as Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Cuban-Americans and so forth, but deny me the same right. I can't be identified in Government statistics as a Polish-American, and other Euro-ethnics can't be identified as an Italian-American and so forth. I wrote to the EEOC months ago about this. Got no reply. Offered to sit down with them. Got no reply. That's part of what we mean when we talk about tensions.

At this time, when jobs are being increasingly distributed at all levels on the basis of numbers, and the belief that equality of result is more important than equality of opportunity becomes more widespread, it is important that each group that makes up this brilliant mosaic called America be separately identified and counted so that it does not end up being left out or locked out or the victim of new, albeit perhaps unintended, patterns of discrimination.

The dynamics of employment and ethnicity are quite complex, and this paper is not intended to be a total review of this area, but simply an effort to illustrate different perceptions and create new attitudes and better initiatives and solutions in this difficult problem area.

I know I come on hard, because that's the way I've been taught as a trail lawyer, but I intend you no offense. I hope all of you understand that. I want to work— we want to work together. We just don't want to be left out. Hear me.

Contrary to what has been said previously in some places, no group needs to be a target group or bear the brunt of Affirmative Action. Instead we need new initiatives, such as the one we suggested in our brief in the *Weber* case. We don't want to only complain. We like to suggest constructive results or programs. We don't say we know it all, but we like to offer help.

We set it forth Affirmative Action based on a point system in the *Weber* case. We said, look, Affirmative Action, as it is presently being conceived and executed, shuts some people out. It's a new form of exclusion. Instead of doing that, when a person really has a case of discrimination — and there are many — and I think Irv said it clearly that the blacks have a unique situation here — let's give them and anyone else that qualifies, extra help like we did veterans, a point system. We identify the people, identify the groups and so forth, and we give them some help in that way.

This idea should be explored, not only to correct glaring deficiencies in present Affirmative Action practices, but also to respond to such issues as to how long should Affirmative Action continue,

whether Affirmative Action should continue to be available to recent immigrants, refugees, and other arrivals – something that perhaps you, Vice Chairman Horn, would be interested in as part of immigration law reform – and the impact of present Affirmative Action policies on such values as initiative, hard work, and competition.

I think a point system would not harm initiative, hard work, and competition as the present system does. I think you would still essentially maintain these other fundamental American values.

For a fuller appreciation of our concerns, I would like to submit for the Commission's consideration, as Exhibit 1, copies of testimony and presentations we made regarding the 1980 census, the so-called Sugarman proposals, before the Civil Service Commission, the EEOC, and comments on Congressional employment, SR 431, as well as our briefs from *Bakke* and *Weber*.

EXHIBIT A

STATEMENT OF LEONARD F. WALENTYNOWICZ, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS REGARDING THE 1980 CENSUS

Mr. Chairman and members of this Committee: On behalf of the Polish American Congress and its President, Mr. Aloysius A. Mazewski, who is unable to be here today because of other pressing commitments in Rome, Italy, I wish to extend our sincere appreciation for this opportunity to express our concerns and views with respect to the subject matter of this hearing.

Americans of Polish heritage view the coming 1980 Census with mixed feelings. We support enthusiastically the constitutional requirement that there be a Census periodically for the reasons cited in the findings and purposes set forth in the Census Act of 1977. These include such purposes as the need for accurate information to plan and analyze policies and to allocate funds so as to promote the general welfare. What troubles us, however, is present plans and practices relating to what kind of information is going to be collected, how it is to be collected and to what use it is going to be put to.

We don't believe anyone will seriously question the utility of an accurate data and analytical base in making informed decisions. The Census Bureau itself issued a 66-page summary detailing the rationale behind the data it will seek in the 1980 Census and the statutory authority supporting it. The importance of such data and analytical base is increased by the impact of our present inflation and declining economic expansion. Such data has become even more important as the American society switches emphasis from assimilation to pluralism. If pluralism is to work, then it is extremely important that all of

the groups that make up America be identified and counted and not just some, and especially in an America that has to tighten its belt. Essential to a successful operation of a pluralistic society is the belief that each group is fairly treated, which means, among other things, equality of opportunity in such areas as jobs, education, housing, federal funds, etc. Fortunately or unfortunately, depending on your point of view, this concept of equality has evolved to a point where equality of result has become more important than equality of opportunity. For example, the U.S. Office of Personnel Management today talks of "underrepresentation", meaning in essence that a certain number of jobs at all levels of government activity should belong to a certain group simply because of the numbers of that group. The U.S. Supreme Court in the celebrated *Weber* case has approved similar rationale in private industry.

We could go on to detail other examples, but the point is clear, numbers are very important in determining group and individual success and position in a pluralistic society, so that it is important to be identified and counted.

These observations bring us to a consideration of what specifically troubles us in the 1980 Census. Neatly put, we believe the proposed census makes only a half-hearted attempt to identify and count us, and unless remedial steps are taken, the census will end up being a source of new patterns of discrimination and unfairness.

For example, we wonder about the wisdom and fairness of including a question relating to race, and national origin or descent for such groups as Spanish/Hispanic, Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Korean, Vietnamese, Guamanian, Samoan, Eskimo and Aleut, on every Census form, but limiting identification of Polish Americans and other like groups to only the long Census form which will be sent to only 21% of America's households.

We have been advised by the Census Bureau that such groups as Samoans, Eskimos, Aleut, Filipino, Korean, and Vietnamese are estimated to be so small in number and so dispersed that an accurate count can only occur if the question is asked on all forms. We understand and support such rationale if the premises are accurate, but we cannot understand nor do we accept the decision to count such large groups as Spanish/Hispanics and Blacks on a 100% basis while failing to count in the same manner significant groups such as Polish-Americans, Italian-Americans, Irish-Americans, etc. We have never been identified and accurately counted. So, how can the Census Bureau conclude that a sample count is sufficient?

We also wonder about the wisdom and fairness of the form of the questions on the long form by which a person can identify himself as a Polish-American, Italian-American, Arab-American, Irish-American

and so forth. We all realize that the Census is a form of burden on one's time. In addition, and without being pompous, it is clear that many people will have difficulty in understanding and responding to the questions. Thus, we can see the utility in creating categories in facilitating a response such as has been done in question four and seven of the short form, i.e., Black or Negro, Puerto Rican, Chicano, etc. Yet, no such categories have been created on the form for groups such as Polish-Americans, Italian-Americans, Greek-Americans, Irish-Americans, etc. To the contrary, a person has to write in how he identifies himself, instead of checking a box. A similar form of question dealing with Spanish/Hispanic used in a dress rehearsal in Virginia proved confusing and was altered. We don't know what confusion will result from the present form of the question dealing with ancestry, but the potential is there. Another aspect of our concerns in this area is that a person can and should be identified two or three times in different ways. For example, a person does not only identify himself as black or white under question four, but can further identify himself as to his national origin on question 14. The way the questions are presented now makes it unclear whether an American of Mexican origin should identify himself as white under question four, as Mexican and Hispanic under question seven, and again as Mexican and Hispanic under question 14. Similarly, it is not clear whether an American of Korean origin should identify himself as Korean twice, once under question 4 and another time under question 14.

Present government practices make categories mutually exclusive. It is important to determine what kind and how data is collected in the first instance so that it later is not misinterpreted or manipulated.

We hope that our remarks are not misconstrued, for we take no offense to and support groups such as Blacks, Hispanics, women Asian-Americans and other groups who have acquired acceptance by the bureaucracy as separately identifiable groups to actively compete for upward mobility and their place in American society, provided we are treated fairly and given the same consideration. We recognize that America is black and white, male and female, and Hispanic and Non-Hispanic.

Our concerns here must be considered in light of what has occurred to groups such as ours for the past 20 years. When the civil rights movement first began in the 1950's, it rightfully concerned itself with the redress of the rights of the groups that were totally or mostly left out at that time, such as blacks. Unfortunately our practices and preoccupation with the problems of groups which were originally totally or mostly left out, has created new patterns of discrimination and the reality of totally or mostly leaving out groups such as Polish-Americans, Italian-Americans, etc. A vivid example of this is the

record of the Civil Rights Commission, upon which we testified previously. Fortunately, members of Congress such as Senator Jesse Helms and Congresspersons Barbara Mikulski and Donald Edwards were sensitive to our pleas and were instrumental in passing S.721 which now directs such Commission to study discrimination and affirmative action, including Federal policies and practices, as they affect Americans of East European and South European origins.

We remember the tremendous effort that was made to include the ancestry question in present census forms, but we also feel and experience the intransigency that exists even now to the justice of such groups as Polish-Americans, Italian-Americans, etc., to be recognized in their own right and not as part of an amorphous group called, "none of the above," "other," or "White other than Hispanic."

While we appreciate the efforts that have been made up to now to rectify this problem area in the census, much more must be done. The people who take the census must be selected carefully so that they reflect a sensitivity to what is involved, an ability and talent to respond, appropriate background to secure confidence, and above all fairness and without any preconceived notion that the census is to benefit only certain groups.

Next, the public must be educated as to how the forms are to be completed, the need for and desirability to identify oneself, and that one is not a disloyal American if he or she does identify his or her national origin.

The bureaucracy and especially the Census Bureau must be made aware that there is no impediment, philosophically, practically, constitutionally, statutorily, judicially, by executive order or otherwise, which prevents them from creating new categories for groups such as Polish-Americans, Italian-Americans, Irish-Americans, etc., and that such groups and categories must be considered whenever decisions are made.

We have been advised by the Census Bureau that they have developed the computer capability of handling several hundred different categories so that we can dismiss as pure obstructionism and discrimination the persistent claim that it would be unwieldy to create and handle more than the five categories that are currently fashionable.

We have also been advised by the Office of Management and Budget that all government agencies can create additional categories for data collection and analysis. We suggest to this Committee that you question the further direction of OMB that all such additional categories be subsumed under the existing five categories.

We are also concerned that the data eventually collected will make no legal distinction between those who are here legally and those who

are here without legal sanction. We understand the argument that local authorities should be reimbursed for providing services to individuals that the Federal government has permitted to remain in our country without legal sanction. We wonder whether the best solution is to create a permanent subsidy for this condition to remain. Turning to a different aspect of this concern, we protest vigorously bureaucratic and judicial decisions, especially quotas, timetables and goals, that are based on data that includes or fails to distinguish between those who are here legally and those who are here without legal sanction, and data that fails to distinguish between those who have suffered discrimination and those who have not.

There are other observations we can make, which we will defer in order to respond to any questions and permit others to be heard. We don't pretend to know all the answers, but we do know when we are being treated unevenly and unfairly.

We are tired of having our legitimate needs, views, and values, neglected or treated with indifference by our government. We are tired of always being included in the target group that suffers the adverse consequences of many of the preferences being created and given today by our government. Simply put, if we are to share in the burdens, we want to share in the benefits.

Even so, and since we are all Americans, we have hope and we want to work with you, the Census Bureau and the bureaucracy to improve the situation so that America lives up to its promise of true equality instead of resorting to pseudo-equality based primarily on political fashionability. Thank you for your time.

**STATEMENT OF LEONARD F. WALENTYNOWICZ,
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS,
TO THE U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
DECEMBER 5, 1977**

The Polish American Congress welcomes this opportunity to comment on the plan proposed by Commissioner Jule M. Sugarman.

It is the first effort, to our knowledge, that attempts to deal comprehensively with all the programs that have been created over the years giving certain groups either preferences or special emphasis in filling government jobs. In its own fashion it attempts to correlate and coordinate all these programs so that those affected, as well as the Commission, can acquire and determine some sense of purpose, direction, and control of government efforts, practices, and policies in this area. We compliment you and the Commission since this proposal and these hearings permit all of us to focus on just what is occurring in government hiring practices.

Nevertheless, we have grave misgivings and reservations about your plan. These stem initially from the lack of clarity in the language used. These misgivings and reservations are further increased by the plan's failure to refer to important elements of the overall problem of providing jobs for everyone who is entitled to compete, on a fair basis, and in accordance with law.

We recognize that it is not your responsibility to provide jobs for everyone who wants one, but it is your responsibility to see to it that everyone who wants a federal government job covered by Civil Service is treated fairly and in the manner provided by law.

This then lends us to the crux of this problem as we now see it. What practices should our government engage in its employee selection process given the following:

1. Ours is a country based on free enterprise and individual initiative.

2. That our economy is not expanding as rapidly as our population base or more narrowly the number of those who want jobs increase more rapidly than the number of jobs available.

3. We have evidence of historic and present discrimination.

4. Traditionally our basic national policy is to achieve recognition by competition and merit.

5. We are a pluralistic nation, composed of many different groups identified on a variety of bases, including race, color, creed, sex and national origin and that mix is constantly changing as a result of different patterns of immigration.

6. As a result of our belief in human rights our legal system places a great premium and priority on individual rights.

Many of these factors and a more detailed consideration of them are set forth in the Statement of the American Jewish Committee submitted to you with reference to this proposal, the essence of which we agree with and support.

Measured against this background, this proposal is most inadequate for at least the following reasons.

First, the plan fails to distinguish sufficiently between those groups that the law definitely gives preferences to, such as veterans and disabled veterans, and those groups that are and should be the beneficiaries of "affirmative action" or "special emphasis" programs. For example, the plan is unclear as to how the veterans preference would be "observed," as in the case of the proposed use of "established registers" as an alternate selection method. Which track in that 2-track system would the veteran be placed in and what would occur if a veteran is not a member of a group such as black, Hispanic or woman, which have been identified already as being subject to "adverse impact?"

Second, the language of the proposal is in many ways vague and deceptive. For example, it is stated that in each authorized selection method there may be no discrimination or reverse discrimination because of race, sex, national origins, religion, age, marital status, or handicapped condition. Yet there is no definition of "reverse discrimination," nor is there any mechanism created to collect and analyze data in each of the prohibited areas of discrimination. The impression is created that there is concern for all, but in practice there is a preoccupation with only certain groups, namely women, blacks, Hispanics, American-Indians and Asian-Americans. America is made up of many more groups than just these. The President himself recognized this in his Executive memo dated July 27, 1977, which requested all departments and agencies to collect data on his Presidential Appointments in more than 16 different categories including Irish, German/Austrian, Italian, Polish, French, Russian, Scandinavian, Middle Eastern and other Eastern European origins as well as the ones which preoccupy this agency and government efforts generally.

You state there is "considerable presumptive evidence of an historical and perhaps current pattern of adverse impacts" yet you fail to detail what you mean. A reasonable observer looking for fairness would consider whether any "special emphasis" program favoring only certain select groups would have a disproportional impact on other groups not so favored. An illustration may be helpful. While whites may be considered as a homogeneous group for racial distinctions, they are not when viewed from an ethnic perspective. Viewed in this fashion Blacks, Orientals or Asian-Americans, Native-Americans, whites and other such categories contain many subgroups. Presently, these subgroups are not important from a black viewpoint (though this may change shortly as a result of immigration patterns) but they are very vital to the various subgroups that are included in the "white" category.

Many of these subgroups have and still are suffering discrimination and include such groups as Polish-Americans, Italian-Americans, Arab-Americans and so forth. We believe this discrimination includes a lack of recognition in many of the 140 occupational categories which you have requested detailed analyses, particularly in the area of professional and other higher grade positions. Yet nowhere have you shown a concern for this "adverse impact" or even indicated a desire to collect data and analyze it in this regard.

Additionally, you fail to specifically define what you mean by "affirmative action" or "special emphasis" creating the perception that you will be giving preferences to groups which have not been authorized by law.

Third, you have failed to justify the proposed criterion of 95% and 80% to trigger the use of special selection methods and schedule "A." Veterans preferences are clearly set forth by law and their use is not triggered by any "adverse impact." The above criterion has apparently been established to implement more rapidly "affirmative action" policies. In the absence of any Congressional directive setting forth preferences for any other group beyond veterans, the only justification for such criterion is to eliminate discrimination and the effects thereof. To our knowledge there is no data and analytical base that establishes these figures as the actual discrimination that has occurred and that these criteria are what is needed to overcome the effects thereof. General comparisons of the proportion of jobs any one group holds or obtains as new hire with that group's proportion of the general population is some evidence that discrimination may exist but falls far short of proving actual discrimination or justifying the exclusion from the selection process of any person or group which was not responsible for that discrimination. In an independent society such as we have, there may be a number of reasons other than discrimination that may account for some, if not all, of the disparity that may exist between the proportion of jobs any one group holds and that group's proportion of the general population. Further, your plan does not allow for regional differences.

Different groups may suffer discrimination in different areas of our country. For example, and this is an oversimplification, white ethnics may not suffer discrimination in the Southwest because few live there. Hispanics because many do live in this area are significantly affected. The situation would be different in the Midwest and East. In any event, any departure from the system of competition and selection on merit as authorized by Congress should be clearly justified by other lawful considerations and reliable data and analyses. In addition, these criteria and the way you plan to use them smack of a de facto quota scheme, since they are exclusionary in nature.

Fourth, your plan is preoccupied with only certain select groups and makes no provision to include other discriminated groups or sub-groups that may exist. To say that this plan is available to all discriminated groups and subgroups is nothing but a cruel hoax when no effort is made to collect and analyze a comprehensive data base. It would seem to any sincere, non-partisan observer that a full survey of all the groups covered by prohibited discrimination would be made and maintained before any substantial departure from selection by merit, as suggested here, would be considered. Such a survey is quite possible and is not precluded by any Congressional or Presidential directive and if anything is authorized in the same fashion as those that were done for the groups now being favored by the Commission.

Contrary to the belief of some, neither Congress, the President, nor the U.S. Supreme Court has conferred any special status or protection for the groups the Commission is preoccupied by. In addition, such a survey would also tend to reassure those groups not receiving any "special emphasis" of the fairness of any program or action. A prime example of the present deficiency in your plan in this respect is the inclusion of Hispanics, a group considered by the U.S. Bureau of Census as over 95% white, without even considering whether any other subgroup of the "white" race should also be a beneficiary of your plan or showing that no other subgroup is entitled to such consideration. Failure to do this creates new patterns of discrimination or at least the perception thereof.

Fifth, your plan fails to specify what criteria you plan to use when exercising the special selection method or Schedule A. Specifically, it fails to indicate how you will determine the "proportion of ensuing vacancies" which will be filled when adverse impact is found; when the evidence of adverse impact in an occupational category would "disappear"; what are "normal minimum qualifications" and what would prompt the Commission to decide when these requirements would be "questionable."

The above comments highlight our major concerns but there are others. Your plan fails to allow for more recent arrivals to the United States in the groups favored by you. Many of these persons may not have suffered discrimination and yet may end up as beneficiaries of your plan. If this were all that was involved then perhaps the generous nature of our country would prevail. But when the practical effect of your present plan would adversely affect many individuals who have never practiced discrimination but in fact may have vigorously fought it, then fundamental fairness and justice is again violated even though some may say it is for a "higher" cause.

We conclude by suggesting that the plan should be revised in light of these hearings. We understand that there is much dissatisfaction over the degree of progress in our fight to eliminate discrimination and the effects thereof. Many would want instant and complete rectification. To do this, given our present circumstances, would require at least the temporary abandonment or relaxation of competition on merit, a political decision that should be made by Congress and the President in accordance with our Constitution, and not by administrative fiat.

Our belief in this respect is reinforced when we see a concerted effort to adopt an "Equal Rights" Amendment and we hear our President speak "why not the best." Neither expression contains any commitment or approval of a system whereby groups are given jobs in

our society as a reflection of their numerical strength. In fact, these expressions implicitly negate such an arrangement.

Thus we would hope that every effort to rectify discrimination and the effects thereof be made without relaxing or abandoning competition by merit even temporarily. If, however, a decision is made to relax or abandon this principle bureaucratically, then everyone who has been discriminated in a prohibited manner should benefit therefrom and not just certain select groups.

Finally, we hope that you understand our comments. We are not against anyone, nor do we wish to create resentment. Nevertheless, when the system of selection is being radically changed, and when persons and groups who have attempted to work within that system are being adversely affected even though they themselves have been and are subject to prohibited discrimination and have fought against such discrimination, we must by necessity speak out. We do not see the necessity of creating a fiction that "all white males" are the cause of our discrimination problems and that "all such white males" should bear the brunt of affirmative action and special emphasis programs that in effect deny them the right to compete for government jobs, in order that we may speed up the recognition of certain groups. We would also like to see that such programs, properly conceived, include the whole broad spectrum of women available and desirous of recognition and not just women of certain racial, ethnic, and political beliefs. We hope to continue this dialogue with you and all concerned, for this is a common problem which should be approached with the belief that first of all, we are Americans.

Finally, we hope that this is just the beginning of a new-found interest by the Commission in Euro-ethnics and the Commission efforts to chart a course to achieve true equality.

We recognize and believe that America is black and white, male and female, Hispanic and non-Hispanic, but we also recognize and we also believe that we will never achieve true equality unless we recognize that America is also more than black and white, male and female, Hispanic and non-Hispanic, and part of that "more" is us.

At this time, when the President and other leaders are asking all Americans to share fairly the burden of the increasing difficulties America is facing, it is more important than ever that we achieve better ways of sharing fairly the benefits of America.

We offer our continued cooperation to this end and I'll be pleased to answer any questions you have.

[The complete paper follows.]

EMPLOYMENT AND ETHNICITY

By Leonard F. Walentynowicz *

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission: Speaking for the Polish American Congress and reflecting what I believe to be the sentiments of many Americans of Euro-ethnic origins, I wish to express our sincere appreciation for this opportunity to present our concerns and views with respect to the subject matter of this hearing.

As we previously indicated, civil rights have long been dear to the hearts and minds of people of Polish and other Euro-ethnic background and tradition, and if anything, are more so with those who are or have become United States citizens.

We claim no special privilege to speak out on human rights, including civil rights, but we believe that a full and fair examination of our history both here in America and where our roots originated, will confirm that we also know of the suffering, as well as the other devastating effects that discrimination, defamation, and denial of other civil and human rights causes. What is somewhat unique is that much of this discrimination has occurred within the context of one race, while this Commission's attention, at least up to now, has been focused primarily, if not entirely, on discrimination between races, sexes, and people of differing color.

This preoccupation, however, is not unique to this Commission, for it pervades much of this Federal bureaucracy as well as the judiciary, executive, and legislative branches of government. What is most unfortunate is that such preoccupation creates mixed feelings of cynicism, neglect, resentment, and alienation, resulting from a belief that our Government is paying lip service to a declared policy of prohibiting discrimination based on race, color, creed, sex, and national origin, but it is only acting to overcome and remedy discrimination based on race, color and sex.

The feeling is compounded by the manner in which the concept of affirmative action has evolved, and the fashion in which data is being collected and analyzed. This feeling is further exacerbated by the difficult economic circumstances America is presently facing and the failure of many of our institutions to allow for other significant American values and groups in our effort to fight discrimination and the effects thereof.

* Executive Director of the Polish American Congress, Washington, D.C.

Thus we welcomed heartily the recent enactment to the Civil Rights Act of 1959 of Section 104(G) [S.721], which in substance directs this Commission to study policies and practices regarding discrimination and affirmative action and how they affect Americans of East European and South European origin.

We similarly welcome this consultation and hope this is just the beginning of a nationwide effort to ensure that our commitment to civil and human rights is fairly and evenly applied and is not distorted by claims of priority and lack of resources.

It is not the responsibility of this paper to cover the broad spectrum of civil and human rights to which all Americans are entitled to, but I make these general observations so that my comments on employment and ethnicity may be better understood.

Employment and ethnicity can be approached from a number of directions but given the brief amount of time available for me because of the nature of this consultation, I think it best to start from the viewpoint of data collection and the use such data is put to.

For mixed reasons, not all sensible and acceptable, the Federal Government presently collects data regarding employment policies and practices in five categories: black, Hispanic, Native American, Asian American and White other than Hispanic, which categories are repeated for both sexes. The best examples are the EEOC reporting forms.

Over the years as efforts to fight discrimination and promote affirmative action developed, there has occurred a belief that persons in the first four categories have been the victims of discrimination and deserve the benefits of affirmative action, regardless of personal circumstances, and that everyone in the last category either was guilty of discrimination or had to suffer the consequences of providing the benefits of affirmative action to the persons in the first four categories.

As we pointed out in the briefs we filed with the United States Supreme Court in the *Bakke* and *Weber* cases, such restricted data collection and use and the beliefs and practices resulting therefrom are fundamentally unfair and violate the civil rights of a good many Americans, including a good number of Euro-ethnics, especially those in the last category.

Such limited data collection is harmful in a number of respects. For example, a person in any of the four favored categories claiming job discrimination, can readily fortify his case by data indicating disparity between the number of persons of his category actually employed and the number available for employment. A Polish-American, Italian-

American, or Slavic-American doesn't have this data available to him. Another example involves affirmative action. There has developed over the years, a belief that numerical disparity alone requires "affirmative action" to "lock" each of the favored groups into almost every job category, particularly those jobs reflecting upward mobility.

One prime example is the appointment of Federal judges, where tremendous effort has or is being made to appoint blacks, Hispanics, and women, but no effort is being made to appoint Polish-Americans and other like ethnic Americans, even though a cursory examination of the judicial lists will reflect a dearth of individuals from these groups.

As we have repeatedly stated, we take no offense and we generally support members of the favored groups striving to improve themselves, provided we also are treated fairly and given the same consideration. Essentially that is our problem in the area of employment - we are not being treated fairly, nor are we given the same considerations.

A mind set has been created that only those in the favored categories should benefit from affirmative action and cannot be guilty of discrimination, however that term from time to time may be defined, while those in the last category must suffer the consequences of this type of affirmative action regardless of whether they discriminated or were the victims of discrimination themselves.

Perhaps what is most amazing is that these categories were established without any concern as to the status of groups such as Polish-Americans in American society. As a result, job opportunities and the upward mobility of such groups has been seriously and adversely affected.

Accordingly, and as a first step, we recommend that the government direct that additional separate categories be created for groups such as Polish-American, Italian-American and so forth. Much of the authority is already there, in circular No. A-46 issued by the Office of Management and Budget on May 12, 1977, even though it is disregarded in practice. The Census Bureau has advised us that the government has developed the computer capability of handling several hundred different categories so that the persistent claim that it would be unwieldy to create and handle more than five categories that are currently fashionable can be dismissed as pure obstructionism and discrimination.

Polish-Americans and other like ethnics condemn as hypocrisy the insulting government policies and proclamations that encourage them to take pride in their roots and preserve their separate identity when it

comes to culture. And yet at the same time when it comes to employment, educational opportunities and federal funds, they are lumped into categories such as "other", "none of the above" or "white other than Hispanic". We also wonder about the equanimity of government policies that permit Hispanics to identify themselves also as Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, Cuban Americans etc., but deny the same right to us.

At this time when jobs are being increasingly distributed at all levels on the basis of numbers in the belief that equality of result is more important than equality of opportunity, it is important that each group that makes up this brilliant mosaic called America be separately identified and counted, so that it does not end up being "left out," or "locked out," or the victim of new, albeit perhaps unintended, patterns of discrimination.

The dynamics of employment and ethnicity are quite complex, and this paper is not intended to be a total review of this area, but simply an effort to illustrate different perceptions, and create new attitudes, and better initiatives and solutions in this difficult problem area.

Contrary to what has been said previously in some places, no group needs to be a target group or bear the brunt of "affirmative action." Instead we feel new initiatives such as the one we suggested in our brief in the *Weber* case (affirmative action based on a point system), should be explored not only to correct glaring deficiencies in present affirmative action practices but also to respond to such issues as how long should affirmative action continue, whether affirmative action should continue to be available to recent immigrants, refugees, and other arrivals, and the impact of present affirmative action policies on such values as initiative, hard work, competition, etc.

For a fuller appreciation of our concerns, I would like to submit for the Commission's consideration copies of testimony and presentations we made regarding the 1980 Census, before the Civil Service Commission, and the EEOC, as well as our briefs in *Bakke* and *Weber*.

Finally, we hope that this is just the beginning of a new found interest by the Commission in Euro-ethnics, in the Commission efforts to chart a course to achieve true equality. We recognize and believe that America is black and white, male and female, Hispanic and Non-Hispanic, but we also believe we will never achieve true equality unless we recognize that America is *more* than black and white, male and female and Hispanic and Non-Hispanic. Part of that *more* is *us*. At this time when the President and other leaders are asking all

Americans to share fairly the burden of the increasing difficulties America is facing, it is more important than ever that we achieve better ways of sharing fairly the benefits of America.

We offer our continued cooperation to this end, and would be pleased to answer any questions you have.

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1976

No. 76-811

THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Petitioner,

v.

ALLAN BAKKE, *Respondent*

On Writ of Certiorari to the
Supreme Court of California

BRIEF OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS,
THE NATIONAL ADVOCATES SOCIETY AND THE
NATIONAL MEDICAL AND DENTAL ASSOCIATION
AS AMICI CURIAE

LEONARD F. WALENTYNOWICZ
Suite 714
Walbridge Building
Buffalo, New York 14202
(301) 229-8091

Attorney for Amici

June 7, 1977

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1976

No. 76-811

THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Petitioner,

v.

ALLAN BAKKE, *Respondent*

On Writ of Certiorari to the
Supreme Court of California

**BRIEF OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS.
THE NATIONAL ADVOCATES SOCIETY AND THE
NATIONAL MEDICAL AND DENTAL ASSOCIATION
AS AMICI CURIAE**

This brief amici curiae is filed with the consent of the parties, as provided for in Rule 42 of the Rules of this Court.

INTEREST OF THE AMICI

The amici are 3 national organizations composed of Americans of Polish descent and origin. The Polish American Congress was founded to protect the civil rights of Americans of Polish descent and origin and to promote their welfare. The goals of both the Na-

tional Advocates Society, composed of lawyers and the National Medical and Dental Association composed of physicians and dentists, are to advance the welfare of its members, establish proper relationships with the public and promote the dignified and honorable progress of their respective professions.

Since the heritage of Polish Americans and their own history in America is inextricably involved in the fight against discrimination, we feel we have a vital interest in the issues presented by this case and believe the Court should have the benefit of our concerns so that the Court's final decision may reflect a full range of views.

So much has been written on the subject matter involved herein that it would help little to repeat and recite authority and comment previously made except where absolutely necessary. Furthermore, much of this has been done already by both the majority and dissenting opinions of the Supreme Court of California in this cause.¹

Since this is a constitutional question which will be decided by this Court regardless of what has been said before and by whom, we ask this Court to intensely scrutinize from a broad perspective what is happening in the United States with respect to "special admissions" programs in professional schools and other affirmative action programs. Are these programs in reality and practice living up to the majesty of our Constitution, the language of our laws, and the lofty statements of our leaders, or have they become or will

¹ *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, (1976) 18 Cal.2d 34, 132 Cal. Rptr. 680, 553 P.2d 1152.

they become vehicles by which some disadvantaged and discriminated groups and individuals secure benefits and special privileges while other disadvantaged and discriminated groups and individuals are still denied the promise of America?

It is in this light that we present our brief.

ARGUMENT

In considering the constitutionality and legality of affirmative action programs particularly "special admissions" programs one should be careful to avoid being swept up in a tide of righteousness designed to rectify a particularly serious wrong. It has been said that a sense of guilt and righteousness can be a powerful and legitimate human impulse. Whether it can be translated into wise policy is another matter. Common experience has taught us that good intentions are not sufficient justification to support actions that may infringe on the rights of others. Likewise a long history of discrimination whether confirmed by prior court decisions or not, though sufficient to prevent present and future discriminatory treatment of a like kind, does not necessarily establish a basis for the approval of actions or a program which invades the rights of others. Thus in matters involving discrimination, including efforts to overcome the effects thereof, it is essential and due process requires that those who propose a program which treats particular individuals and groups preferentially over others justify their actions by an adequate data and analytical base.² Over

² Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment. This Court has said so in a number of different cases in a variety of contexts. *McLaughlin v. Florida*, 379 U.S. 184 (1964) pp. 191-192, 196, catalogues them.

the years the Courts have required such a base in the struggle to eliminate discrimination, overt and otherwise, against black people and other racial and ethnic groups³ particularly under the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and there appears no sound reason here to do otherwise.⁴

Such a base serves many other useful purposes beyond justifying laws and policies, for it also provides the basis for securing federal assistance⁵ and can promote public acceptance and approval of efforts to eradicate discrimination and the effects thereof provided such data indicates that those efforts are fair and equitable. On the other hand, if such data or the lack thereof indicates an uneven approach by revealing an indifference to solving the problems of *all* who have been discriminated against or giving attention and favor only to the problems of some discriminated groups but omitting others, great resentment and dissatisfaction results. Efforts based on such an uneven approach, even though well motivated, serve only to delay our goal to achieve full integration as rapidly as possible.

What was the approach of the school authorities here and what base, if any was developed by them? First, it is conceded that Davis has no history of prior dis-

³ For example: *Oyama v. California*, 332 U.S. 663 (1948); *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 356 (1886). There are a number of other cases referred to in the opinions of the California Supreme Court below.

⁴ *McGowan v. Maryland*, (1961) 366 U.S. 420, 426; 6 L.Ed. 393, 299, 81 S.Ct. 1101.

⁵ *Collection and Use of Racial and Ethnic Data in Federal Assistance Programs*. A Report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Feb. 1973.

crimination. Thus, the special admissions program was not designed to overcome the effects of specific objectionable practices at this school but simply to overcome what the authorities there believed to be systematic discrimination throughout the State. Some commentators argue that absent a history of prior discrimination, no affirmative action program can be constitutionally justified. Others say that it is unreasonable to prohibit a state agency from acting on its own to achieve racial balance in its professional schools, equating this goal to a rational if not compelling state interest. There are other commentators who go on to suggest that it is foolish to require a finding of individual cases of discrimination before permitting authorities to act to overcome patterns of general and systematic discrimination.

While authorities need not nor should not wait to correct general and systematic patterns of discrimination,⁶ they cannot act in an arbitrary fashion or create new patterns or types of discrimination even if their action is taken to rectify effects of past discrimination or with benign motives. The advantage in waiting until particular acts of discrimination occur is that it enables the remedy to be fashioned more appropriately to the harm involved without running the risk of creating potential harm to others who may be innocently affected.

Here it is clear that the Regents of the State of California failed to make a comprehensive survey of the kind and extent of discrimination occurring in its professional schools so that a constitutionally justifiable remedy could be fashioned. California perhaps more

⁶ *Board of Education v. Swann*, 402 U.S. 43, 46 (1971).

than many other states, represents the great mosaic that makes up America. Its climate, location and other desirable characteristics attracted and still attract *all* kinds of people: farmers, actors, retired persons, youngsters, adventurers, settlers, Italian Americans, Mexican Americans, Polish Americans, Blacks, White, Orientals and on and on. Yet even though faced by the mandate of 42 U.S.C. 1981 and 2000d⁷ and a national policy reinforced by at least two Presidents explicitly prohibiting discrimination in employment and education based on race, color, sex, religion and national origin,⁸ the authorities in the State of California chose to cast their attention only on select groups and fashioned a remedy not only constitutionally impermissible but patently unfair. There is no reasoned explanation why Blacks, Chicanos and Asiatics have been the *only* beneficiaries of the special admission program and others similarly disadvantaged and discriminated have

⁷42 U.S.C. § 1981. Equal rights under the law.

“All persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have the same right in every State and Territory to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, give evidence, and to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and exactions of every kind, and to no other.”

42 U.S.C. § 2000d. Prohibition against exclusion from participation in, denial of benefits of, and discrimination under Federally assisted programs on ground of race, color, or national origin.

“No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.”

⁸ See e.g., Executive Order 11478.

been excluded.⁹ It is now clear why the People of California amended their Constitution on November 2, 1976, to specifically include race, religion, and ethnic heritage as additional factors which cannot be used to deny a person admission to their State University.

The record is not clear, however, why the administration designed a program which benefited only select groups instead of addressing the problem as a whole. Perhaps it is due in part to the momentum of the civil rights movement which has been characterized by Black problems and participation and in which Blacks have played a significant leadership role from the start. Because of the unsavory role slavery has played in the history of our country, it was only natural for all of us to have our attention centered by the problems which flowed from this most fundamental form of discrimination.

Nevertheless, this Court, Congress, the Executive and our national leaders have repeatedly stated in one form or another that our national policy, with regard to discrimination in general, forbids more than racial discrimination. Color, religion, sex and national origin

⁹ Even though the record fails to specifically show that the University authorities comprehensively surveyed the racial, color, sexual, religious and ethnic composition of the State of California and compared those results with a similar survey of the medical profession, what is in the record, particularly the statement of the Admissions Committee Chairman, shows that the authorities were concerned only with the problems of Blacks, Mexican Americans, Indians and Orientals. While it is true that a full survey could result in a finding that there are no other disadvantaged or discriminated groups, common experience such as the defamation practiced against Americans of Polish descent and origin cause one to be skeptical unless such a finding is firmly established by evidence.

are equally paramount and today we have quite properly added age and the handicapped.

Yet in practice, the attention of most policy and decision makers has been almost totally focused on the problems of race resulting in a de facto priority to the extent that we are approving programs and actions designed to overcome effects of racial discriminations even though they create new patterns of other types of discrimination equally prohibited, as was done here.

We know of no policy, set by this Court, the Congress or the Executive which states that racial or any other type of discrimination deserves a higher priority than other prohibited types. There may come a time when such a decision may be made but it can be constitutionally justified only when a data and analytical base is created fully exploring the status of all groups and individuals covered by our anti-discrimination policies something which has not been done either by the State of California or our national government. This base should also reflect the difference in impact between those efforts which simply prohibit or forbid discrimination and those efforts like the instant program which attempt to overcome effects of past discrimination. We are at a time when we realize our resources are not unlimited, and that our economy has bounds and limits to its growth. Accordingly, the competition for jobs and education is becoming more acute. It is one thing to say that such competition is to be conducted on merit or without regard to race, color, sex, religion and national origin. It is quite another thing to say that our Constitution permits that competition to be conducted in a manner whereby some are

given special benefits and privileges because of their race, color, sex, religion and national origin. If there is a good reason to do this should it not be extended to *all* similarly circumstanced, and at the *same* time? In any event, such a decision should not be made simply because a group is more vocal, better organized, potentially possessed of more political leverage or by the emotion of the moment. It should be made by the full political process exploring in detail all that is involved so that public confidence can be secured and divisiveness avoided.

Nevertheless, most state and national practices and even much of the previous Court litigation pay attention primarily, if not in some instances exclusively, to racial discrimination overlooking not only our other problem areas but also the impact of our efforts to eliminate racial discrimination and the effects thereof on these other problem areas.

Some progress in expanding the scope of our attention has been made, particularly with respect to those people now generally classified as Hispanics.¹⁰ Yet very little data, if any, has been collected indicating what problems, if any, we face with respect to religious and national origin discrimination other than Hispanics. Whether this is so because of limited resources¹¹ or

¹⁰ *Counting the Forgotten*, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, April 1974.

¹¹ Discussion held with John A. Buggs, Staff Director U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, February 18, 1977. He indicated to this writer that the time may be ripe for the creation of a data base indicating the present state of those other forms of discrimination. In the preamble to *Counting the Forgotten*, the Commission states:

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

preoccupation with one form of discrimination, the fact is it should not continue if we are to put in practice what we preach and state in our Constitution, laws, national and state policies.

Some have argued that there is no additional data base because there are no additional problems. We ask this Court whether there is a substantial difference between a Black being called a "nigger" and a Polish American being called a "Pollack", whether telling a Black or Mexican American he cannot qualify is substantially more degrading than telling a Polish American the same thing; whether the lack of recognition of Blacks and Latins in senior levels of corporate management is more serious than the lack of recognition of Polish and Italian Americans.¹² If not, then we suggest

Investigate complaints alleging denial of the right to vote by reason of race, color, religion, sex or national origin, or by reason of fraudulent practices;

Study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, or in the administration of justice;

Appraise Federal laws and policies with respect to the denial of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, or in the administration of justice;

Serve as a national clearinghouse for information concerning denials of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin; and

Submit reports, findings, and recommendations to the President and the Congress."

Given this mandate by Congress, an impartial observer may wonder why the Commission has not acted more forcefully to carry out its full mandate instead of restricting its efforts to certain areas.

¹² *Minority Report, the Representation of Poles, Italians, Latins and Blacks in the Executive Suites of Chicago's Largest Corporations*, (1973) prepared by the Institute of Urban Life for the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, Washington, D.C. 20017. See Appendix "A".

that there is substantial evidence to justify the collection of comprehensive data and the creation of a total analytical base dealing with the problems of discrimination based on national origin within a racial group as well as across racial lines. Polish Americans are not the only ethnic group that deserve consideration, there are many others within all racial categories including Italian Americans, Arab Americans, Jewish Americans just to name a few.

The failure to collect such data and to approach the prohibited forms of discrimination on an even and fair basis brings us to the very crux of why the instant program is constitutionally unsound.

Whenever a special admissions program of the type here is created, there follows, by necessity, a division and the creation of a "group" who does not receive the special benefits. Who is and should be in this "disfavored" group? To meet due process and equal protection requirements this group should not include individuals and groups disadvantaged by other forms of prohibited discrimination in the absence of a clear constitutional mandate that one form of prohibited discrimination is more important than the others.

Though the record does not show precisely how the authorities here came to their decision, it is clear however that in practice any White would be ineligible for the special program even though he or she may have suffered invidious discrimination because of his or her national origin. It is also clear that in practice the program was not designed to benefit all who suffered from prohibited discrimination, but only if you were Black, Chicano or Asian.

The definition of Chicago is not entirely clear but if it is roughly equivalent to Hispanic as defined by the Census Bureau, it is important to note that 98% of the population of Spanish origin¹³ is classified as within the White race by such Bureau. If this group is considered White, giving them preferential treatment and denying such treatment to other Whites similarly disadvantaged is arbitrary and capricious without regard to "reverse" discrimination.

What happened here is also what happens all too often in our national programs. Preoccupation [by the authorities] with certain forms and types of discrimination has resulted in indifference to other types of discrimination equally bad and prohibited with the result that the groups and persons so suffering and forgotten have in effect been told to suffer more for the sake of improving the lot of those receiving attention.

The greatest irony of this result is that many Whites who have championed the cause of civil rights have ended up being in this "forgotten and disfavored" group. Why are "Whites" who never practiced discrimination, but fought for and championed equality, and who themselves suffered discrimination obliged to continue to suffer simply because other Whites practiced racial discrimination? If Whites are to suffer for the "greater good" then for how long and for whose benefit?

The "special admissions" program here is also objectionable on the grounds of vagueness. Though it sets a definite quota it does not readily define who qualifies for it or how long the program will last. The prime

¹³ *Counting the Forgotten, supra*, p. 43.

justification of the program is the numerical imbalance between the number of persons of any one ethnic and racial group and the number of professionals from that group. There is no firm indication that all of that disparity is due to discrimination. Some of the disparity may be due to cultural tendencies as in the case where more Blacks tend to become professional basketball and football players than professional hockey and tennis players or in the case where more Hispanics tend to become professional baseball players than basketball players. Further, no attention has been paid to immigration patterns particularly unusual situations such as the Vietnamese refugee program and the proposed amnesty of illegal aliens presently in the United States. In this context, what justification can be given to those White disadvantaged groups and individuals living here for one, two and three generations for the fact they have to meet higher standards simply because they are White while Chicanos, Blacks, Asians who have recently arrived, in some instances not legally, are to be given a preference.

We do not suggest that a "special admissions" program is never constitutionally feasible or that less significance be attached to the problems of Blacks, Chicanos and Asians. We do say that for such a program to be constitutionally permissible it, (1) cannot be arbitrary as it is here in giving preference to one kind of White ethnic group (Hispanic) without showing why other White ethnic groups similarly situated have not even been considered, (2) cannot be concerned with race alone but must also provide relief for other groups who have suffered prohibited discrimination such as color, sex, religion and national origin of all types, (3) must demonstrate that those included in the "un-

avored" group will not be discriminated in a prohibited manner by the program itself and (4) establish a sufficient data base indicating more precisely why such a program is needed, how long is it to last, and who is to benefit therefrom.

A few final comments. It has been argued by some that this case is not "ripe" for determination;¹⁴ that among other things there is not enough evidence in the record to show the kind of discrimination being practiced against Blacks, Chicanos and Asians. For the reasons previously stated, we believe this case is particularly "ripe". It is important that this Court declare its concern for *all* the types of prohibited discrimination and that they must be allowed for in any special admissions program. The record here makes this case an especially appropriate vehicle for this Court to do so.

The opinions of the Court below have addressed to some extent the concerns expressed herein. We note that the dissenting opinion agrees in its Footnote No. 10 that if the effect of the instant program may in fact be utilized as a means of discriminating against a subclass of the majority (disfavored) group, then the program could not be considered benign and presumptively constitutional. It goes further by stating that there is no such claim that the program had in fact such a differential impact. This brief is devoted to making such a claim, and we agree with the dissent that once the claim is established the present program

¹⁴ See the many briefs of various Amici including the Brief of the National Urban League, et al. on the petition for certiorari and Price M. Cobbs, M.D., et al. on the appeal itself.

is in fact equivalent to invidious racial classifications and is presumptively unconstitutional.

We note also that the dissent in its concluding remarks claims that the use of racial classifications here is a matter of policy for the school authorities and not of constitutional dimension even though the commentators are divided over the desirability of racial classifications. We disagree with the claim and suggest that when racial classifications are used without allowing properly for their impact on other disadvantaged and discriminated groups, it is for the Courts to decide their constitutionality particularly when their utility is in doubt.

We wish to reaffirm our desire to work with all those concerned so that feasible solutions reasonably protecting the interests of all can be found. It has been said that "our society cannot be completely color blind in the short term if we are to have a color blind society in the long term."¹⁵ We suggest that the metaphor is imperfect. Good eyesight sees beyond black and white; it sees a world made up of different sexes, races, religions, colors and ethnic backgrounds. Perfect vision sees a world integrated on all these grounds and not only on some.

¹⁵ *Associated Gen. Contractors of Mass., Inc. v. Altshuler*, 490 F.2d 9, 16 (1973).

CONCLUSION

The special admissions program as presently formulated by the authorities of the State of California should be declared illegal as constitutionally unsound with appropriate advice as to the feasibility and direction of any future such efforts.

Respectfully submitted,

LEONARD F. WALENTYNOWICZ
Suite 714
Walbridge Building
Buffalo, New York 14202
(301) 229-8091
Attorney for Amici

APPENDIX "A"

MINORITY REPORT

THE REPRESENTATION OF POLES, ITALIANS, LATINIS AND
BLACKS IN THE EXECUTIVE SUITES OF CHICAGO'S LARGEST
CORPORATIONS

By Russell Barta, Ph.D.

This report was prepared by THE INSTITUTE OF URBAN LIFE, 820 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60611, for THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR URBAN ETHNIC AFFAIRS, 4408 Eighth Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20017.

For information about single copies of this report, which are available without charge, or about the cost of quantity orders, please write to one of the above.

© Institute of Urban Life.

The question "How many are there?" has become one of the most provocative and unsettling questions being raised on all levels of American society. It reflects the national preoccupation with evaluating the success or failure of various ethnic groups in gaining their share in the American system for distributing income and power. Thus, in just a matter of a few years questions regarding a person's race or ethnic background, once felt to have no public relevance and even considered illegitimate, now not only are being asked but even require answers by law. Companies with government contracts are now required to file reports indicating their utilization rate of Blacks, Latins, American Indians, Eskimos, and women. In January, 1973, the U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Federal Contract Compliance, issued new guidelines to cover discrimination

Mr. Barta is professor of social science at Mundelein College of Chicago. He had the assistance of Helen A. Smith of the Graduate Program in Urban Studies at Loyola University.

against persons because of religion or ethnic origin. These guidelines said:

Members of various religious and ethnic groups, primarily but not exclusively of Eastern, Middle, and Southern European ancestry, such as Jews, Catholics, Italians, Greeks, and Slavic groups continue to be excluded from executive middle management, and other job levels because of discrimination based upon their religion and/or national origin. These guidelines are intended to remedy such unfair treatment.¹

What the guidelines in effect recognize is that, despite the powerful American rhetoric which emphasizes individual achievement, power and affluence in reality still flow along group lines, and that an individual's religious or ethnic affiliation may in fact still be an obstacle to his advancement.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the extent to which members of the Polish, Italian, Latin, and Black communities have penetrated the centers of power and influences in Chicago-based corporations. This was done by determining how many Poles, Italians, Latins, and Blacks either serve on the board of directors or occupy the highest executive positions in Chicago's largest corporations.

In focusing on Poles, Italians, Latins, and Blacks, this study selected at this point in time is historically significant. The 1960's saw the rise of group consciousness among Blacks and Latins, and their relentless pursuit of parity with other groups in the U.S. This process released the latent consciousness of other groups, such as Poles and Italians, who are becoming increasingly aware that like Blacks and Latins, they may not be sharing equally in the affluence of American society.

¹ 60-50.1 of Chapter 60, Title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

Thus, although this study originated at the request of leaders of the Polish American Congress, Illinois Division, and the Joint Civic Committee of Italian-Americans in Chicago, they were more than willing to see the study expanded to include Blacks and Latins. In the Chicago metropolitan area, where nearly 34 per cent of the seven million population is either Polish, Italian, Latin, or Black, such a perception of mutual concerns could have a positive influence on the future of group relations and thus on the very shape and tone of life in the city and suburbs.

The corporations reviewed in this study were identified by combining the *Chicago Daily News* and *Chicago Tribune* lists of the Chicago area's largest corporations in 1972. Among the thousands of corporations based in the Chicago area, 106 were identified as the largest industrial firms, retailers, utilities, transportation companies, banks, and savings and loan institutions. More than half of them (66 per cent) were included in *Fortune* magazine's 1972 list of the largest 500 industrial corporations or *Fortune's* lists of the largest non-industrial firms in the U.S. These 106 corporations, therefore, comprise the top layers of the economic and financial power structure of Chicago—and of the nation. It was the top management of these corporate giants and their boards of directors who were scrutinized in order to determine the representation of Poles, Italians, Latins, and Blacks.

Information about directors and officers was taken directly from the 1972 annual report of each corporation. The number of directors of all 106 corporations totaled 1341; the number of officers, 1355. For the purposes of this study, honorary board members were not included, nor were officers of less than vice-presidential rank such as assistant vice-presidents, assistant secretaries, or assistant treasurers. Where a firm was controlled by a holding company, only the directors and officers of the holding company were counted. An officer who also was a member of the board of directors of the same firm was counted twice, once as director, again as officer.

TABLE I

Representation of select ethnic groups in the Chicago metropolitan area population and on the boards of directors and among the officers of the 106 largest Chicago area corporations.

	% Area Population	Directors		Officers	
		No.	%	No.	%
Poles	6.9	4	0.3	10	0.7
Italians	4.8	26	1.9	39	2.9
Latins	4.4	1	0.1	2	0.1
Blacks	17.6	5	0.4	1	0.1
All Other	66.3	1305	97.3	1303	96.2
Total	100.0	1341	100.0	1355	100.0

Notes:

The "area population" refers to the Chicago metropolitan area: the six counties of Cook, Kane, Will, DuPage, Lake, and McHenry, whose population in 1970 was 6,979,000.

The percentages of area population was prepared by Michael E. Schiltz, Director of Loyola University's Graduate Program in Urban Studies. For Poles, Italians, and Latins, the estimates include first, second, and third generations, based on U.S. Bureau of Census data.

The Black population is based on 1970 data from the U.S. Census Bureau.

TABLE II

Number of corporations, of the 106 examined, which had no directors or officers who were Poles, Italians, Latins, or Blacks.*

	No. of Corporations without director	No. of Corporations without officer
Poles	102	97
Italians	84	75
Latins	105	104
Blacks	101	105

* 55 of the 106 corporations had no Poles, Italians, Latins, or Blacks either as directors or as officers.

Findings and Conclusions

Thirty-six, or less than three per cent, of the 1341 directors were Polish,² Italian, Latin, or Black. Fifty-two, or less than four per cent, of the 1355 officers were Polish, Italian, Latin, or Black. These four groups make up approximately 34 per cent of the metropolitan area's population. When translated into individual percentages, the findings indicate that 0.3 per cent of all directors were Polish, 1.9 per cent Italian,³ 0.1 per cent Latin, and 0.4 per cent Black. Out of all officers, 0.7 per cent were Polish, 2.9 per cent Italian, 0.1 per cent Latin, and 0.1 per cent Black. (See Table I.)

² In referring to Poles, Italians, Latins, or Blacks, the author means Americans who are of Polish, Italian, Latin (Spanish-speaking background), or Black ancestry.

³ One person of Italian background serves on nine different boards. If he were to be counted only once, the percentage of directors who are Italian would be reduced from 1.9 percent to 1.3 percent.

How does one make a judgment about such information? How can it be used to evaluate the extent to which Poles, Italians, Latins, and Blacks have entered the executive suites of Chicago's major corporations? Are Poles, Italians, Latins and Blacks equitably represented there?

To answer such questions the executive suite data was compared to the population of each of the four groups in the Chicago metropolitan area. This comparison provides a rough but fair guide for determining whether each group has achieved parity or whether it is underrepresented.⁴

If one compares (Table I) the percentages of officers and directors whose backgrounds are Polish, Italian, Latin, or Black to the percentage distribution of these four groups in the population, it becomes clear that all four groups were grossly underrepresented on the boards of directors and in the executive positions of Chicago's major corporations. Thus, although Poles make up 6.9 per cent of the metropolitan population, only 0.3 per cent of the directors are Polish. Italians make up 4.8 per cent of the population, but only 1.9 per cent of the directors are Italian. Blacks comprise 17.6 per cent of the population yet only 0.4 per cent of the directors are Black. Latins are 4.4 per cent of the population yet only 0.1 per cent of the directors are Latin. The same general pattern holds if one compares the percentages of officers who are Polish, Italian, Latin, or Black to the percentage distribution of these four groups in the population.

As a matter of fact, Poles, Latins, and Blacks were virtually absent from the upper echelons of Chicago's largest corporations. 102 out of the 106 corporations had no directors who were Polish; 97 had no officers who were Polish. Only one corporation had a Black officer and only two had Latin officers. While the Italians were more numerous in

⁴ What should serve as an equitable norm, and how to apply it, is, of course, open to discussion. One can anticipate increasing public discussion of the matter as more groups pursue group gains,

the executive suite than the other three groups. 84 corporations out of 106 still had no directors who were Italian and 75 had no officers who were Italian. Finally, 55 out of the 106 corporations had no Poles, Italians, Latins, or Blacks, either as directors or as officers. (See Table II.)

Other significant patterns emerge from the data. Poles and Italians do better in their representation in executive positions than they do as board members. The opposite is true of Blacks, whose major source of representation comes from appointments to boards of directors rather than from holding top executive positions. No Poles were located among the public utilities and banks reviewed in this study, either as directors or as officers. As for Italians, 16 were associated with banks or savings and loan institutions. However, there were no Italians in the executive suites of the utilities.⁵ On the other hand, three out of the five corporations with Black directors were public utilities. The number of Latins was not large enough to yield any significant pattern.

Hopefully, this study of four ethnic groups in the corporate structure of metropolitan Chicago will be extended to include their representation in major civic groups such as public boards and commissions, influential private agencies and associations, foundations, and social clubs. Similar studies of other ethnic groups such as Czechs, Greeks, Lithuanians, etc. should be conducted in the Chicago area. Given the lack of adequate research on American ethnic groups, similar surveys should be undertaken in other large cities.

As such studies accumulate, the result may be a national profile for each of America's ethnic groups showing precisely the extent to which each of them share in the power

⁵ An Italian, however, does serve as an officer of the two subsidiaries of one of the utilities.

and affluence of the nation. In the process the nation will learn to what extent the American corporation is a "truly public institution bound to the same criteria of selection that today affect government service—freedom from bias, and the requirement at the same time to represent and reflect all parts of the American population."⁶

A Note on Method

Trying to determine ethnic origin is a hazardous enterprise. In order to make this study as accurate as possible, knowledgeable leaders from the Polish, Italian, and Latin communities were asked to identify ethnic names by studying the lists of directors and officers in each annual report. In cases of doubtful ethnic origin the individual's office was contacted directly. Each corporation having no apparent representation from any of the four ethnic communities was informally contacted to double check the preliminary findings. In regard to Blacks, all available studies were utilized and persons familiar with the Black community were consulted. Also helpful were several lawyers and business leaders who were generally knowledgeable about many of the corporations studied. If there are any errors in the final tally for each group, the margin of error would not be sufficiently great to invalidate the findings of this study.

A manual describing in full the method used is being prepared by the author and will be distributed through the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs in Washington and the Institute of Urban Life in Chicago.

⁶ Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, *Beyond the Melting Pot*, 1963, p. 208.

THE 106 CHICAGO-BASED CORPORATIONS

Abbot Laboratories
Admiral
Allied Mills
Allied Van Lines
American Bakeries
American Hospital Supply
American National
Amsted Industries
Baxter Laboratories
Beatrice Foods
Bell Federal
Bell & Howell
Borg-Warner
Brunswick
Bunker Ramo
Carson Pirie Scott
CECO
CENCO
Central National Bank
CFS Continental
Chemetron
Citizens Bank Park Ridge
Chicago Bridge and Iron
Chicago-Milwaukee
Chicago and North Western

Chicago, Rock Island and
Pacific
Combined Insurance
Commonwealth Edison
Consolidated Foods
Continental Illinois
Corporation
CNA Financial
De Soto
Donnelley (R. R.) & Sons
Drovers National Bank
Exchange National Bank
First Chicago
First Federal
FMC
General American
Transportation
Goldblatt Brothers
Gould
Harris Bankcorp
Hart, Schaffner & Marx
Heller (Walter E.)
International
Hilton Hotels
Home Federal
Household Finance

Illinois Bell Telephone
Illinois Central Industries
Illinois Tool Works
Interlake
Inland Steel
International Harvester
International Minerals
& Chemical
Jewel
Kemperco
Kraftco
Lakeview Trust
LaSalle National Bank
Libby, McNeill and Libby
Marcor
Maremont
Marleman
Marshall Field
Masonite
McDonald's
McGraw-Edison
Morton-Norwich Products
Motorola
Nalco Chemical
National Boulevard Bank
National Can

National Tea
Northern Illinois Gas
Northern Indiana Public
Service
Nortrust
Northwest Industries
Northwest National
Bank
Outboard Marine
People's Gas
Pioneer Trust
Pullman
Quaker Oats
St. Paul Federal
Santa Fe Industries
Searle (G. D.)
Sears Bank & Trust
Sears, Roebuck
Signode
Spector Industries
Square D
Standard Oil (Indiana)
Sunbeam
Swift
Talman Federal
Trans Union

UAL

U.S. Gypsum

UNICOA

Universal Oil Products

Walgreen

Ward Foods

Washington National

Wieboldt Stores

Wrigley (William) Jr.

Zenith Radio

Comments of Leonard F. Walentynowicz,
Executive Director of the Polish American Congress,
With Respect to S. Res. 431

While S. Res. 431 is a welcome initiative and effort to help promote equal opportunity and recognition in the area of Congressional employment, it is significantly deficient in several respects. We make this observation in light of our experience with similar programs and procedures enacted in the fields of private and other public employment, such as Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Presidential Executive Order #11246, and the regu-

lations and policies and practices of the Civil Service Commission, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Civil Rights Commission. Such experience indicates that these agencies and many others responsible for fair employment policies practice a much different gospel than the one that is given to the American public for belief, and we have detailed our concerns and conclusions in support thereof in comments and testimony given before (1) the Civil Service Commission with respect to the so-called "Sugarman" proposals, (2) the EEOC with respect to their proposed guidelines designed to protect employers from claims of "reverse discrimination" and (3) the Senate Subcommittee on the Constitution with respect to the proposed

extension of the Civil Rights Commission.

Copies of such comments and testimony are enclosed herewith.

In the context of this bill our concerns essentially deal with the parochial preoccupation by the Executive branch of government and many

members of Congress and their staff with only certain forms of prohibited discrimination, namely, race, sex and color, and only certain designated groups, namely, blacks, Hispanics, native Americans and Asian Americans, and women without even bothering to find out whether any other groups that form part of this mosaic called America need similar attention or may be unfairly affected by the attention and in many cases preferences given the favored groups. We want to avoid in the field of congressional employment the uneven and discriminatory application of similar type procedures now found in the field of private and other public employment.

To put it another way we want to be sure that the Board, Office, Director and other employees of the bureaucracy created by this resolution understands absolutely that Congress desires that discrimination based on religion and national origin other than Hispanic gets the same kind of priority and attention as the presently favored types and that such bureaucracy does not use as a convenient excuse the present insensitivity of the already existing government agencies.

In addition it has become overwhelmingly clear to us that the government's failure to collect data on any groups other than on the designated minorities and women is fundamentally unfair and discriminatory. As we stated in our additional comments to the Senate Subcommittee the

present practice of lumping together as a homogeneous unit anyone who is not included as a member of a designated minority defies common sense.

Doing so presumes that anyone in that non-minority unit has the same degree of upward mobility or equal opportunity. This assertion would be immediately proved suspect and even conclusively refuted if data were collected on such groups as Polish Americans, Arab Americans, Italian Americans, etc., as such data is collected and analyzed for the designated minorities. The failure to collect data also creates unfair attitudes among those in power including judges for it gives them a convenient excuse to assert that those groups who are not being counted either have no problem or have no standing to assert their rights. A vivid example of this was a recent decision of Judge

Charles R. Richey of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia in the case of Bachman v. Pertschuk, C.A. 76-0079, wherein he excluded Polish Americans and other white ethnics from the benefits of a stipulation regarding the hiring practices at the Federal Trade Commission even though he included all members of the designated minorities notwithstanding that the action was maintained only by blacks as a class. Another example is the affirmative action program in the case of Bakke v. California, now awaiting decision by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Accordingly, we ask that the Resolution be amended by adding the following language in Title II, Section 202(b) after the conclusion thereof:

The Office shall gather and maintain information on categories of employees and individuals beyond those presently designated as minorities. There shall be as

many categories as the Office receives complaints reflecting the specific type of discrimination.

and the following language in Title III, Part D:

(d) All forms of prohibited discrimination shall be given the same priority and attention especially in formulation and implementation of any affirmative action plan. Whenever data and numbers are used either to establish discrimination or to remedy the

effects thereof such as timetables and goals, comparable data and analyses must be created for all other forms of prohibited discrimination including all of the categories created pursuant to Section 202(b) hereof. In the event numerical remedies are to be used, they must be accompanied by a statement reflecting the impact such remedies will have upon the groups who are not included as the beneficiaries of any such remedy.

We of course would be happy to meet with any committee and the staff thereof to work out other acceptable language if the proposed language is unsuitable.

DISCUSSION

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. My first question would be: The statement has been made that the Polish-American Congress did send the appropriate letter to EEOC. Is there a reason why that has not been responded to?

MR. LEACH. I have no knowledge of the letter. I didn't receive a copy of it. I can't answer that.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. It was directed to the Chairman?

MR. LEACH. I'll be glad to make an inquiry.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Okay, if that could be furnished to Mr. Leach, perhaps if a copy would come back both to you and to the Commission, we would like that as part of the record at this point, as Exhibit B.

EXHIBIT B

To:

Hon. Eleanor Holmes Norton, Chair

Attn:

Executive Secretariat

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

Comments of Leonard F. Walentynowicz,
Executive Director, Polish American Congress,
on Proposed Guidelines Relating to Remedial
and/or Affirmative Action, et al.

We wish to compliment you on the initiative you have displayed in attempting to utilize one of the tools Congress gave you to help do the Commission's job. Faced with uncertainties and vicissitudes and buffeted by competing factors and groups, I am certain that private and governmental employers would welcome guidance from you that would not only indicate the practices they should adopt in implementing *fairly* Congressional and executive policy in this area but would also provide them with a measure of protection from exaggerated and

unfounded claims of discrimination once they adopt such practices. Never-the-less, the proposed guidelines and the commentary issued therewith are illustrative of one of the major reasons why more progress has not been achieved in eliminating prohibited discrimination based on race, color, sex, creed, and national origin without any priority to any one type over any other. The guidelines as well as the Commission's policies, practices, and comments establish priorities and preferences, which in effect create new patterns of discrimination and attack fundamental American values of individual rights and initiative. Essentially this has come about because of the Commission's preoccupation with only certain forms of discrimination and an impatience to remedy these kinds of discrimination without fully considering what impact this preoccupation and the proposed remedies have on other forms of prohibited discrimination and other constitutional rights and values including merit selection and equal protection of the law.

In addition, the Commission preaches the gospel of equality for all but engages in a practice of either outright or de facto preferences for certain groups on the grounds that such is necessary to rectify the effects of past discrimination. Perhaps such a practice can be justified constitutionally but such a decision should be made by Congress and the President and only after a comprehensive survey is made of *all* the discrimination suffered by the groups that make up America and not just a certain select portion thereof.

As a result of these factors much resentment has been created, thereby slowing progress in eliminating prohibited discrimination. Further this resentment against the unfair and uneven application of our laws and executive orders regarding prohibited discrimination and affirmative action programs is all too often indiscriminately and irresponsibly labeled as another form of racism, thus again reducing the teamwork necessary to overcome this major problem in American society.

Having made these observations it would be appropriate to indicate how they relate to the specific proposals under consideration here.

First of all, the language in paragraphs I, II and III of the proposed guidelines, if literally read, expresses a gospel of equal concern for the five prohibited areas of discrimination reflected in Executive Order 11246 and Title VII, namely, race, color, creed, sex, and national origin. Unfortunately, however, the Commission's practices result in the collection of data of only certain groups namely, blacks, Hispanics, Native American, and Asian Americans, and whites or others,

duplicated for males and females. There is no statutory or executive mandate limiting the collection of data only to these groups. The memo from the Office of Management and Budget merely requests that uniform data be collected to facilitate budget purposes, and we have been expressly advised that more categories than those used by the Commission can be used if it is necessary to accomplish legislative and executive mandates. Interestingly enough, data is collected on Hispanics, a group which is considered over 95% white by the U. S. Bureau of Census without any justification why data is not being collected on any other sub-group of the white race, even though it is common knowledge that there are a large substantial number of such sub-groups including Polish Americans, Italian Americans, Arab Americans, Jewish Americans, etc., and that many of such groups are discriminated against in a variety of ways similar to the ones being counted, including such discrimination as defamation and lack of upward mobility.

Accordingly, if an employer wanted to make an analysis as suggested in paragraphs I, II and III of the guidelines, he could not do so, because the data would not be there. This would particularly be so in certain highly ethnic areas such as Chicago, Detroit, New York, Cleveland, or with nationwide employers. Thus the Commission by these guidelines preaches one gospel but practices another. Significantly, President Carter by memorandum dated 7-27-78, requested all departments and agencies to collect data on the racial, sex, and ethnic makeup of his executive appointments and ancillary help along 16 different groups, thus recognizing the need for more categories.

Secondly, the Commission suggests in paragraph IV of the guidelines the use of certain ratios, goals, timetables or other numerical remedies. To the extent that their use is restricted to actual discrimination to be remedied, such use cannot only be justified and sustained as a proper remedy, but also emphasized as being consistent with the public statements of the President. Nevertheless, the language used in the guidelines contemplates their use in a much broader sense and purpose and to the extent they are so to be used, they constitute a de facto quota system and are objectionable not only on constitutional and statutory grounds but are in contradiction of the public statements of the President. In this context, it is suggested that numerical disparity alone is not conclusive evidence of actual discrimination but is simply one possible indicator thereof. Further, the use of numerical remedies as proposed here has the effect of emphasizing group rights over individual rights and initiative, thereby adversely affecting competition by merit.

Another deficiency is the failure of the Commission to articulate what the goals and timetables should represent. Do they mean more

participation in the job force at a sacrifice in merit? How long are they to be used? Until there is absolute numerical parity between the number of the group employed and the number of the group in the relevant work force? If so, how do we allow for nondiscrimination factors such as cultural preferences, incentive, hard work, initiative and natural competition? In any event, if numerical remedies are to be used, regardless how disguised, then in the interest of fairness and equality they should be used for all disadvantaged and discriminated groups and not only for some.

Third, in paragraph VII of the guidelines and in the commentary issued to explain and interpret the guidelines, the Commission indicates a preference for certain forms of discrimination. This is a violation of the mandates given it by statute and executive order. As indicated previously, these mandates require the Commission to overcome prohibited discrimination on an equal and fair basis without any priority or preference for any one type of discrimination. To do otherwise, without allowing for the impact on those kinds of prohibited discrimination not receiving attention is to create new patterns of discrimination. To put it another way, the non-favored ethnic group and individual not only has to compete on the merits but they also have to overcome the de facto preferences given other groups and individuals for discrimination that in many instances the non-favored group and individual was not responsible for.

The Chair's statement that the Commission must protect employers from charges of "reverse discrimination" is simply another manifestation of this uneven and unfair application by the Commission of its mandates. The groups favored by the Chair do not have a special right of protection or preference. Employers should be given guidance and encouraged to make self-analysis and formulate plans to avoid "reverse discrimination" as well as the discrimination sought to be protected by the Chair. In fact, such employers should be given guidance, encouragement and data to make self-analysis and formulate plans to avoid all the forms of prohibited discrimination and to correct past injustices to all groups and not just some.

In conclusion, we suggest that these guidelines be redrawn in light of these comments and their effect delayed until the Commission creates a sufficient data base to carry out its mandate fairly and equally as originally intended and required by legislative and executive mandate. We offer our continued cooperation to this end.

Dated: February 28, 1978, Washington, D.C.

Do my colleagues have any questions of Mr. Leach?

Go ahead. Commissioner Saltzman?

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Obviously, Mr. Leach, the perception of some is that the needs of the ethnic community have been ignored by EEOC. This has fostered bitterness, or at least some sense of hostility toward other communities because of the seeming absence of equal effort by EEOC against ethnic discrimination on a par with efforts to overcome racial discrimination. Has the EEOC undertaken in the past, or does it plan to address the employment needs and discrimination practices against Euro-Americans?

MR. LEACH. Mr. Saltzman, let me answer that a couple of different ways.

One, it may be charged that EEOC has not done enough on behalf of any protected group under Title VII, and depending on which community of interest you're talking with, you're going to receive that charge, and I agree with it. I agree with it, for a lot of different reasons but basically it is because the government has never done enough. Secondly, I think it has to be understood clearly – may I just say that this witness, I think, made a very strong, articulate statement, one that in many respects I agree with and I think he makes a very good case. But at the same time I want to point out that there are certain things that it has no control over.

One, EEOC is a law-enforcement agency. Individuals who are discriminated against in the context of the work place come to EEOC and file charges of discrimination alleging that they've been unlawfully not hired, that they've been unlawfully discharged, that they have been unlawfully not promoted – a host of other infractions. We have to investigate those individual complaints. We don't go out and seek them. They come in our doors.

We have 50 or more offices around the country. We receive about 7,000 charges of discrimination or inquiries every month, 30,000 a year. We have to investigate, make decisions on, and then if the employer refuses voluntarily to conciliate the case, we then go to court and we start the process over again. We have to sue the employer, and we have to get a court to agree *de novo* that the evidence supports the claims of discrimination.

Let me tell you the statistics on who files charges in America with EEOC. Fifty percent of our charges are filed on the basis of black race discrimination. Thirty-five percent of our charges are filed on the basis of discrimination because of sex. That's approximately 85 percent in all. Eleven percent more are filed on the basis of national origin, Hispanic. That leaves about four percent. Three of that four percent

file on the basis of religious discrimination. That leaves one percent of our charges that are filed from the ethnic Americans, which the witness speaks of. To a large extent, this dictates the expenditure of our resources. We have no control. The decision's made for us by those who appear affected. As I say, we're a law-enforcement agency.

On the other hand, we do try to reserve some of our resources to bring systemic pattern and practice types of cases. As I said in my statement, in doing this and in performing this mission, we must in reality and in the sense of perception give the impression and make it stick in reality that we do this fairly, and with equity, and even-handedly in behalf of all citizens who are protected by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act.

We are going to have a review. It's undergoing now with respect to a task force effort of the EEO one through six reporting data, which gives us information on the array of employees that exist in the work force. Every employer having 50 or more employees must file these reports by law, subject to criminal and civil penalty.

Those reports were first issued I believe in approximately 1966, and it's long past due in terms of a judgment, a critical judgment, as to whether or not the information that we're receiving is adequate to support the enforcement of the law.

That's why we've appointed this task force; that's why within the next few months we'll be holding hearings, and I invite this witness to appear at those hearings. I invite all others, and perhaps this Commission as well to give us some help to decide how we better can identify discrimination and better use and marshal our resources to meet it in behalf of everyone who's protected by the law.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Are you suggesting that it is feasible to include, as was requested by the witness, Euro-Americans?

MR. LEACH. Differently than it is now being included? It may be. I don't know. I haven't really focused on it. I'm waiting for the task force report and their recommendations.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. One final question.

In such voluntary Affirmative Action programs as undertaken by the Kaiser Company, do those programs benefit in any way others than merely members of the black community? Are there benefits to the ethnic community, especially those on the lower economic level?

MR. LEACH. The Kaiser case was, as you know, a black case, a race case. It's quite conceivable that - and even in looking at our voluntary guidelines on Affirmative Action that we published in January of this year, they could apply to any under-represented ethnic group in the relevant labor market that surrounds an employer's place of business.

What we tell employers is this. We say take a look at your work force. Take a look at your relevant labor market and your pool of qualified employees in that market and make a judgment. Is there a significant under-representation of any ethnic category protected by Title VII in this work place of yours; and if there is, can it be justified?

That brings up the tests, the selection device, the height requirement, whatever that employer has in the way of a college degree requirement or whatever. Is it job related? Is it justified by a business necessity? If it isn't, then that under-representation cannot be lawfully explained and the statistical inference arises that probably discrimination against that group, whatever it is, has occurred, justifying affirmative or remedial action.

We seek to order those employers to go out and undertake special recruitment efforts, affirmative action, goals and timetables, whatever it takes to correct that imbalance. When it's corrected, perhaps discrimination no longer will be seen in that work place. But until it is, it just may exist.

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. I'd like to comment on a couple points that Mr. Leach made that are very, very important from our perspective, if time permits. If you want me to comment now, I'd be happy -

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Well, if you would like to respond now, I hope that you will.

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. I'd like to do so now in fairness to Mr. Leach.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Right.

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. With respect to the point that the number of complaints was only one percent - my feeling based on my experience with the Government, in the State Department, my presence in Washington for 5 years, and my activity in Polish-American and East European affairs is that the prime reason for such a small number of complaints is the public perception that the Government doesn't seriously entertain them.

You may come here and say a lot of nice things about the way our laws in theory work, but these people are not dumb; they're looking at the practice, and they're looking at reality.

You may talk about a balanced work force, but when you tell the employer that when he makes his survey of his work force to find out its make up and needs, and then your statistical form lumps everybody left in this last category, well, you know what the obvious answer is.

And that's one of the reasons people don't file a complaint, because they know they're not included in the reporting form. In addition, they're told by the Government agencies, such as the State Department, that they're not officially recognized.

When I used the essence of the argument you just made a moment ago with the Office of Management in the State Department, that is, the need to determine the relevant work force nationwide, for foreign service officers, I was told that we don't count.

They said the only ones that count are those listed on the form. They further stated that the Civil Service Commission directed that the first four groups designated are to be the only beneficiaries of affirmative action. When I asked them and the Civil Service Commission for the authority for such direction, they couldn't find it.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Well, that's the point I wanted to pursue, and let me pursue it while Mr. Leach is here. I would be curious personally, Mr. Leach, whether you would favor additional categories on the EEO-6 form.

MR. LEACH. Educational institutions.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Yes.

I mean do you get involved? Are there comparable forms in industry where you ask for the data?

MR. LEACH. Well, I want to see the specifics. As I said, Vice Chairman Horn, we have a task force. Three program offices in Washington in our headquarters are joined together now looking at these issues. They're examining it. When we do make recommendations, we have to have hearings on it. It's a little premature to say in what fashion -

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. When is that supposed to report, that task force?

MR. LEACH. Within the next 2 months, and then we go to hearings after that.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. And do we know yet the way the question will be posed by that task force?

Is it open-ended as to the number of groups?

MR. LEACH. It's going to be open-ended as to what changes will be made in our forms.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. It is open-ended.

MR. LEACH. It's going to be open-ended in terms of the context of all these surveys, all of these reports, all of the information that is gathered by EEOC.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. So then any ethnic group -

MR. LEACH. Theoretically, that's right.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Any ethnic group would have a right to testify, to state their case, and presumably it then gets down to the feasibility in terms of the mechanics. From your testimony, I understood that you had checked with various agencies, and there is no problem on the mechanics.

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. Originally I was told there was. I was advised by the State Department that mechanically we couldn't have more categories - but then when we pressed our case with the Census Bureau, the Census Bureau created for tabulation of its new 1980 Census forms something like 600 different categories, and the Office of Management and Budget, as I stated before, permits the inclusion of any number of other categories.

The capacity and authority for more categories is there. The present five categories evolved basically as a bureaucratic decision. These five categories are not the result of a Congressional decision or even a Presidential decision except to the extent that the Office of Management and Budget reflects the will of the President.

For a while there was a decision that we were to have only five categories, but because of pressure and fairness, as well as existing law, Office of Management and Budget concluded that more categories could be created, except that if more categories are created, they are to be subsumed under the existing five categories.

I question the wisdom as well as the legality of that last proviso, but at least Office of Management and Budget determined that we can have more categories. I see no mechanical difficulties in having 10 or 600 more categories if that's necessary.

MR. LEACH. These aren't our forms. Let me make it clear. What he's talking about are not the EEO-one through six series of survey information, and as to what his experience at the State Department is, I can't talk about that.

EEOC never had jurisdiction over the Federal Government until January of this year. We're just now promulgating our policies, our practices, our procedures on discrimination law in the Federal sector. So what the State Department has done in the past, I also have no knowledge of.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Let me ask along that line: Has EEOC had any input to the Census in the '70's with reference to the 1980 Census categories? Were you consulted on the diversity of those categories?

MR. LEACH. I testified at a meeting of the President's Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics. They in turn were going to make some recommendations with respect to the 1980 Census that would be helpful to us. So I guess in that context, they did get some information from us as to what our specific needs were. As to the details of that testimony, I'd have to refresh my memory. It was well over a year ago.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Well, take it off the top of your head. Do you recall if EEOC advocated then broadening the categories from the four protected -

MR. LEACH. Yes, yes, we needed broader, more specific information. We needed broader and more clearly defined categories.

We needed more information with respect to incomes. There has been a host of specific recommendations.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. I think, to round out this portion of the questioning, I would like your statement, if you wouldn't mind, to file it with the Commission, and we'll put it in the record at this point, as Exhibit C.

EXHIBIT C

**REMARKS OF DANIEL E. LEACH
VICE CHAIRMAN, EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COM-
MISSION
BEFORE THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL
RIGHTS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
December 4, 1979**

ETHNICITY AND EMPLOYMENT

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was created to enforce Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended. Title VII was enacted to end job discrimination on account of race, sex, color, religion, and national origin. It is designed as well to bring those previously excluded from or kept down in the workplace into the economic mainstream.

At the outset, let me say that this law must be administered fairly. The enforcement agency preeminently responsible - EEOC - must be perceived as being even-handed in its approach to employment discrimination. The observations I make transcend the various bases of discrimination under the Act. The minorities involved reflect the full spectrum of protected groups whose ethnicity has adversely affected them in the workplace. They all suffer employment discrimination.

It would appear, first of all, that employers have constructed specific barriers to the hiring of minorities. They lie mainly in areas of testing, and other screening devices, and in the area of recruitment. My Commission has found a decided increase in total paper and pencil test usage and a marked increase in doubtful testing practices which, based on our experience, tend to have discriminatory effects. The same is true of arbitrary height requirements or weight requirements. In many cases, employers have been relying almost exclusively on these tests as the basis for making the decision to hire, transfer, or promote.

Minority candidates frequently experience disproportionately high rates of rejection by failing to attain score levels or whatever has been established as minimum standards for qualification. This may be a valid and acceptable practice but too often we have found that employers have been using tests that have not been shown to be predictors of job performance. That is a critical issue under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. Even now, paper and pencil tests, height requirements, degree requirements and a host of other filters are used. Some legitimately. Others, as the devices that serve to filter or screen out certain types of people for jobs or promotions.

Recruitment barriers are just as serious. For new hires, employers or incumbent employees are likely to contact only their friends and associates – the buddy-buddy practice that so often served to eliminate minority candidates. And still does. It may well depend on where the hiring net is thrown – be it toward the local high school or college or in the direction of the suburbs. And the discriminatory effect continues on down stream; it does not stop at initial hiring.

It should be noted that job discrimination against minorities often operates in three dimensions: discrimination in hiring and even if hired, discrimination in the form of segregated or unequal initial job assignments and after assignment, discrimination in job progression – in the advancement and promotional opportunities that relegate minority workers to less desirable, lower-paid jobs.

Of course, there are pockets of progress. Some minorities are gaining increased skills through education and training. Some employers or industries are endeavoring to respond to the mandate of the law. But by and large, government must continue to press against the barriers, strike them down and prod, push, pull and order industry to undertake remedial and affirmative action. That is my perception of EEOC's work – it is what I have experienced in my three and one-half years with the Commission.

Part of the answer has rested with measures that serve to identify the barriers – measures such as Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection. These are the standards set by government to inform employers as to their legal responsibilities in seeking to gauge individuals and their fitness for hiring and promotion.

It has been the use of tests or other devices or standards that are not properly job related or justified that has so adversely affected the hiring, promotion, and transfer prospects of minorities. The Courts have been generous in finding unlawful discrimination where these tests have not been validated, where they do not evince a high degree of job relatedness. Further, the employer giving or acting upon the results of the particular test must be able to demonstrate that suitable alternative selection procedures are unavailable. While a violation of

the Uniform Selection Guidelines may serve to identify unlawful job discrimination, these guidelines do contain a provision that offers encouragement to employers who have sought to respond. Embraced within the Guidelines is the so-called “bottom-line” clause. It says that even where an employer cannot validate a selection procedure, government will not take action if, in a general sense, it appears that notwithstanding the infraction, those who have been left out or kept down in that employer’s work force are being brought in and moved up. In other words, there may be a technical violation of the law, but employers endeavoring to correct the effects of job discrimination ought to be encouraged. That is the message of the “bottom-line.”

Beyond employee selection procedures there are other recent developments that this Commission – the Civil Rights Commission – perhaps ought to be looking at. The *Weber, Kaiser Steelworkers* case I think is relevant to this dialogue. There, you will recall, the Supreme Court placed its stamp of approval on voluntary affirmative action programs as a way of bringing blacks into the economic mainstream. It could well apply equally to Hispanics and other protected groups if an appropriate fact pattern exists. To briefly review the facts and holdings of this case, until 1974 Kaiser hired as craft workers for its Gramercy Louisiana plant only persons who already had prior craft experience. As a result there were very few blacks in craft jobs; in part at least – as the Supreme Court opinion specifically noted – because blacks had long been excluded from construction craft unions in that area. In 1974, Kaiser and the Steelworkers entered into a collective bargaining agreement which changed the practice throughout the country with respect to craft jobs. Rather than hiring from the outside, Kaiser established a training program to train its production workers to fill craft positions.

The agreement provided for separate seniority lists, one black and one white, with the proviso that at least 50% of the new trainees would be black until the black percentage of craft workers approximated the percentage of blacks in the SMSA work force. As a result of the agreement, some blacks selected for training had less plant seniority than some of the whites whose bids were rejected. Brian Weber was one of those whites. He brought suit and the rest is history. While Title VII protects whites as well as blacks, the Court ruled that the plan at stake did not violate the Act because it was an affirmative action plan voluntarily adopted by private parties to eliminate traditional patterns of racial segregation in employment. This case should bring to a halt those cries of “reverse” discrimination uttered in the fact of such a long standing and continuing national blight. That is the way our Supreme Court saw it. But the verdict is still out.

The primary concern of Congress in prohibiting job discrimination was the lowly plight of those in our economy who had been riveted to unskilled and semi-skilled positions. The statute was to open up job opportunities; to bring people into the economic mainstream who had previously been barred.

What does *Weber* mean, then, in the context of a response to be fashioned by employers? First of all, it means that employers, without fear of retribution, can train minorities – along with untrained whites – for greater participation in the work force. This could mean the inclusion of minorities in occupations from which they have historically been excluded – perhaps white collar jobs, in management, and in upper economic sales jobs. Government must do everything it can to encourage employers to take advantage of the *Weber* ruling, and I look forward to the views of this Commission on that issue.

Still another potential weapon in government's hands is the EEOC's authority to identify and eliminate patterns and practices of job discrimination. We know from our statistical data that while the old slogan may no longer be visible – “anglo males only” – it still is operating to the detriment of others. Government must better use its power to identify the barriers and strike them down. At EEOC we are seeking to construct a systemic enforcement program that will marshal resources in a fair and logical manner – taking aim, for example, at the very worst practices in order to achieve the greatest results. For this purpose we are just beginning to use this research base of ours as a law enforcement tool – to make more critical and rational judgments about where resource allocations might make their most effective impact – whether it is an industry, an employer, an issue, geographically or however else job discrimination arises.

While the Commission brings numerous actions against employers who perpetuate policies and practices which result in low utilization of available minorities, we have not done enough. Neither have the other elements of the Federal Government who are in this business.

What this all says is that while Congress has given us some tools to fight employment discrimination and to attack it institutionally we are just recently learning how to mount a more effective effort. Government is indeed trying to do better. President Carter's Civil Rights Reorganization Plan says that. Also saying it are those strategies fashioned to encourage voluntary compliance with Title VII; whether it is the “bottom-line” of the Testing Guidelines or Voluntary Affirmative Action as exhibited by the *Weber* ruling or targeting employers on a worst-first priority basis, we must encourage those who seek to comply and scrutinize carefully those who appear not to.

But these are only the seeds that may lead employers in the 1980's to restructure their workplaces to meet the demands of the law and national policy. What about the present?

This is no easy or simple task. To so many questions there appear few, if any, answers.

There is the traditional resistance. There is the political resistance. There is the economy. We appear headed for a period of economic decline. In the past unemployment has been borne disproportionately on the backs of minorities – those who entered the workforce last are the first to go. There are so many obstacles. I look forward to any recommendations that this Commission might offer as to layoffs, work sharing and whatever else may be required to mitigate this period of economic down turn.

Thank you.

* * *

Commissioner Saltzman, did you have any further questions?

Commissioner Ruiz?

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Yes. Let's go back 10 years. The data collection effort by blacks and Hispanics didn't always exist. The blacks and the Spanish a decade ago were relatively in the same position and using arguments that the Polish-Americans are today. Blacks and Hispanics felt locked out of the employment market because they weren't properly identified. Now, I do not know exactly what this ethnic group was doing 10 years ago, but apparently 10 years ago they were happier than they are today. I don't know. But what was available at that time to the blacks with relation to census and to the Hispanics with relation to census was, I surmise available to ethnics as well.

The ethnic community that we are involved with at the present time is probably susceptible to identification, because the big problem at this time is how in the heck are you going to identify yourself?

As I see the picture here, ethnics are not really opposed to affirmative action; they just want to be included in the affirmative action. In the affirmative action ladder, because you speak about the ladder – they too want to have upward mobility, as I notice here on the statistics, to executive suites.

It's not a case of injustice. It's a case of the Government lags. I welcome what is occurring here today because as I see it, from an ethnic point of view, unfortunately, there has been a lag, and it isn't reverse discrimination, because the laws are there.

So I think this hearing is very important for purposes of getting on the ball.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Chairman Flemming?

CHAIRMAN FLEMING. I appreciate very much the dialogue that has just taken place, for this reason. The Vice Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has made it clear that there is a study under way dealing with this basic issue, that there is going to be a public hearing as a result of that study.

This in turn will give the various groups who share this concern the opportunity to make representations based on the study and based on their own study.

I think it is very, very important for Government to make sure that these opportunities are provided, not just in the employment area, but also in some of these other areas that we've had under consideration.

If you were here, you may have noted, I addressed some questions relative to public hearings on certain other regulations, because those did provide an opportunity to raise these issues and get them before the people who have to make decisions, and I think it is very, very important to utilize those channels when they open up. I think this dialogue has been very, very important.

From the standpoint of the *Weber* case, I think there's one thing that sometimes we overlook. The first thing that the agreement did between the management and the steelworkers was to open up opportunities for all current employees of that particular company. In other words, the company had been going to the outside to employ craft workers and was discriminating against all of their own employees. And this agreement opened up an opportunity for all of them, so that the result was that not only did black members of the community have opportunities that they hadn't had before, but members of the white community also had opportunities that they hadn't had before. I think that's an aspect of the *Weber* situation that's interesting.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Mr. Nunez?

STAFF DIRECTOR Louis Nunez. No questions.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. All right.

Mr. White?

ASSISTANT STAFF DIRECTOR WHITE. Just one question, Commissioner Leach. Mr. Walentynowicz indicated in his testimony that he would advocate a connection with Affirmative Action point system. Would you care to comment on that?

MR. LEACH. A point system? I missed that. I -

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. It's in the brief we filed in the *Weber* case. I suggested a point system instead of the kind of quotas, time tables, and goals we have now, which not only are exclusionary in practice but also raise serious questions and problems with other values we hold highly. If the person can show discrimination, then give him a

remedy through a point system. That way you don't exclude everybody else and seriously impair the rights of innocent individuals and groups.

Give him a preference – as the present system is designed to do – but unlike the present system, don't exclude everybody else, and thus deprive innocent groups and individuals of their chance to compete.

MR. LEACH. The law of Title VII is involved, and I must say that is – insofar as I know, it has not been presented in the context of that evolutionary process. It's an interesting consideration, but of course we try to administer the Civil Rights Act, and –

MR. LEACH. I beg your pardon. Title VII does expressly mention Affirmative Action in Section 706.

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. But not in terms of the way it's been conceived –

MR. LEACH. Remedially, as a remedy, yes, it does. The Courts may order Affirmative Action, and –

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Let me ask you, Mr. Leach, assuming the point system concept regardless of the categories for which points might be given, how might an idea like that get into the bloodstream of the EEOC? I mean, are there occasions when the regulations open up for comment and it is appropriate to get a new idea into Government?

MR. LEACH. Oh, certainly. Every time we issue guidelines on any subject, particularly on the issue of Affirmative Action, as in the guidelines issued earlier this year – we have a public hearing or at least we seek public comment. In the course of those comments, I recall no one proposing that this kind of system be adapted. I would have to look at, or my Commission would have to look at other consequences of such a point system. Would it produce polarization? Would it provide devices? I frankly don't know the answer to this; it's certain it could be proposed, and I suppose considered, but I just haven't thought much about that.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. I would like the Staff Director to refer the point system proposal to the EEOC to see what, if any, consideration has been given to it.

Before you leave, Mr. Leach, one thought. You mentioned these categories of complaints, and then you did eventually mention the systemic approach of EEOC. I had thought from our previous discussions with you and Chair Norton that most of the complaint investigation resources of the EEOC were now going into the systemic approach, class actions, if you would, rather than into processing individual complaints. Could you tell me what proportion of those –

MR. LEACH. Well, Vice Chairman Horn, conceptually, that is our goal and always has been, but we don't control the spigot. We have no

discretion. We have to investigate individual cases. We can't turn people away. We can't let them slip through the cracks. The statute won't let us. Therefore, they control – the individual charging parties largely dictate the use of our resources.

We have a backlog. We're trying to get at our backlog. It is diminishing for the first time in history.

As we reduce our backlog and are able to prospectively process charges as they walk in the door on a current basis, we'll be able to devote more and more of our resources to systemic Commission-initiated actions and lawsuits.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. While we're in fiscal 1980 now, could you give the Commission a rough idea in terms of compliance activities what proportion is being spent on processing and resolving the individual complaint versus pursuing the systemic complaint approach?

MR. LEACH. It would be a bad guess.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Over half?

MR. LEACH. Yes, well over half, and I would say –

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. On the individual.

MR. LEACH. Our backlog now, based on current projected resources that are coming in over the next two fiscal years, will be eliminated within the fiscal year 1981, probably by the end of that fiscal year. At that time we should have a fully operating, most effective, systemic enforcement program. But until that backlog is eliminated, that will be –

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Well, I can understand that. Do you have an estimate, after fiscal 1981, as to what proportion of resources will be needed to keep up with the individual complaints versus the systemic approach?

MR. LEACH. Well over half of our resources by that time will be devoted to systemic work.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Well, very good. We thank you both.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Will the four panelists to continue the session on employment and ethnicity come forward?

Professor Frieda Rozen is an instructor in the Department of Labor Studies at Pennsylvania State University.

She has concentrated primarily on the role of the blue and white-collar women workers and union involvement in the labor market, including minority rural young workers, publishing various articles on women and work.

She earned her Master's degree in social work at the University of California at Berkeley, and is now pursuing her Doctorate at Pennsylvania State.

Welcome. You will have about 20 minutes to give us a briefing of the paper which you submitted on employment and ethnicity. That paper will be entered as a part of the record.

**STATEMENT OF FRIEDA SHOENBERG ROSEN,
INSTRUCTOR OF LABOR STUDIES, DEPARTMENT OF LA-
BOR STUDIES,
PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY,
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA**

Thank you. I've been asked to address myself to the question of ethnics and employment, to evaluate the effects in the employment area of ethnicity and now the effect on ethnics of affirmative action programs for other groups, for women and racial minorities, and what's happening to ethnics because of the changes there.

Now, in the light of the rather overt confrontation on those issues this morning, I have a sense that whatever it was I was trying to say was pussy-footing, really, and somewhat evasive. I was going round and round, but they came right out and said it in so many words to each other.

However, on the other hand, I do have a feeling that maybe walking around the edges of the issues and looking at them is also important, even though I think it's very good to start off with the kind of direct confrontation that we had this morning.

All of us have a sense that employment opportunities in the United States are really structured, and that whatever we may say about a simple peanut farmer who got to be President of the United States, we realize that for most people employment opportunities are laid out and limited.

We don't say it in those kinds of words. We also have a distinct sense that there's an ethnic link to these kinds of limits that are set on what people can really do out there in the world of employment.

And, again, you could hear it from the group here - this isn't very explicit. Everyone has a feeling that ethnicity has a pretty close connection with what people can achieve in the way of employment, but no one really likes to say it, and, you know, this morning when Miss Galina Suziedelis jumped on that issue, I think she clarified for the rest of us the conflict that all of us have about that.

But we know Americans tend to know that there is this link and it's built into our stereotypes. All of us know what to expect in some of the older American films about who's going to have what kinds of jobs. We've built stereotypes around the link between occupation and ethnicity or race.

Now, in a way that didn't bother us too much for a long, long time, because we like to think that we were all on kind of a escalator. We

like to think that, yeah, people of my ethnicity or people of my race aren't very far along in terms of jobs and occupations now, but look at what happened to the people who used to have these kinds of jobs two generations ago, and we're well on the way.

Today that doesn't satisfy us any more. In the first place, I think we've begun to realize that we don't all move up the ladder quite as smoothly as we used to think we did. We realize that there are conflicts involved in that move up the ladder, and I think the other thing is we just don't like the idea of being in a particular place on a ladder because of our race or ethnicity.

We like to think that that whole American dream about individual achievement and opportunity is a little more true than it seems to be.

Well, to the extent that we're wanting to question this whole business, we need to find out if it's true that there is this link, and I think the more you listen these last 2 days, the more you realize that we really don't know how close the link is between ethnicity and employment opportunity.

We can tell fairly clearly from the numbers out there what is going on with women. We can tell fairly clearly what's going on with blacks. We can tell what the link is between race and employment opportunity.

But the situation with figures for ethnicity is much more difficult, and I think that's a point that was implied this morning. It's a point that has to be made more clearly. The census only tells us about people of various European and Asian and some Latin stocks in terms of the foreign generation and the children of foreigners and that is it. You are never identified later on in the census in terms of your national background in any way.

The other problem in the census is that the census never identifies people in terms of religion, and this means that when you take some of the East European groups and you're mixing the Jews with the Orthodox or the Catholics, or whoever is the bulk of the population in that particular country, you're getting a very mixed kind of figure, because the occupational mobility seems to have been quite different for Jews from what it has been for the others.

You're getting the same kind of problem even with the Irish where the situation for Protestants and Catholics seems to be very different, but you can't quite sort it out from the census.

So we can't really use the census to get a fix on what happens to people in the third or fourth generation due to their ethnicity. We don't know if it is a problem. Is there discrimination in the United States against people who are of Italian derivation or of Polish derivation?

We've got a pretty clear hunch, but we can't pin it down from the census. We have other figures. Dr. McCreedy works with an organization; he and Andrew Greeley and some of their colleagues have put together a good many statistics, but theirs are limited. They're trying to point out, I think, what the problems are in the census and how great it would be to have better statistics. But I don't think they feel satisfied with what they found. So we're in a bad way as far as really knowing.

The impression we have from looking at the statistics, to the extent that we trust them you know, after that long destructive job I've done on the statistics, I feel foolish saying to you, well, this is what the statistics say.

To the extent that the statistics do reflect something that really is going on out there, it seems that most of the Euro-ethnic groups aren't doing that badly in terms of median income.

They're above the white median you know, the white family income, median family income for the United States. There are variations among them. They're not very far above.

I think the thing that must gall is that where you do sort out the statistics on religion, you find that the Jews are further above over and over again, and so this is what makes the being above, the median of the other groups, but not that far above, a problem.

Now, as to occupational distribution, again, these groups aren't doing that badly. They're different among themselves.

The figures I used from the census were mostly for the children of immigrants, that second generation American from each of these countries, and there the occupational distribution, in most cases, is more attractive than that for the white American in general, but you could compare them too.

You find that people of Italian, Polish, Czech, and Russian extraction tend to show up a lot more in the skilled occupations. They also show up more in factory jobs.

You find that, in the Greeley figures, the Jews and in the census figures, the Greeks, you find them showing up disproportionately in the professions, in managerial occupations and so on.

But, as I said, it's hard to tell what any of this really means. It's hard to tell what happens in the third and fourth generation. It's hard to tell what would happen when you really sort it out by religion and so on.

The thing that struck me the most as I looked at this, and that I'm going to come back to very strongly in a few paragraphs is the fact that you find that most of the "Euro-ethnics" are settled in the Northeastern States and in the North Central States.

You find that 41 percent, if you can judge by the first and second generation, and I'm sure that's a sound way to judge - 41 percent of all

the ethnics of European extraction in this country live in the Northeastern States, and when you include the ones in the North Central States, you've got something like 66 percent of all ethnics of European derivation.

Now, that's kind of an interesting thing to play around with.

I went from looking for these statistics to examining the kinds of explanations, the ones that I've been brought up with. As a late graduate student, I'm familiar with the research of the 1950's and the 1960's and back to the days when I was in college before that.

And I tried to examine some of the explanations for why you find the particular occupational distributions you do among ethnics, to see if they made sense to me in the light of what I thought I was seeing out there now.

And the older explanations, the ones that people are still writing about, that were especially popular in the 1960's and in the early 1970's, tend to go with social-psychological interpretations.

You compare two groups, you compare a group of East European Jews and a group of Southern Italians, and you find that the East European Jews have achievement values and the Southern Italians tend not to have as strong achievement values, and this explains to you why the Jews have ended up with higher incomes and professional and managerial jobs and so on.

Another way to look at that is to say that maybe they didn't get where they did, but the thing sort of went together and not necessarily in a casual sort of way.

Now, there's another kind of explanation that's also been floating around for a while, that I think you're seeing more of and more response to in some of the academic literature now, that I found very interesting.

And this is an explanation that tries to look not only at what happened to people in terms of occupations, why did they end up on the kind of occupational ladder that they seem to be on now, but also what has influenced their sense of ethnicity?

This isn't the purpose of looking at this, but it comes along with it.

Well, this kind of explanation, I think, puts the emphasis on the history, when people came in, what happened where they went, what happened to them afterwards at the places that they went to.

And, I think, if you look at American ethnic groups in those terms, if you look at who came in at a time when the clothing industry was opening up in New York City, and you settled in cities like New York and Philadelphia, and had the kind of opportunity structure that there was, or who came into the United States at a time when you were moving further into the country towards the steel industry that was developing, or the mining industry that was developing, and moved

into the kinds of cities that we have in Pennsylvania today, the smaller cities, the cities where there has been a kind of industrial stability of sorts.

There were jobs, but not a terribly wide kind of opportunity structure.

I think you find that a much more interesting and meaningful way of looking at what has happened to particular ethnic groups in the United States.

It makes more sense to me to understand where Italians are, if the census statistics reflect it in any way, where Polish people are, if you look at it in terms of their links to some of these kinds of communities and some of these kinds of industries.

And the important insight that comes out of that is that a lot of these people are tied today into those areas of our country that are on the verge of having very serious problems, that two-thirds of the people in this country of "Euro-Ethnic" derivation are living in the Northeast and in the North-Central States where you've got the steel industry in serious trouble.

The textile industry went long ago. Shoes went long ago. The clothing industry is leaving those areas. Those are all going into the Sun Belt; they're all going abroad, and you're finding less and less investment in the kind of occupations that our European ethnic groups have been involved in.

Those kinds of occupations may not have moved more than small minorities of them way, way up the status ladder, but those are the occupations that gave them some kind of stability in the past, and those occupations are getting up and walking out on them.

And I think that a lot of the implications of where we are today may grow out of that kind of analysis, rather than looking at a specific group and testing it on its achievement values or something like that.

The essence of what I want to say is that I think we need better data on ethnics. I think we ought to follow them beyond the second generation, if we're at all interested in the effect of ethnicity. I think we need to start sorting out the effect of religion on ethnicity in census data.

I think we need to look at different kinds of American communities to see if the kind of community people lived in was as important in what happens to them as their own particular ethnicity.

I think we need to worry about the problems of the kinds of communities that ethnics are living in more than we need to worry about the particular ethnics. I think maybe if the community they lived in got to be better, their whole situation might get to be better, and I think we need to evaluate the kind of affirmative action programs we're doing, training programs we're doing, and so on, to see if we're

training everyone – women, racial minorities and ethnics when they get into these programs – if we're training for occupations that are leaving the parts of the United States that they live in.

[The complete paper follows.]

EMPLOYMENT AND ETHNICITY

By Frieda Shoenberg Rozen*

The rigidity of the occupational structure is not visible until someone does the unexpected, and jars us into recognizing how firmly we are tied to the expected. Americans have always talked about everyone's chance to get to the top, but when a bright, young person from an ethnic neighborhood drops out of high school, or goes to the Vo-Tech school, no one is surprised. When the son of the smalltown bank president goes to work in the factory right after high school graduation just like his Slavic friends, people wonder, and the whole town buzzes if the doctor's daughter goes to the Vo-Tech school to study cosmetology or secretarial skills or carpentry. Why would youngsters from those kinds of families do that?

In many American communities, these occupational expectations and opportunities are more closely linked to ethnicity than to many other variables, but the link is part of an invisible structure that we all know, take for granted, and do not examine.

How close and how limiting is this link? And what happens when governmental and social pressures break the link for some groups, widening the horizons of possibility, but leave the other groups just where they were, dependent on the usual forces and events? These are the questions we are trying to answer today. They are very important questions, and cannot be answered with reliable data.

Popular culture has always incorporated an acceptance of this link between ethnicity, race, and occupations, for an important part of ethnic stereotyping has to do with jobs. Cartoons and the theater remind us of the pervasiveness of certain assumptions for the first 60 years of the century: the maid was always black, or, on the west coast, Scandinavian, the tailor was always Jewish, the cop was always Irish, the fruit vendor always Italian, and the millworker always Polish. Bit parts were available to those who fit the stereotype, even if the big parts were not. Occupational stereotyping was not totally negative. The immigrant coming into the country found it advantageous to walk into an employment situation that was available because people from

* Department of Labor Studies, Pennsylvania State University

his home village or his country had established a reputation in that kind of work. If landmen or paisanos or compadres introduced the newly arrived immigrant to the foreman, and he accepted their assurances of the new man's reliability or accepted the proffered bribe, the promise of immigration was on the way to fulfillment. Maybe the immigrant's son also would be introduced to the same foreman when his time came; but to the extent that these processes were examined, it was assumed that the differentiation would disappear after Americanization, that the son could go into any kind of work, that the sons of immigrants would find that they had used separate but equal routes into the land of opportunity.

Now it seems that the differentiation does not disappear and the significance of that differentiation is variously interpreted even by members of this audience, members of ethnic groups, people with professional interests in the concerns of ethnic groups.

Michael Novak, speaking in Philadelphia in 1976, alluded to a "commonsense notion that persons of different groups tend to do better at different jobs" (speaking at *Conference on Affirmative Action: Ethnic Perspectives*, sponsored by the Nationalities Service Center and the Community College of Philadelphia, October 29, 1976, printed proceedings). He pointed out the historical factors that have led some nationalities to cluster in this industry, others in that, and suggested that cultural preferences might operate. He warned that statistics proving variation in occupational distribution do not necessarily prove discrimination or a need for programs like affirmative action aimed at that variation. But included in Novak's own statement was the concept that causes many among us to view these matters in a different light: the idea of stratification. There has been, in Novak's own words, "tremendous ethnic stratification in American Society." The occupations in which different groups cluster are not simply different from each other, they are on different rungs of the ladder. Some are, in the judgement of the total society, better, and some are worse. Some draw greater rewards and some draw lesser rewards. And some are far less secure than others. The "statistical group patterns" linked to ethnicity are also systematically linked to class and opportunity. When variation suggests locked doors, it must be questioned.

No one ever doubted that there was stratification, that it was a ladder on which some people were on the lower rungs. But one of the reasons that for so long Americans accepted the obvious link between ethnicity and occupation, and the equally obvious correlation with stratification, was that people were also aware of a process now called ethnic succession. Even those who did not think that, within a generation, all immigrants would have access to equal places in the society, did believe that all ethnic groups were moving up, that some

groups were farther up the scale because they had arrived several generations earlier. The best way to explain the process of ethnic succession, especially to the typical American male, is to review the history of professional boxing. Members of each group can point to a time when there were no prominent boxers of their ethnicity; then to a time when every little boy in the neighborhood wanted to emulate the current champion, who *was* of the same nationality or race; and then, if that period was in the 1920's, 1930's, or 1940's, a time when fewer and fewer children in the particular ethnic neighborhoods looked to the boxing ring as the ticket out. Boxing, because it is dangerous and difficult, gives way to more attractive routes, less dangerous sports, sports linked to the educational system, increased numbers of skilled jobs, or eventually, entree to the business or professional world and thousands of boys no longer dream of the ring. Boxing almost perfectly indicates the time at which the group is on the threshold – ambitious, but with limited choices, and it vividly illustrates the workings of occupational shifts.

Ethnic succession indicates the move by one whole ethnic group after another from unskilled labor into skilled occupations, then into office, sales or other white-collar work, and later into professions like teaching. In many American cities, it is possible to point to the first Irish, Jewish, or Italian schoolteacher, and a decade or two later, to see that a majority of the teachers in that system are Irish, Jewish, or Italian, and then the time, not many decades later, when the next racial or nationality group is teaching in the schools.

In the past, ethnic stratification was perceived in conjunction with ethnic succession, so it was assumed no group was on a particular rung of the ladder permanently. This expectation implied, of course, that the next rung was available because the group that used to be there had also moved up a rung. If ethnic succession was working, then nobody needed to complain, because everyone's time would eventually come. There were unspoken assumptions in the system that all groups would start in the same place and move in the same order; that by the time Italians arrived on the higher rung, the previous group, maybe Irish, would have moved up a rung, so they would always be ahead of the Italians, but the Italians were higher than they had been, and that was good enough. I think those were the unspoken assumptions when I was growing up.

Today, the flaws in the system are showing. Groups did not all start from the same starting line, so some groups have a very long way to climb. The idea that at the end of the 20th century individuals of Polish or Italian descent should still be held back because their immigrant ancestors were peasants rather than city people is unacceptable. And Americans are less willing than before to tolerate permanent

catchup games. Even if people are moving up the income and status ladder, if they are permanently in a stratified relationship with other groups, and *always* behind other groups, that is no longer right. And some of the unspoken rules of the game do not work, if they ever did. When members of a group moved from ditch digging into good factory jobs, they moved as quickly as they could, and few members of the group retained the group's hold on digging ditches, so those jobs were available to the next group down the line. But when a group has been teaching school, and some of its members start moving up, the group isn't ready to give up schoolteaching, and the tensions build up, as has been obvious in the last decade. Various ethnic groups are in competitive contention for the same occupations, even though one is coming from below, and the other is lingering from above.

So American society is examining the processes of the occupational structure, and reexamining the assumptions that were the bases for so long for unquestioning faith in the "unseen hand of the market."

It is at this point that questions start getting asked and affirmative action programs become part of public policy. Current policies are in existence because the point has been made that employment barriers have been causally linked to race and sex and ethnicity, that they wouldn't change in the normal course of events and with the passage of a little time. However, in the case of race and sex, it is possible to test these contentions. The census, other Government agencies, numerous sources of data within universities, and survey agencies have amassed statistics which can be studied on these questions, and it is possible to evaluate the charge that actual discrimination, rather than pure chance or temporary history, explains occupational patterns for women and racial minorities. Therefore programs have been instituted to overcome the discrimination against women and some racial minorities.

With these programs set in place, it is becoming more important to test the charge that groups other than women and racial minorities have also suffered systematic discrimination. What are the effects of ethnicity on employment? If it is true that people are where they are because of their groups, then we should know that, and decide what to do about it. If it is not true, then we are free to go on to the solution of other problems. The rest of this paper is concerned with examining available data, reporting some explanations of the partial findings, and suggesting problem areas in relation to ethnicity and employment.

Employment data on ethnic groups is in a different condition from that regarding women and racial minorities. It is far less adequate, and subject to misinterpretation. The Bureau of the Census is where most numbers are collected, and it should be the best source for the data we need, but it is not adequate in these areas. The census usually identified

the foreign-born, but through long periods in the 19th century, their children were not identified from other native-born. The process of assimilation was not expected to take more than a generation. After the restrictive immigration laws half a century ago, immigrants were expected to decrease in number and in influence, so for a period in the 20th century, the descendants of immigrants were identified as children of the foreign-born, but not in terms of their country of origin. Some of these census decisions and omissions were based on the belief that immigrants would be so completely integrated into the society that queries about their origins would be offensive intrusions or interpreted as attempts to set them apart. It is becoming apparent that ethnic origins do not disappear after the first generation or even the second, and that they may affect employment opportunities in ways that cannot be accurately gauged with currently available statistics.

Today, the foreign-born and the next generation, the children of the foreign-born, are identified by country of origin, and their schooling, occupation, income and other data are tabulated in relation to these categories. If respondents do not have a foreign-born parent, they are not questioned about foreign origins at all. The only question that identifies later generations in relation to ethnic origins asks what language other than English was spoken in the person's home when he or she was a child. This question has only limited usefulness in identifying third or fourth-generation ethnics, since the employment opportunities of many third generation individuals may be affected by their ethnicity without a foreign language being spoken in the home. In fact, the common American pattern is to retain many of the older marks of ethnicity long after the mother tongue has become inaccessible. Furthermore, the census makes no use of this information about foreign language other than to tabulate it: no cross tabulations as to occupations, education, income, and so on are available in the printed volumes. The raw census data may be available, but scholars have not made use of it, as they can of the published data. (For the Spanish-speaking, no matter what their generation, this situation is being corrected, but not for other ethnic groups.)

So, as to the most likely source of data, there is only information for the foreign-born generation and the children of that generation, but not for the succeeding generations. For these two generations, quite a bit of information is available, but because later generations are not identified, the data on the lingering effects of ethnicity is limited.

These are not the only serious shortcomings of the census data for evaluating the effects of ethnicity on employment. I do not know the legal history of the census, but I assume that for reasons growing out of the separation of church and state, or because of our fear that

religious discrimination could develop, the census does not ask religious identification. This seriously limits the value of census data. When certain ethnic groups, for instance the Irish, have been differentiated by religion in other surveys, there have been significant differences between Catholics and Protestants in education, occupation, income, and other variables. The two religious groups seem to be separate subgroups within the Irish nationality group. (See Andrew Greeley, both *Ethnicity in the United States*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974, and *The American Catholic*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1977.) Catholic-Protestant differences may also be important in relation to other European nationality groups. Available data also suggests that Jewish-Catholic or Jewish-Russian Orthodox distinctions are necessary with the data concerning the Polish, Russian, Lithuanian, Latvian, and other east European groups, if that data is to make sense. The occupational distribution of Jews is very different from that of the other groups from each country. Greeley's studies indicate that trends are seriously muffled when the two religious groups are not differentiated. Some studies have even suggested important income variations among Protestant subgroups in the United States. (Galen Gockel, "Income and Religious Affiliation: A Regression Analysis," *American Journal of Sociology*, 74:632, p. 49).

There are other sources of Government data, but they are hardly more enlightening on later generations or religious differences. The Federal Government has included a question on ethnic origins, rather than the narrower question concerning a foreign language spoken in the home, on some Current Population Survey series reports limited to a few European groups. In the March 1972 survey, about half of the 204.8 million people covered identified themselves with one of these origins. There are then, a lot more people with identifiable ethnic connections than the two-generation census count of "foreign-stock" indicates, and the census would be a source of important information if 102 million, instead of the 33.6 million in the two generations currently identified, could be studied. However, the Census Population Survey figures have very limited value because they do not differentiate between generations at all. Summary information about an immigrant group that is mostly third, fourth, and fifth generation is treated in the same way as information about a group that is mostly first and second generation.

There is some other data on ethnics in addition to census and Census Population Survey data. For this, we can thank Andrew Greeley who has contributed a great deal to the understanding of ethnic differences as they relate to achievement both by drawing attention to the paucity of research and the poor quality of data (see especially, *Ethnicity in the United States*, p. 35-40), and by drawing attention to and reanalyzing

available survey data that was collected for other purposes by major university research organizations. An abbreviated attempt to examine the "facts" about European ethnics and employment will begin with census data and will compare that with some of Greeley's findings, which differentiate religious subgroups within nationality groups. Greeley's data is based on a smaller population, and it gets even smaller seeming by the time he sorts all the categories and subsets. Between his data and the census, definitive answers are not possible, but important questions are suggested.

On what basis do we determine that groups have or have not suffered from discrimination? Even more directly, how do we assess their occupational accomplishments? The income people can earn and the kinds of jobs they hold are measures. The commonly accepted values of this society accept the census occupational categories as a loose sort of ranking: skilled jobs better than unskilled, professional and technical a higher attainment than others. Of course, income and occupation are closely related to questions that have been examined in earlier sessions: to education and to residence, as those two are related to each other as well as to employment. So this examination of ethnicity and employment will only touch on questions that are often antecedent to the ones dealt with here. Since I work closely with union members, I am particularly sensitive to the dangers of jurisdictional intrusion, and I will tread carefully, especially since I will have arrived at some of these conclusions before I have had a chance to hear the comments on education and housing and ethnicity. The figures quoted will be from the 1970 census, which is, in late 1979, as outdated as a census gets before it becomes history, but since the chief interest here is in trends and comparisons, it will suffice.

A quick measure of income is the median income. A selected comparison of the median incomes for families of several European nationalities are listed below. I have arbitrarily selected only certain of the national groups listed in the census. Seventeen European nationality groups are identified, but I have chosen only those most frequently mentioned in discussions of ethnicity, the Irish, Polish, Russian, and Italian, as well as a couple included to suggest comparisons for later studies. Czechoslovakians are included because they are a Slovak group without the large number of Jews that are included in the figures for Russian and Polish immigrants. Likewise, I have included Greeks because they are an identifiable Mediterranean group which might usefully be contrasted to the Italians. The figures I have chosen are for only second-generation natives of foreign or mixed parentage. These were selected because the third generation is not listed, as noted earlier, and because studying the immigrant generation would lead away from a focus on effects of ethnicity to the effects of immigration.

In 1969 median income for all U.S. families was \$9,327, but for all white families, it was \$9,763. For the native families of foreign or mixed parentage from the following countries, it was: Ireland \$11,776, Poland \$12,275, Czechoslovakians \$11,094, Greece \$12,847, U.S.S.R. \$14,281, Italy \$11,857.

The group with the lowest median, Czechoslovakians, is \$1,300 above the median for white Americans, and the other nationality groups are even higher. Does this mean that not only are ethnics not the victims of discrimination, but that they are the most fortunate beneficiaries of the American system? That conclusion cannot be drawn from the figures above because they are for the whole nation, and important regional differences must be considered.

There are wide differences among median incomes for white families in different regions of the country: Total White \$9,763, Northeast White \$10,529, Northcentral White \$10,234, South White \$8,733, West White \$10,464. Why is this relevant to Euro-ethnics? In large part, they are concentrated in those regions with higher median incomes, and least likely to reside in the South, which has the lowest median income:

Total Population in Each Region, and Percentage of that Population Which is Foreign-Born, or Native of Foreign-Born or Mixed Parentage.

	U.S.	N.E.	N.C.	S.	W.
Total population	203,210,158	49,044,015	56,564,917	62,782,882	34,808,344
2nd generation	11.8%	19.9%	11.3%	4.4%	14.4%
1st generation	4.7%	8.4%	3.3%	2.1%	6.6%
Total for 1st and 2nd	16.5%	28.3%	14.6%	6.5%	21.0%

Although these figures only deal with the two generations, they also reflect the settlement of older generations of the same groups, partly because we know from history that immigrants in earlier periods settled in these areas, and because we also know that the usual pattern is for new immigrants to gravitate to areas settled by their earlier compatriots. It should also be noted that the number of Euro-ethnics in the South is even lower than appears from the table, because the figures for foreign derivation in the South include many from the Hispanic countries of this hemisphere. More than 28 percent of the residents of the Northeast are first or second generation Americans of foreign extraction, as compared to only 6.6 percent in the South.

A more important way to evaluate the distributional disparities by region is to note that around 41 percent of the total number of foreign-born and natives of foreign or mixed parentage reside in the Northeast, although that area is the residence of only 24 percent of the total population. The two generations of "foreign-stock" are distributed by region as follows:

Foreign-Born and Native of Foreign or Mixed Parentage (including Hispanic, Asian, and all others)

Total	33,575,232	100%
Northeast	13,901,734	41.40
North Central	8,247,860	24.56
South	4,113,769	12.25
West	7,311,869	21.78

These figures suggest that the economic prospects of "Euro-Ethnics" are closely tied to the prospects of the Northeast and North-Central States. Until now, their median incomes have reflected the

**Percentage Distribution in Occupations, for Native White Males and for Selected "Foreign Stock"
Native of foreign or mixed parentage**

	White male	Irish	Poland	Czech	USSR	Greece	Italy
Total no. Occupation	33,668,902	329,686	685,002	209,483	586,991	84,537	1,231,052
Professional, technical workers	14.70	17.5	15.01	13.70	24.57	21.42	12.48
Managers, administrators (except farm)	11.61	15.08	14.49	9.79	22.74	21.17	13.69
Sales workers	7.34	8.35	7.19	5.08	15.99	10.71	7.49
Clerical workers	7.54	12.49	8.69	8.53	7.54	8.25	9.07
Craft and kindred workers	21.89	17.52	23.58	26.21	12.07	14.68	23.73
Operatives (except transport)	13.29	7.02	16.75	16.17	5.28	7.60	11.88
Transport equipment operatives	5.89	4.88	4.53	4.22	3.47	4.07	6.31
Laborers (except farm)	5.94	3.71	4.51	4.69	1.93	2.47	5.27
Farm and farm managers	3.26		.91	4.01	2.38	.37	.57
Farm laborers and supervisors	1.64		.22	.58	.35	.15	.20
Service workers (except private household)	6.95	12.33	7.11	6.98	3.66	9.10	9.29
Private household workers	.36		.02	.02	.01	.01	.02

advantages of concentration in those areas. However, future prospects are less positive, and that will be discussed below.

The particular ethnic groups we are examining, other than Czechoslovaks, are more highly urbanized than white American families as a whole, and urban incomes are higher than rural. Also, the median age of the groups differs, and this influences income, since it correlates with education differently in various groups.

Greeley had a much smaller sample, of course, than the census (with some of his groups numbering just over one hundred, and others, several hundred) but he did differentiate by religion and by age. He found, as those familiar with the data know, that Jews had higher incomes than other Russian, Polish, or German people, but his most interesting finding was that among Catholic ethnics *over* 40 years of age, only the Irish earn above the national median (Greeley found Irish Catholics more successful than the median, and Irish Protestants less successful. Because religious differences are not listed, the census figures on the Irish are almost as distorted as those on Russians) but among those *under* 40, all but the Spanish speaking earn more than the national median, the Slavs highest above the median (\$1,022), Italians next (\$896), and Poles lowest, but still higher than the median (\$370). (Greeley, *Ethnicity in the United States*, p. 73). This suggests that census figures for the U.S.S.R. and Poland are largely but not totally deceiving through the inclusion of the higher earnings of Jews, although figures quoted by Lopata suggested that a very large proportion of the 1902-1924 immigration from Poland was Jewish. (Helena Znanieski Lopata, "Problems of Estimation and Parameters," *Polish Review*, XXI, No. 4 (1976) p. 102-103).

The occupational distribution is also computed from the census, comparing the native males of foreign or mixed parentage from the selected European countries to white American males. The occupational categories are the standard census classifications. The figures are limited to males for reasons of time and space, and because there seem to be cultural differences among these ethnic groups as to female labor force participation rate and some occupational variation among the females that would distract from a quick overview.

Not only is each of the ethnic groups different from the distribution for the U.S. white male, but there is a large variation among groups. The Russian and Greek groups are more heavily concentrated in professional and technical occupations than the national average. The Russian figures probably reflect the Jewish-Orthodox Church mix. The Irish rate is between the Greek-Russian and the U.S. white male, while the Italian group is just lower than the rate for the U.S. white male. For managers and administrators, the group from Czechoslovakia is the only one below the national average, but the Italian group is

above it by less than the others. The Russian group stands out in terms of the size of the percentage in sales work, the Greek group has fewer in sales than the Russian, but slightly more than the others. The Czech group trails. The Irish are especially high in clerical work, and this may reflect, among other explanations, government employment. The Polish, Czech, and Italian groups are all more likely to be craft workers than the American white male average, while the other groups are less likely than the national average to be "operative excluding transportation," meaning in many cases, a semiskilled or unskilled factory worker, while the other groups reported were are well below the average. The Irish, Greek, and Italians are disproportionately in service occupations, and the Russians (or Russians, including Jews) disproportionately *not* in service occupations.

These figures seem to confirm some of the popular conceptions of Italians. A lot of Italians *are* skilled craftsmen in the building trades, and Italian, Polish and Czechoslovakian men *are* likely to be in the skilled jobs in factories and in other trades, and often in the semiskilled or unskilled factory jobs. The Irish, Russian, and Greek workers are often in the white collar occupations, in a different mix for each, but all heading for the desks.

Greeley's findings suggest an even greater concentration than that reflected in census figures of Polish, Italian, and Slavic men in the crafts and in factories, especially among the "Slavic", a category which includes Russians but not Russian Jews.

None of the statistics quoted, neither the Census Bureau's nor Greeley's, control for the size of cities in which the groups live. In Greeley's sample 81 percent of East European Jews live in metropolitan areas of over two million, while only 44 percent of Italians, 30 percent of Polish, and 28 percent of Slavics do. A case could be made for the differential effect on occupational distribution of size of city. Greeley does *not* control for generation in the secondary data he is analyzing. Since 80 percent of the Irish in his sample are in this country three generations or more, while only 31 percent and 30 percent of the Polish and Slavic respondents are native children of native parents, generation probably relates to important differences in occupational distribution, no matter how imperfectly the American dream operates.

The 1970 census listed each of the nationality groups, including all the European groups, for each of several selected Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, and a cursory examination of the occupational distribution for a particular group in two different cities, as compared with native white Americans, and as compared with the other nationality groups in this discussion, suggests that analysis of aggregate U.S. figures may not be telling us the most important things we want

to know. We really want to know if European-ethnic Americans are finding themselves locked into narrow opportunity structures. Do they have decent jobs and decent incomes, but a sense that they are not going anywhere in terms of status? The aggregate census figures and Greeley's seem to suggest that. But what has locked certain groups in and not others? Why have the Jews moved up the job prestige and income ladder, even though they are subjected to certain kinds of discrimination? Why does it seem as if Italian and Polish groups stay a step behind the others in education, although their income is sometimes higher? If there is something causal in a group's culture, something carried over from generation to generation, then that group should have similar experiences wherever it settles in the United States. If, on the contrary, granting their hereditary values, groups find that their environment is also causal, then they should have different experiences when they settle in various cities or areas under dissimilar circumstances. And these different experiences when they settle in various cities or areas under dissimilar circumstances. And these differences should lead us to an understanding of the group's aggregate experience if many of their settlements were of a particular kind.

The next section summarizes influential social science explanations for the seeming disparities in occupational mobility among ethnic-religious groups. A good deal of attention has been directed to social-psychological explanations. Rosen (B.C. Rosen, "Race, Ethnicity and the Achievement Syndrome," *American Sociological Review* 24 (February 1959): 47-60) suggested that the socioeconomic achievement differences he found between Jewish boys and Southern Italian boys correlated with differences in achievement-related values and achievement motivation. Lenski (G. Lenski, *The Religious Factor*, New York: Anchor, Doubleday) also looked to differences in work-related values. This is to say that some ethnic groups, but not others, place a high value on individual achievement. The groups most likely to achieve are those for whom work has high intrinsic *and* extrinsic value: people who like to work *and* who like to be rewarded for their work. The "values" described in these studies are psychological constructs developed to fit combinations of responses found from sets of questions exploring attitudes. Vecoli (Rudolph Vecoli, "The Italian Americans" *Center Magazine*, July-August 1974, p.31) describes values discernible in people's lives. He points to the importance of the family and the home for Italian-Americans, both which could de-emphasize the importance of occupational achievement in terms of status, although not of achievement in terms of income. In a more recent discussion, Schooler restates similar ideas in terms of culture rather than in terms of psychological syndromes (Carmi Schooler, "Serfdom's Legacy: An Ethnic Continuum," *American Journal of*

Sociology, May 1976). He argues that Southern Italians were peasants in Italy, acquired cultural traits in those roles which made it possible for them to accept subordination, and in the United States, stepped into jobs in which a willingness to accept subordination was also an asset, or even a necessity.

Recently, other sociologists have proposed that it is necessary to look at what happened to groups when they arrived and in the periods that followed, instead of studying their social-psychological characteristics out of context. Assimilationists believe that the differences with which groups come will dilute and become less important, and pluralists believe that the differences will continue in importance. Yancey *et al* (William L. Yancey, Eugene P. Erikson, and Richard N. Juliani, "Emergent Ethnicity - a Review and Reformulation," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 41, June 1976, pp. 391-403.) suggest, instead, that groups find themselves where they do in the United States partly because of the baggage they brought, and largely because of the situations they found when they arrived and with which they had to deal in ensuing periods. This approach suggests that a group's ethnic characteristics or consciousness may be formed, reinforced, revived, or dissipated by the kinds of experiences it has. Its economic and occupational experiences are the most important of all in influencing the total environment, and creating or denying future economic and occupational opportunities. Many Jews had urban skills when they came, but also, they came at a time of rapidly expanding opportunities in the clothing industry which, in the late 19th century and early 20th, was located in the biggest cities offering good prospects for upward mobility. So Jews brought urban skills and had opportunities to improve them. The Slavs and the Poles came when the mines and the steelmills were seeking workers, and they settled in areas that provided stability but few routes for education and mobility. All these groups, including the Italians, settled in communities to which they formed strong ties. Such ties made them reluctant to leave in search of greater opportunities elsewhere, or even to abandon the area during a period of economic decline. The educational and economic achievement of Greeks, if the data in the census is correct, may be due not only to the culture or values they brought, but also to the smaller settlements they formed in many communities, compared to Italians, Poles, and others. Relative marginality prevented the formation of large, secure enclaves, and may have led to the recognition of opportunities for entrepreneurship and an emphasis on pushing the children up and out. Other groups, living in larger ethnic communities, were able to settle, even though poorly, and maintain ties to an industry that offered the promise of future employment without upward mobility. The single Vietnamese and other Oriental families

moving into our towns today may be recreating the patterns of the groups whose experience was related to marginality.

If the occupational distribution of the various Euro-ethnic groups is to be examined in terms of the structure that each group came into, and in terms of the changes in the structure over the years that the group has been settled in the United States, there is a greater need to study societal trends than to speculate about or measure nationality-group psyches. The value placed on individual achievement and education, or, conversely, the value placed on family loyalty and stability, cannot be dismissed. But in some settings, achievement drives, if they are to operate, call for superhuman efforts, and in other settings, they are rewarded and reinforced.

What opportunities are there for the Italian, Polish, Slavic, and other groups to keep moving up in the way that the Irish and the Jews did, and what are the opportunities for all the Euro-Ethnics to break through the final barriers in industry and finance, if they wish? And what effect will the affirmative action programs for women and racial minorities have on these opportunities?

When Euro-ethnic groups are compared in two cities (or, more accurately, in two Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas) (SMSAs) in two different parts of the country, the rankings between the groups may shift: a group that has a lower median income in the East may have one of the higher median incomes in the West. Or a group with an especially low percentage of professional and technical workers in one part of the country may have an especially high percentage in another area. Even educational rankings shift for some of the groups, although they shift little for others. (Some groups have a much higher educational level in west coast SMSAs than in the East, but they still rank below most of the other ethnic groups.)

It is obvious that groups found different opportunities in each region, and that despite ethnic succession, they got locked into occupational roles in certain cities. In some cases, superficial analysis suggests that the group which is the largest ethnic group in one city may be of low status there, while the same nationality group, when it is a smaller group in another city (large, but smaller than some others) is of relatively high status. Of course, when particular ethnics are dispersed or are a very small group, they seldom differ from the other segments of the society. In the past assimilationists would have concluded that ethnic groups should disperse, but neither ethnic nor racial groups will accept that answer today. However, analysis of the mobility processes related to dispersal can lead to an understanding of mobility processes that could operate in large, cohesive, ethnic communities. Despite limitations in census data on ethnics, a serious study rather than a glance at the comparative occupational distribu-

tions in different metropolitan areas should be conducted on recent data. Lieberman developed some of the most interest in theoretical frameworks in the literature using 1950 census data in the early 1960's (Stanley Lieberman, *Ethnic Patterns in American Cities*, NY: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963), and it is time to examine the implications.

Study of the variation for a group from one area to another should be very fruitful for increasing our understanding, but the reality of the near future lies in the Northeast and North Central States, where the Euro-Ethnics are most concentrated. As mentioned earlier, 28 percent of the population in the Northeast is made up of first or second generation immigrants, two-thirds of first and second generation are in the Northeast and North Central States, and we know that most of the older ethnic settlements are also in these areas.

One of the most important phenomena of recent decades has been the shift of industry away from the Northeast. A few decades ago, there was the shift of the textile industry from New England to the South, and in more recent decades, the shift of other industries, not only of the plants, but of the headquarters and other operations to the part of the country we call the Sun Belt. In the last few months, and especially, this week, the newspapers have been filled with stories of steel-companies that are closing plants, threatening to close them, or cutting back in employment. The automobile industry is currently in the midst of some of the most serious layoffs in its history, at the same time that most of the major companies have relatively new plants in other areas or are producing cars abroad. As plants of an earlier era become obsolescent, instead of renovating, reconvertng, or reconditioning them, firms take the opportunity to move to currently more attractive areas, within the country or abroad. This means a shift of jobs away from the major ethnic settlements of the Northeastern cities, in particular. Clothing, shoes, autos, steel, the electrical industry, all are industries which drew immigrants to Pittsburgh, Detroit, New York, and New England. When these industries go south or go abroad, it is workers of Polish, Slavic, Portuguese, and Italian descent, as well as blacks, who are left behind.

So as a Pennsylvanian, I think in terms of regional problems, and I suggest that these regional problems are some of the most important that must be considered in a discussion of the problems and prospects of the European ethnics. These regional problems relate to several specific topics which most clearly address the civil rights issues of ethnics in relation to employment. Affirmative action or reverse discrimination. training programs, productivity questions, and executive suite exclusion must be examined in this context.

I am sure that my remarks will elicit disagreement among you. With the statistical evidence as inadequate as it is, no one is sure about the

state of ethnic groups in 1970, and there is even less evidence of what are the results of government programs encouraging the hiring of women and racial minorities. But educated guesses are possible. If people of Polish, Slavic, and Italian extraction are disproportionately employed in the skilled trades and in factories or other production jobs, if the Irish and Italians are disproportionately in clerical jobs, which probably includes government employment, then it is their jobs for which women and racial minorities are competing both through affirmative action programs and in training programs. There are union and employer apprenticeships, jobs with good mobility potential and the highest rates of pay available in particular areas that are going to women and racial minority members in many communities, jobs that might have been filled by young men of the ethnic groups that we are discussing. In certain communities, it is obvious that revised seniority practices, combined with affirmative action hiring, followed by recession-induced layoffs, caused bumping of ethnic white workers and the layoff of some of them. But these are not the greatest threat to the continued improvement of the status of ethnic minorities in these communities. It is, instead, the shift of jobs, of plants, of whole industries away from the groups under discussion. So ethnic Americans are facing a critical period in terms of jobs, but it is because they are settled in the areas from which the jobs are going, rather than because women and racial minorities are not waiting for ethnic succession to proceed at its normal pace. The stereotyped image of the ethnic fighting affirmative action, is of the hardhat or the skilled craftsman in the building trades. Italian, Polish, and Slavic workers are in the skilled trades in high numbers but again, even where affirmative action programs and training programs are instituted with some sincerity, it is not the women and the blacks that are the big problem. It is the serious unemployment in the building industry and the high interest rates that will cause even more unemployment in that unfortunate industry before things get better.

Agreeing with this assessment of the situation will not leave you in a sanguine mood. (Affirmative action may not be the culprit.) But whatever theories of social analysis or race relations we espouse, it is clear that when groups are in competition for limited goods, the situation is more conducive to conflict between these groups than when groups are not in competition but are striving for shared goals. If the country is facing a period not only of a threatening recession, exacerbated by our fuel problems, but, also a period of long-range regional and international readjustments, a period in which jobs are moving to low wage areas of the country and low wage countries, tensions will increase. Women and blacks will be perceived as the villains when really, they are only reaching for a piece of the pie in the

American tradition, but the pie will have gotten smaller, which isn't in the American tradition. Of course, some of the jobs that women get due to affirmative action will go to ethnic women, so not all gains of women are losses of ethnic groups.

If training programs are not to discriminate against ethnics or waste their time or that women and racial minorities, they will have to be focused on the kinds of employment that will be available in the industrial areas of the North, rather than training for occupations that will disappear to Texas or Alabama or Taiwan or Hong Kong. Training programs in shrinking industries offer few openings, so they lead to exclusion, and they are dead end, so they lead to frustrations.

These problems are overwhelming if we think of ethnic groups in terms of occupational distribution of 1970, with disproportionate numbers in the categories of crafts and operative. However, the future is promising if Greeley's findings on education are correct. They indicate that increasing numbers of Italian, Polish, and other Catholic youth from ethnic groups are going to college (Greeley, 1974, p. 78) and one of the advantages of ethnics being concentrated in those areas of the country where they live at present is that there is a great concentration of educational opportunities in the Northeast. The occupations that the Labor Department projections for the eighties (*People and Jobs: A Chartbook of Labor Force, Employment and Occupational Projections*, Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics Regional Report 25, Dec. 1976) forecast are the sort for which many college students, especially those who are first-generation college educated, would prepare. The technical jobs in health care, the engineering jobs, and the professional jobs in financial institutions are the ones that the sons and daughters of craft workers will be ready for.

The connection between productivity and ethnic groups also relates to the regional shifts of the economy. The areas of the country where ethnics settled were historically highly productive. The labor force was skilled, the necessary educational facilities existed, and there was a tradition of hard work and of familiarity with the demands of an industrial society. When employers move, they do not always find the same kind of work force in the new areas. Wages may be lower, but with decreased productivity the gain is illusory. But a real threat to productivity in relation to ethnics lies in the danger that management will fail to maintain its investment in those areas where ethnics are employed. If corporate decision makers let their facilities deteriorate and plan to abandon their factories in the North and build new more modern plants elsewhere later, productivity in the areas where ethnics are working will decrease. Productivity will decrease not because ethnic workers are hostile about having to work with women and blacks, but because productivity is dependent not only on the qualities

of the worker but also on what he or she has to work with in the way of materials and equipment as well. The fearful cycle of decreased productivity reinforcing the desire to move will have started.

What about executive-suite exclusion? What does that mean, and does it affect members of Euro-ethnic groups? Lee Iacocca's frequent appearances on television, urging us to buy his cars, serve also as a reminder of how infrequently Italians, Poles, Jews, Slavs, or Greeks, any east or south Europeans, are found at the highest administrative levels of American industry or finance, though many of them may be moving, as they are, into respectable income and job brackets, and although the educational attainments of many of them are higher than those of nonethnic Americans. Why don't we find them at the top decision making levels? A recent newspaper story ("White Protestant Sues Club on L.I. over Minority Bias," *New York Times*, Nov. 14, 1979, p. B2, col. 1) suggests some of the reasons. "A white, Anglo-Saxon Protestant insurance executive who says he 'fit in like wallpaper' at exclusive Long Island country clubs for twenty years" sued his own club after they cancelled his membership, a cancellation, he says, that was inspired by his urging the club to admit minorities. He argued that people who were denied access to country clubs were denied the opportunity for the business deals and other transactions carried out on the golf course. At the same time that I was reading this story, a young Anglo-Saxon Protestant man I know was hired because, the firm told him, he belonged to the most exclusive club in the city and moved in the kind of social circles the company wants to deal with. He has the requisite professional skills, as well, but they did not seem to be the most decisive consideration.

In a more academic statement of this point, Kanter (Rosebeth Moss Kanter, *Men and Women of the Corporation*, N.Y.: Basic Books, 1977, chapter 3) suggests, "Conformity pressures and the development of exclusive management circles closed to 'outsiders' stem from the degree of uncertainty surrounding managerial positions." If people at the higher reaches of management will have to deal with the unexpected, then top-level management wants to know that they will do it in the same way as current top level management, and promoting people with the same social experience, same social characteristics and background is a way of making sure of that. It does not mean that they will do it best, but they will do it like the people presently on top. People who are "different" might be hard to relate to under pressure, and they are not totally predictable. Kanter suggests that people who don't fit in are found in increasing numbers away from the top, and they are found in staff positions where they serve as technical experts. A few ethnics are showing up at the top within the last few years, and they seem to have come up the "technical" route. One assumes that in

the near future they will seem more familiar to the Anglo-Saxon Protestants at the top. One also assumes that as top management feels the pressure to open the doors to women and racial minorities, white ethnics will look less different than they have. The problem of executive-suite exclusion will be addressed by all the measures we take to make this a more democratic society. Better educational opportunities, fewer restrictions on housing, and some court cases challenging the right of the country clubs to discriminate, (while members are eligible for tax breaks and the clubs are eligible to development assistance from government) : all of these will lead to a decrease in executive-suite exclusion.

Where should we go in the future to deal with the employment-related effects of ethnicity? First, we need the data to answer a lot of questions, and secondly, we need to deal with the grave problems facing society because many of these problems will especially impact on the areas where about two-thirds of the Euro-Ethnic Americans reside.

1. We need better data on ethnics. We need to identify people by ethnicity beyond the second generation, and we need to agree on an appropriate measure so we can trace lingering effects of ethnicity, as well as the effects of immigration.

2. We need to find ways which would allow us to sort out the confounding effects of religion of ethnicity, so that we can do relevant analysis.

3. We need to do comparative studies of American communities to find under what circumstances a particular ethnic group is at the bottom of the job ladder, and under what circumstances the same group can have a respected role occupationally in another community.

4. We need to do comparative studies to find whether ethnic groups can have an occupational distribution that is considered "good", or "high status" without becoming residentially or culturally dispersed, or without being a miniscule group in the community.

5. We need to study those communities where particular ethnic groups have suffered occupational stagnation to determine whether there are communities with problems so pervasive that they need to be revived at the community-wide level, rather than in terms of one or two or three nationality groups.

6. We need to evaluate the training programs which we are emphasizing in affirmative action plans, and study whether these are the ones that will lead to a secure future in those communities, or whether they need to be supplemented with training programs geared to all those who will be obsolescent, as well as the groups which had been previously excluded.

7. We need to study – now before a more serious crisis is upon us – the problems of the older industrial areas of the North. These are not just the problems of the two-thirds of the ethnics or of the blacks in the inner city. They are the problems of the whole American economy. If we let those areas decay, we let the promise of America decay. We will have neither civil rights nor civil liberties nor democracy if we fail to meet the challenge of better and more fulfilling jobs for all Americans, men, women, and those who originally came from Africa, from Asia, from Europe, and now from Latin America.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN Good. Thank you very much. We appreciate having your paper and your summary of it.

Our next panelist will be Russell Barta, Professor of Social Services at Mundelein College in Chicago and a former member of the Human Relations Commission for Evanston, Illinois.

Professor Barta has written and lectured on the ethnicity and the extent of discrimination against black, brown, white ethnics in the executive suite; he received his Doctorate in sociology from Notre Dame.

Professor Barta, you have about 15 minutes to summarize your conclusions .

**RESPONSE OF RUSSELL BARTA,
PROFESSOR OF SOCIAL SERVICES,
MUNDELEIN COLLEGE, CHICAGO**

DR. BARTA. Thank you. I certainly agree with Professor Rozen on the condition of the data now available, and I think all of this was reinforced by that fascinating testimony we had just before the luncheon break.

Therefore, I think my remarks may be more tentative than they will be definitive.

Since Professor Rozen's paper did, in several pages, deal with executive-suite exclusion, I think I'd like to begin my remarks with my own study of the largest 106 corporations in the Chicago area, almost half of which made the Fortune 500 in 1972.

What I sought to determine was the relative presence or absence of Poles, Italians, Hispanics, and blacks in the executive suites of those corporations. As far as I know, it was the first such systematic study and, no credit to me, it was requested by the ethnics in the City of Chicago.

I think that kind of a study was only anticipated by studies done by various Jewish agencies to document the exclusions of Jews from executive positions in banks, insurance companies and other large-scale corporations.

Using my study as a prototype, a similar study was conducted in Detroit, Mich. and essentially came up with the same results.

Poles, Italians, Hispanics, and blacks were grossly under-represented in the executive suites of the largest corporations and grossly underrepresented relative to their size in the population, and relative to their presence on either the board of directors or executive positions.

No one was surprised by these findings, least of all the Poles, Italians, Hispanics, and blacks. This was no new information, especially for the Poles and Italians.

They wanted these studies done in order to legitimate, to document what they already knew. Apparently they had complained for some time about such exclusion, but they could find no one to listen to them, or no one to take their own findings seriously.

I think this underscores the need to develop research on other ethnic groups in America, not only their presence or absence in the corporate structure of American society, but their representation on foundations; major civic groups, such as public boards and commissions; influential private agencies and social clubs.

Could not the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights encourage such studies, because as they accumulate, the result would be a national profile for each of America's groups, white ethnics, black ethnics, thus serving as a moving indicator of how far they've come and how far they have yet to go.

And the emphasis should be not only on the negative, but on the positive, as well. I think our society has a problem with morale if we're constantly reminded about how we have failed and rarely about how we have succeeded.

The Italians and the Poles in Chicago agreed with our suggestion that both blacks and Spanish be included in the survey. Neither group perceived themselves as in conflict with or in competition with blacks and Spanish. And their perception of white and black ethnics sharing common problems was also shared by the blacks in Chicago.

The Chicago Defender, in giving full coverage to the study, headlined their half-page story in this fashion: "Blacks Haven't Made it Yet, but Neither Have the Poles or Italians." As a colleague of mine remarked, that kind of a headline alone justified the study.

And at a time when we tend to stress the negative aspects of intergroup relations, it might behoove us to seek more deeply the positive views on which to build bridges of cultural cooperation and understanding.

Professor Rozen concludes the section on executive-suite exclusion with these words: "Ethnics are showing up at the top within the last few years, and they seem to have come up the technical route. One

assumes that within the near future they will seem more familiar to the Anglo-Saxon Protestants at the top. One also assumes that as management feels the pressure to open the doors to women and racial minorities, white ethnics will look less different than they have. The problem of executive-suite exclusion will be addressed by all the measures we take to make this a more democratic society; better educational opportunities, better restrictions on housing – or fewer restrictions, – some court challenges of country clubs and so on.”

Those concluding sentences raise a number of questions. First of all, isn't coming up the technical route and not the line route a symptom of the very problem we're talking about?

It seems to me it is common knowledge that the way you make it in corporations is going up the line route. For example in Boston, a number of years ago, if you were Irish, Catholic Irish, the only route you had through the corporation was the technical route, and this was perceived as limiting one's ability for mobility to get to the top.

Number two, why should top management feel the pressure to open the doors to women and racial minorities and not feel the same kind of pressure to open the doors not to whites, but to Italians, Poles, Czechs, Serbs?

Thirdly, when Professor Rozen suggests to white ethnics, as I think she does, that they be patient, get a little more education, wait for the social clubs to open their doors, I wonder, why should white ethnics be receptive to such counsel and other minorities not?

How are we going to respond to the white ethnics who, in increasing numbers, point to their exclusion from executive suites not only of private corporations, but the executive suites of foundations, public commissions, certain sectors of Government?

How should the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights respond? Are white ethnics being discriminated against as they claim and thereby excluded from these various executive suites?

I'm not sure that I really know. If I use EEOC norms, they definitely are.

Nathan Glazer and Moynihan had the same problem when they were dealing with discrimination against Italians in New York. They weren't quite sure. They thought that they were.

Andrew Greeley, in an update on Professor Rozen's data says, in commenting on the underrepresentation of Slavic men at the level of managers, if black underrepresentation among managers and sales personnel is to be explained as a form of discrimination, it is at least arguable that discrimination can also be invoked to explain the Slavic-Catholic underrepresentation.

I side with Andrew Greeley, because I'm trying to counter the tendency of always using the past of white ethnics against them, as it were, to explain away their present position.

At the same time, in the case of other minorities, we use their past history to help them, to justify our actions for them.

There is a tendency, often, when white ethnics complain about problems, to turn their attention to their past and say, well, look, you have an Italian father and he didn't push you out into the mainstream – whereas for other minorities, we look to the present structure, the present practices of the system to account for their disabilities.

Social science data can't solve all of these issues. It depends on how we use them, and how we use them depends on our perspective and our values.

Discrimination, as EEOC keeps reminding employers, can be a very subtle process, often occurring despite the best intentions of the employer. We have no studies of the objective consequences of this selection process, not for whites, but for Poles, Italians and other ethnics.

What are the elements that enter into the filtering process, elements that are nonability factors, that have nothing to do with competence.

Certainly, we have nothing comparable to the studies by Robert Quinn and others at the Institute of Social Research on how the selection process of executives discriminates against Jews – I refer you to their book, *The Chosen Few*. I suspect that many employers, conditioned as they are to think in terms of white and black, would have no idea whether or not they are discriminating against white ethnics, and neither would EEOC. They don't have the data.

However, as EEOC has taught us, it is the consequences of employment practices, not the intent, which determine whether discrimination exists.

Professor Rozen, in her paper, seems to be convinced – and here I think, incidentally, she knows more about blue-collar workers than I do – that white ethnics, at least in the trades and in skilled occupations, have not much to fear from affirmative action programs for other minority groups, that a greater threat comes from the long-term economic decline of the geographic areas in which they seem to be concentrated, to live and work.

I share her concern for the impact of economic decline in these industries in which white skilled ethnics may find themselves.

As to the impact of affirmative action programs, I'm not that sure who is or who will monitor the impact of affirmative action programs on nonprotected workers.

Will the United States Civil Rights Commission? Will EEOC?

I do share Professor Rozen's concern for the future of group relations in this country if the national pie from which all groups get their slices shrinks in size.

What worries me, though, is not the conflict that may result as much as the kind of conflict. There has always been and always will be conflict among groups that make up American society, and it seems to me this is only a reflection of the dynamism of the social processes in our society, that they're not frozen, that there is movement taking place.

The genius of the society, why it has survived and perhaps others not, why it has survived up until now the crucible of pluralism, is that we've been able to accommodate and negotiate one another's needs, not through social engineering, but through political sensitivity and know-how.

But our success has also been due to the fact that the various groups have accepted the same rules of the game and consider them basically fair - the major exception, of course, being the black.

Let me summarize this, then, by saying that what I'm concerned about is the growing perception (not just among white ethnics) that somehow the rules of the game have changed. What are the rules exactly?

This bothers me because it seems to me it may be one of the sources of the corrosion of the sense of confidence and legitimacy that we have in our government institutions. It is reflected by recent polls.

I would then only conclude by saying that the rise of ethnic consciousness is not just a U.S. phenomenon; it's worldwide. I think the reason that it's worldwide has something to do with the fact that our societies are modern societies.

It also has something to do with the fact Government increasingly is becoming a major arbiter of economic well-being; and as long as that remains and modernizing processes go on, ethnicity as the basis for economic rights is something that is gong to stay with us for a long time.

I think that's the reality. The question is whether we'll catch up with it.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN . Thank you very much.

**RESPONSE OF LYDIO F. TOMASI, DIRECTOR,
CENTER FOR MIGRATION STUDIES OF NEW YORK, INC.**

FATHER TOMASI . I should like to congratulate both the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for courageously attacking the formidable task of the civil rights of "Euro-ethnic Americans" and Ms. Rozen for

equally courageously answering that call in her interesting presentation.

The commissioned topic of analysis was employment and ethnicity, the focus being on patterns and practices of ethnic employment, including 1) executive-suite exclusions, 2) training and career development, 3) quotas and 4) the impact of Title VII and related laws and court decrees on ethnic classes.

These specific points were not part of the main thrust of Ms. Rozen's paper, which dealt mostly with the search for a possible link between ethnicity and occupation.

As Ms. Rozen notes, data on the socioeconomic mobility of the "Euro-ethnic Americans" are remarkably scarce. However, the various sociopsychological and cultural explanations of this phenomenon have been replaced in the past quarter century by a politico-economic approach. That is, there has been a discernible shift from the modification of individual attitudes to the concept of social change.

That ethnic stratification was once perceived (and many times developed) in conjunction with ethnic succession may have often been the case, but that ethnic succession now fails to materialize because of the industrial shift from the Northeast, where "Euro-ethnic Americans" are mostly concentrated, to the Sunbelt cannot wholly explain the relationship of employment to ethnicity. According to the literature of ethnic revival, one would conclude that the whole of ethnic America was contained in the urban north, in communities like South Boston, Kensington, Gage Park, and Hamtramck. "That profile", observed Arthur Mann, "left out millions of families who lived in pleasant small towns, comfortable suburbs, and stable neighborhoods on the outer rims of big cities."¹ Also, unemployment, together with inflation and energy shortage, are hardly the exclusive problems of "Euro-ethnic Americans." "Minority" groups are not exclusively found among the poor. Many Euro-ethnic Americans² would have some difficulty with Ms. Rozen's faith that "within the near future they will seem more familiar to the Anglo-Saxon Protestant at the top" (p. 32).

In dealing with employment and ethnicity in the case of Euro-ethnic Americans, our stratification analysis, in my opinion, must extend the concept of poverty "beyond the narrow limits of income to the qualities of political and personal relations"³ within the history of

¹ Arthur Mann, *The One and the Many: Reflections on the American Identity*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979, p. 43.

² For instance, the National Federation of American Ethnic Groups at the Convention of April 27-29, 1979, adopted a resolution, "requesting that other ethnics be listed under the categories entitled to affirmative action". (*Ethnic Newsletter*, Vol. 1, No. 1, October, 1979).

³ S. M. Miller and Pamela Roby, *The Future of Inequality*. New York: Basic Books, 1970, p. 9.

ambivalence of American immigration policy.⁴ Contrary to the Kerner Report (1968), our nation is not moving toward two societies, separate and unequal, but we have had two, and more than two separate and unequal societies from the beginning which is how it will probably remain for a long time.

While statistical data alone cannot be deemed indicative of discriminatory practices, a strong case can be developed when it is supported by independent evidence of discrimination against individuals. Thus, for instance, Dr. John Nielsen (1 Washington Square, New York City), a Yale graduate, could not find employment until he changed his Slovene name Sesek into Nielsen. Professor Joseph Velikonja of the University of Washington could not obtain the endorsement of the local newspaper to be elected last year to the Board of Education, because he is a Slovene immigrant. Many others like them continue to go through the same experience of the theoretician of cultural pluralism, Horace Meyer Kallen, who was let go by Princeton after learning that he was a Jew. Even in the home of his favorite Harvard professor, Kallen felt that Mrs. William James thought "that somehow a Jew. . . Jews were outsiders, they did not belong."⁵

This year "Attorney John Lucido, represented by Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights Counsel Robert Destro, won the first skirmish in a landmark employment discrimination lawsuit based on religious and ethnic prejudice. Lucido charges his former employer, the prestigious Wall Street law firm, Cravath, Swaine and Moore, with denying him a partnership in the firm because he is a Catholic of Italian descent"⁶ Only 15 out of 912 partners in the 20 largest New York City law firms are Italian Americans according to the plaintiff's brief in the pending law suit.

The 1975 New York Conference on Italian American Agenda stated that "the bio-medical situation at City College suggests that the Italian American is being denied access to the benefit of others who are less qualified."⁷

The New York State Italian American Legislators Caucus reported last year that more than 25 percent of the students at City University of New York are Italian Americans, while the Italian American faculty comprises about 4.5 percent of the entire CUNY faculty: "of

⁴ Charles B. Keely, *U.S. Immigration Policy: A Policy Analysis*. New York: The Population Council, 1979. P. 8-29. The major point of the forty-one volume report of the Dillingham Commission on Immigration was that the new immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe threatened both American society and the American stock. More recently, Michael Kane's book, *Minorities in Textbooks* (1970) shows that American textbooks continue to "present a principally white, Protestant, Anglo-Saxon view of America".

⁵ Arthur Mann, *The One and the Many: Reflections on the American Identity*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979. P. 139.

⁶ *The Novak Report on the New Ethnicity*, 7:1. Oct.-Nov. 1979.

⁷ *The Italian American Agenda*. New York: The National Italian American News, 1975, p. 24.

the approximately 7,400 positions within CUNY's professional ranks, approximately 380 are filled by Italian Americans. Of these positions about 200 are at the lowest level or assistant professor category."⁸ The Italian American Legislators Caucus claims that faculty discrimination has been registered in the areas of appointments, promotions, tenure, and major committees. It is convinced that a pattern of discrimination exists. "The use of 'Waivers' by various college presidents within CUNY is a vehicle used to pass over for promotion Italian American faculty members, who have all the requisite background and qualifications, for those with less background and qualifications. This procedure of issuing 'Waivers' has led to a practice in many cases of 'cronyism' being practiced to the detriment of Italian American faculty members and to the advantage of those in power."⁹ "Approximately 40 Italian American groups have banded together in Chicago to take collective action in this and similar areas of concern."¹⁰ However, a 1974 article in the prestigious journal, *Science*, asserted that Catholic antiintellectualism accounts for a lack of Catholic scientists.

The above cases seem to indicate that "Ethnic affirmation is more than wearing an Afro hair style, attending an Italian opera, or taking a course in Jewish cooking. It permeates our social system in general and our political system specifically, thereby affecting the opportunity structure for all Americans whether or not they choose to identify with a particular ethnic group."¹¹ These "Euro-ethnic Americans have always felt that the real issue that divides them and "other minority groups" is power and position – not bias."¹² The 1972 Equal Employment Opportunity Act included educational institutions that were exempt under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which applies to employers generally and is not based on a contractual relationship with the federal government. The issue under Title VII was the effect of the employment practices on opportunities for the hiring and promotion of minorities, not the employer's state of mind.

Italian-Americans and most of the "Euro-ethnic Americans" were never part of the majority in educational institutions, but they are nevertheless classified with the privileged majority. They may face benign discrimination, but the entire thrust of the civil-rights-enforcement program in regard to employers' policies is not the intent but the effect of the hiring and employment procedure.

⁸ *A History of Italian American Discrimination at CUNY*. A Report by Senator John D. Calandra, Chairman, Italian American Legislators Caucus. Albany, NY: New York State Senate, 1978, p. 2.

⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 40.

¹⁰ Fred Barbaro, "Ethnic Affirmation, Affirmative Action, and the Italian-American", in *Italian/Americana*, 1(1):41-58. Autumn, 1974.

¹¹ *Ibidem*, p. 42.

¹² *Ibidem*, p. 47.

“The alarm expressed by some academicians that ethnic, racial, or sex considerations in the recruitment and employment of faculty members is irrelevant, and even dangerous if standards are to be maintained, is based on assumptions that past and present procedures have resulted in excellence and that subjective considerations (real bias) have never played a significant role in determining faculty choices.”¹³

The Council Against Poverty reminded us that many “Euro-ethnic Americans” are not part of the privileged majority; in fact, they are well represented among “the hidden poor.”¹⁴ Not only the elderly among the Italians, Irish, and those from eastern European countries face serious problems. The needs of these ethnic poor are outlined in community studies,¹⁵ but they are not met by city, State and Federal agencies.

Even outside this neglected segment of Euro-ethnic Americans, other challenges have to be met in dealing with employment and ethnicity. For instance, “through diligence, resourcefulness, and painful struggle”, Jews “have achieved a prominent economic, cultural, and educational position; their professional representation is equal to that of the topmost American religious, ethnic, or racial group. Nonetheless, the old stereotypes and negative prejudgments persist, especially in the social club and to a considerable extent in the ‘executive suite’ – selection and advancement in major American business and industrial corporations.”¹⁶

Elsewhere, I had the opportunity to observe that in our national experience, economic gains are not automatically translated into gains in other important realms of life, that would break down the wall of social and psychological exclusion.¹⁷ Being included in society, which means being accorded respect and accepted in social and political relations with others, has been increasingly an important part of the issue of inequality.

It is on this level that we must remind ourselves that the ultimate aim of social policy is to eliminate various forms of institutionalized

¹³ *Ibidem*, p. 55.

¹⁴ *The Hidden Poor: The Needs of Low Income Ethnic Groups Living Outside Poverty Areas in New York City*. New York: Community Council of Greater New York, 1977.

¹⁵ *A Study of Three White Ethnic Neighborhoods*. New York: Urban Priorities Associates, 1976. *A Portrait of the Italian American Community in New York City*. Josephine Casalena, Congress of Italian American Organizations, 1975. *The Needs of the Growing Greek-American Community in the City of New York*. Hellenic American Neighborhood Action Committee, 1973. *Jewish Poverty Issues*. Rabbi Jack Simcha Cohen, Metropolitan New York Coordinating Council on Jewish Poverty, New York City, 1975.

¹⁶ John Slawson, *Unequal Americans: Practices and Politics of Intergroup Relations*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1979. p. 10.

¹⁷ Lydio F. Tomasi, *The Ethnic Factor in the Future of Inequality*. New York: Center for Migration Studies, 1977.

inequalities and not ethnicity. "Euro-ethnic Americans" must be equally accepted as Americans.

The religious variable seems to have a great deal of weight for "Euro-Ethnic Americans" in not being "included" in American society.

According to a three-part series on anti-Catholicism in America recently published in the *Boston Globe*,¹⁸ a growing number of Catholics, many of whom are the children and grandchildren of immigrants, feel that what is lacking is respect – "respect for their talents, their beliefs and what they feel are legitimate ambitions for their institutions – respect, that is, from other Americans."¹⁹ Among the areas where the effects of prejudice and discrimination are visible are the following:

- a) Under-representation of Catholics in the faculty and administration of American colleges and universities;
- b) Under-representation of Catholics in the corporate boardrooms.

While Catholics as a group are better educated and have higher average family incomes than members of any other Christian denomination (the Irish Catholics are the group with the highest family income among gentile, white, ethnic groups in this country, the Italian Catholics are the second, followed by German, Polish and Slavic Catholics) according to Andrew Greeley, a sociologist of the National Opinion Research Center, they lag behind other groups at the same educational and income levels in what he calls "occupational prestige." That is, while Catholics make as much or more money than other Americans on the average, they are less likely to be found in the boardrooms of the largest corporations or on the faculties of colleges and universities. For example, former Massachusetts Banking Commissioner Carol Greenwald's study showed that Catholics in 1976 held only 28 percent of the senior management posts in banks in Massachusetts, although they were more than half the state's population. The Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, which has grown from 16,000 to 26,000 members in the last year, has collected other figures, detailing the absence of Catholic ethnic groups in the largest Chicago businesses, New York law firms and American universities (only 10% of university teachers several years ago were Catholic, compared with a general population that was 24% Catholic). "I am not prepared. . .to contend that the research explicitly establishes that the underrepresentation is the result of discrimination", Andrew Greeley said in his recent book, *An Ugly Little Secret: Anti-Catholicism in American Life*. But, he said, the problem of underrepresentation has

¹⁸ James L. Franklin, "Anti-Catholicism in America: Does the Old Fire Still Smolder?" *Boston Globe*, February 4, 1979, pp. 1 and 14; February 5, 1979, pp. 1 and 6; February 6, 1979, page 25.

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, *Boston Globe*, February 4, 1979, page 1.

been almost completely ignored and such “inattention. . .is evidence of bigotry”.

Economic success is not sufficient to extinguish “the old fire” of prejudice and discrimination of “Euro-Ethnic Americans.” Nor is their relatively recent political success. Catholics are the largest single religious group in the present 96th Congress with 116 of 435 seats in the House and 13 of 100 seats in the Senate. The *Congressional Quarterly*, however, published an analysis of abortion votes, using an asterisk to identify Catholic members of Congress – something the Catholic critics said would have been unthinkable in the case of Jewish legislators and aid to Israel.

“I regard prejudice against (the Catholic) Church” wrote historian Arthur Schlesinger, Sr. of Harvard University “as the deepest bias in the history of the American people.” Much earlier on August 24, 1855, Lincoln wrote to Joshua Speed: “As a nation, we began by declaring that ‘all men are created equal’! We now practically read it. . . ‘all men are created equal, except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics.”

Good statistics on the problem are lacking. Continued inattention to the possibility of anti-Catholic prejudice and discrimination is itself harmful, while it remains one of the major obstacles for “Euro-Ethnic Americans” to an equal redistribution of the power resources among, and availability of these resources for, all the groups of American society.

“Notwithstanding the certitudes of ethnic ideologies” wrote in his recent book *The One and the Many: Reflections on the American Identity*, Arthur Mann, Professor of History at the University of Chicago, “America is not merely a collection of ethnic groups. . . It is easy enough to cite the occasions when that inclusiveness collapsed under one form of bigotry or another. From the Alien and Sedition Acts of the 1790’s through the Know-Nothing eruptions of the 1850’s, through the triumph of Anglo-Saxonist proscriptions in the 1920’s, through the internment of Japanese Americans in the 1940’s, there is an ugly legacy of hatred, violence, and dangerous and foolish thinking. But the prescriptive part of the national creed, in every instance thus far, provided a resilient and therefore self-correcting mechanism.”²⁰ This consultation hopefully will help to regain this sense of wholeness, pride and confidence by calling attention not only to the fact of employment discrimination of “Euro-Ethnic Americans,” but also by pointing out the causes and the remedies, not just by being taught “to be nice to each other.” Litigation and legislation, however, will be greatly handicapped without attitudinal or motivational support within the individual and his community.²¹ To produce the desired change in

²⁰ Arthur Mann, op. cit., pp. 177-178.

²¹ John Slawson, op. cit., page 180.

attitude which will assure the elimination of discrimination in the broadest possible fashion in all aspects of employment, more studies in the politicoeconomic area are needed to answer such questions as the following:

“What has happened to the progress made some years ago in eliminating discriminatory practices in the ‘executive suite’? What guidelines are needed for success in this area? Where do we stand today in the matter of ‘social discrimination’, which is tied up closely with the ‘executive suite’? And finally, what is needed to strengthen the basis for its obliterations?”²²

* * *

**RESPONSE OF ESTA BIGLER, LABOR ATTORNEY,
BUREAU OF LABOR SCIENCES, NEW YORK, NY**

Thank you. It's a pleasure to be here.

The past 2 days have certainly opened up a whole new world to me, and I owe a great deal of thanks to all of you.

I would just like to add that I am the child of a mixed marriage, so that you understand my perspective totally, that on one side I am first-generation American and on the other side I am second-generation American. I have been able to observe in my own family, by watching what happens to the children on each side, the effects of immigration and ethnicity.

In addition, I'm also a labor educator, and it's from this vantage point that some of the concerns I will express today have developed.

The students I teach are all trade union members, and they fall into two groups. They are either overwhelmingly Euro-ethnic Americans or black and Hispanic, both men and women.

In reading Professor Rozen's paper, it seems to me that she makes three basic points. One is that ethnic groups are stratified into certain occupations and in relationship to each other.

The question is whether this is discrimination, the unseen hand of fate, or natural selection. I will try to address myself to this shortly.

Second, she states that most ethnics live in the Northeast where jobs are declining. We, everyone in this room, must address this very important question of a shortage of employment opportunities, a shrinking of the pie, so to speak.

²² *Ibidem*, page 180. The American Jewish Committee's executive-suite program which has changed markedly the position of the Jews in the United States, should be used as a model for Euro-Ethnic-Americans. See Edwin Kiescher, Jr., "the Case of the Missing Executive: How Religious Bias Wastes Management Talent. . . and What is Being Done About It", American Jewish Committee, January 1973. Also, some guide to information on employment and ethnicity should be developed on the model of *A Guide to Information on Equal Education Opportunity*. Robert Vivolo, ERIC Clearing House on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1977.

And of course, what we've heard all afternoon, that there is a precious need for more data so that we can in fact analyze what is happening on the American employment scene.

While I agree with all of these points, and I think they're very important, I would like to add some of my own concerns.

I don't believe that we can discuss Euro-ethnic employment without dealing with another question, the question of class.

Immigrants come to this country, and they join the working class. They work with their hands. They work in factories. They dig ditches. They're operators. They work in steel mills.

This has ramifications for where they live, the kind of education the children receive, and what occupations they and their children go into.

It seems to me that our society spends a great deal of time trying to pretend that we are a classless society, that we have no classes; that there are no class distinctions.

I believe very strongly that there are these distinctions, and that we must analyze the experience of Euro-ethnic Americans in these terms.

Professor Rozen, in her paper, at the very beginning of the paper, talks about the son of a small town bank president who goes to work in the factory right after high school, just like his Slavic friends, and people wonder and the whole town buzzes.

I think this is a class question. If you were talking about, to change it for a moment, a Jewish doctor's daughter or son or a Slavic dentist's daughter or son, we'd have some of the same reactions. Thus, class is a very, very important factor that has to be considered throughout this analysis.

In addition, we have to understand what it's like for a worker in our society. The position of a worker at the work place is a passive one. You take orders. You don't give them. You don't challenge. You must be passive at all time.

Euro-ethnic Americans in the working class – they often don't make enough money; but even if they do suffer from the stigma of working with their hands. Our society says that working with our hands is not honorable.

Someone today talked about menial jobs. There are no jobs that are menial as far as I am concerned. It's only the image that people have in their heads, and that must be addressed and changed.

The position of the working class in our society leads to confusion for the children of European immigrants and for the immigrants themselves, since in Europe, being a crafts person, working with your hands, producing something that you could hold was honorable, was something that gave you status within the community.

You come to the United States, and all of a sudden you are no longer performing an honorable job.

While I agree with those who spoke yesterday, that it's important that Greek-Americans, Jewish-Americans, Italian-Americans know about the poets of their group, the philosophers of their group, the writers of their group, the Nobel scientists of their group, we also have to infuse into our educational system information concerning who built this country, who with their hands and their sweat built it and continue to build it and provide large parts of the GNP.

When I was in school, I spent a great deal of time learning about Carnegie and how he helped to build this country. I spent a lot of time learning about Rockefeller. Yes, they taught us about the robber barons, but aside from teaching me who built the Erie Canal, no one ever mentioned American workers. Significantly, they never mentioned the fight of immigrants in this country to build institutions to protect themselves, institutions which were illegal when they started the fight unions.

These institutions have mirrored the economic and the ethnic representation in the employment situation, and for a complete picture we have to look at them as well.

But just to step back, in the development of unions in this country, Euro-ethnic Americans were at the fore-front of the fight. People like Sacco and Vanzetti gave their lives, yet these are names that most school children have never heard.

I ask some of you in here if you know the names Clara Lemich, Eugene Debbs, Bill Heywood, people who were instrumental in building the United States and the American labor movement. Yet, children who go into the labor movement, people who go into jobs, who will someday belong to unions have never heard of these leaders.

At the same time, our schools teach that to be successful means to be middle class. Well, I object strenuously to that. We teach what we call middle-class values, the Anglo American system, as I heard it referred to yesterday. What this does to children of Euro-ethnic Americans is to make them feel that their parents are somehow a failure.

My father is a dress cutter. For the entire time I have been alive, he has worked two jobs to support his family. He believes that he is a failure because American middle-class values tell him that to be a success he should wear a white shirt and a tie and a jacket to work, and he doesn't. So in his eyes, he's a failure, and he has tried desperately to push both my sister and me so that we would not be failures.

This of course affects the children and the way they perceive their parents as well as their own sense of ethnic identification.

I mentioned earlier that unions often mirror the ethnic groups that helped to form them. I think immediately of the dress industry which was predominantly Jewish at the turn of the century, and the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, and the Amalgamated

Clothing Workers Union. You think of transit workers in New York, and I don't think anyone can forget Michael Quill's brogue when he was involved in collective bargaining.

Now some of these unions did not have an impact in terms of who came into the system or who was employed. For example, in the needle trades there have always been Italians, and now the needle trades are becoming overwhelmingly Hispanic and black. I teach a special group of trade union students from the needle trades and my class is predominantly black and Hispanic.

There are other occupations, however, specifically the construction trades, where unions have been intimately involved in who gets into the system, and who is allowed to work. For example, you have George Meaney's Irish Plumbers Union in the Bronx; you have other ethnic groups in control of who gets hired in specific trades.

Many of you may not know that in the construction trades, the way you get sent on job site is through a hiring hall. If the union doesn't send you out, you don't work. At one time many unions, particularly craft unions had restrictive requirements in terms of membership. You could not join if your father didn't belong or if your uncle didn't belong. The purpose of these rules was protective to keep jobs for their families in a hostile world.

Obviously, this kept out women; it also kept out other ethnic groups besides the one that was in control, and it kept out blacks and Hispanics.

I think there's no question that there has been a history of discrimination in employment against ethnics.

Recently I was involved, before I left private practice, in a suit which involved 10,000 women in a major manufacturing operation in New Jersey. When we began to meet the class of 10,000 women, it became clear to me that there were only two ethnic groups that were employed.

I met only Slavic women or Irish women. Investigation revealed that the male work force was Slavic and Irish and that the supervisors themselves were Slavic and Irish. What happened at this plant was a selection process that involved picking your own group to be employed.

And what has been the result of that suit, and what will eventually be a court-ordered affirmative action plan, is that now there must be objective selection criteria so that all ethnic groups and sexes will have a chance to work in that particular facility in all jobs.

No longer are promotions based solely on what the supervisor thinks about you. Now there will be written evaluations with written criteria. Therefore, even though our suit was aimed specifically at

women, the ramifications in terms of ending all kinds of discrimination are clear.

I would just like to mention the unemployment problem. I think we should begin to look at new ways of dealing with the shrinking employment pie. I am very concerned that we don't pit one group against another, rather that we force the pie to be made bigger or that we find a way to share the pie. One group in pursuit of its rights should not be seen as attacking the other group or taking food out of the other's mouth.

Some of the things that I think we should think about are shared work. We should think about a shorter work week. We should think about different layoff procedures in terms of seniority. You know, traditionally, layoffs occur on a first in, the last out/the last in, the first out basis.

We should look to examine the possibilities of changing that; this means we must include unions and worker organizations in any discussion about employment and ending discrimination in employment.

We also have to recognize that discrimination is not a one-dimensional problem. I think that was the thrust of what I was trying to say when I talked about the different ethnic groups in control of different occupations.

In addition, I would just like to make a few suggestions to the Commission of areas to be evaluated.

We heard a lot of discussion this morning about the EEOC and discrimination. As you all know, in discrimination law, we have a theory of private attorneys general. Individuals must prosecute their own suits, unlike discrimination on the basis of union activity. In those cases the National Labor Relations Board prosecutes for the individual without cost.

We should re-evaluate the EEOC, and I suggest that the EEOC be patterned after the National Labor Relations Board.

Another area of concern is the effect of spending in a community for construction, or other Federal programs in which jobs are created. We should think in terms of requiring employment on a community basis. We should evaluate the impact of those jobs on that community.

Finally, the last area I'd like to mention concerns what we have been talking about the last two days, contracting out services to various ethnic groups, to insure social services reach that particular group.

That brings specific problems in terms of equal employment opportunity for everyone else. I have been confronted with one group saying, "I only want to hire Catholics, another, I only want to hire

Jews," but yet they are using public moneys to dispense a nonsectarian service. We should examine this area very, very carefully.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Very good.

I must say, Ms. Bigler, you are somebody after my own heart. I have made a lot of your arguments for 10 years, and I am glad to hear somebody offer them as a witness, because it has been sheer frustration since no one in the civil rights bureaucracy in Washington seems willing to face up to the problems you are talking about, which are those of economic class, among others.

You did mention that you wanted different layoff procedures and seniority, last in, first out, and I'm just curious. What would those be?

MS. BIGLER. Well, I was thinking of the possibility of senior employees agreeing to be the first ones to be laid off instead of the junior employees. These senior employees would in essence be on sabbatical. They would have a specific time off, to pursue their interests at full salary or at three-quarter salary. We don't always have to take the newest worker into the system and then put him or her back out on the street.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Okay. I'll yield now to my colleagues.

DISCUSSION

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. I've been very much interested in the emphasis on the lack of data. Of course, that developed this morning. In fact, it's run all the way through the consultation.

I've also been interested in references to what, in effect, have been some case history in the executive-suite study in Chicago, and you refer to one somewhere in Detroit.

While people are working on getting us in a position where we have better data, should there be more emphasis on case studies, singling out situations in particular areas with particular types of employers and so on, to see if we can get evidence in that particular way?

Right along with that question, I'm also asking the question as to whether or not there has been as much emphasis as there should be on studying the impact of the practices of labor union on this particular issue.

I'm very much interested, and Commissioner Horn was, in the comments that have been made along this line, and I'm just wondering how much attention has been paid in terms of research in this area to that particular aspect of the problem, and if it would warrant more attention than it has received up to the present time.

I guess really what I'm thinking about are case histories on the management side and case histories on the labor side, and whether or

not that in turn would produce some evidence that would be helpful. I just toss that out.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Who would like to be responsive?

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. When I had discussions with counsel for the Steelworkers Union in the *Weber* case, I raised precisely that point.

In answer to your question, Mr. Chairman, when I was preparing our brief on the *Weber* case, I had discussions with counsel for the Steelworkers Union, on precisely that point. I was trying to find out why the Union negotiated the kind of affirmative action plan they did. I wanted to know, what data they had available, and used because the plan in the *Weber* case benefited more than blacks.

While blacks, in fact, have been the chief beneficiaries, the plan benefits women and the other - what I called earlier this morning - favored four categories, and I asked, well, what about other groups?

I asked how can anyone make a decision that these are the only groups that should be receiving this kind of treatment and attention by the union and private industry, if one doesn't have the data that reflects the status of other groups. His answer was and I'll conclude with this that the Government doesn't require us to do it; therefore, we don't do it.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Any other response?

DR. BARTA. As to the suggestion about case studies, I would endorse that very strongly, because otherwise we're left with gross-national figures, and under those gross-national figures, there can be all kinds of things which are hidden.

For example, the income figures hide the lack of status, prestige. We may argue about how important they may be, but nevertheless it hides those.

Besides, what goes on in Chicago may not be what goes on in Los Angeles and what goes on in Los Angeles may not be the same thing as in Miami and so on. The problems are, to some extent, national, but they're also local, and if groups are to get involved in them, they've got to get down to their local areas.

So I would strongly endorse the encouragement of more and more case studies.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Miss Bigler?

MS. BIGLER. I must preface this by the statement that I consider myself to be a labor union attorney, that I have represented labor unions and will in all likelihood do so again.

On the labor side, I think it's very important that we have studies in this area, but I also think it's very important that the people who do these studies don't come in with a middle-class and an antiunion bias. The analyst must understand why the unions were structured the way they were, why they felt it necessary to protect their jobs and to

protect their communities. The studies must not lead to union busting, or labeling the people in those unions as racist.

Ms. ROZEN. I'd like to add something to that, too that is related to what Miss Bigler said, and that is when you start to ask those questions at a time when the economy is tightening up, then you get exactly the kind of effect she's talking about, when we start asking a lot of questions about union discrimination, which certainly all of us know has been there all through the years.

But when we start asking those questions specifically at a time when there is a cutback in the building industry, then it certainly looks like we're part of union busting, and so we have to address ourselves to economic questions at the same time that we're addressing ourselves to questions of patterns of discrimination.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. In other words, you would not preclude asking them and this Commission's been asking them, after great and strenuous urging; this Commission started asking them in the early 1970's, about 10 or 15 years after it should have asked them.

But you're saying solve both problems at the same time.

Ms. ROZEN. Yes, right.

MR. TOMASI. Looking from past experience in collecting data, I would say that litigation and legislation are not enough unless we develop some programs, some educational and motivational programs to prepare the individual and the groups to accept the legislation.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Okay. Any other questions?

Commissioner Saltzman?

Mr. Nunez?

STAFF DIRECTOR NUNEZ. Professor Rozen, I was very impressed by your paper because it was based on hard data contrary to the popular wisdom, it would appear that there is a considerable amount of data that can be analyzed as to the status of Euro-ethnics in our society, and I had a thought, in hearing some of your comments on the limitations of the data, that you indicated very clearly that a lot of this data is computed by looking at the first and second generations.

But would not the assumption be that if you went farther, third, fourth, fifth generation, perhaps the statistics would be better, rather than worse -

Ms. ROZEN. You mean the people would be better off or the statistics would be more meaningful?

STAFF DIRECTOR NUNEZ. Well, obviously the statistics would probably be more meaningful, but perhaps their income would be higher and their occupational status would given the fact that the longer you remain here, that would be an assumption.

MS. ROZEN. That's an assumption that you and I are making. We don't know, and I think a lot of groups are saying to us, and they may be right, there is a lingering effect.

You and I and, perhaps, they have been assuming that by the second generation, the blight is off, or whatever.

But perhaps some people are trying to say to us maybe it doesn't happen that fast, and unless we know, we can't argue. And I think that was the point you were making this morning. I totally agreed that either Poles and Italians are just doing fine and we ought to drop the question, or they're having problems and we ought to check it out.

But we don't know. And everybody can get up and say whatever they want, because we can't really argue.

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. And then there's a great degree of tension because of that uncertainty.

MS. ROZEN. Yes.

STAFF DIRECTOR NUNEZ. Mr. Walentynowicz, Professor Rozen, we are talking about priorities. There are priorities in public policy in our nation as well as any other society; and when you look at these statistics, and you look at similar statistics for black and Hispanics which range from 60 to 65 percent of national norms, and these statistics would suggest that the groups that are identified are above the national norms, the question of priority and concern does arise.

MS. ROZEN. Okay, and that's, I guess, where my priorities are. I'd like to get the numbers because I think you'll be proven right, but I don't want to take a position on that because I don't know.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. It is obvious that, when you talk about a national norm, there are people above and below the national norm, and the problem - what everybody has been suggesting here for two days - is that we do not know which groups lumped under "white other" might consistently and predominantly be below that national norm.

As I understand your testimony, it is not a question of using the data to deny others clearly below the national norm an opportunity, but rather it is a desire to help clear the air, and, - as you said, - perhaps provide greater understanding if you found that your ethnic group was above the national norm; then maybe the people above the norm would be willing to help others who were clearly below it.

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. Exactly, and that way we get more progress toward what our ultimate goals are. That's the whole point of it, though I also want to point out, that when we think in terms of affirmative action, we tend to average everything out and overlook the possibility of great disparities in particular categories.

Thus to use the present data, without more, don't deny the accuracy of it since I just don't know - is basically unfair.

To take these figures without being certain that they are reliable, and fully reflect the relative status of all the groups that make up America, and then immediately conclude that such data gives us a sense of priority or permits us to draw priorities, is grossly unjust, and is another form of discrimination. I suggest that the effort to collect the additional data we're talking about would take so little in extra resources and so little extra time if we set our minds down to do it, that the issue of priority that you referred to, Mr. Nunez, could become either obvious or irrelevant. If we do need to determine priorities, then we would have an accurate and full data base that would support a system of priorities which everyone would be in a position to readily accept.

STAFF DIRECTOR NUNEZ. Just one last comment, Mr. Walentynowicz.

As an individual who spent a good 10 years helping to include the Hispanic component in the census, it is a very difficult process to change the way we bureaucrats deal with issues once we set our minds to it.

The change in agencies' thinking, like the Bureau of Census, is not that easy.

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. Don't I know it.

STAFF DIRECTOR NUNEZ. It took 10 years of testimony and studies to get where they're at so that I think it's a difficult process. It's not just a conceptual process. It's the ingrained desire to stay with what you have in any kind of organizational mechanism.

MR. WALENTYNOWICZ. I recognize the difficulties. But they must be overcome to secure true equality and justice.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. As a witness said yesterday, I will use the term Euro-ethnic for the first time in my life. I've read it before this - and that is if you want to solve the problem, more Euro-ethnics have to get into the census and the civil rights bureaucracies of the Federal Government.

Commissioner Ruiz?

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. The Government doesn't require us to do it, so we don't do it was the response given to Attorney Walentynowicz in the identification of categories in the *Weber* case.

Now, this is the point which was made earlier. If the Government doesn't require us to do it, who will require the Government to do it in this democracy?

Isn't the power with us? Isn't the power with the ethnics?

Now the major impact upon me by this panel is a feeling that our work and social environment is changing very rapidly, so fast that we cannot collect data on it.

Yet it's taking place before our very eyes. We're probing into taking a position but fast, insisting on census for information – a little bit of pessimism, but I think you can move the unmovable if you get organized; otherwise, you're going to be a species that disappeared, like certain species of animals disappeared from Earth because they could not adjust with the changing environment.

We observed this afternoon that one final arbiter is Government, whether it be the Supreme Court or such agencies as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Ethnics have apparently not adjusted with the changing environment as they should.

Attorney Walentynowicz seemed to agree that rather than to just fight, he's been a warrior that's gone through the mill, I can see –

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. I have an empathy for a lawyer that does, and if you can't beat them, you've got to join them by making Government adjust to your needs.

Change the rules of Government to include ethnics in upward mobility ladders.

Our ethnics may be 10 years late, but I think we should adjust; I don't think we should miss the boat again.

This strategy that has been used and of help to blacks and Hispanics during the last 10 years should be adopted. There is more going for everybody by uniting forces for an evenhanded justice for all segments of our body politic.

And this is what has been evolving in these hearings, and it's making me feel real good.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Thank you.

May I express to each member of the panel our gratitude and appreciation for the contributions that you have made.

Seventh Session: Communications, Media and Ethnicity

We now turn to the area of communications media, and I'm going to ask Commissioner Ruiz to preside while these presentations are made, and I'm going to say now so that no one will misunderstand, as we move along, that I know that we've got to adjourn at 5:30 p.m., and I want to make sure that those who are coming on near the end of this consultation have the opportunity of presenting their views.

So, Commissioner Ruiz, it's going to be important to keep this particular panel on schedule, just as it will be important to keep the next panel on schedule.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Mr. Richard Gambino is a Professor of Education and Philosophy and a founder and Director of the Italian Studies Program at Queens College.

He has served as adviser on ethnic studies to the New York State Department of Education, the New York City Board of Education, and numerous colleges and universities.

A prolific writer and frequent speaker on the impact of public policies and perceptions on ethnic Americans, he was host and coproducer of 10 NBC programs on the contemporary problem of Italian Americans.

He holds Bachelor, Master's and Doctoral degrees in Philosophy.
Mr. Richard Gambino.

**STATEMENT OF RICHARD GAMBINO,
PROFESSOR OF EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY,
QUEENS' COLLEGE, NEW YORK**

Thank you very much.

Mindful of the need to keep the schedule, I will summarize the first, major portion of my paper, and then read only the last two pages or so.

In the first part of my paper, I talk about the major accomplishments that have been made since the 1950's in the area of civil rights for certain racial minorities and for women.

And without underestimating what still needs to be done in that area, few would deny that a great deal of progress has been made.

I also wrote about the great progress that has been made in combating anti-Semitism in the United States, using the historical perspective of the past to the turn of the century, and I said this is, in my opinion, largely because of the very laudable efforts of Jewish organizations.

However, these were not the only biases which were dominant in American society not very long ago. There were other biases, other than racial; namely, they were ethnic ones, and I think that these biases are still very strong in the United States for a number of reasons, which I will speak of in a moment, and that perhaps the groups hit hardest by the ethnic biases are eastern and southern European background groups.

Why are these biases still around? Since the 1950's the biases against racial minorities and women have been under frontal assaults on all fronts, from the mass media and governmental power to the marshalling of schools, universities and textbooks, etc.

American Jews took the initiative on their own years ago, and established antidefamation leagues and have been, in my opinion, very successful in that endeavor.

However, the old nativist biases against southern and eastern Europeans have never been frontally assaulted in our society, on any level. The schools have not done it; Government has not done it; mass media have not done it; no one has done it.

I went on to write about and summarize what nativism was in the United States because I think it's important to realize tht it was not just a backwater movement.

It included, at the turn of the century, up through the 1930's, the best and the brightest in the United States, and I give examples of outrageous statements from Woodrow Wilson, U.S. Grant, etc., and I could multiply these statements.

I also wrote it was not limited to the top strata of society, but it was reflected right down to the very bottom and introduced all kinds of popular stereotypes into the American folklore.

I think the result of nativism from the 1840's to the 1930's was to establish in the American mind something that is instantly recognizable to most Americans when they hear it, but which they are only semiconscious of until they hear it.

And that is a hierarchy or racial and ethnic groups in the United States. One is considered "most American", according to this hierarchy, and one might say "most human" and "least human".

As I see the hierarchy, it's as follows. At the very top, of course, are Anglo-Saxon Protestants. They have - in popular mythology, which we all imbibe with our milk in this country - a proprietary hold on our country as it is presented, on its traditions and its founding, on its major accomplishments, etc.

Next in the hierarchy are other Northern European Protestant groups, then Western European Catholics, then southern and eastern Europeans and Jews, Latin Americans, Asians, American Indians, and blacks.

That's the hierarchy as I see it. It's not rigid, of course, but I think in general terms, a case can be made out that it does exist in virtually all levels and all compartments of American society.

Then I go on to discuss examples, contemporary examples in the various media, and I took the media in a very wide sense to include textbooks, and what the publishing media calls trade books, nonfiction, newspapers, movies, television, and magazines.

Starting with textbooks, they are among the earliest influences upon Americans. As children in schools, we are captive to them for years, during a most formative time of life.

Last summer, I researched how widely used textbooks treat American ethnic groups. All of them were printed in 1979, and used in American grade schools. The results were monotonously uniform.

Southern and eastern European groups were either neglected or negatively stereotyped.

I choose these examples not to make my point – the examples are chosen at random. I could just as easily have chosen any of the books I looked at.

For example, a 1979 fifth grade text called *Understanding the United States*, published by McGraw-Hill, proclaims on its front page that it is concerned with “the themes of cultural pluralism, equality and social justice.”

But the basic message of the text is laid down early in its pages. I quote again from the book: “The *dominant* or major cultural group in the United States is British American. The minor culture groups are called *subcultures*. Among them are Italian Americans, Japanese Americans, Navaho and Cuban Americans.”

The book does not explain how British Americans, some 15 to 30 percent of the U.S. population, are the major or dominant group. Is it because English is our *lingua franca* ? Because our governmental system is heavily British in derivation? There is immeasurably more to culture than these two components.

In all other areas, other ethnic groups have contributed enormously, in many instances more than British Americans. Yet, in the text’s 303 pages of American history, these other groups are reduced to one chapter each for the Amish and Spanish speaking, and three chapters on Native Americans.

A blanket species, labelled “immigrant groups,” is given six pages – that’s pages, not chapters – three of which are headed “Problems of Immigrants.”

Another 1979 text on the United States, designed for third graders, uses typical American families and individuals as illustrations for conveying the flavor of American life. The surnames of the families in the book are – and I include all of them – Mitchell, Dunlop, Maynard, Wilson, Everson, Cooley, Wachtel, Elliott, Virgil, Ortega, Dohan, Cheng, Sloan and Sheehan.

In the text or photos, some of these are identified as black, Oriental or Hispanic.

The book gives the impression that there is no one in the United States from Eastern or Southern Europe.

Bigotry through neglect and condescension marks another 1979 textbook, a history-geography book meant for grades four through six.

Of the book’s six chapters on Europe, *three* are on the United Kingdom. Eastern and southern Europeans are either ignored or barely mentioned.

For example, in the 427-page book, Italy is given 11 lines – not chapters or pages, but *lines*. These inform the students that Italy is

divided into north and south; that the north is industrial, the south agricultural, and that “from here many people depart for other countries.”

Examples from today’s textbooks, on all levels of education, can be multiplied endlessly.

An examination of them shows the veracity of a conclusion by Professor Mildred Dickerman, chairperson of the Department of Anthropology at Sonoma State College, CA.

In a 1973 study of school curricula, she found that “American schools are racist by design. Their racism is part of a larger philosophy, an ethnocentric dedication to the remodeling of citizens to conform to a single homogeneous acceptable model” made up of “Anglo-Saxon and North European groups.”

Negative stereotypes of southern and eastern European groups is a staple also of popular books for adults or trade books. Members of these ethnic groups serve as conventional, short-hand ways to evoke such qualities as criminality, stolidity, stupidity, vengeance, anti-intellectualism, clannishness, working-class primitivism, racism, over-sexuality, corruption, right wing neofascism, and social and cultural backwardness.

Here are two examples from a bounty – and I choose two because they are very popular books, both made into movies, one for television and one for distribution in theaters.

Two examples: The character “Falconetti” in Irwin Shaw’s *Rich Man, Poor Man* is dragged into the story at a convenient point – he has nothing to do with the story – from nowhere to move the plot along by committing murder and homosexual rape of a black man.

Similarly, Kurt Vonnegut, in *Slaughterhouse Five*, conveniently uses an Italian American as a *deus ex machina* of irrational vengeance to kill – that is murder – his WASP protagonist, whose name, incidentally, is Billy Pilgrim.

Newspapers usually drink from the same bigoted well in dealing with southern and eastern Europeans. In addition to the standard use of stereotypes, newspeople have a conventional code all their own.

For example, the words “boss” and “machine” never refer to Protestant individuals or groups.

Richard Nixon was called many things, but not a “boss.” Franklin D. Roosevelt occupied the White House for almost 4 terms and held the Democratic Party in his hip pocket. Yet even his most vehement enemies never used the word “machine” to describe his power, unique as it is in American history.

These are code words for a Catholic and, on some occasions, Jewish politicians.

Television and films are the major kingdom of ethnic stereotyping. Poles, in their characters, usually represent walking Polish jokes. To drive home the point, stand up comics and sit-coms actually tell real Polish jokes.

Greeks, when they are portrayed on television, are walking symbols of clannishness and emotionalism. Italians are buffoons, criminals, or both.

A whole new generation of Americans is learning the latest evolution of the "dumb" stereotype from "Fonzie," "Laverne and Shirley," "Angie," and "Roseanne Roseannadanna." And a plethora of mafia dramas have branded an ethnic group with a mark of Cain that none of us will ever live to see erased.

Ethnic caricatures are sometimes funny and sometimes dramatic, but I quote Quintilian, who wrote 2,000 years ago, "That laughter costs too much which is purchased by the sacrifice of decency."

In the last couple of decades, the television industry and movie industry have begun to implement that moral with regard to certain racial minorities. They have yet to show that they are even sensitive about it with regard to eastern and southern European minorities.

Anyone committed to the proposition that such treatment of southern and eastern European groups does not reflect, perpetuate, and aggravate social injustice against these groups must also be committed to the position that racist and sexist treatment in the communications media did no harm to blacks' and women's civil rights. Corrective courses of action suggest themselves: Organized inquiry into the treatment of ethnics by the various media; employment of ethnics and ethnic consultants by the media; and all appropriate corrective measures pushed through moral persuasion, legal coercion, and governmental pressure.

To deny the conclusion is to affirm that the old nativist injustices are not wrong or important. Unfortunately, the present state of affairs in the communications industries does mostly just that.

Thank you.

[The complete paper follows.]

THE COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA AND SOUTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPEAN ETHNIC GROUPS

By Richard Gambino *

In the 1950's, 1960's and 1970's injustices based on race and gender were attacked in massive frontal assaults in the United States. Without underestimating what still needs to be done to overcome race and sex biases, few would deny that great progress has been made in these areas in the last decades. Great strides have also been made in opposing anti-Semitism since the turn of the century, mainly by antidefamation efforts of Jewish organizations. Yet, these were not the only unjust prejudices prevalent in American life. Old biases against other groups – ethnic ones as distinct from racial ones – run through American history, and exist today. They reached their most overt expression during the heyday of the anti-foreign nativist movement, roughly from 1850 to the 1930's. Fact is, because these biases have *not* been frontally attacked, they remain firmly embedded in our minds and society, albeit often despite our being unconscious of them – just as millions of Americans were unconscious about race and sex prejudice 25 years ago. Perhaps chief among the still vital and mostly unchallenged nativist bigotries are those against people of southern and eastern European background. These include Poles, Italians, Greeks, and Slavs, people Michael Novak has labelled, in satirical protest, “P.I.G.S.” Of course, they also include many others, e.g., Slovaks, Ukrainians and Hungarians.

In essence, nativism was against all people who weren't of northern European, Protestant background, preferably British. It began as a major current in America in reaction to the great immigration from Ireland that began in the 1840's. For the Irish were the first non-Protestant group to migrate to our shores in large numbers. (Excluding, of course, Africans, who were “kept in line” first by slavery, then by Jim Crow repression.) Nativism organized itself in 1843 into the American, or “Know-Nothing,” Party. Its planks were the drastic restriction of non-Protestant immigration, a 25 year residency requirement for voting, and limiting all political offices to the American-born. By 1850, the Party was credited with delivering 25 percent of the vote for Millard Fillmore, whose only other claim to fame is the false legend that he was the first President to introduce the

* Professor of Education and Philosophy and Director of Italian American Studies, Queens College, New York, New York.

bathtub to the White House. The nativists split briefly over the Civil War, but after that distraction, they turned their attention to the large numbers of “undesirables” who were immigrating – Poles, Italians, Jews, Hungarians and others. (Remember that “honky” is but a bastardized version of “hunky,” a nativist term of less than endearment for Hungarians.) The political pressure was led by the “best” people; e.g. Henry Cabot Lodge, whose 31 years in the U.S. Senate (1893-34) resulted in a rich output of bigoted anti-immigrant speeches and articles; U.S. Grant, who in 1875 reflected on the Civil War with the thought: “If we are to have another contest in the near future of our national existence, I predict the dividing line will not be Mason and Dixon’s, but between “ ‘Protestant’ ” patriotism and intelligence on one side, and “ ‘Catholic’ ” superstition, ambition, and ignorance on the other; U.S. Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer, who in 1919-21 forcibly rounded up immigrants and deported them to Europe without burdening them with a trial, or even a hearing or specific charges; Woodrow Wilson, who wrote that the turn-of-the-century immigrants were “men of the lowest class from the south of Italy and men of the meaner sort out of Hungary and Poland, men out of the ranks with neither skill nor energy nor any initiative of quick intelligence.” Vice President Calvin Coolidge, a man of celebrated few words, who managed a 1921 burst of loquacity in *Good Housekeeping Magazine*, writing that “biological laws show us that Nordics deteriorate when mixed with other races” (i.e., ethnic groups); Herbert Hoover, who before pronouncing the economy “basically sound” after October 29, 1929, noted that “immigrants now live in the United States on sufferance. . . and will be tolerated only if they behave.” Hoover’s generosity was topped by James J. Davis, Secretary of Labor under Presidents Harding and Coolidge. Mr. Davis commented that earlier Protestant immigrants to America were the “beaver type” that built up America, whereas the newer immigrants are “rat-men” trying to tear it down.

However, nativist expression wasn’t limited to such a lofty plane. By the time immigration from southern and eastern Europe was all but cut off by the “Emergency” Quotas Act in 1924, nativism had found widespread, grassroots, American-as-apple-pie expression among ordinary citizens. In fact, the popular expressions had graduated to the status of American lore, much more resplendent in malice even than nativist American law. The American vocabulary had been enriched by such words as “mick,” “dago,” “wop,” “guinea,” “pollack,” “hunky,” “kike,” “yid,” and “greaser.” All of American culture, from the melting-pot public schools to the employment office, from universities to the vaudeville stage, sang of a human hierarchy, in which southern and eastern Europeans were not the lowest to be sure,

but not fully “American” (read “human”) either. A glance at that hierarchy reveals two things. First, most Americans immediately recognize it, although they usually admit they had only a semiconscious awareness of it before it was made explicit. And second, the hierarchy conforms exactly with the traditional prejudices in Britain about the rest of the world’s peoples. It is a British import dating from before the American War of Independence and surviving into America’s history to this day. From top to bottom, here are the strata, from most to least “American-human:”

- Anglo-Saxon Protestants
- Other Protestant British
- Western European Catholics
- Southern and Eastern Europeans and Jews
- Latin Americans
- Asians
- American Indians
- Blacks

Ancient history? Overstatement? An oversensitive ethnic riding his particular hobbyhorse? Consider, for example, the current scene in the communications media – print and electronic. Starting with the former, textbooks are among the earliest influences upon Americans. As children in schools, we are captive to them for years, during a most formative time of life. Last summer, I researched how widely used school texts treat American ethnic groups. The results were monotonously uniform. Southern and eastern European groups were either neglected or negatively stereotyped.

For example, a 1979 fifth grade text, *Understanding the United States* (McGraw-Hill), proclaims on its front page that it is concerned “with the themes of cultural pluralism, equality, and social justice.” But the basic message of the text is laid down early in its pages. (The italics are the book’s): “The *dominant*, or major culture group in the United States is British American. The minor culture groups are called *subcultures*. Among them are Italian Americans, Japanese Americans, Navaho and Cuban Americans.” The book does not explain how British Americans, some 15 to 30 percent of the U.S. population are the major “dominant” group. Is it because English is our *lingua franca*? Because our governmental system is heavily British in derivation? There is immeasurably more to culture than these two components. In all other areas, other ethnic groups have contributed enormously, in many instances more than British Americans. Yet, in the text’s 303 pages of American history, these other groups are reduced to one chapter each for the Amish and Spanish speaking, and three chapters on Native Americans. A blanket species, labelled “immigrant groups,”

is given six *pages*, three of which are headed “Problems of Immigrants.”

Another 1979 text on the United States, designed for third graders, uses “typical” American families and individuals as illustrations for conveying the flavor of American life. Their surnames are Mitchell, Dunlop, Maynard, Wilson, Everson, Cooley, Wachtel, Elliott, Virgil, Ortega, Dohan, Cheng, Sloan, and Sheehan. In the text or photos, some of these are identified as black, Oriental, or Hispanic. The book gives the impression that there is no one in the United States from eastern or southern Europe.

Bigotry through neglect and condescension marks another 1979 textbook, a history-geography book meant for grades four through six. Of the book’s six chapters on Europe, three are on the United Kingdom. Eastern and southern Europeans are either ignored or barely mentioned. For example, in the 427-page book, Italy is given 11 *lines*. These inform the student that Italy is divided into North and South; that the North is industrial, the South agricultural, and that “from here many people depart for other countries.”

Examples from today’s textbooks, on all levels of education, can be multiplied endlessly. An examination of them shows the veracity of a conclusion by Professor Mildred Dickerman, chairperson of the Department of Anthropology at Sonoma State College, CA. In a 1973 study of school curricula, she found that “American schools are racist by design. Their racism is part of a larger philosophy, an ethnocentric dedication to the remodeling of citizens to conform to a single homogeneous acceptable model” – made up of “Anglo-Saxon and north European groups.”

Negative stereotypes of southern and eastern European groups is a staple also of popular books for adults (“trade books”). Members of these ethnic groups serve as conventional, short-hand ways to evoke such qualities as criminality, stolidity, stupidity, vengeance, anti-intellectualism, clannishness, working-class primitivism, racism, oversexuality, corruption, right wing neofascism, and social and cultural backwardness. Two examples from a bounty: “Falconetti” in Irwin Shaw’s *Rich Man, Poor Man* is dragged into the story from nowhere to move the plot along by committing murder and homosexual rape of a black man. Similarly, Kurt Vonnegut, in *Slaughterhouse Five*, conveniently uses an Italian American as a *deus ex machina* or irrational vengeance to kill off (murder) his WASP protagonist.

Newspapers usually drink from the same bigoted well in dealing with southern and eastern Europeans. In addition to the standard use of stereotypes, newspeople have a conventional code all their own. For example, “boss” and “machine” never refer to Protestant individuals or groups. Richard Nixon was called many things, but not

a “boss.” Franklin D. Roosevelt occupied the White House for almost four terms and held the Democratic Party in his hip pocket. Yet even his most vehement enemies never used the word “machine” to describe his power, unique as it is in American history.

Even when newspeople attempt favorable coverage of southern and eastern European groups, their treatment is steeped in condescension. There is more to cover than people munching pizza, kielbasi and souvlaki. But you seldom know it from the American press. Even their selective use of words “ethnics” betrays the nativist bias. We may say to the Fourth Estate, “Yes, Virginia, even WASPs are an ethnic group.”

The supreme instrument of the updated nativist bigotries, however, is composed of the electronic media – television and movies. Supreme because, I am convinced for reasons I argued at length elsewhere,¹ that these media have an unmatched, great influence on the minds and behavior of Americans. Television and films are the major kingdom of negative ethnic stereotyping of Southern and Eastern European groups. Poles usually represent “Polish jokes.” To drive home the point, stand up comics and sit-coms still tell actual Polish jokes. Greeks are walking symbols of clannishness and emotionalism. Italians are buffoons, criminals, or both. A whole new generation of Americans is learning the latest evolution of the “dumb,” stereotype from “Fonzi,” “Laverne and Shirley,” “Angie,” and “Roseanne Roemannadanna.” And a plethora of Mafia dramas have branded an ethnic group with a mark of Cain that none of us will live to see erased.

Yes, ethnic caricatures are often funny or dramatic. But with regard to racial groups, television and movies have at last heeded, in the two decades, the truth that Quintilian penned almost two thousand years ago: “That laughter costs too much which is purchased by the sacrifice of decency.” But the media have yet to begin to apply the moral to southern and eastern European ethnic groups.

Anyone committed to the proposition that such treatment of southern and eastern European groups does not reflect, perpetuate, and aggravate social injustice against these groups must also be committed to the position that racist and sexist treatment in the communications media did no harm to blacks’ and women’s civil rights. Corrective courses of action suggest themselves: organized inquiry into the treatment of ethnics by the various media; employment of ethnics and ethnic consultants by the media; and all appropriate corrective measures pushed through moral persuasion, legal coercion, and governmental pressure. To deny the conclusion is to affirm that the old nativist injustices are not wrong, or important.

¹ “Television: One-Eyed Sorcerer,” Richard Gambino, *Freedom at Issue*, May-June, 1978.

Unfortunately, the present state of affairs in the communications industries mostly does just that.

* * *

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. I notice that Miss Noschese was having a lot of fun listening to the stereotypes conjured by the media, so I'm going to ask her to speak next.

Miss Noschese is the Executive Director of the National Congress of Neighborhood Women; an independent television and video producer and director. She is personally working on two films about ethnic women.

Her written work includes the article: "Ethnic Women and the Media," published in the fall of 1978 issue of this Commission's Civil Rights Digest.

She also holds a Master of Arts degree in communications. She is the chairperson of the Ethnic Caucus for the Continuing Committee for the International Women's Year.

She is a member of the Advisory Committee for WNET.

Miss Christine Noschese.

RESPONSE OF CHRISTINE NOCHESE

Yes, I was enjoying Mr. Gambino's statements on ethnic stereotypes, and a lot of that stuff is what I'd like to elaborate on, because I feel that my own personal experience, what looking at the media has meant to me in terms of being an ethnic, working-class woman myself, has really had a lot of detrimental effects on myself and other people I know of similar class and ethnic background.

I know the Commission has done a lot of work on the media and on race and minority groups in the media.

One of the things that I think that we should not overlook is the internalization of what these media images do to the individual.

One, constantly - and in the case of ethnics, we see no images like ourselves. We see all the values we hold dear, our family, our religion, our community and our work life, made fun of, put down, seen as pathological, seen as criminal.

I mean one of the interesting things to me is that the ethnic community is supposed to deal with - be very profamily. Yet when we look at television, when we look at the movies, all we see is the WASP, upper middle-class ethnics as having healthy families, right from "The Hardy Boys" to "Father Knows Best" to the series on the family on major television.

When we look at public television, all we see is upper middle-class conflicts, stories, and mostly British dramas at this time.

Now we look at what the film and the media have done to the working-class ethnic family. We even can say that the family – and it has been our own ethnics that have done this to the family – is seen as pathological. It is never seen as healthy.

The ethnic family is always leading to criminality, neurotic, oppressive of their children, closeminded and reactionary.

The women are hardly seen in any positive role-models at all, even in that media. The women are usually seen as passive, inarticulate, and never saying anything about the moral integrity of what their sons-in-action do.

In the “Godfather,” I don’t think very many of us who have had ethnic mothers would think that our mothers would sit there and send their children off to kill people. I don’t think that in the Irish family the strong mother is always there with James Cagney. I think that that kind of image of women and of mothers has been so detrimental to making the ethnic woman feel strong about herself.

I feel, also, that our religion is always made fun of. It’s either seen as a coverup for crime; it’s seen as something to joke about. It’s seen as something that’s never positive.

The media has played our issues, as always, the negative parts of the issues. If it’s community issues, it’s reactionary statements that are community, not positive statements about ethnic’s concern for community.

I think that in terms of our class and our work, the working-class person is seen as stupid, reactionary, closeminded, pathologically criminal, and never openminded, never progressive, never radical, and never for social change.

I also feel that the – that somehow this has all influenced a sense of who we are, that this kind of constant barrage of not seeing ourselves anywhere, looking at the media and just seeing no reflection, looking at commercials and seeing no positive reflection – I think what’s happened to “Euro-ethnics” is very similar to what’s happened to blacks in the media, and I don’t think that could be really underestimated.

I think that we grow up thinking that the only way to make it is to be a WASP, to be blonde, to be tall, to be thin, as Laura said, to talk – not to talk a certain way, not to have certain dialogues, not to use our hands, not to be emotional, and not to be expressive, and I don’t think this only affects women; it affects men.

I think the position of ethnic men is seen to brutalize women; they’re seen as gangsters; they’re seen as oppressive of women. They’re never seen in any positive family context. They’re never seen as making a living to support their families in a healthy way, but they’re seen as brutal and violent towards their women.

And I think that women are seen as not having any power in the family. They're Edith Bunkers; they're listening to the man; they're doing all this kind of stuff. They're not powerful, and this goes against even our own stereotypes.

It's just constantly happening over and over again.

I think we have to make some recommendations, and I think that because Hollywood and commercial television is set up to reinforce these kind of violent dramatic actions, we can't depend on them for our answers.

I think that's what we have to do, and our ethnic directors have sold us down the river, as far as I'm concerned. They haven't had the power to make films that have been positive towards our families, except for John Silver in *Hester Steel*, I must say.

I think that what we have to do is take another approach. We have to look at the public media and look at curriculum for schools, because we have no other choice.

We can't do it in terms of the commercial media. We have to start looking at granting films that are dramatic in terms of progressive issues, and films - we have to just have Government policies that are going to develop commercial films, and Government policy that is going to produce things that counteract the Hollywood industry, because I don't see that we can do anything about any of that stuff.

I feel that we have to have media and publications that have a realistic view of "Euro-ethnics", their historical contributions, and I feel that another thing that public television does - and I am on the Advisory Board of NET - there is no screen time. We have absolutely no screen time. The blacks want programming, the Latins want programming, and we don't have enough time to show all of these ethnic groups to the media.

Well, I suggest another approach. Maybe if we took the approach of what people were saying for the last 2 days and start relooking at our history and relooking at how many there are of us in this population, we could just be in all the media. We could be in the music, the cultural, and the arts programs. We could be in the dramatic programs. We could be in the theater programs. We could be in the documentaries, all of us together. We don't have to be in these specialized slots where there's not going to be any room, and there'll be an ethnic error every night.

I think that that is one thing that we have to look at in terms of public television, and I also think that we have to look in terms of more cable stuff and more - I also think that one of the things that's really missing is what happens to the ethnic person in terms of making their own products and developing their own art forms, and that's been brought up by Georgia and it was also brought up by Dr. Scalon.

And we have to look using a very holistic approach, because unless we start encouraging this type of production from ethnics themselves, we're not going to get the material we want in a positive way.

And there should be grants and people in positions of power in the National Academy of Arts, in the National Academy of the Humanities, and in the State councils.

Because unless we do this, and unless "Euro-ethnics" are represented in those divisions, it's just not going to happen, and I think a lot of the material will be biased.

And basically, I think that one of the things that we did do was we presented a whole panel on – at that point it was called White Ethnic Women for the National Institute of Education, and practically every person who did research, whether it was in education, whether it was in community planning or neighborhood policy, recommended that they needed media materials on ethnics, and they were talking about film, and they were talking about video.

This, however, hasn't been published yet, so I don't know when it's coming out. I guess they're not interested in publishing it, even though there is research work that can be used by the Commission from about 10 women.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. I appreciated the enthusiasm of your delivery.

Our next panelist, Thaddeus Kowalski, is chief of Chicago's Office of the Public Defender where he has worked since 1964. And he is a member of the Illinois Commission on Human Relations.

He was National Chairman of the Polish-American Congress Anti-Defamation committee, and was president of that organization's Illinois division.

He had discussed defamation problems frequently on radio and television, and has filed a test case against a major network, alleging ethnic defamation.

I hope you make reference to that case in your delivery.

Go ahead.

RESPONSE OF THADDEUS L. KOWALSKI

I intend to confine my paper to the area that I am particularly interested in and knowledgeable, that is defamation on television. Southern and Eastern Europeans have been shown in an unfavorable image, i.e., stereotyped negatively by the television media, in movies, but primarily by television. Television is extremely important because it enters everyone's home. Unannounced, it is there. Historically, I think beginning in 1968, Vice President Agnew, while campaigning, used a term, "Polack," on television, which is a slanderous term. His statement was picked up by the newspapers, and Bob Hope began using the term "Polack" on television. It just sort of became acceptable

from that point on, historically. We have come to know that as “the dumb Polish jokes” from that point on. So from 1968 on, over ten years now, Eastern and Southern Europeans, especially Polish-Americans, have been ridiculed on TV in a most defamatory way. Certainly, the years from 1972 to 1975 were the worst. Each network had these jokes. They portrayed Polish-Americans in a negative image. The names of the comedians in situation comedies are numerous, some of them are: “All in the Family,” Bob Hope, Redd Foxx, Carol Burnett, Monty Python, Dick Cavett, “Don Rickles Show,” Steve Allen, and numerous others. Professor Gambino describes the nativist philosophy in his excellent paper. The nativist philosophy is the motivating force behind these jokes, and expresses the prejudices of the nativists on prime-time TV.

In 1972, I became so disgusted with the ethnic genocide being thrust upon the Polish-American community in the name of humor, I reacted by becoming the national chairman of the Anti-Defamation Committee of the Polish-American Congress. I was not in the Polish-American organized community prior to these jokes being aired on TV. As a lawyer, I saw the hypocrisy that was being perpetrated by our three networks, ABC, CBS, and NBC. As the national chairman, I wrote an anti-defamation guide; it had four printings between the years of 1971 and 1975, and was distributed throughout the United States to Polish-Americans. The sense of degradation felt by the Polish-American community at that time and now are very deep and are very divisive. There is a basic difference at laughing at someone and with someone. The Polish joke and the Italian jokes are jokes against ethnic groups. I don't laugh with them. They are degrading and humiliating. They result in ethnic genocide. These jokes on TV enter everyone's home, and that is a basic difference between them and a social joke that is confined to a small social group.

What effect have these jokes had on the Polish-Americans especially younger children? Psychological trauma, a feeling of inferiority, second class citizenship. Their classmates also see the Polish-Americans or the Italian-Americans as inferior as a result of these jokes. I took a survey of the sophomores at Glenbrook West High School, in Glenview, a suburb of Chicago and of a high school in Miami, Florida. In a series of questions, and with written responses, I asked these students what effect television had in creating a strong negative image of their Polish-American classmates? The result was the TV was the primary instrument in forming their negative opinion.

I am a lawyer and not a sociologist, and I am angry. Why should this ethnic genocide of Polish-Americans and Italian-Americans, and the Mafia stereotype, continue to be perpetrated upon us, and why should we be made, as a result, second-class citizens? Are the three

networks the primary perpetrators of this ethnic genocide? Yes, there is no question of it. They are aware of what they have done and are doing. The networks are unwilling to change. I personally have spoken to the representatives of every network from 1972 on. I have talked to producers, directors, vice presidents of programming, and legal counsel, in Chicago as well as in New York and Los Angeles. Very little sensitivity was shown by the networks. In fact after a particularly bad program in 1972 on an ABC TV network against Polish-Americans, I flew to New York, and I spoke to a vice president of ABC TV. After we discussed the program at length, I had a promise from him, that ABC TV would never do it again. A month later Steve Allen hosting the Dick Cavett Show had 15 minutes of the most degrading and humiliating Polish jokes. I filed suit shortly thereafter against ABC Television requesting "reply time", under the FCC regulations. We did not get our reply time for technical reasons, but we did go as far as the U.S. Supreme Court. But the suit conclusively showed the FCC as unwilling to assist in any way the Polish-American community. I requested the FCC to use their moral influence, which I thought would be important, because as a lawyer, I could see the problems of censorship under our freedom of speech. There is no legal way that the jokes can be stopped, but the moral influence of the FCC against these jokes would be great.

The U.S. Civil Rights Commission may consider the area of negative stereotyping in the media as a small issue compared to all the other areas of interest. But in TV stereotyping, the Commission can act immediately. It can commission a study to research the type, the extent, and the character of ethnic defamation on television, and the impact on the ethnic community and especially the psychological damage that these ten years of negative stereotyping has had on children. Children are especially prone to deep psychological trauma, negative self-image from the jokes. As a result of this study, the Commission can recommend actions to the President and Congress. I was particularly distressed when the 1977 Commission report on stereotyping in the media totally omitted the ethnic stereotyping of Polish-Americans or Italian-Americans who have been for more than 10 years the primary targets of stereotyping by the networks.

I hope the Commission will undertake this study and make the proper, legally feasible recommendations.

DISCUSSION

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Well, I would like to comment. I don't think I have a question, particularly, because I followed these presentations with great interest and have been very much impressed by them, and I don't have any doubt at all in my mind but that you

have put your finger on a very serious and important issue, because I increasingly am impressed with what the media, particularly the television media, can do in terms of what it can do to people, to persons who are members of certain groups.

I think the basic paper that has been prepared for us, and I think, the comments on the part of the two panelists will be very helpful to us in dealing with this particular issue, and, I think, it is one that cannot be – I just want express appreciation.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Vice Chairman Horn?

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. You mentioned, Mr. Kowalski, that your filing was, I assume dismissed for technical reasons?

MR. KOWALSKI. It was dismissed on technical reasons because the FCC and then the Appellate Court here in Chicago found that there was certain preconditions in order to get reply time, and that they found that the ethnic community was not, in essence, stereotyped, under their legal reasoning, we were not stereotyped.

Technically, under the FCC regulations, we were not stereotyped. You and I would look upon the stereotyping in another way, but under the legalese, it was not stereotyping; therefore, we were not entitled to reply time.

I wanted reply time because I realize that the freedom of speech and the Constitution was overwhelming. I certainly did not use censorship for that reason.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. That's been one of the arguments we have had with the FCC, and as you suggest in your own comments, it is obviously a very sensitive area that can be counterproductive to any group in society, if Government does intrude on program control and the degree to which it intrudes.

The argument has been over the degree to which the Federal Government should interfere with programming decisions that are made by networks in a free society, if we do not want to go down the road toward a propaganda ministry and having everything else being controlled out of Washington.

How do you and the people in the Polish American Anti-Defamation League deal with that question of the degree to which Government intrusion should come in the communications media through the Government's power to regulate the air waves?

MR. KOWALSKI. Well, I think we're very sensitive to that issue because of the fact that we do realize that you cannot – we cannot, have censorship in America. At the same time, we have this problem, which I think we all consider an issue – negative stereotyping.

So how do we react with it? I think perhaps the ways I mentioned before – is the moral climate. If we can change, increase the sensitivity of Americans to this issue – just as the sensitivity of the Americans of

the problems of the black, the Hispanic and the Asian community has changed over these many years – has it not – so, too, we hope that the moral influence of many Governmental agencies, as well as others, will change the atmosphere, so this will not occur anymore, because censorship is not the answer, of course.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. Some have suggested that the election of a Polish Pope did more good to solve the problem than almost anything else.

Do you have any perception about that?

MR. KOWALSKI. My perception is, I think, that's the only positive thing I've seen on television, the positive image, as Christine spoke of. You never see any positive image of any sort.

Do you remember the time when you saw an Italian-American or Polish-American in a positive image lately, within the last 10 years on television? I don't remember one. I watch some television, not too much. It just isn't there.

But now it also brought up another issue. The Pope visiting the black community, visiting the Hispanic community, and other communities, he showed the tremendous pluralism and diversity of Americans, especially among Catholics, and this brings an issue of which we are all addressing ourselves to at this moment.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. If you could file with the Commission, if it would not be inconvenient, the actual brief in which you did raise this issue, I think it would be appreciated. We would like to include it as part of the consultation.

MR. KOWALSKI. I certainly will do that. May I just mention just one thing.

The television code, I don't know if you have seen that code, it has beautiful pronouncements in there, but they're all useless, because in them they say very clearly there should be no ethnic defamation and all that. In fact, the code, back in 1972 and 1973 was even stronger. I could show you how it began to be watered down year after year.

I have all these. It's totally useless. We cannot look to the television networks to do this.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. In your comments you referred to a possible leadership role on the part of the Federal Communications Commission.

MR. KOWALSKI. Well, not of the FCC – of this Commission.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Well, I thought, though, in your comments that you also associated the Federal Communications Commission with the possibility of a leadership role.

I would like to make that as a suggestion. In our last report, we bore down very heavily on the fact that the Federal Communications Commission has at various times found ways and means of exercising

leadership without imposing any regulatory decision on the networks, and we, of course, had to follow or walk a rather narrow line here, also, as between our concern about the stereotyping on the part of the networks, for example, and the First Amendment, because we're likewise very much concerned about protection of rights under the First Amendment; but the FCC, from time to time, has held hearings, for example, for the purpose of getting certain situations on top of the table without having in mind any possibility of following up with the issuance of an order, but for the purpose of getting the information on top of the table, and, I think, the children's -

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. I think you do face that delicate line with the FCC since it has regulatory power, which we do not have.

It is one thing for us to moralize on issues; it is quite another thing for an agency that controls whether or not you get a license to moralize with all the implications that might be drawn in the industry that "Unless we do what they say or imply, be it one commissioner or the whole Commission, then there goes our licence."

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. I appreciate that, and of course I'm reflecting a little bias that I have in the direction of people in public office or government agencies from time to time exercising leadership on particular issues, even though they may not be in a position where they can issue regulations, and I appreciate -

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. If "leadership" is a euphemism for "censorship," then I'm against it.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Well, so am I, but if it's that; but on the other hand, I think it's possible to exercise that leadership without getting over into the realm of censorship.

Too often, I think public officials will back away from that kind of an opportunity.

DR. GAMBINO. I would like to suggest that freedom of speech and freedom of inquiry are also rights enjoyed by this Commission.

You are perfectly free to inquire into the practices of textbook publishers and the television and movie industries. You are perfectly free to issue results of those inquiries. You are perfectly free to make moral judgments and political judgments, if you will, on those inquiries.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Commissioner Horn and I are not discussing what this Commission could do at all. Our dialogue related to the Federal Communications.

You summed up very effectively what we can do.

DR. GAMBINO. I understand, but the same red herring will be raised if you do it, that you are bridging the First Amendment rights.

VICE CHAIRMAN HORN. But we're Governmentally approved gadflies, so we have the sanction of Congress to do the things we do.

DR. GAMBINO. I'm suggesting that you increase your sting.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. Well, the situation is not unique. We do it all the time.

A Mexican ruffian bandit as descriptive of Mexican Americans was eliminated from the TV screen as a negative stereotype. I think they were advertising a Mexican food product some years ago.

Everybody thought it was real funny, excepting the Mexican Americans, so what they did was boycotted the product, boycotted and organized, and this Frito Bandito disappeared from the market, and later on, apparently it was effective, because they attempted to introduce other matters of that type, and there was already an organization existing which was effective.

Mr. White?

ASSISTANT STAFF DIRECTOR WHITE. Mr. Kowalski, I have another question that I wanted to ask you.

First, when you talked with the agency officials, as a lawyer, did it occur to you to get that promise in writing?

MR. KOWALSKI. Yes, it did occur to me. The vice president would put nothing in writing. He would put nothing in writing, and as a result, it was just more a statement from him to me and my associates that he wouldn't do that, and unfortunately, of course, it happened.

We have to look upon what are the basic premises of what the networks work for.

If they work - if their basic thrust is that of profit, then it's profit motivation, whichever - which motivates them, and if they get the best in this ethnic stereotyping, they'll continue that. They will continue to do that.

ASSISTANT STAFF DIRECTOR WHITE. The question I did want to ask you is whether in your talks with the networks officials, ABC, CBS, NBC, whether you discussed the employment patterns with them.

MR. KOWALSKI. Oh, yes, we certainly did, and the answers we got were very similar to the answers that the blacks and the Hispanics and the Asians received just before us; namely, you don't have any qualified people. I know that was told to the blacks and Hispanics, because I've spoken to their members.

And the same thing was raised again. You'd think by then that networks would learn a new line, but they didn't.

When we came in there, they told us the same thing all over again, and that's still their official pronouncement to this day, that we have no qualified people.

All of a sudden, in Chicago, they found qualified people. They found qualified blacks when they had to. They found qualified Hispanics and Asians - all of a sudden, out of the woodwork, as if miraculously, they appeared.

It was their own ineptitude and insensitivity which was their handicap and remains still.

COMMISSIONER RUIZ. I'll have to interrupt at this time because our time is passing.

For our eighth panel, on intergovernmental relations and ethnicity, I'll return the chair back to the Chairman.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Just before the panel breaks up, I'd just like to kind of - the dialogue I was having with Mr. Gambino on the role of this Commission, because, as I indicated to you, I felt that you very accurately summarized the role of this Commission and the role that the Commission has played down through the years.

I happened to be serving in the Cabinet in 1956 when the Cabinet, along with President Eisenhower, was considering making a recommendation to the Congress for a creation of a Commission on Civil Rights.

The late President was very much interested in seeing such a Commission come into existence.

Some of my colleagues said to him, "You could do this by Executive Order. You don't need to ask for legislation."

His reply was, "I think the time has come to bring into existence a body that could get the facts on top of the table." He said, "If they're going to be able to do that, there will be times when they'll need the right to subpoena witness and put them under oath, and the only way we can confer that right is by going to the Congress."

But he kept reiterating the time has come to get the facts on top of the table, and then on the basis of getting them on top of the table, arrive at findings and recommendations which are made to the President and to Congress.

So I just want to say to you that we share your summary. It is the role of the Commission and has been in the 22-odd years that the Commission has been functioning.

Thank you all very, very much, all three of you, for your contributions.

Eight Session: Intergovernmental Relations and Ethnicity

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. I now - our last subject matter of discussion, particular subject matter area, deals with intergovernmental relations and I've asked Commissioner Saltzman to preside during that discussion.

Commissioner Saltzman.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Myron B. Kuropas will be our presenter. He is presently principal of the Rosette Middle School in Dekalb, IL.

During the last year of the Ford Administration, he served as special assistant to the President for Ethnic Affairs. His efforts there resulted in a series of ethnic White House conferences, the creation of Presidential and multiagency policy-review boards and increased emphasis on ethnic priorities in several Federal agencies.

For three years prior to that appointment, he was the Chicago regional director for ACTION, the Federal umbrella agency for numerous volunteer efforts.

He holds B.A. and M.A. degrees in Psychology and a Ph.D. in Education.

Dr. Kuropas, it's nice to have you.

**STATEMENT OF MYRON B. KUROPAS,
SUPREME VICE-PRESIDENT,
UKRAINIAN NATIONAL ASSOCIATION**

Thank you very much, Rabbi.

The purpose of my remarks this afternoon will be: one, to identify those factors which have had an influence and continue to influence government policies and programs related to ethnic and immigrant groups in America during the past 100 years; two, to describe briefly a relatively successful intergovernmental communication model which improved Federal relationships with American ethnic groups during the 1970's; and three, to define those issues which I believe will be of significance to Euro-ethnic Americans during the 1980's, focusing on the significance of the 1980 census in helping to determine what the governmental responses will be to these various issues.

For the first 200 years of American history, three conceptual models or ideologies, namely, Anglo-conformity, the melting pot, and cultural pluralism, have competed with each other in American thinking to explain the way a nation, which started out largely white, Anglo-Saxon, and of the Protestant faith, has absorbed 42 million immigrants and their descendants.

One might say that on the whole, and by what seems to be long established custom, public policy has tended to define ethnic diversity as a "problem," that is, an impediment to the maintenance of a cohesive social order.

The focus of much of Government policy has been on what Joshua A. Fishman has termed the "disappearance phenomenon," that is, the process by which ethnic groups have become assimilated into American core society and the rapidity with which various governmental intervention programs have helped these groups in becoming culturally indistinguishable.

To a great degree, of course, Government policy has been a reflection of American public opinion.

When, in the late 1800's, the so-called new immigrants, that is, those who came to these shores from southern and eastern Europe, demonstrated resistance to the melting pot process, the Government addressed the problem at its source.

The Federal establishment simply passed a series of exclusionary immigration laws which began with the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and culminated with the Johnson-Reed Act of 1924.

When certain ethnic groups already living in America continued to preserve their heritage, their language, and their values, public opinion demanded an affirmation of loyalty to the United States.

"There is no room in this country for hyphenated Americanism," declared former President Theodore Roosevelt in 1915.

"America for Americans," echoed a host of citizens who supported instant amalgamation.

And as the drum beats of the Americanization movement became more strident, there were certain excesses and certain attacks upon the foreign element.

Some of the more nefarious results of this melting pot mind-set were the persecutions of German-Americans during World War I, the various abominations of the Ku Klux Klan during the 1920's, the investigations of foreigners by the House Un-American Activities Committee of Congressman Dies in the 1930's, and of course, the internment of Japanese-Americans during the 1940's.

Two generations of young ethnic Americans, meanwhile, were educated in American public schools where they were made to feel less than American if they spoke a foreign language or ate foreign foods, or sang foreign-language songs, or responded to ethnic values and customs.

There was a public policy shift during the 1960's when the so-called ethnic problem was redefined for the visible minorities.

There was an argument that stated that some ethnic groups could not disappear because they were "culturally" deprived and "suffered" from certain racial characteristics which resulted in economic discrimination.

The Federal establishment began to devise new strategies which would enable the melting pot to function more effectively for these particular groups.

At the root of the problem, the policy makers decided, was racism and poverty, and what was needed, they concluded, was an all-out, two-pronged Government effort that would eliminate both in the shortest period of time.

There was a new era of Government involvement with ethnicity, with the great society programs of the 1960's. Ethnic assimilation was now to be accomplished through greater economic and educational opportunities, through improved housing, and through more efficient social delivery systems.

When, in the late 1960's, the expectations and promises of the Federal establishment proved to be unrealistic, frustrated blacks took to the streets to accentuate their rights.

Studying the causes of the civil disorders which rocked the United States during this period of time, the Kerner Commission concluded that America was rapidly approaching two separate societies, one white and one black.

The solution, the Commission suggested, was to be found in an expansion of higher education opportunities for minorities, the elimination of *de facto* segregation, the increase of funds for low-interest loans in the inner city, and the expansion of minority job opportunities in the private and public sectors through the elimination of racial discrimination.

The Commission cited the Coleman Report, which, it reasoned, called for an intensification of efforts to bring about truly integrated and, therefore, superior education for inner-city children.

Bringing minorities into the mainstream was the general thrust of both the Kerner and Coleman reports, and both were in the best melting pot tradition: the elimination of an ethnic problem through assimilation. During the 1970's, busing and affirmative action became the major means for achieving this end.

But there was a second ethnic phenomenon which occurred during the 1960's which, although precipitated by rising black awareness, evolved along significantly different ideological lines.

This ethnic stream came to be identified as the new pluralism, and it was anti-melting pot in both spirit and orientation. And in contrast to the assimilationists, the new pluralists viewed ethnicity as a resource, rather than a problem.

A turning point for ethnic Americans and the single most significant accomplishment of the new pluralists during this early phase of their activity was the passage of the Ethnic Heritage Studies Act of 1971.

For the first time in our history, the Federal establishment was willing to fund educational programs which perpetuated and developed America's rich ethno-cultural legacy.

Welcomed as a cool rain after a very long and a very hot dry spell, this Act was perceived by many Euro-ethnics as an event which signaled the demise of the melting pot as an American societal idea.

They believed that cultural pluralism would soon become the standard by which all public policy would be evaluated.

So confident were some pluralists of their perception that they predicted the 1970's would go down in American history as the decade of the ethnic. They were exuberant over the success of the other minorities, and some of them began to dream of new and natural coalitions of ethnics and minorities which would lead America into a new era of brotherhood and understanding.

The 1970's, of course, never lived up to pluralist expectations. For some people they are now viewed as an era of reversal. Some ethnics believe it was they and not the Anglo-Saxon power structure that had to pay the price for America's past policies of racial discrimination.

Euro-ethnics have watched their lovingly preserved neighborhoods destroyed by very ill-conceived and poorly managed Government housing programs. They have watched their children bused to schools in communities that really didn't want them.

Supreme Court rulings notwithstanding, many Euro-ethnics still believe affirmative action programs are a form of reverse discrimination which penalizes those who are least able to absorb the socio-economic loss.

After 20 years of attempting to sensitize the Federal establishment to the values of the pluralistic model, the pleas of Euro-ethnics to the Government are either politely ignored or dismissed as racist in effect. The melting pot lives on.

There is, of course, at least one other way of going about the Government's business, and it was tried with mixed success in the White House during the Ford Administration.

This approach is based on two important premises: number one, that every significant segment of the American polity has a right to be heard when Government policies and programs which affect their lives are being considered; and two, bureaucratic arrogance and indifference can be best addressed in an authoritative and, if necessary, an authoritarian manner when it becomes insensitive to group needs.

In dealing with ethnic Americans, the White House made certain assumptions with reference to the way communication was going to be established: The first assumption was that most self-conscious ethnics belong to some type of religious, social, fraternal, political, or other organization in their ethnic community. The second assumption was that the articulated goals and objectives of various ethnic organizations are reflections of the goals and objectives of its members. The third assumption was that the elected officers of the various ethnic organizations are people who are most in tune with the needs and sentiments of the membership. And four, that in listening to elected ethnic leaders, one can begin to understand and to appreciate ethnic concerns.

Once the significant ethnic organizations were identified, their leaders were invited to the White House and they were asked to identify the major issues of 1976 for ethnic communities. They were, in order of their priority: number one, neighborhood revitalization; number two, education and ethnicity; number three, the 1980 census; and number four, Federal social service delivery systems.

Dealing with the issues involved a well-defined process which included the following steps: Step No. 1: The particular issue was defined and a position paper was prepared by a representative of the ethnic community who was believed to be qualified to deal with the concern; every effort was made to have the paper include specific recommendations which the Federal Government would be able to follow in developing a solution. Step No. 2: The position paper was circulated among those Federal agencies which were or could be involved in the solution. The paper was usually delivered to the ranking person in the agency and it was made clear that the President was interested in their response. Step No. 3: Federal responses were monitored and, if necessary, negotiated to make certain that the problem or need was being addressed in a proper manner. Step No. 4: The President was briefed regarding the concern and the proposed Federal response. Step No. 5: Ethnic leaders most involved with the problem were invited to the White House where the position paper was read, where agency heads had an opportunity to respond, and where invitees had an opportunity to react. The President, of course, usually met all participants to inform them of his intentions to assure that all recommendations were acted upon at the earliest opportunity.

The Special Assistant for Ethnic Affairs monitored the Federal agencies involved with the solutions to see if further Federal assistance was required.

One of the conferences, as I have mentioned, dealt with the 1980 census, and the person who developed the paper for that conclave was Dr. Michael Novak.

He stated that it was necessary to have much better data on America's ethnic groups for the following reasons:

No. 1. - Serious understanding, public comprehension, and a meaningful Government policy require an accurate profile of the American people; No. 2 - for better or for worse, statistical profiles of group characteristics are being used by the courts and by Federal agencies to award various entitlements and to develop social programs. Inaccurate data can lead to certain penalties; and the designations "foreign stock," "country of birth," and "mother tongue" used to identify ethnics in 1970 were inadequate to include America's many diverse groups.

We had a response from the Bureau of the Census, and one of the respondents in 1976, Mrs. McKenney, is here with us. I shall not dwell on the other points made by Dr. Novak. Mrs. McKenney has had access to my paper, and, in order to save time, I will skip over this section and allow her to address the various issues dealing with the 1980 census and with the various ethnic groups in the United States.

What about the importance of the 1980 census? In my mind, the importance of the census upon the direction of American public policy development cannot be overestimated. If the census is conducted and analyzed from a pluralistic perspective, that is, in an effort to truly determine the full scope of cultural and social diversity in this country, then the results should demonstrate, quite conclusively, I believe, that many ethnic Americans did not melt into mainstream American life but retained, instead, a certain degree of cultural and behavioral identification with their ethnic heritage.

If the 1980 census demonstrates that the United States is, indeed, not a melting pot for all Americans, the implications for public policy could be enormous.

The acceptance of a pluralistic ideal may mean a re-evaluation of our approach to a number of issues.

The term "minority" may have to be either eliminated as a functionally meaningless term – all of us are minorities in the United States, even Anglo-Saxons – or expanded to include all groups who have been, for a variety of discriminatory reasons, denied an opportunity to attain equal status and representation in our society.

Another real issue that may emerge as a result of the 1980 census will be something that many of us have realized, and that is that the Federal Government – that is, the Federal establishment, the Federal bureaucracy – is not representative of the population it is intended to serve.

If the 1980 census suggests that national percentages for ethnic groups are higher than they are in the Federal bureaucracy, then it may be necessary to institute a recruiting campaign which would enable our Government to become more representative of and, hopefully, more sensitive to diverse group needs.

There may have to be a need, as the result of the 1980 census, to change the Government decision-making models that have been functioning up until this time. One of these models has already been suggested.

Utilizing the particular approach or the model – and there are many variations of it – would guarantee the inclusion of all groups affected by Government programs in the process.

In a pluralistic society, no single group should dominate the focus of Government social programs. The major objective should be consen-

sus among blacks, Hispanic Americans, women, youth, ethnics, and other major constituencies directly affected.

There might also be a need for a greater decentralization of the Federal bureaucracy. Another of the frequent complaints of almost all segments of our society has been the frequent inability of our Washington-based bureaucracy to make programmatic allowances for local variance.

The problem with uniform, rational, comprehensive solutions is that they are biased towards the unitary answer. But ours is a diverse society with differing local needs and resources.

The decentralization of the Federal bureaucracy may have to be part of the answer derived from the 1980 census.

And finally, in the area of public policy development, once the Government agency personnel have become more representative and tolerant of diversity, once a consensus model has been developed, once local variation has been taken care of through decentralization, then the next and final step would be to develop a clear rationale for the actual development of public policy.

During the 1980's, many issues will emerge to compete for the attention of governmental agencies. But if I were to select a single philosophy that would best serve the nation during this period, it would be one that was based on an ideological commitment to the strengthening of local institutions such as the family, the neighborhood, the Church, and the voluntary organization.

The age of big Government and Federal entitlements, I'm afraid, is here to stay. But in a society which is predicated on a melting pot rationale, as we have seen, bureaucrats tend to be biased towards unitary solutions and final answers.

The challenge of pluralistic public policy development, on the other hand, is to search for alternative local service delivery systems, to take steps to strengthen them, and to embrace the multitude of particular interests which constitute our particular polity.

The family, as we know, has been discussed. Much has been written about it. The Federal Government is presently involved with it. If you have any doubts that the American family is in trouble, then the recent decision by President Carter to establish an office for families in the Department of Health and Human Resources should serve to remove all doubt.

I'm very fearful of the department that's going to address the family. Given the totalitarian approach of the Federal Government up until now - the Government's melting pot mind-set - this particular bureau, if not monitored properly, could do more damage to the family than all the other actions that have been taken against the family within recent years.

The neighborhood, of course, has been already mentioned. Much has been said about it, I shall not dwell on this subject.

Religious institutions are also worthy of our concern in a pluralistic society. My fear in this regard is not that the Church will take over the functions of the State. My concern is that the State, in dictating standardized beliefs and values, will take over the functions of the Church. Our personal sense of identity, our values, our customs, and our perceptions of the meaning of life in an increasingly materialistic, uncaring, and narcissistic society are enhanced by a belief in a Supreme Being.

Voluntary associations are also beginning to erode in a society where the Government is willing to take on more and more of the responsibility for the social ills which beset us. Individual initiative is being destroyed in the process. Ethnics are especially concerned by this turn of events because the voluntary association has played such an important role in their lives. Voluntary associations represent the bedrock of ethnic communal life.

Today, America is faced with a crisis of will. Most Government programs which have been directed at ethnic groups have failed.

The poor are still with us, but we no longer wish to discuss poverty, let alone fight it.

Discrimination still exists, and we are closer than ever to two, some say three, separate societies.

We are disillusioned with the past. We have little faith in the future. The 1980's do not seem very promising. And yet, there is hope.

We can learn from the mistakes of the past. We can adopt a pluralistic ideology in our approach to social policy development. We can develop a disposition to preserve those institutions which stood the test of time and which still have much to offer in a pluralistic society.

We can learn to avoid totalitarian solutions. Decision-making models do exist. It is not too late. Next time, we can do it right.

Thank you.

[The complete paper follows.]

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS AND ETHNICITY

By Myron B. Kuropas, Ph.D.*

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to:

1. Identify those factors which have influenced and continue to influence Government policies and programs related to ethnic and immigrant groups in America during the past 100 years, and to analyze the attitudes and behaviors of those who are presently involved in their implementation.
2. Briefly describe a relatively successful inter-governmental communication model which improved Federal relationships with American ethnic groups during the 1970's and discuss how it was used to clarify ethnic concerns regarding the 1980 census.
3. Define issues which the author believes will be of significance to ethnic Americans during the 1980's, focusing on the significance of the 1980 census in determining governmental responses to these issues.

Factors

For the first 200 years of American history three conceptual models or ideologies - namely Anglo-conformity, the melting pot, and cultural pluralism - have competed with each other in American thinking to explain the way a nation, in the beginning largely white, Anglo-Saxon, and Protestant, has absorbed 42 million immigrants and their descendants.¹ On the whole, and by what seems to be long established custom, public policy has tended to define ethnic diversity as a "problem," an impediment if you will, to the maintenance of a cohesive social order. The focus has been on what Joshua A. Fishman has termed the "disappearance phenomenon."² that is, the process by which ethnic groups become assimilated into American core society and the rapidity with which Governmental intervention can assist these groups in becoming culturally indistinguishable.

To a great degree, of course, Government policy has been a reflection of public opinion. When, in the late 1800's, the so-called

* Supreme Vice-President, Ukrainian National Association and Former Special Assistant to the President for Ethnic Affairs

¹ Milton M. Gordon, "Assimilation in America: Theory and Reality", *Daedalus* 90, No. 2 (1960), p. 263.

² Joshua A. Fishman, "The Historical and Social Contexts of an Inquiry Into Language Maintenance Efforts", *Language Loyalty in the United States*, ed. Joshua A. Fishman (The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1966), p. 21.

“new immigrants,” that is, those who came to these shores from Asia as well as from southern and eastern Europe, demonstrated a resistance to the melting pot process, the government addressed the “problem” at its source. The Federal establishment simply passed a series of exclusionary immigration laws which began with the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and culminated with the Johnson-Reed Act of 1924.³ When certain ethnic groups living in America continued to preserve their heritage, their language, and their values, public opinion demanded a reaffirmation of loyalty to the United States. “There is no room in this country for hyphenated Americanism” declared President Theodore Roosevelt in 1915.⁴ “America for Americans” echoes a host of citizens who demanded instant amalgamation. As the drum-beats of the Americanization movement became more strident, excesses against the so-called “foreign element” became more common. The more nefarious results of this melting pot mind-set were the persecutions of German-Americans during World War I, the abominations of the Ku Klux Klan during the 1920’s, the investigations of “foreigners” by the Dies House Un-American Activities Committee during the 1930’s, and the internment of Japanese-Americans during the 1940’s.⁵ Two generations of young ethnic Americans, meanwhile, were educated in public schools where they were made to feel “less than American” if they spoke a foreign language, ate foreign foods, sang foreign language songs, or responded to ethnic values and customs.

Past acceptance of the melting pot ideal by America’s academic community helped confirm its ideological legitimacy. Concentrating their attention on the disruptive effects of successive immigrations on American societal cohesion, historians praised the early frontier as the “crucible” of fusion and liberation⁶ and argued that the melting pot served a similar purpose in that its major function was to “spiritually transform” new immigrants.⁷ Following a similar line of reasoning, sociologists focused on the debilitating aspects of culture conflict between first generation immigrants and their children, demonstrating little interest in the social benefits of cultural diversity.⁸ Psychologists adopted the concept of “conflicting role orientations” as their frame of reference for the study of the ethnic phenomenon, ignoring the psychic value which could accrue to those whose self-concept was based on a strong cultural identity.⁹ Educators, concerned with both

³ Edward G. Hartmann, *American Immigration* (Minneapolis: Lerner Publications Co., 1979), pp. 90-107.

⁴ Arthur Mann, *Immigrants in American Life* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1974), p. 180.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 147-168.

⁶ Frederick Jackson Turner, *The Frontier in American History* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1920), pp. 22-23.

⁷ Hans Kohn, *American Nationalism* (New York: Collier Books, 1961), pp. 22-23.

⁸ See Robert Ezra Park, *Race and Culture* (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1950).

⁹ See Irvin Child, *Italian or American?* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943), pp. 87-187.

the maintenance of a cohesive social order and the elimination of culture conflict, also became involved with the disappearance phenomenon. For scholars such as Professor Elwood P. Cubberly, “to Americanize” meant “to assimilate and amalgamate” immigrants “as part of our American race and to implant in their children, so far as can be done, the Anglo-Saxon conception of righteousness, law and order, and popular government, and to awaken in them a reverence for our democratic institutions and for those things in our national life which we as a people hold to be of abiding worth.”¹⁰ In practice, the ultimate success of the American public school came to be defined in terms of its ability to maintain Anglo-Saxon cultural dominance.

The direction of public policy development began to shift during the 1960’s when it became increasingly obvious that some ethnic groups – most notably the visible minorities – could not “disappear” into the Anglo-Saxon mainstream. Adopting an approach that was ostensibly more sensitive to individual group differences, the Federal establishment reviewed the status of certain minorities in America and concluded that direct Federal involvement was necessary if assimilation was ever to be fully achieved. Accelerating a program of racial liberalization which began in the 1930’s with efforts by Federal administrators to include blacks in at least some of the benefits of the New Deal¹¹ and culminating in the 1954 Supreme Court decision declaring *de jure* school segregation unconstitutional, the Federal establishment became more intensely involved with the future economic well-being of America’s visible minorities. The intent was laudatory. Believing that racism and poverty were at the root of the minority “problem,” the Federal Government focused on actions which would permit minorities to become economically indistinguishable as the first step in the assimilation process. To make the melting pot work for these groups, a plethora of Great Society programs were initiated and implemented. The high points of this monumental effort were the creation of the Office of Economic Opportunity in 1964 and the passage of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Act of 1966. The emphasis was on the amalgamation of minorities through greater economic and educational opportunities, improved housing, and more efficient social delivery systems. As welfare rights became a national issue, new bureaucracies came into existence to deal with the burgeoning number of welfare recipients.¹² When, in the late 1960’s, the expectations and promises of Federal social engineers proved unrealistic, blacks took to the streets to accentuate their rights.

¹⁰ Cited in Lawrence Cremin, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education* (New York: Random House, 1961), p. 68.

¹¹ Francis Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward, *Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1971), p. 232.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 242-282.

Studying the causes of the civil disorders which rocked the United States during this period, The Kerner Commission concluded that America was rapidly approaching two increasingly separate societies – one white, the other black. The solution, the Commission suggested, was to be found in an expansion of higher education opportunities for minorities, the elimination of *de facto* segregation, an increase of funds for low interest loans in the inner city, and an expansion of minority job opportunities in the private and public sectors through the elimination of racial discrimination. The Commission cited the Coleman Report which, it reasoned, called for an intensification of efforts to bring about truly integrated – and therefore superior – education for inner-city children.¹³ Bringing minorities into the mainstream was the general thrust of both the Kerner and Coleman reports and both were in the best melting-pot tradition – the elimination of an ethnic “problem” through assimilation. During the 1970’s, busing and affirmative action became the major means for achieving this same objective.

But there was a second ethnic phenomenon which occurred during the 1960’s which, although precipitated by rising black awareness, evolved along significantly different ideological lines. *This* ethnic stream came to be identified as the “new pluralism” and it was anti-melting pot in both orientation and spirit. In its initial phases, it was essentially cultural in focus and concentrated on the need of ethnic minorities to achieve a sense of the legitimacy of their ethnic diversity. The new pluralists were not interested in assimilation or amalgamation. On the contrary, their major concern was with the perpetuation of their unique heritage. As the 1960’s came to an end, certain other ethnic groups, following the lead of the visible minorities, began to demand a greater sensitivity and responsiveness from the Federal Government.

A turning point for ethnic Americans, and the single most important accomplishment of the new pluralists during this early phase of their activity, was the passage of the Ethnic Heritage Studies Act of 1971 which provided, for the first time in our history, a federally funded program for the preservation and development of America’s rich ethno-cultural legacy. Welcomed as a cool rain after a long and hot dry spell, this act was perceived by many ethnic leaders as an event which signaled the demise of the melting pot as an American societal ideal. Cultural pluralism, they concluded, was now to be the standard for social policy development within the Federal establishment. So confident were some pluralists of this belief that they predicted that the 1970’s would go down in American history as the “Decade of the Ethnic.” Exuberant over the success of other minorities in gaining

¹³ *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* (New York: Bantam Books, 1968), pp. 410-482.

their rights, many pluralist leaders began to dream of new and natural coalitions of ethnics and minorities which would lead America into a new era of brotherhood and understanding.

The 1970's, of course, never lived up to pluralist expectations. If anything, they are now viewed as an era of reversal by some ethnics who believe it was they – and not the Anglo-Saxon power structure – who had to pay the greatest price for America's past policies of racial discrimination. This perception is especially difficult to accept in light of the fact that discrimination because of national origin does not appear to have changed substantially during the past 20 years. Some American ethnic groups have watched their lovingly preserved neighborhoods destroyed by ill-conceived and poorly administered Government housing programs. They have been forced to permit the busing of their children to schools located in communities that really didn't want them. Supreme Court decisions notwithstanding, they still believe affirmative-action programs are really a form of reverse discrimination which penalizes those who are least able to absorb the socio-economic penalty. And yet, despite two decades of efforts to sensitize the Federal bureaucracy to the values of the pluralistic model, their pleas to their Government are either politely ignored or dismissed as racist in origin.

In concentrating on the evolution and nature of the Federal establishment's involvement with this Nation's ethnic minorities during the past twenty years, I wish to make it clear that it has not been my purpose to criticize depolarization, one of the major intents of that involvement. Discriminatory attitudes and behaviors among certain segments of our society were and continue to be a major obstacle to equal opportunity for all. Programs designed to reduce racial and ethnic animosities are laudatory and need to be continued. Not all federally directed or inspired programs have achieved this noble aim, however. Some, unfortunately, have resulted in greater polarization, less opportunity for some, and greater ethnic alienation. What is even more disconcerting is that blacks and other minorities still feel left out of the mainstream. Urban schools still fail to provide a quality education for all. The poor are still with us. Whites are still fleeing the cities and we appear to be nearer the reality of two – some argue three – separate societies than ever before.

If the intent of federal intervention is not the cause of the present state of affairs, then what is? Part of the answer, I believe, can be found in the Federal approach, the philosophical frame of reference of the Federal establishment which makes it difficult, if not impossible, to view our nation as a social order built on local institutions – the family, the neighborhood, the Church, the voluntary association, the ethnic group – which form the basis of personal identity and communal

involvement. At best, the Federal decision-makers have merely failed to consider some of these institutions as resources in the strengthening and enrichment of our society. At worst, the federal establishment has engaged in actions which have weakened these institutions making it that much more difficult to effect cohesion and stability.

Attitudes and Behaviors

Today America is suffering from a crisis of will. We are disillusioned with Federal intervention and its ability to solve problems in a meaningful way. We are weary of social change. We have little faith in the future.

As far as some ethnics are concerned, one reason for this state of anomie can be traced to an attitude and a behavior on the part of Federal bureaucrats which can be best described as arrogance. It is an arrogance, they believe, which reflects a lack of familiarity with and sensitivity to the basic tenets of pluralism. While it has been possible to change the thinking of some American academics and other national opinion-makers, and even to get some of them to reject the melting pot as a viable American model, it has not been possible to change the attitudes and behaviors of the majority of Federal bureaucrats who have been and apparently still are firmly committed to ethnic disappearance. Most – and this includes blacks who have recently achieved a modicum of influence within the Federal system – continue to maintain and nurture an ethnocentric perception of the American polity which eschews cultural diversity. The present thrust towards socio-economic assimilation is based on an ideology which views ethnic differences as obstacles which must be overcome.

Diversity of all types – especially in Washington – appears to be outside of the daily experience of the Federal bureaucracy. Because of their relatively high pay and almost total economic security, most Federal decision-makers enjoy similar standards of living. Many have attended the same universities, live in similar non-ethnic neighborhoods, read the same newspapers and journals, travel in the same social circles, and adhere to the same social mores. What is more, they have a tendency to reproduce in a manner which virtually guarantees the perpetuation of the species. Every governmental bureaucracy subjects its recruits to an intensive socialization process aimed at the elimination of differences. To be successful, and to achieve tenure, recruits must become intimately familiar with the agency's mission, with the myriad procedures designed to fulfill that mission, with the importance of garnering Congressional support for the mission, and with the lexicon of "buzz words" which distinguish the bureaucrat from ordinary mortals. Dissidence is tolerated, but only to a degree. If one wishes to merely survive, one can afford to disagree on occasion.

If one wishes to get ahead, however, one plays the game. Even those who come into the agency with a clearly defined purpose are more often than not absorbed by the process of bureaucratization. Some delude themselves into believing that they must play the game until they can make it up the ranks – presumably to a more significant decision-making level. In far too many instances, however, by the time these well-intentioned bureaucrats attain greater status, both the desire and the ability to go against the tide has been severely diminished. Those who start at the top – usually as a result of an outside appointment – are quickly eaten up by the system. Small wonder that the average tenure for high-level Government appointees is approximately eighteen months. The bureaucracy and its need to maintain ideological homeostasis remains unchanged.

A Model For Pluralistic Decision Making In The Federal Government

There is, of course, at least one other way of going about the Government's business, and it was tried, albeit with mixed success, in the White House during the Ford administration. This approach is based on two important premises:

1. Every significant segment of the American polity has a right to be heard when Government and programs which affect their lives are being considered.
2. Bureaucratic arrogance can be best addressed in an authoritative – and, if necessary, an authoritarian – manner when it becomes insensitive to group needs.

The White House model of which I speak was developed by William J. Baroody, Jr. during his tenure as Director of the White House Office of Public Liaison (OPL). The Office consisted of special assistants to the President, each of whom was charged with liaison activities with one of the following groups: women, minorities or blacks, Hispanic-Americans, and ethnics. In addition, there were also individuals who dealt with youth, business and professional groups, and other special interest coalitions that were functioning at that time. It was understood that all OPL contact was to be developed without regard for politically partisan affiliations.

The objectives of each liaison person were to:

1. Serve as a direct two-way communication link between the White House and significant constituencies.
2. Keep the President informed of major issues and concerns within their respective constituencies.
3. Participate in the development of Government strategies which addressed major constituent concerns.

4. Sensitize governmental agencies to the existence of various constituencies, their concerns, and the need to develop strategies which address them.

In dealing with ethnic Americans, certain assumptions were made concerning the manner in which communication was established:

Assumption 1. Most self-conscious ethnics belong to some type of religious, social, fraternal, political, or other organization in their ethnic community.

Assumption 2. The articulated goals and objectives of various ethnic organizations are reflections of the goals and objectives of its members.

Assumption 3. The elected officers of ethnic organizations are people who are most in tune with the needs and sentiments of the membership.

Assumption 4. In listening to elected ethnic leaders, one can begin to understand and appreciate ethnic concerns.

Once the significant ethnic organizations were identified, their leaders were invited to the White House to meet President Ford and, more importantly, to identify their major concerns. During 1976, four domestic and three foreign policy issues were identified by a majority of ethnic leaders, and each was addressed by means of a conference either in the White House or the State Department. In order of priority, the domestic concerns included:

1. Neighborhood revitalization
2. Education
3. The 1980 census
4. Federal social service delivery systems

Dealing with the issues involved a well-defined process which included the following steps:

Step 1. The issue was defined and a position paper was prepared by a representative of the ethnic community who was believed to be qualified to deal with the concern. Every effort was made to have the paper include specific recommendations which the Federal Government could follow in developing a solution.

Step 2. The position paper was circulated among those Federal agencies which were or could be involved in the solution. The paper was usually delivered to the ranking person in the agency – either Cabinet Secretary or the Director – and it was made clear that the *President* was interested in a response.

Step 3. Federal responses were monitored and, if necessary, negotiated to make certain that the problem or need was being addressed adequately.

Step 4. The President was briefed regarding the concern and the proposed Federal response.

Step 5. Ethnic leaders most involved with the problem were invited to the White House where the position paper was read, agency heads responded, and the invitees reacted. The President usually met all participants to inform them of his intentions to make certain all recommendations were acted upon at the earliest opportunity.

Step 6. The Office of Public Liaison monitored the Federal agencies involved with solutions to see if further assistance was required.

Reflecting back on our successes and failures, I believe our successes – and they were by no means overwhelming – were due to our use of a pluralistic, non-confrontation model which identified the problems and suggested solutions in a dispassionate, organized, and well-documented manner, permitted Federal officials to respond in a similar fashion, and, perhaps most important of all, made full use of the power of the Presidency to overcome bureaucratic arrogance which existed, we learned to our dismay, within both the Federal establishment and the White House itself. Our failures, as one might suspect, were due mainly to our inability to overcome bureaucratic resistance even with the assistance of whatever power was perceived as residing in the Oval Office.

The OPL Model And The 1980 Census

The Office of Public Liaison began to address the 1980 census issue early in June of 1976. A position paper was prepared and read by Dr. Michael Novak¹⁴ who emphasized that the census was important to America's ethnic groups for the following reasons:

1. Scientific understanding, public comprehension, and meaningful government policy development require an accurate profile of the American people. "Ours is a complex population," stated Dr. Novak, "not accurately grasped by simple slogans. There are many mythical views of the population and many popular misconceptions." We may imagine "a mainstream that doesn't exist, for example, or have a misleading image of how large or small one part of the population is." An example one could cite in this regard is the feeling that most of us have that our society is dominated by Anglo-Saxons when, in reality, they are in the minority.

2. For better or for worse, statistical profiles of group characteristics are being used by courts and Federal agencies to award various "entitlements" and to develop social programs. Inaccurate data can lead to penalties. An example one could cite here is the perception that during the 1970 census, certain minority groups were undercounted, resulting in a loss of Federal funding. According to data presented to the House Subcommittee on Census and Population in 1976, it was

¹⁴ Remarks of Dr. Michael Novak, White House Conference on Ethnicity and the 1980 Census, Washington, D.C., June 1, 1976.

estimated that the State of Illinois was undercounted by some 300,000 persons in 1970. Chicago accounted for 131,337 of that total, of which approximately 88,000 were racial minorities. The "loss" in revenue sharing funds was an estimated \$2 1/2 million.¹⁵

3. The designations "foreign stock," "country of birth," and "mother tongue" used to identify ethnics in 1970 were inadequate to include America's many diverse ethnic groups. The "foreign stock" designation did not include third- and fourth- generation ethnic Americans who still consciously identified with their ethnic community. The term "country of birth" usually referred to nation-states in existence in 1970. Interpreting the designation U.S.S.R. to mean "Russian," for example, one well-known urban sociologist in Chicago developed an ethnic map of the city which totally excluded some 60,000 Ukrainians living there, and located a large "Russian" population residing in the Rogers Park area. As any Chicagoan knows, Rogers Park was a predominantly Jewish area in 1970!

To remedy the situation, Dr. Novak offered the following proposals:

1. a) Expand the category "foreign stock" so as to gain an accurate count of third, fourth, and later-generation descendants of immigrants. b) When "foreign stock" alone is listed, supply a warning with the table, pointing out the exclusion of later generations.

2. Recognize the difference between the subjective and objective components of cultural belonging. a) Objectively, it might ask for the identification of the ethnic background of each respondent's grandparents or ancestors. b) Subjectively, it might ask each respondent to identify his or her own cultural heritage or heritages, as he or she believes these to be significant to his or her own life.

Dr. Novak suggested the following wording for the two types of questions: a) Name the culture or nation in which your four grandparents were born. If they were born in the United States, from which nations of origin did their ancestors come? b) In your mind, with which cultural heritage, or heritages, do you identify through family ties?

3. In listing the categories of self-identification the Census Bureau should assist respondents by demonstrating sensitivity to name changes during different historical eras. The modern nation of Yugoslavia should be admitted, for example, but so should its earlier component nations - Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, etc.

4. In asking about culturo-religious matters, the Census Bureau should couch its questions in appropriately nonreligious terms. The questions would not concern present religious belief or church affiliation. Rather, they would concern cultural influences. They

¹⁵ *Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Census and Population of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service*, June 1 and 2, 1976 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976), pp. 94-96.

would not ask about the individual commitment of the respondent. The question for eastern Europeans, for example, might be worded as follows: "Whatever your present commitment, would you consider that the strongest cultural influence within your family and yourself was from a culture that was. . . Catholic, Lutheran, Calvinist, Jewish, Orthodox, Anglican, secular, other?"

5. The Census Bureau might ask respondents to locate themselves on a scale of cultural identification that would allow for major combinations or degrees. The question might be worded as follows: "When you think about your own identity, would you describe it in any of the following terms?"

- (a) Present citizenship
- (b) Religion or world view
- (c) Own cultural background
- (d) Ancestral, cultural background
- (e) Mixed, ancestry unknown
- (f) Mixed, ancestry known but a matter of indifference
- (g) Mixed, but one or two heritages more significant to me than others as follows:

6. The Census Bureau might include a question asking whether respondents changed their names to those of a different nationality, either in this or in preceding generations.

Responding on behalf of the Bureau of Census at the White House conference were Robert L. Hagan, Deputy Director, Meyer Zitter, Chief of the Population Division, Alfred Tella, Special Advisor to the Director, and Nampeo McKinney, who at the time was Assistant Chief of the Population Division. I am pleased that Nampeo McKinney is with us this afternoon with a new title, Chief of the Ethnic and Racial Statistics Staff.

Unable to work directly with the Director of the Bureau, who, I learned later, was preparing to leave, I continued to press the Deputy Director to take further action once our conference was concluded. Soon after becoming acting director, Mr. Hagan did follow through by inviting Mr. Novak and twenty ethnic experts to a conference at the Bureau of Census to discuss a different approach to the ethnic origins question. Admitting that the previous focus on first and second-generation ethnics was inadequate, Mr. Hagan professed an interest in extending the scope of the data. The Bureau of Census meeting, held in October of 1976, was billed as an effort of the Bureau to adopt the broader concept of " 'origin or descent.' " I am anxious to learn whether this meeting, and the White House conference which preceded it, had any impact on how the 1980 census addresses the ethnic factor in American life.

1980 Ethnic Issues

The importance of the 1980 census upon the direction of American public policy development cannot be overestimated. If the census is conducted and analyzed from a pluralistic perspective, i.e., in an effort to determine the full scope of cultural and social diversity in this country, then the results should demonstrate, quite conclusively, I believe, that many ethnic Americans did not “melt” into mainstream American life but retained, instead, a certain degree of cultural and behavioral identification with their ethnic heritage. If the 1980 census demonstrates that the United States is not a melting pot for all Americans, then the implications for public policy could be enormous. The acceptance of a pluralistic ideal may mean a re-evaluation of our approach to a number of issues.

A. Minorities

The term “minority” may have to be either eliminated as a functionally meaningless term – all of us are minorities in the United States, even Anglo-Saxons – or expanded to include all groups who have been, for a variety of discriminatory reasons, denied an opportunity to attain equal status and representation in our society. “It is not the specific characteristics, whether racial or ethnic, that mark a people as minority,” wrote sociologist Louis Wirth in 1945, “but the relationship of their group to some other group in the society in which they live.”¹⁶ To offer the benefits of affirmative action to a third-generation Chinese-American whose parents have achieved middle-class status and to deny these same benefits to a Polish-American whose parents are struggling to remain above the level of poverty is simply not an equitable way to go about the Government’s business. Such actions tend to exacerbate racial and ethnic polarization rather than eliminate it.

B. Government Recruitment

The 1980 census will confirm, I believe, that the Federal Government is not representative of the population it is intended to serve. In a study entitled “Making It in America: Differences Between Eminent Blacks and White Ethnic Groups,” a comparison was made between the 1924 and 1974 editions of Marquis *Who’s Who* focusing on the ethnic affiliations of noted Americans in nine separate areas of endeavor. As might be expected, black listings in the area of Government and politics increased from 1 percent to 13 percent. Italians dropped from 8 percent in 1924 to 6 percent in 1974, Jews

¹⁶ Louis Wirth, “The Problem of Minority Groups”, *Theories of Society*, ed. Talcott Parsons, et al. (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961), Volume I, p. 311.

declined from 8 percent to 4 percent during the same fifty-year period, while Slavs declined from 12 percent to 7 percent.¹⁷ If the 1980 census suggests that national percentages for ethnic groups are higher than they are in the Federal bureaucracy, then it may be necessary to institute a recruiting campaign which would enable our Government to become more representative of – and, hopefully, more sensitive to – diverse group needs.

C. Government Decision-Making Models

Another approach to the sensitization of Government officials to pluralism may be through the adoption of a decision-making paradigm patterned after the White House model mentioned earlier. Utilizing that approach would guarantee the inclusion of all groups affected by Government programs in the developmental process. In a pluralistic society, no single group should dominate the focus of Government programs. The major objective should be consensus among blacks, Hispanic-Americans, women, youth, ethnics, and other major constituencies directly affected. It takes time, patience, and high tolerance for frustration to develop a consensus model, but the end product of such an effort is usually far more acceptable than programs which have been designed by a small group of people who are out of touch with America's diversity.

D. Decentralization of the Federal Bureaucracy

Another frequent complaint of almost all segments of our society has been with the inability of our Washington-based bureaucracy to make programmatic allowances for local variation. The problem with uniform, rational, comprehensive solutions is that they are biased towards the unitary solution. In this approach to social planning, pluralism is viewed as an enemy because it is often a source of diversified solutions to problems that are diversely defined and diversely caused. But ours is a diverse society with differing local needs and resources. Neighborhood revitalization in Seattle, for example, may need to be developed in a way that is substantially different from the neighborhood revitalization process in Chicago or Cleveland. Assigning Federal bureaucrats to various locales will help them identify the problem more precisely, enable them to locate local resources more readily, and, most important of all, make them more accountable to their constituencies. As long as program design, budget, and day-to-day operations are determined in Washington, diversity will not be served. Effectiveness and efficiency will also suffer because of overlapping and duplicated functions, a lack of harmony with local needs, and higher administrative and program costs.

¹⁷ Stanley Lieberson and Donna K. Carter, "Making It in America: Differences Between Eminent Blacks and White Ethnic Groups", *American Sociological Review* (June, 1979).

Decentralization of Federal decision-making will not be easy to achieve. The Federal bureaucracy has traditionally resisted all such moves with a tenacity that is awesome to behold. Most of us who have been involved in such a move, however, can testify to the fact that while it was painful, the benefits were worth it.

E. Public Policy Development

Once Government agency personnel have become more representative and tolerant of diversity, once a consensus model has been put into place, once local variation has been taken care of through decentralization, the next and final step is to develop a succinct rationale for the actual development of public policy. During the 1980's, many issues will emerge to compete for the attention of Government agencies. If I were to select a single philosophy that would best serve the Nation during this period, it would be one that was based on an ideological commitment to the strengthening of what Peter L. Berger and Richard John Neuhaus have termed "mediating structures" defined by them as "those institutions which stand between the individual in his private life and the large institutions."¹⁸ Four such institutions are the neighborhood, the family, the Church, and the voluntary associations, all of which are an integral part of ethnic group life in America.

The age of big Government and Federal entitlements is here to stay. In a society which is predicated on a melting pot rationale, as we have seen, bureaucrats tend to be biased towards unitary solutions and neat answers. The challenge of pluralistic public policy development, on the other hand, is to search for alternative social service delivery systems, take steps to strengthen them, and embrace the multitude of particular interests which constitute our polity. The future viability of the family, the neighborhood, the Church, and the voluntary associations will constitute, in my opinion, the major focus of concern for America's ethnic groups during the 1980's. Some of these issues have already been discussed by others during this two-day consultation, so I shall dwell, albeit briefly because of time constraints, on those which need further exposition.

The Family

"The family" wrote Berger and Neuhaus in 1977, "may be in crisis but there is little evidence that it is in decline."¹⁹ As heartening as that conclusion may be, the perception of American ethnics is otherwise. The ethnic reality is that slowly and imperceptibly, the seven basic functions of the traditional family – economic, education, status and prestige, protection, religion, recreation, and affection – are being eroded by emerging norms which suggest that family functions can be

¹⁸ Peter Berger and Richard John Neuhaus, *To Empower People: The Role of Mediating Structures in Public Policy* (Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1977), p. 2.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

better performed by other agencies, namely the factory or office, the school, media created status symbols, the police department, the clergy, as well as social clubs, the film and television industry, and the myriad of other nonfamily oriented recreational options that are presently available for those who want to live life with gusto. Even the affection function of the family is being replaced by some with membership in various pseudo-religious cults and groups which offer a sense of family-belonging to their faithful. While the demands of our present industrial society mandate a certain familial dependence upon other agencies, the danger lies in the trend towards total dependence and more unitary and comprehensive need fulfillment by other agencies.

In a pluralistic society, family structures should be related to the life styles of its members, be they Amish, Afro-American, Ukrainian, Jewish, Catholic, urban, or rural. Public policy should be designed to accommodate this diversity allowing, at the same time, for greater independence through the recognition of the significant affective functions performed by family units. The criterion for all families – nuclear, extended, multiparent, single parent – should be their ability to perform those functions in an environment which encourages the personal growth of all of its members.

If anyone doubts that the American family is in trouble, then the recent decision by President Carter to establish an Office for Families in the Department of Health and Human Resources should serve to remove all doubt. Given the Federal establishment's past record of social totalitarianism, however, this development makes me very nervous. If the action is merely to respond to current American anxiety with a politically motivated ploy, then we can relax after November of 1980. If, on the other hand, the President's action is viewed as a green light for the Federal bureaucracy to expand its ranks and to develop still another set of regulatory social policies, then we're really in trouble.

The Neighborhood

"The neighborhood," stated Geno Baroni at the 1976 White House Conference on Neighborhood Revitalization, "is a neglected unit of American urban life."²⁰ "A sense of neighborhood, a sense of belonging, or cultural identification, are threatened," declared President Ford at the same conference. "Increasingly," concluded the President, "centralized government in Washington, which has grown more powerful and very impersonal, is part of the problem."²¹

²⁰ Remarks of Msgr. Geno Baroni, White House Conference on Ethnicity and Neighborhood Revitalization, Washington, D.C., May 5, 1976.

²¹ Remarks of Gerald R. Ford, *ibid.*

Monsignor Baroni and President Ford were both right. Neighborhoods have been neglected in some instances, but in other instances they have been destroyed by Government programs which were ill-conceived and poorly administered. Neighborhoods are a key to public policy development in pluralistic society, but the answer is not *more* government but *less*. The emphasis should be on concern and not control.

The Church

Institutions of religion are important in a pluralistic society because they represent a vital dimension in the lives of millions of Americans who voluntarily support almost 500,000 churches and synagogues in this country. Church attendance is beginning to increase, but the danger today is not that churches – or any one church – will take over the State. The threat to pluralism lies in the possibility that the State will take over certain functions of the Church and, as in totalitarian societies, begin to dictate values, ideals, and moral standards. Religious diversity is a powerful deterrent to that eventuality. Current concerns with the abominations of certain so-called religious cults should not blind us to the great benefits which our religious institutions have brought to our nation. Our personal sense of identity, our values, our customs, and our perceptions of the meaning of life in an increasingly materialistic, uncaring, and narcissistic society are enhanced by a belief in a Supreme Being.

The Voluntary Association

Finally, the voluntary association, that unique American phenomenon which has traditionally enabled us to become, in a very direct way, our brothers' keepers, should not be allowed to wither because of competing Government programs. Public policy should be designed to encourage local initiative in responding to recognized public responsibilities.

For the American ethnic community, the voluntary association is crucial to its well being. Present Government policy which confuses integration with assimilation and affirmative action with equal opportunity runs counter to the principle of pluralism. What mindless bureaucrat, one wonders, decided that an old people's home for Italian-Americans must be racially integrated in order to receive Government funding? What possible social benefit can be derived from recent efforts on the part of the Federal establishment to remove the tax exempt status from privately-controlled charitable, fraternal, and other voluntary associations? What right does anyone have in a pluralistic society to decide – as have some labor and feminist groups – that volunteerism is a form of exploitation? Like the other mediating structures already discussed, voluntary associations encourage individual freedom, initiative, and social diversity. Not all Government

programs need to be governmentally controlled. Not everyone needs to be a dependent client of the State.

Conclusion

Given the level of ethnic anomie which presently exists in the United States, it should be clear that the Federal establishment's attempts to define ethnicity as a problem and to deal with it from a melting-pot perspective have failed. The end result of much of the Federal Government's intervention in America's ethnic communities has been the rise of a new and increasingly arrogant brand of social totalitarianism in Washington, D. C. which has weakened those very institutions - the family, the neighborhood, the Church, and the voluntary associations - which have enabled American ethnic groups to retain a modicum of control over their collective destinies. For some minorities, many of whom are still dependent wards of the Federal bureaucracy, equality of respect for ethnic diversity has not matched the equality of opportunity which the Federal establishment has attempted to provide. For other ethnic minorities, recent Federal intervention has resulted in a sense of growing powerlessness and animosity towards a system which they believe has not only failed to recognize their communities as worthy of attention, but has unfairly discriminated against many of their numbers as well.

No better example of Federal arrogance and lack of recognition towards certain ethnic groups can be found than that which presently appears to exist within the U.S. Census Bureau. Despite many and varied attempts by ethnic communal leaders to be "counted" in 1980, the Bureau hasn't even acknowledged the existence of some groups. The recent comment of one Bureau official that they still weren't sure whether it was appropriate to list Ukrainians and Byelorussians as "Russians" is symptomatic of the problem we face. If we can't even get the Federal establishment to formally recognize our *presence* in the United States, then how can we ever hope for any meaningful effort from our Government to understand our needs?

As we look towards the 1980's, America's ethnic leaders are not overly optimistic. And yet, we are not totally without hope. This conference is a definite indication that not all members of the Federal establishment are oblivious to the pluralistic perspective. Decision-making models do exist. There is still time to develop a Federal disposition towards the preservation of those institutions that have stood the test of time and that still have much to offer in a culturally diverse society. We can learn to avoid totalitarian solutions. It is not too late. Next time, we can do it right. And *you*, the members of this Commission, can help make it right!

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Thank you Dr. Kuropas.

Marcia Kaptur, our respondent, is currently the Director of Policy at the National Consumer Cooperative Bank in Washington, D.C.

She has recently held positions on the White House Domestic Policy Staff where she specialized in community development, land use, housing and neighborhood revitalization.

She holds a Master's degree in urban planning, has authored several articles on that subject, and is a former Director of Planning and Design with the National Center for Urban and Ethnic Affairs.

RESPONSE OF MARCIA C. KAPTUR

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you very much. It's a great pleasure to be invited to appear before you today, and I want to begin by quoting from the original paper I received from Myron Kuropas. He says that the average tenure for high-level government appointees is approximately 18 months.

My tenure, however, was 32 months. I would like to suggest that this is perhaps because, when an ethnic American reaches that level of decision-making he or she stays twice as long.

I also want to say that I feel some discomfiture in appearing on a panel that is entitled "Euro-Ethnic". I think that I have a much broader concept of ethnicity, and I would certainly include in my definition of ethnicity Chinese-Americans in San Francisco, Afro-Americans in Detroit, Greek-Americans in Cleveland, et cetera.

I happen to be second generation Polish-American. For myself and for people like myself, I hope that in the decades ahead there will come to be an appreciation and a greater understanding of the dual heritage that we hold and of what implications this has for American life.

In addition I hope that people like myself will have increased access to decision-making at the very highest levels of Government and in the private sector.

Finally, my hope in appearing before you today is that the Civil Rights Commission, one of the few entities which has a broad legislative mandate, can explore the various dimensions of ethnicity that cut across the range of domestic concerns.

Now, I have heard no definition of ethnicity offered during the past two days. I would encourage you to create one for purposes of further discussion. But, in spite of there not being one, I would like to focus my discussion on three concerns in response to Myron's paper.

First of all, I am very concerned not only about discrimination based on national origin, but also on heritage. Second-generation Americans

really don't fit into the national origin category, and we have no way of knowing if discrimination based on heritage is a problem.

Second, I question the *representation of various ethnic groups in policy level decision-making environments*, both in the public and private sectors.

And, third I am concerned about how the recommendations that will flow from this particular convocation will be institutionalized.

On this final point I worry very much about – and caution myself against institutionalizing anything, especially at the national level. If you look back to when, for example, the Bureau of Indian Affairs was created or even the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, it will be seen that we tend to freeze into law at a particular time certain ideas, values, and approaches, and then issue regulations. Often the mere act of institutionalizing fixes a management structure and a behavior pattern, which over time becomes obsolete. I worry that if we freeze into law or regulate on ethnicity in the early 1980's, it will cause problems 20 years down the road. So I am very cautious about any changes that we recommend here.

I am also concerned about how one takes the political and the cultural agenda of ethnicity into the policy arena of Government. I'm not quite sure how to do that.

My observation is that people make policies. The individuals that serve at very high levels, and the values they hold, become the real linchpins during critical discussions of new initiatives at the national level.

I don't think Myron Kuropas said this in his remarks here; however, his paper mentions that, “. . . because of their relatively high pay and almost total economic security, most Federal decision-makers enjoy similar standards of living. Many have attended the same universities, live in similar non-ethnic neighborhoods, read the same newspapers and journals, travel in the same social circles and adhere to the same social mores.”

From my own personal experience, I feel I was an exception to this standard rule. It was wonderful to be at the White House for three years, but I think that the particular mind-set that exists in many circles at the national level, and the people who sit there making policy, do not represent the worlds I have known in other places, including the City of Chicago. I became a part of a world most Euro-ethnic Americans have not known.

I want to express doubt about how one can best handle ethnic issues while on the White House Staff.

The staff that I served on, the Domestic Policy Staff, which, in the former Administration, was headed by John Ehrlichman and in The Carter Administration, by Stuart Eisenstat, is divided into functional

categories. There are specialists, mostly non-Euro-ethnics, who are attorneys, in justice, education, housing, finance and urban affairs, agricultural and rural affairs, transportation, arts and humanities, health, human resources, and employment, energy and environment, regulatory reform, taxation, civil service and Government affairs. Congressional committees are similarly focused and, of course, the Congress has special committees in such areas as small business and aging. There is no category called ethnic affairs.

Thus, what has tended to happen is that ethnicity is treated as a political category with separate people in political liaison relating to ethnic constituencies that are organized on the outside. The linkage between the political constituencies and the policy makers, let's say, or the people who deal in policy, is very tenuous, if it exists at all.

We need to tighten that linkage. For the constituencies on the outside, there is a real need to organize in a way that can affect policymakers, because they are, in fact, different warm bodies sitting in the same building with political operatives, but looking at the issues in different ways.

I would like to suggest also that the problem of different people in this country affecting policy is not a problem just for the Euro-ethnics, but for all groups that traditionally have been excluded from the highest levels of decision making.

Who gets included in discussions; in which discussions are they included; are they included in a ceremonial fashion or in a substantive fashion? Who gets invited back? Who gets the informal phone calls that matter so very much when you're strapped for time?

Many of the people who have testified today have never been consulted across the broad range of policy areas that I have outlined.

Now, in order to give you some specific recommendations in reference to Myron's paper, and in terms of your own authority, I was wondering what the possibilities would be to modify the law and to add the word "heritage" to the language in your mandate which prohibits discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

I would like to endorse the suggestion of others that the Commission select a discrete number of issues resulting from this meeting for more specialized research, and I'd like to just tick off a couple of those.

One would be an indepth study of the ethnic composition - not just Euro-Americans - of political appointments and high-level government career positions, as well the high-level positions in the corporate sector, including the media, which was discussed in the last session.

I think that is extremely important. In terms of the White House staff itself, whether it be the Carter Administration, the Ford Administration, or future Administrations. I think we need a back-

ground study of policy makers – who these people are. Separate them from the political people, because they are different and their influence is different.

In this regard, I would like to refer to an article that was in the *Washington Post* a couple of weeks ago that described the preponderance of white males in staff directorship positions in the Congress. Similarly a recent *Wall Street Journal* article presented the fact that the corporate boardrooms have been much more up-to-date in representing different groups than, in fact, the Government itself. There was documentation that the private sector has been much more responsive than the Government.

And then finally, there is some original research that I would like to refer to your staff. This was done by a professor from York University in Toronto. His name is Colin Campbell and he has written three books: one on Canada, one on the United States, and one, I believe, on West Germany. They are all entitled *Superbureaucrats* and concern the people who occupy the very highest levels of decision-making in the governments. While on assignment with the Brookings Institute, he interviewed me and over 200 other people in the White House, the Office of Management and Budget, and at high levels in the agencies. He has taken that work back to Toronto and will be publishing it there.

The raw data that he obtained were indepth on background, ethnicity, religion, occupation of father, et cetera. It could be very useful to this Commission, and I would commend it to your attention.

Next, I would suggest that in a separate study you explore why culturally and place-sensitive educational programs to build cross-cultural understanding are the exception rather than the rule in the educational system of this country.

When I was working as a neighborhood planner in a multi-ethnic area here in Chicago I couldn't understand why children with Puerto Rican, Polish, and Italian heritages couldn't learn more about one another's "histories" in their regular educational curriculum. It was impossible for me to effect that, being a community development person rather than an educator. Nonetheless, I saw it as a great weakness. Such education would have helped greatly in stabilizing and improving that particular community.

I would also like to suggest that staff be directed to work with other agencies on a demonstration basis perhaps, to explore how community development and social services can be decentralized to be more sensitive to group diversity in this country.

The President's Commission on Mental Health recently made some suggestions about how mental health services might be decentralized. I

think we need to look at decentralization across the broad range of Federal programs.

To summarize, I want to stress the importance of appointments of persons sensitive to ethnic issues at all levels, both in and out of Government.

Second, focussed research should be directed to key ethnic concerns, not so much on how Government can compartmentalize people, but rather how Government can redefine its relationship to community institutions to strengthen them in conditions of diversity rather than to weaken them.

I would also like to encourage you to define broadly the term "ethnicity" so that it becomes a new paradigm for describing the social undercurrents – in reality, social history – of the United States.

And finally, I would like you to help me identify how we can help initiate a continuing institutionalized national capacity to examine these issues in the future.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Thank you.

Paul J. Ascioffa is the Federal Agency Liaison Officer with the National Endowment of the Arts, responsible for coordinating the policies and programs of that Federal agency with other agencies.

He has been the Executive Director of the National Italian-American Foundation and the Director of Communications for the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs.

He holds a Master's degree from Northwestern University's School of Speech and has extensive experience with both print and electronic media.

Mr. Ascioffa.

RESPONSE OF PAUL J. ASCIOLLA

Introduction

Good afternoon. My name is Paul J. Ascioffa and I am Director of Federal Agency Relations for the National Endowment for the Arts, a Federal Agency advised by the National Council on the Arts in Washington, D.C. I am also privileged to be Honorary Chair of the Illinois Consultation on Ethnicity in Education which I helped found together with some of my colleagues here in Chicago under the leadership of David G. Roth, Midwest Director of the Institute on Pluralism and Group Identity of the American Jewish Committee.

I am pleased to be able to respond to Dr. Myron Kuropas' paper and to be able to give some of my own reactions and observations to which he has alluded.

It is opportune that this Commission is focussing on issues which face Euro-ethnic Americans and the entire American society. This consultation in a small way begins to respond to the Commission's mandate to investigate discrimination on the basis of "national origin." It is my hope that one day the Commission would consider the addition of the words "and ethnic identity" to its mandate, thereby including both native-born Americans as well as newer immigrants. American ethnicity is a genre all its own, indeed a whole new culture within the American experiment, which is dynamic and living, not a thing of the past.

In preparing for this consultation and this panel, I came across a file containing much correspondence about a proposed consultation on the representation of ethnics by mass media. In fact, in 1973 we sponsored an all-day workshop on the subject with Chicago area ethnic groups. The consultation was never held and nothing more was heard about the subject until the Commission's report issued on August 15, 1977, four years later. That report devoted only 62 lines of a 181-page report to *Ethnic Situation Comedies*. Hardly a penetrating analysis of the state of art!

But enough of the past. This consultation comes at an opportune time when the issues dealing with the quality of group life in America, the questions surrounding the concept of unity in diversity, and a searching for the richness and strengths which make America what it is, are coming under close scrutiny. I believe that the richness and strengths of ethnicity, properly understood, have a role in redefining American life and in providing coping mechanisms for individuals and groups in a diverse and complex American culture.

If America is a mosaic, I believe that ethnicity can be part of that cement which holds the Nation together.

Since I have this luxury, I should like to state my personal philosophy about ethnicity and it is incorporated into what I call the *Paul Principle*: You cannot organize ethnicity, but in organizing, if you ignore ethnicity, you are doomed to fail.

I also believe that ethnicity cannot be segregated from the larger issues of American society and must never be used by one group or individual as a lever against another group. I reject selective moral outrage when it comes to human and civil rights. These rights are indivisible and inviolable.

I also subscribe to the theory that has been voiced by such a distinguished historian as Arthur Mann of the University of Chicago, that there is a distinction between being an American either by birth or naturalization and how one is an American. The former means citizenship and says nothing about how individuals or groups relate to James Madison's concept of Federalism. What makes us Americans is

the subscription to the truths of American democracy: acceptance of equal access to opportunity, adherence to the tri-cameral form of government, and allegiance to the Constitution. That's all. How we are Americans is totally up to us. Age, sex, religion, race, cultural background, physical ability, language, geographic residence, class – nothing makes us more or less American. When that distinction is blurred, and there is a tendency to homogenize in order to unify, then we are in real trouble and values become politicized, very confused. One of the beauties of ethnicity is that it gives people options to move in and out of this set of values which impacts on their identities.

Specific Reactions To Dr. Kuropas' Paper

Now permit me to react to and suggest some areas of discussion about the subject at hand: attitudes toward immigrant and ethnic groups and defining social policy in the 1980's in reference to Euro-ethnic Americans. I will not deal specifically with the issue of the census which I know Ms. McKinney will explore thoroughly.

Attitudes Toward Immigrants And Ethnics

American society has accepted diversity and pluralism as basic aspects of its national life in the United States Constitution. James Madison was the foremost advocate of Federalism and his *Federalist papers* testify to his precious legacy to constitutional literature. The judicial and legislative traditions of this Nation offer consistent evidence of more than two centuries of co-existence not without occasional outbursts of conflict – of groups and peoples with diverse religious beliefs, cultural traditions, and economic status. A mosaic of values and diverse groups, our society has embodied perhaps better than any society in modern history, the ability of people and groups to live together, accept, and eventually come to enjoy each other's differences.

No matter how ingenious we have been in dealing with groups (and we still have much to learn about how groups and individuals interact) we still have managed, somewhere along the line, to develop theories on how to get rid of differences in order to achieve a cultural-unity – the monolith of the American dream – in which all nations are melted into a new race of men (Jean de Crevecoeur, *Letters from an American Farmer, Let. iii, 1788*).

It is the very presence of immigrant groups in our midst and the continuing immigration, whether by choice or force, which gives renewed meaning to the words of Emma Lazarus, "Give me your tired, your poor. . ." Ethnicity is here to stay.

Because the charter group of Americans did not understand the nature of the American Republic and the complexities of building a

community around citizenship rather than religious, cultural, geographical, or sexual values, and because some never accepted the wisdom of unity in diversity (*E pluribus unum*), there have come forth a succession of theories of accommodation:

1. *Disappearance*. This theory maintained that the people would vanish and so would their differences when welded together in the New World and its admittedly egalitarian society. There are some prominent sociologists today who still maintain this basic philosophy of acculturation.
2. *Melting Pot*. This phrase was devised with all good intentions in a play by the same title (*The Melting Pot*, Act i) by an English Jew, Israel Zangwill. He came to America to try to understand how Jews maintained their identity in such a complex society. Zangwill's words were quickly taken by assimilationists and nativists to mean unity of culture rather than the maintenance of cultural identity in the midst of a broadly complex society.
3. *Cultural Pluralism*. This theory came about shortly after World War II but in the columnar sense, providing no movement from one identity to another, and freezing people and groups into irreversible common identities.
4. *New Pluralism and Pluralistic Integration (Higham)*. This system has emerged as the most sensitive and sophisticated system to explain both the richness and strengths of ethnicity and the dangers of ethnicity when espoused by chauvinists.

In short, immigrants become the ethnics of our society, bringing with them into many generations. cultural, religious, and psychological baggage which has a direct bearing on how individuals and groups cope in a quickly changing society.

Culture, however, is not just the celebration of Columbus Day or Polish Constitution Day or Chinese New Year, or eating paella in a Mexican-American restaurant or clam chowder in New England.

If I may borrow from the poignant words of the Old Chief of the Digger Indians, as Ruth Benedict quotes:

In the beginning God gave a cup,

a cup of clay.

And from this cup

they drank their life.

They all dipped in the water,

but their cups were different. Then he added in sorrow:

Our cup is now broken.

It has passed away.

The things which gave significance to the life of his people, the domestic rituals of eating, the succession of ceremonials in the villages, the standards of right and wrong – these were gone – and with them the shape and meaning of their lives. . . their identity.

Culture is the sum total of the ways of thinking, acting, believing, reacting, feeling, loving, and being which makes a person Polish rather than Italian, American rather than Ukrainian. It helps define the things that mean reverence, faithfulness, devotion, respect, femininity and masculinity, loyalty and fidelity, one's identity and expectations.

When people begin to understand that culture is changing, they have the impression that their identity is disappearing, when actually, if we understand pluralism correctly, it is the cultural expressions and the symbols which are in the state of rapid – almost uncontrollable – change. This phenomenon is more accentuated and noticeable in a vast and complex culture which is made up of many cultures.

At present our American culture is undergoing a violent and substantial cultural trauma and reshaping of cultural symbols which meant for some an anchor of security. Things are in transition. New immigrants are constantly coming into the American scene, the more to add richness to our culture, but bringing with this phenomenon the constant reality of change and adaptation.

The older ethnic neighborhoods with their sights, sounds, smells, colors, and contacts are slowly disappearing or reappearing in the form of grotesque imitations urged on by commercially enterprising entrepreneurs. In many instances neighborhood residents have become so enthralled by this ersatz world that they are the first ones to opt for a radical change from the “old ways” and traditions.

Frequently the intermediary institutions like governments, churches, and schools as well as the less formalized social-fraternal organizations which once catered to particular ethnic groups have either failed to adapt to the change or cling to the old ways prompted by nostalgia and residual ethnic comfort and security and can no longer meet the needs of any group within the community setting. They become relics. The peasants and the poets transplanted from Europe, the neat world of faith and culture, in many instances have disappeared.

Urban planners and the acculturation process espoused by institutions of power and policy, the Church and State, educational and social service agencies and their delivery systems are taking care of scattering the broken pieces of the cup.

No common style of American life reappears. Not that there ever was one culture, nor should there be, outside of the common cluster of values which make us American citizens. Policy-makers must under-

stand the intimate connection between culture and identity, attitudes and values, and must not opt for clean and neat choices which unnecessarily label diversity as "cultural cacophony." A blurred perception of the dynamics of cultural change has seduced policy-makers into believing that ethnicity is Balkanization and that the divisions are so great and the options are so few that being an American is confused with American citizenship. This has happened all too frequently to Euro-ethnics who suffer the absence of color differentiation. What has happened to persons of color differentiation in society is a clear record of discrimination and negligence.

How deeply imbedded this cultural nativism became is evident in the stated and public opinions of leaders and policy-makers. I would like to submit for the record of these proceedings. some quotes about *America: The Melting Pot* (The Home Book of Quotations, 10th edition, 1967, p. 55) to show how some attitudes have penetrated the American official mentality at the highest levels. I take the liberty of giving you one sample of this attitude:

America is not to be made a polyglot boarding house for money hunters of twenty different nationalities who have changed their former country only as farmyard beasts change one feeding-trough for another.

Theodore Roosevelt, Speech

Bridgeport, Connecticut

As you can see, even Government agencies, Presidents, former Presidents, and prospective Presidents react rather than act when it comes to dealing with the realities of immigration and ethnicity. Ethnic, racial, cultural, and religious discrimination is not a thing of the past but a gaping and festering sore on our communal soul. The xenophobia which afflicted our policy-makers during the era of the Know Nothings, the discriminatory immigration legislation of 1891, 1924, and 1952, the Presidential Executive Order 9066 which led to the detention of 110,000 Japanese Americans in 1942, the hysteria which took Italian-American and German-American programs off the air and closed down community foreign language newspapers in the 1940's, the *America Love it or Leave it* banners held high in the 1950's, the blanket hatred aimed toward Vietnamese in the 1960's, the sweeping slurs aimed at Iranians even today and all the political opportunism which panders to that type of mentality, is not a thing of the past.

Defining Social Policy And Ethnicity In The 1980's

Permit me now to deal with public policy-making in the Federal Government in general and then as far as it deals with Euro-ethnic

III—America: The Melting Pot

3 Here [in America] individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men.

MICHEL GUILLAUME JEAN DE CREVECOEUR, *Letters from an American Farmer*. Let. iii. (1782)

America is God's Crucible, the great Melting-Pot where all the races of Europe are melting and reforming! . . . God is making the American.

ISRAEL ZANGWILL, *The Melting-Pot*. Act i. Produced in New York City, Oct., 1908.

There is here a great melting pot in which we must compound a precious metal. That metal is the metal of nationality.

WOODROW WILSON, *Address*, Washington, 19 April, 1915.

We Americans are children of the crucible.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT, *Speech*, 9 Sept., 1917.

4 America! half brother of the world!

With something good and bad of every land.

P. J. BAILEY, *Festus: The Surface*, 1. 340.

5 There's freedom at thy gates and rest

For Earth's down-trodden and oppressed,
A shelter for the hunted head,
For the starved laborer toil and bread.

BRYANT, *Oh Mother of a Mighty Race*.

Asylum of the oppressed of every nation.

UNKNOWN, *Democratic Platform*, 1856.

6 She of the open soul and open

door,
With room about her hearth for all mankind!

J. R. LOWELL, *Commemoration Ode*.

8 I do not think that you can do better than to fix here for a while, till you can become again Americanized.

THOMAS JEFFERSON, *Letter to Barlow*, 20 April, 1802.

We go to Europe to be Americanized.

EMERSON, *Conduct of Life: Culture*.

9 We have room in this country for but one flag, the Stars and Stripes. . . . We have room for but one loyalty, loyalty to the United States. . . . We have room for but one language, the English language.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT, *The Great Adventure*. Also last message to the American Defense Society, 3 Jan., 1919, two days before his death.

America is not to be made a polyglot boarding-house for money hunters of twenty different nationalities who have changed their former country for this country only as farmyard beasts change one feeding-trough for another.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT, *Speech*, Bridgeport, Conn.

There can be no fifty-fifty Americanism in this country. There is room here for only 100 percent Americanism, only for those who are Americans and nothing else.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT, *Speech*, Republican Convention, Saratoga. Also in *Foes of Our Own Household*.

10 I will put in my poems that with you is heroism upon land and sea.

And I will report all heroism from an American point of view.

WALT WHITMAN, *Starting from Paumanok*.

11 Some Americans need hyphens in their names because only part of them has come over.

WOODROW WILSON, *Address*, Washington, 16 May, 1914.

There are a great many hyphens left in America. For my part, I think the most un-American thing in the world is a hyphen.

WOODROW WILSON, *Speech*, St. Paul, Minn., 9 Sept., 1919.

Hyphenated Americans.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT, *Metropolitan Magazine*, Oct., 1915.

When two flags are hoisted on the same pole, one is always hoisted undermost. The hyphenated American always hoists the American flag undermost.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT, *Fear God and Take Your Own Part*. Ch. v.

12 O Liberty, white Goddess! is it well

To leave the gates unguarded?
On thy breast

Fold Sorrow's children, soothe the hurts of Fate,
Lift the down-trodden, but with hand of steel

Stay those who to thy sacred portals come

To waste the gifts of Freedom.
T. B. ALDRICH, *Unguarded Gates*.

Americans. I cannot predict what will happen to change the ways decisions are made in Washington, but I can speak of how difficult it is to make ethnicity an integral part of the decision-making process. Remember *Paul's Principle* if I may be self-serving: you cannot organize or make policy only according to ethnicity, but in making policy, if you ignore ethnicity you are doomed to fail.

In my own agency, the National Endowment for the Arts, there has been a real effort to deal with the pluralism of the American population and accessibility to the arts for all Americans. The pluralism of arts policy is based on the simple fact that art is an expression of peoples' culture and if culture is diverse so should the funding patterns be which are part of a Government agency which is ultimately accountable to the public through the Congressional process.

We have been accused by elitists of diluting the quality of artistic endeavors because our Chairman, Livingston L. Biddle, believes in community arts and in making the arts accessible to all groups. The initiatives we have undertaken with other Federal Agencies such as the Department of the Interior, the Department of Education, Small Business Administration, Housing and Urban Development, Department of Commerce and Labor have been maligned by special interest groups. We have seen the establishment of the Office of Minority Concerns which houses the office for Hispanic Affairs. The Community Arts Task Force which was convoked and has presented its report after one year's work had cultural pluralism and diversity as a top priority in its recommendations. Likewise, the Expansion Arts program has intensified its efforts in policy and planning geared toward ethnic diversity in its funding. The Five Year Plan approved by the National Council on the Arts, composed of 26 presidentially appointed advisors to the Chairman of the Arts Endowment, speaks eloquently in both its Statement of Goals, and Plan, to the development of ethnic and cultural diversity in its funding. Ours is one of the few agencies I know that openly acknowledges the richness of ethnic diversity and is doing something about it.

The efforts of the Arts Endowment have only begun and we can see an intensification of these efforts in the 13 programs. This is one of the agendas my office of Federal Agency Relations has with it when it approaches other Federal agencies for joint projects. But most important, the National Council on the Arts, the Chairman and his Deputies, as well as the Program Directors are all convinced that diversity at all levels is the only real mechanism through which to effect change.

The role of policy-making in the Federal establishment as well as in the private sector – and here I speak from experience in both the

private foundation world and the Federal Government – is known to be a difficult task. One of the reasons for this is that there are so many actors with so many apparently divergent agendas. Another reason is that most of us like neat answers to very complex issues.

Viable public policy must be flexible and ever conscious of the differences in American cultures. No monolithic public policy will serve the diverse needs of a varied population. This may seem a tautology, but there are those technocrats both in and out of Government who refuse to acknowledge the fact. The raising of important and sensitive issues in this context and in an “anonymous bureaucracy” can be a very discouraging task. Being an honest broker can be very unrewarding.

However, a slow, methodical, and compassionate, as well as informed, approach is essential to the policy broker. A knowledge of how government works, how people work together, and a comprehensive grasp of the matters to be discussed, may actually work. I have tremendous respect for the political process though not necessarily for all of the actors in that process. One must refuse to become cynical or to be brutalized by the process which can ultimately wear you down. Keeping one’s ideals consonant with the goals of the agency to which one is committed is a most difficult task. But it can be done.

In any case, the Federal policy-making establishment is no different from the rest of the world – just a bit more concentrated. There is cynicism and skepticism, ignorance and intransigence, turf-protection and just plain laziness and all that goes with bureaucracy. All these and other maladies infect the public policy-making machinery and the people who make it work. . . or don’t make it work. Indeed, the newcomer to Washington may suffer cultural trauma in the crazed world of numerals and initials and hyphens. All this may debilitate even the most zealous of policy idealists and purists.

I would advocate to people within the Federal establishment and elsewhere that before they venture into the making of public policy they follow the advice of an Asian proverb:

Go to the people

Live among them

Learn from them

Love them

Serve them

Plan with them

Start with what they know

Build on what they have.

Also:

Citizenship may be defined by law but what gives meaning to it is participation.

(Citizens Participation Development Group Ottawa, 1971)

It is my conviction that the issues we have spoken about during this consultation must be **INSTITUTIONALIZED**. This requires leadership within the Federal Government and its agencies as well as unselfish leadership in the private sector. People within Government respond to advocacy and pressure. The pressure must be sophisticated, focused, united, and persistent. Lack of consistency on both sides is the greatest obstacle to **INSTITUTIONALIZATION**.

Issues once raised must be pursued. Advocacy must be persistent and directed toward the proper agency head, staff, and policy-makers. This calls for consistency and perseverance. Otherwise the issues will fall into the hands of opportunists who will utilize legitimate issues for their own aggrandisement.

Frankly, I believe, and this is my personal opinion, that on the issues of Euro-ethnic Americans and their civil rights, the so-called leaders both inside and outside of Government still don't have it together and they don't know what they want, or they have become so culturally compromised that the real issues are accommodated to less noble ideals. They have the malaise!

The issues are real. The needs of the communities out there are real. The needs must be met but there is only a ghost of a network of true believers solid enough to effect the changes needed for institutionalization.

The concept of ethnicity as a factor in American culture has always been an uphill battle to wage. Unless it is kept alive consciously, it will diminish or indeed vanish. Part of the reason, in my opinion, why ethnicity has made such small gains in Federal public policy-making is that strange things have happened to ethnicity. Ethnicity has been:

1. *Romanticized and glamorized* by novels, articles, readers, lectures, radio, television and film, newspaper columns and newsletters, and personal born-again ethnic apologias where the thrill of ethnicity and the process of raising the issues is more important than the product and policies which result.
2. *Commercialized* by ethnic entrepreneurs from T-shirts to topless bars.
3. *Politicized* by offering it as a commodity to be bartered for votes, political appointments, contracts, and grants.

4. *Plagiarized* in sundry ways such as ethnic food-fun-famous people, films-television-media, festivals, and television situation comedies.
5. *Polarized* by using it as a wedge to get a piece of the pie without respect for the rights of other individuals or groups.
6. *Mythologized* by separating it from real life, and giving it exorbitant transcendental meaning. By the way, don't be surprised if you see two new books on the bookstands: *The Joy of Ethnicity* and *Inner Ethnicity*.
7. *Homogenized or Balkanized* by editorial writers and columnists, it depends on the time of the year or the crisis.
8. *Criticized* as the root cause of social strife and intergroup conflict.
9. *Memorialized* following a coup de grace from a *Time* magazine essay or some scholarly journal. . . .or as just the special demon of another Washington-based special interest group.
10. *Canonized* by chauvinists who would make ethnicity the snake oil for all of society's ills and the miracle cure for all our troubles.
11. *Guerilla-ized* in a jungle-type warfare search and destroy mission making a journey up the river like the travellers of Joseph Conrad's *Heart Of darkness* and Francis Coppola's *Apocalypse Now!* searching for Colonel Kurtz.
12. *Capitalized* by compensatory grants and contracts and other drippings from the table of the Federal coffers.

We have been able to do almost everything except institutionalize ethnicity and the self-evident reality: monocultural social policy cannot satisfy the needs of a pluralistic society!

A WORD OF CAUTION. I advocate institutionalizing ethnicity and all that it means; but I realize that we are dealing here with a double-edged sword. I just don't want words written into laws and never implemented. . . .or written into guidelines and regulations and never acknowledged. Ethnicity then dies a death by status quo and ennui. I do not mean that ethnicity should be such a sacrosanct concept that reasonable compromises are forbidden. I do not mean that this important issue should be placed into the hands of the inexperienced and those who would treat it as a joke and in a cavalier manner.

By institutionalization I mean the integration of ethnicity, its richnesses and strengths, into relevant policies, and the accessibility of these policies to policy-makers. We want to be taken seriously and want to be able to compete in the realm of ideas and policy.

I should like to complete this statement by asking two questions and providing two answers:

1. How far have we come as a national community in acknowledging Euro-ethnicity in public policy? A short way. A small step. While progress has been made in the private sector, Government is still fundamentally interested in a social service delivery system and policies which are clean, neat, and easy. What we propose seem messy and incoherent to those who are guided by regulations which clearly define competencies and leave no room for flexibility. In fact, for many, what we propose is incomprehensible. Outside of those who are culpably ignorant, there is abroad an invincible ignorance which is difficult to penetrate. We have a long way to go.
2. How far have we come on the intergovernmental level and how will it be in the 1980's? What can we do? We have not come far. Again, while there has been some progress (only fools or ideologues would disagree,) but we have a long way to go.

My recommendations, which I offer for your consideration, are as follows:

1. As far as possible, ethnic issues should be de-politicized. By this I mean, ethnicity should be taken out of partisan politics both on the National and local levels. On the Federal level, the Executive Branch and its agencies, the Congress and its committees and subcommittees, should become aware of the human issues and cultural value systems which adorn the American electorate. The issues which have become political footballs have led to inter- and intra-ethnic conflict and have left scars on both sides, although both sides should be natural allies. Bad cases make bad laws, my counsellor friends tell me.

For my part, I would target the following agencies through which to bring the issues to a head through thorough investigation and research of the issues:

- a) The United States Commission on Civil Rights
- b) The Equal Employment Opportunities Commission
- c) The Office of Federal Contract Compliance (Labor)
- d) Small Business Administration
- e) Office of Minority Business Enterprise (Commerce)
- f) Economic Development Administration (Commerce)
- g) The National Endowment for the Arts
- h) The National Endowment for the Humanities
- i) The National Science Foundation
- j) Administration on the Aging
- k) President's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women
- l) The National Institute on Mental Health

- m) The White House Conference on Families
 - n) The Department of Education
 - o) The Department of Health and Human Services
 - p) The Department of Justice
 - q) The Department of Housing and Urban Development
 - r) The Corporation for Public Broadcasting and Public Broadcasting System
 - s) The Federal Communications Commission
 - t) The Federal Trade Commission
 - u) The Bureau of the Census (Commerce)
 - v) The Department of State/International Communications Agency
 - w) The Department of the Interior
 - x) The Department of Labor
 - y) Community Services Administration
 - z) Internal Revenue Service
 - aa) Federal Bureau of Investigation
 - bb) Federal Home Loan Bank and many others too numerous to mention here. Systematic research must be done, relating to needs and public policy.
2. The full force of an Executive Order of the President and other assistance from the domestic arm of the White House should be engaged in this effort.
 3. The establishment of a White House Office for Ethnic and Community Affairs with a rank of Senior Assistant to the President of the United States and with accessibility to him. Through that Office, the establishment of an Interagency Task Force on Ethnic and Community Affairs. In order to change policy, bureaucrats at all levels have to be identified and sensitized to this high priority item which should be integrated into their policy-making apparatus. I know that what I suggest is not easy to accomplish. But movement toward such a process should be taken seriously at this opportune time. Otherwise we are engaged again in what one frustrated Federal official some time back called an "arid exercise."

What I am suggesting is a real, authentic, and consistent accessibility to policy-making and policy-makers, making these and other issues part of mainstream policy, yet de-politicizing the issues as far as possible from the partisan system in which we operate. The ideas must compete with others, and not be set aside.

Conclusion

These reactions are a result of a long career of dealing with these issues, both in and out of Government. Some are personal and some

reflect the position of the agency I represent. I have suggested that some progress has been made, but not nearly enough. I am eager for the Federal Government to take the leadership role, and that we intensify the outside of Government advocacy in an organized and sophisticated way and deal realistically with the options at hand.

It is my hope that this consultation and the recommendations which this Commission will report will be a giant step in the right direction.

I would be pleased to respond to any questions you or my colleagues may have.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. Thank you.

Nampeo McKenney is the Chief of the Ethnic and Racial Statistic Staffs within the Population Division of the Bureau of Census.

She has authored several papers on ethnic and racial minorities in the United States and had major responsibility for the minority group sections of the 1970 Census Reports.

She holds a Master's degree in sociology from American University.

RESPONSE OF NAMPEO McKENNEY

Thank you.

I'm very pleased to be on the panel today.

I will discuss fully the ethnic data which will be available from the 1980 census, since this has been raised as an issue several times today.

The Census Bureau is keenly aware of the interest and the need for data on the ethnicity of the population beyond the identification of the first- and second-generation Americans.

We now have *two* major efforts which should meet data needs. The 1980 census will include a question on ethnicity (ancestry) which will be asked on the sample questionnaire. The question is open-ended and asks persons to write in their ancestry. The ethnic or ancestry question is based upon self-identification; that is, we ask respondents to report the ethnic group with which they identify. (The terms "ethnic" and "ancestry" are used interchangeably in this presentation.)

This ancestry item will not only provide counts for a large number of ethnic groups, but, also, the social and economic characteristics of these groups. As currently planned, information will be available from printed reports or tape files for the nation as a whole, States, metropolitan areas, and cities.

These data will be used for community planning and development, implementation of the Federal Ethnic Heritage Program, planning State programs, etc.

Analysts will be able to cross-classify ethnic information by relevant social and economic variables, such as education, family relationship, and income.

Our second major effort involves a special supplement to the Current Population Survey covering the general areas of ethnicity, literacy, and language. This supplement, which was conducted in November 1979, recognized both objective and subjective aspects of ethnicity.

The intent of this survey is twofold: one, to provide a basic data set on ethnicity and related areas which will be a bridge between the 1980 census question on ancestry and the 1970 census question on country of birth of parents; and two, to provide a means for evaluating and interpreting the results of our 1980 census question on ethnicity. The results of this ethnic supplement will help analysts to make decisions about the format and content of an ethnic question to be included in future censuses or surveys conducted by other Governmental agencies.

The survey, which is a national sample of the population, will provide information on ethnic groups at the national level. The expected date for advance publication is mid-1980.

In this presentation, I should like to review the Bureau's experience in the area of ethnicity which will provide an understanding of how the approach to be used in 1980 has evolved.

As a result of the public's interest in immigration, the Census Bureau began to collect information on ethnicity in the middle of the 19th century. From that time until this most recent decade, the questions were objective and referred to place of birth of the person, place of birth of the parents and mother tongue. Since a large proportion of the American population was first- and second-generation in those decades, this set of questions proved to be fairly adequate in identifying ethnic Americans.

Since the proportion of first- and second-generation Americans diminished in recent decades and there has been a rise in ethnic consciousness, the need for a more inclusive approach covering all generations became apparent. Therefore, shortly before the 1970 census, the Bureau asked a question on ethnic origin in its November 1969 Current Population Survey. For the first time, the ethnic item was subjective. The format consisted of a listing approach, with about 13 ethnic origins listed with a check box, and an *other* category. A report from this survey was published.

Again, in the March 1971 Current Population Survey, and March of each year thereafter, a question on ethnic origin was included. A report which presented social and economic characteristics from the March 1971 and 1972 surveys was published. Counts of ethnic groups from the March 1972 surveys are as follows:

English, Scottish, and Welsh - 29.5 million
German - 25.5 million

Irish – 16.4 million

Italian – 8.8 million

Polish – 5.1 million

Subsequent to 1972, data from the Bureau's surveys have not been published, primarily because of difficulties of collecting reliable information on ethnic origin.

Let me cite some of the problems. A study conducted on the ethnicity reported for identical persons in both the March 1971 and 1972 surveys, showed that overall, about two-thirds of the people reported the same specific ethnic group in both years, e.g., German, Polish, etc.

However, this proportion varied substantially by ethnic groups. Some groups, like Polish, Italian and Mexican, were very consistent. For example, about 80 percent of persons who reported Polish in 1971 reported that origin in the subsequent year.

But, on the other hand, consistency was very low for some groups, such as English and Irish, where one-half of the respondents gave the same response in both surveys. For instance, persons reported English in 1971, but reported "other" in 1972.

A second problem is that counts of the various groups fluctuated from survey to survey. A part of the fluctuation was due to changes made in our procedures, but a portion was unexplained. This inconsistency in the counts may be related to inconsistencies in reporting.

The foregoing are just two of the problems that had to be considered in planning for an ethnic question in the 1980 census. In the early stages of testing for 1980, we used a modification of the basic listing approach used in our surveys. However, it soon became apparent that such modifications did not resolve the problems cited above. Also, other concerns became apparent.

The identification of all the ethnic groups for which data have been requested would have required a listing of a large number of groups, more than could be accommodated on the census questionnaire.

Also, since the boundaries of countries in Europe have changed over time, it was very difficult for us to determine the most appropriate categories to list. For example, should Ukrainian or Russian be included in a listing of ethnic groups?

Because of these concerns, the Bureau began to explore other approaches. As Myron has mentioned in his presentation, the Bureau held a meeting in October 1976 with a number of experts on ethnicity. One of the recommendations resulting from the meeting was that the Bureau consider using an open-ended approach to obtain information on ethnicity in the 1980 census.

In 1977, we began testing a format which required most respondents to write in their ethnic origin; the results of this test led to the ancestry question which will be used for 1980, and also in the November 1979 survey.

Our testing has shown that most people who do give a response to the ancestry item are able to provide a codable response. Also, the majority provide a single response. Through our coding and tabulation plans, a large number of ethnic groups will be identified in the 1980 census. Our coding procedure allows for the separate identification of about 500 groups.

However, counts will probably be tabulated for about 200 groups for States and large metropolitan areas and will be made available in some printed form.

Counts for 16 ancestry groups will be published in Chapter C of our Volume I reports. This chapter will also carry social and economic characteristics at the State level for six groups which will remain constant from State to State.

We recognize that the concentrations vary from State to State; therefore, characteristics will be shown for an additional four groups which will reflect the most numerous groups reported in each State.

A subject report on ancestry groups, which will be in our Volume II series, is also being planned. It will provide detailed analytical tables at the national level, and possibly some data for selected States and metropolitan areas.

I have briefly outlined our 1980 census plans. A number of ethnic experts have been consulted on our tabulation, coding and publication plans for 1980; we invite persons here today to provide us with their views on the types of data which should be presented in the subject report to meet their needs.

Thank you.

DISCUSSION

MR. SALTZMAN. Thank you.

Dr. Horn?

DR. HORN. Let me ask you, Ms. McKenney. You're a familiar figure with this Commission; you've testified very well before us on a number of occasions.

On that self-identification question, we take the example - we heard it in some of the testimony - of Yugoslavian, Serbian, Croatian, et cetera. I take it, when the Census compiles it, they would take whatever former independent country was involved as well as the current country, and there would be what - both a common coding on that or would there be subsets that identify those that say "Croatian," "Serbia," so forth?

Ms. MCKENNEY. There will be subsets for the coding of the ancestry question. We will have separate codes for Serbian, Croatian, and Yugoslavian groups, and we would expect to have counts of each of these separately.

Mr. HORN. And then you could also aggregate them under Yugoslavian.

Ms. MCKENNEY. That is correct.

Mr. HORN. Okay. To what extent has the Bureau of the Census considered the question of religion in terms of ever asking a question?

I noticed in some of our testimony here we had the report of some of the suggestions Dr. Novak and others had made and one proposed question to the Census several years ago was: "Whatever your present commitment, would you consider that the strongest cultural influence within your family and yourself was from a culture that was Catholic, Lutheran, Calvinist, Jewish, Orthodox, Anglican, secular or other?"

Has that ever been given serious consideration within the Bureau of the Census?

Ms. MCKENNEY. Yes, the question on religion was given serious consideration but was excluded. Also, since Mr. Novak had provided those comments, the Title XIII was revised and now forbids the asking of a question on religion in a mandatory census; this means that a question on religion could only be asked in future surveys which are not mandatory. However, the inclusion of a question on religion in a survey is *not* under active consideration by the Bureau at this time.

Mr. HORN. Just to clarify for me, do you mean the decennial census is mandatory?

Ms. MCKENNEY. That is correct.

Mr. HORN. Therefore, you could not ask that, even if it were a voluntary response and not a mandated response?

Ms. MCKENNEY. That is correct; the law requires that respondents answer all of the questions to the best of their ability.

Mr. HORN. So you're saying that you can ask a question about religion only in a random sample population survey, because you certainly can't in a total census.

What do we mean by the survey when you can ask?

Ms. MCKENNEY. A sample survey of the population is taken each month to collect employment statistics. It is possible to add supplemental questions to the surveys.

We did ask a question on religion in the 1957 sample survey. However, there was a great deal of concern expressed by some of the public about the resulting information; the Bureau has not asked a question on religion in a survey since that time.

Mr. HORN. Okay, you're thinking of the current population survey; is this what we're talking about?

Ms. MCKENNEY. Yes.

Mr. HORN. Okay. One last query. In his formal statement Mr. Walentynowicz said this – and I'd like to read it to you and get your response.

“For example, we wonder about the wisdom and fairness of including a question relating to race and national origin or descent for such groups as Spanish, Hispanic, Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Korean, Vietnamese, Guamanian, Samoan, Eskimo, and Aleut on every census form but limiting identification of Polish-American and other like groups to only the long census form which will be sent to only 21 percent of America's households.

We have been advised by the Census Bureau that such groups as Samoan, Eskimo, Aleut, Filipino, Korean, and Vietnamese are estimated to be so small in number and so dispersed, that an accurate count can only occur if the question is asked on all forms.”

What's your reaction to that concern?

Ms. MCKENNEY. For the geographical areas for which data are required, that statement is correct. I would like to provide some background information on this area. The racial groups were included on the 100 percent questionnaire for several reasons. Statistical Directive No. 15, issued by the Department of Commerce, indicated that data should be collected for certain groups – white, black, Asian and Pacific Islander, the American Indian and Alaskan Native, and the Hispanic; and test results showed that listing the Asian and Pacific Islander groups separately was the best approach for identifying and getting a count of the total Asian and Pacific Islander population and the specific groups.

In addition, several Federal agencies and State governments indicated that counts and characteristics of specific groups for States and small geographic areas were needed for implementation of laws and programs. Inclusion of these groups on a 100 percent basis was the most feasible procedure for obtaining the information required for the small geographic area.

Examples: Alaska and Federal agencies needed information on Aleuts and Eskimos, and Hawaii and Federal agencies requested data on Hawaiians, Samoans, etc.

Mr. HORN. That statistical directive comes from the Reorganization Act, which takes the old office of Statistical Standards out of OMB and puts it in Commerce.

Ms. MCKENNEY. That is correct.

Mr. HORN. To what degree did the Bureau of the Census help prepare that directive or is that statistical directive merely responding to affirmative action requests from the traditional enforcement

agencies of the Federal Government who have really seen only four categories broadly construed, Asian-American, American Indian, black, Hispanic, as those about which they should be concerned?

I mean, did you help prepare that and just send it back to yourself through the Department of Commerce, or did the enforcement agencies do it, or is it just responding to political pressure, et cetera?

Ms. MCKENNEY. I think that directive developed over a period of two or three years with participation from a rather broad group of Federal agencies. There was Census Bureau involvement in it.

However, it started out as a directive primarily concerning educational statistics, and then later expanded to statistical reporting of all Federal agencies.

MR. HORN. Okay. Thank you.

I think the message of all of this is, if somebody else wants themselves on these forms, organize and put pressure on the Government establishment; isn't that about it?

MR. SALTZMAN. I wonder, in terms of the various nomenclature that you suggested - ancestry, national origin, ethnic identification, heritage - what is the differentiation as you see it between these four terms?

Would we be confusing by using national origin and ethnic identification and heritage? That might just overcomplicate.

Can anyone on the panel give us some suggestions about that kind of category?

Ms. MCKENNEY. Ethnicity is perhaps the broadest term. In the academic area, the term ethnicity can encompass race, national origin, and religion. The Census Bureau uses ethnicity in a more narrow sense, differentiating it from race.

One of the reasons why we had not used the term "ethnicity" on the questionnaire is because some people in the communities do not understand it. In fact, we have found that it has been confused quite often with other words; for instance, some people think that we are talking about ethics. That's a problem that we have with using the word "ethnicity."

National origin would be more restrictive, referring primarily to country of origin.

The Bureau has used ancestry interchangeably with ethnicity; again, our experience suggests that people understand "ancestry" better than any other term, i.e., "ethnicity," "origin," or "heritage."

CHAIRMAN FLEMING. I'd like to say to Ms. McKenney, as Commissioner Horn did, that we do appreciate your being a witness again in connection with some of our explorations. As always, you provided us with a very clear statement as to just what the facts are relative to the current situation.

The suggestion has been made that we monitor what goes on in the Bureau of the Census. I think Ms. McKenney knows that we keep in rather close touch with the Bureau of the Census in connection with quite a number of issues, and undoubtedly that monitoring will continue.

The discussion that has taken place relative to terminology, again, illustrates how important it is. And my own experience in government has been that so often we're inclined to get impatient over discussions of this kind, and kind of dismiss them, and then also a point has been made here that I think is very important, that once an issue of this nature has been resolved, it's very, very important to carry forward an educational process, because even though those who participate in the resolution of the discussion may be in agreement, it does not follow that a lot of people out in the country will understand what has happened.

And also, I'm very appreciative of some of the insights that we have been given relative to the development of the decision-making process within the White House under two administrations. I think that this is very, very helpful to us, and I'm sure it is helpful to others.

Our time is over on this.

MR. RUIZ. I just have one question. Very briefly, why couldn't we just use "Polish ancestry" and "Italian ancestry," in a block?

CHAIRMAN FLEMING. What did you say?

MR. RUIZ. "Polish ancestry" or "Italian ancestry" in a block. Why couldn't we use that in the census?

MS. MCKENNEY. That approach would have required a listing of categories in the item, and while "Polish" and "Italian" would have been acceptable, there are other groups for which the most appropriate term to use would not have been clear.

COMMISSIONER SALTZMAN. I appreciate your participation. This was very informative. Thank you so much, Dr. Flemming.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Yes. We are very, very grateful to you for the paper and for the discussion. It's been very helpful to us.

Ninth Session: Wrap-Up

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. By request, I'm changing the order here. Mr. Marciniak will be our first participant in the wrap-up session.

Mr. Marciniak is the President of the Institute of Urban Life and a Professor of Urban Studies at Loyola University in Chicago.

He is also Chairman of the Board of the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, has served the City of Chicago as Deputy Commission-

er of the Department of Development and Planning, and as Director of the Commission on Humans Relations.

Author of two books and a frequent contributor of articles for national periodicals, he holds Bachelor's and Master's degrees from Loyola University.

We're delighted to have you with us.

MR. MARCINIAK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. We look forward to hearing from you.

**STATEMENT OF EDWARD A MARCINIAK
PROFESSOR OF URBAN STUDIES,
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY, CHICAGO**

In preparing this wrap-up, I asked a baker's dozen friends of mine who are university scholars, officials of human rights agencies, editors, public opinion specialists, and others to appraise your interest in the ethnic agenda – your interest in developing future directions and policy initiatives.

In addition, I talked to several of your presenters from yesterday and heard some of the presentations today. Four conclusions stand out for me.

The first is that the U.S. Civil Rights Commission has earned the respect of most Americans. There isn't any doubt about that. You've taken unpopular positions at unpopular times. You've backed up your policy initiatives with solid research; and on many occasions, you've voiced the moral conscience of America.

Last week a former Chairman of yours was quoted in the press as saying that "Being involved in the civil rights movement was something in which we really accomplished something. We changed this country more in one decade in the the 1960's than any movement has every changed anything."

There is no doubt that the Commission has had a distinguished past. The questions today are whether it has a future, whether the Commission's current agenda is relevant, whether the Commission's day-to-day strategies respond to real moral concerns in America.

The second conclusion is that the Commission is being asked to recognize the unique political character of today's thrust for equal rights and equal justice.

When an employment door is locked to someone because of his or her race, religion, or nationality, when a public accommodation is denied, it's a matter of simple justice – clear, unequivocal, simple justice.

The philosopher calls it commutative justice, exchange justice; equals are being treated unequally under the law, the U.S. law or God's law.

But when the thrust, as it has in the last decade or two, shifts to numerical counts of the number of people by race, religion, sex, or ethnic background in a given occupation, in a profession, or in a graduate school, when we start dealing with representation of these various groups in industry and government, justice is still involved. But it's a different kind.

The philosopher calls it distributive justice. What is a fair share? What is the entitlement of each group? How is the Nation's bounty to be distributed?

In a democratic society, all groups are directly affected by such allocations. All racial, all religious, and all ethnic groups not only have a vital stake in these allocations, but they also have a voice, because we do live in a democratic society; and so, to deny any group a voice in the distribution, in setting the fair share, is the denial of a civil right.

One of the many reasons that was repeated to me over the last three months as to why your interest in this subject was important was because of the declining allegiance to, the alienation from, and the continuing and growing disaffection with Government. People were being left out, the Government wasn't paying attention to them, to their needs, and so on. Your interest in them was very important because perhaps there was some contribution that the U.S. Civil Rights Commission could make in the way in which it approached the question of leveling off some of this growing disaffection.

The third conclusion was that not one of the people I consulted thought it inappropriate for the U.S. Civil Rights Commission to focus on the ethnic agenda and to deal with it as forthrightly as it has with other agendas.

The fourth conclusion is that the Commission is being asked, I think, and I've heard it already, to identify common agendas and unifying strategies. In so doing, the Commission's own agenda, its research and publications, the work of its staff, the role of State Advisory Commissions, will need to take some new directions aimed at coalition building in support of what the statute creating the Commission sought to achieve.

Let me cite a few examples of what I heard. There is considerable evidence that the Ku Klux Klan is growing and becoming openly militant. Historically, the Klan has been racist, anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic.

Now why shouldn't the Civil Rights Commission examine the similarities and differences in these three forms of group oppression? Identifying the consequences of this prejudice and discrimination for the victims and for the U.S. society as a whole - that's a bridge building effort.

Another study, another public hearing, or another report, could deal with the role of ethnic communities and ethnic institutions in managing racial diversity and enhancing cultural pluralism in the major cities of the United States.

I think we don't know what's being done in this area at all. There is some work being done in the suburbs, but in terms of the way in which this has been handled and in the way in which it could be handled in the future this could be an extremely important bridge building effort.

As part of this inquiry, the Commission might look at the amazing experience of inner city, Catholic and other private schools: how small schools, how strong leadership from principals, how student discipline have created excellent schools for children of the poor, regardless of race or religion.

Another item: Nowhere is the failure of public policy which ignores ethnicity in cultural pluralism so evident as it is in public education. Nowhere.

The lack of sensitivity by the courts and public agencies, Federal and local, to such cultural, heritage, and language needs is clearly evident among students of Hispanic origins. There is notable evidence that the Hispanic student is not being served well by the existing educational system.

It is difficult. You'd have to be blind to ignore the alarming statistics of low reading scores, high drop-out rates, and the ensuing unemployment and under-employment.

I know that the U.S. Civil Rights Commission has held public hearings, sponsored its Mexican-American education study in the early 1970's, but the deplorable situation prevails.

Here, I think, the responsiveness of Catholic and other private, inner-city schools to the specific needs of ethnic groups, including Hispanics and blacks, has a lot to tell public educators. The Commission could be the vehicle for transmitting that experience and knowledge.

Another item in the 1979 report, "Insurance Redlining, Fact, Not Fiction" issued jointly by the Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin Advisory Committees to the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, is a small step in a new direction. A small step.

The major finding of this investigation was that property insurance was more difficult to obtain in neighborhoods with a concentration of minority or lower income residents or older homes than in other communities.

Then the report inched toward, but finally ducked, the ethnic agenda. Every observer of the urban scene knows well that inner-city ethnic neighborhoods have as terrible a time getting insurance

coverage at moderate rates as the ones that were talked about there. Why not say that, in addition – not in place of – but in addition?

Another item: To the best of my knowledge, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission ignored one of the pioneering attempts in this country to build such bridges and establish common agendas among ethnic, racial, and religious groups.

Dr. Russell Barta, who appeared here earlier, published his minority report entitled “The Representation of Poles, Italians, Latins, and Blacks in the Executive Suites of Chicago’s Largest Corporations.” This was taken from his research in 1974.

That study was ecumenically designed for the precise reasons that you’re having this two-day consultation. While some university centers and other institutions around the country replicated this study for a handful of cities, no effort was made to undertake a national study by any Government agency. What a tragedy!

With your resources, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission could undertake a similar study of *Fortune’s* 500 lists of industrial and nonindustrial giants.

A final suggestion. I think you’ve heard it in several different ways today, but I’d like to tell it to you my way.

The most recent issue of *Civil Rights Update* attempts to justify the expression “Euro-ethnic Americans” by saying that it “is a term preferred by descendants of eastern and southern immigrants.”

I have searched high and low for a study or report which indicated such a preference. I have talked to several dozen scholars of ethnicity and found not even one who would express such a preference.

Now, your choice of expression reminds me of Mrs. Ladonna Harris’ experience as a commencement speaker at an eastern college. As you know, she is the wife of that distinguished Oklahoman, former Senator Fred Harris, and in her commencement address she said, “You’ve made me an Indian; I happen to be a Comanche.”

“There are Cree, Sioux, Apache, Cherokee, Navajo, and others, but you have turned them into Indians,” and I think that’s what everybody’s afraid of; you’re going to turn them into Euro-ethnics.

In conclusion, may I remind you that what I propose here and what others have proposed is not a new idea. John Kromkowski, President of the National Center, described to you yesterday the successes and rebuffs of the Bicentennial Ethnic Racial Coalition in the 1970’s.

There are other experiences of this kind. You don’t have to start from scratch here on this point. You will find experiences all over. Paul Ascioffa mentioned some here in Chicago.

If you look around, you will find that there have been remarkable experiences in this country in the 1970’s, on which you could build.

That would give you the opportunity for exercising the leadership – a renewed leadership – in the 1980's.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. Thank you very much.

It's now my privilege to recognize a veteran in this area, a long-time friend of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Monsignor Geno Baroni. As most of you here know, Geno Baroni has served in the Department of Housing and Urban Development as the Assistant Secretary for Neighborhoods, voluntary associations, and consumer protection for the past 2 1/2 years.

He has long been a national leader in urban neighborhood affairs, and has worked extensively with neighborhood groups to form coalitions on convergent issues.

He has had leadership roles in four White House conferences: Youth, civil rights, hunger-nutrition, ethnicity and neighborhood revitalization.

He was appointed by President Carter to be the Administration's liaison to the National Commission on Neighborhoods, a commission which he helped to bring into existence.

Monsignor Baroni, we're delighted to have you with us and look forward to your summing up.

**STATEMENT OF FATHER GENO BARONI
ASSISTANT SECRETARY, OFFICE OF NEIGHBORHOODS,
VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS AND CONSUMER PROTECTION
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

Thank you very much, Dr. Flemming and members of the Commission. I have to say that I admire your patience. I've been before many Senate and House hearings, and they don't have your kind of stamina to stick it out.

I must say that over the years you've provided distinguished leadership in so many areas and I'm pleased to support the remarks that Marciniak has made here; and I guess what I want to share with you are some of my ideas of where to go from here. I mean you have specifics, you have generalities, even the name and so on, as Ed Marciniak is saying.

So I feel like I've been to an alumni meeting here. In one sense or another everything seems to be very much connected.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. I kind of had that feeling.

FATHER BARONI. It's my own experience, and two things come to mind. One is that many of my friends in here say, "Well, you left the ethnic agenda when you were co-opted by the Government, especially when you went to the Department of Housing and Urban Development."

Well, that's not necessarily true, because there I continue to see the problem. I can't find integrated schools; we can't put housing in certain neighborhoods. At a meeting this morning in Chicago, we can't find anybody in Chicago who knows how to start from scratch – how to integrate a project before we build. Nobody has that state-of-the-art.

A black group in a black neighborhood wants to integrate a project with black, Hispanic, and white in a neighborhood right near the University of Chicago.

That expertise, that state-of-the-art, hardly exists. But we have these experiences every day.

Last week the President of Aetna, one of the largest corporations, finally sat down with six neighborhood groups to try to resolve some of the problems of insurance redlining, black groups, Hispanic groups, mixed neighborhoods, changing neighborhoods, older neighborhoods and so on.

All these things indicate something, that if we want to look at where we go and what the future is and some of things that people have been saying here, and my own experience and I think what's happened in our society – when I approached the Civil Rights Commission 10 years ago to discuss this question, we did not get any kind of response.

In one way, that's sad; in the other way, maybe it's just as well. But you would not have had the experience and the talent and the in-depth kind of presentation as you've had here; and also, the perspective that most of the people that testified here have, a perspective of being concerned about ethnic issues, the understanding, the moral agenda, as Ed said, that created the Commission, and particularly in terms of civil rights and particularly in terms of race and where the country was headed and the white supremacy of the past and all those kinds of issues, that there is hardly a person here that doesn't understand that somehow and some way, in a democracy, in a free and open society, we may be the only place in the world where we have a chance to accommodate people of all kinds of diversity; and, whereas many of us were taught to melt or get off the pot, as I would say, many of us were raised to grow and to imitate or to become an all-American or to become whatever, and so on; and yet to recognize – you know, my friends here are very anxious about my quotations because we keep passing them on to one or the other – that I'm very, very sensitive to the fact, okay, we have these value variations in this common humanity.

But what we don't have and what the Commission might help us to do and what our American society needs – because what happens in our American society very much is going to foretell what happens in our foreign policy and what's happening in the world.

When I started the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, coming out of 10 years of street civil rights experiences and all that, half of my friends told me I was crazy. Americans are scared silly of the word "ethnic."

But it was never legitimate; it was never kosher; we never thought of ourselves as a pluralistic society. We never thought of ourselves in terms of unity and diversity, in terms of how to preserve the one in order to take care of the many.

And what's happening around the world – and I recommend to the Commission the classic study by Harold Isaacs on power and identity in foreign policy – and what's even happening in Iran.

Only a few months ago, in the *New York Times*, December, 1978, the CIA told a *New York Times* reporter that there were no fears of this person, Ayatollah Khomeini. He had no support at all. Six months later, the American Government ordered a massive study of Moslem institutions in the Moslem religious world.

We have no idea why people are so afraid of the word "ethnic." How many people have been killed; how many societies have fallen apart? Whereas, we're a global society, technological. Our society is fragmented. No other place in the world, no other countries in the world, have the mechanism to deal with diversity, whether it's religious or racial or ethnic.

American society is one of the few mechanisms that's left, and one of the reasons many American ethnics are so sensitive, so ambivalent, so anxious to be American, is that we don't want to question whatever we've been taught, and so, you know, we don't learn the language of our father and mother. The teacher said not to.

Okay. The teacher said that because we wanted to be, quote, "American." Somewhere, there was this automatic idea of "Americans" but we don't know who they are or where they are.

One of the points that I want to make about something that we have to deal with goes with what Ed Marciniak said. (I keep wanting to call him Doctor.) We desperately need to legitimize the fact that we're not a melting pot. We're the most ethnically, racially, religiously, pluralistic country in the world.

Let's learn to deal with that. Dr. Rene DuBois talks about tolerance. Diversity is necessary for survival and for the accommodation of a free and open society. So our democratic form of government gives us a common bond. The Declaration, the Bill of Rights, the Constitution, and the kinds of things that the Civil Rights Commission has raised to remind us of that, are very appropriate vehicles.

What we don't have at the day-to-day working level in our communities in our neighborhoods, is somebody in the Department of Housing and Urban Development who knows or understands what

we're talking about here today in the context of race and ethnicity or of blacks or Hispanics or whites or class or regions or different parts of the country.

I was in Alaska recently, and we built some housing there. It was terribly expensive – \$125,000 a unit for two little rooms. Then we built a community center. Of course they have to have a community center.

Well, we went back in the spring and found that eight of the houses were missing. What happened? The native group all moved into the community center. They tore down the eight houses and used them for firewood. Nobody had asked them how to build the houses. Nobody had offered them the options.

We are not a culture of democracy. We've never understood the importance of culture in democracy. I wish I could elaborate on why we're so scared of the word "ethnic" and "diversity". Between 1945 and 1967, 7,480,000 people were killed in over a hundred different ethnic, racial, and religious battles in the world, whether it was Hindus and Moslems in India, whether it's Indian and Moslems in Pakistan, tribal wars in Nigeria, Chad, Sudan, Arabs and Israelis, Indonesians killing Chinese in Indonesia, Chinese killing Tibetans in Tibet, Malays killing Chinese in Malaysia, Indians killing Nagas in Assam and so on, Protestants and Catholics in Ulster, Moslems and Christians in Lebanon, Buddhists and Zengalese and Hindutamalese in Ceylon and Greeks in Cyprus and Kurds and Iraqis and Iranians and Ethiopians, Eritreans and Somalis and on and on and on, Christian-Filipinos and Moslems, on and on and on.

Nowhere in the world is there a mechanism to deal with this thing that keeps coming up. This soft fact of life.

We can talk about the hard facts: America's energy, America's size, America's resources, America's technology and all of that. But the soft facts are those things that are related to ethnicity: race, culture, and diversity.

And I wanted to sum up with an analysis of that: why the Commission, in terms of what it can do and where it's going to go, and what we desperately need if we're going to learn how to live together in our cities and society, and how this affects international policy as well, is summed up in this analysis when we talk about this crucial fact.

Many things, the issues of power and economics, the issue of new technologies, life-creating as well as life-destroying, that will govern the kind of America that will exist and what kind of world in the time to come.

But if our behavior in world affairs is to have more for its object than our sheer brute survival, it has to be based on the maintenance of the democratic and open society that we're trying to create.

Sixty percent of the American people voted when I went to inner city Washington in 1960. In the last few years, 60 percent of the American people have not voted. Somebody mentioned alienation toward government. Why is that so? I don't know if that comes under your mandate or not; you do voting issues as well, I know.

But here is the most crucial soft American fact of all. The model of the democratic open society is what we counterpoise with the assorted models of the closed and increasingly closing societies that now rule most of the world.

The model of inclusiveness and shared rights of accommodation of differences of race, origin, religion, is a model that we counterpoise in deeply bloody we-they tribal, racial, ethnic, religious, and national conflicts that are now tearing the globe into many pieces at a time when it needs, more than anything else, to exist as some kind of tolerably functioning whole.

With the decline and change of national empires, we have 90 new governments and 50-odd older governments, all of them having problems internally on these issues.

Most of the politics created by this fragmentation around the world may be inaccessible to the direct impact of American policy abroad.

But the best that we can hope to do is to be aware enough of its particulars not to stumble over them as we have been doing and to take them into account as we pursue our own interests.

We made the mistake in Indochina; we talked about nationalism. The Chinese and the Vietnamese and the Cambodians were all fighting each other, communist or otherwise, because the nationalist thing is stronger. It reminds me of Tasio Paz' quotation in terms of this. Past epics never vanish completely, and blood still drips from their wounds, even most ancient.

In a global society, there are no deserts; there are no islands. We see the body counts on TV, by our technology, in a fragmented world. There's not any rain forest far enough away to keep these collisions – racial, ethnic, religious, national origin – isolated from international politics.

The best that we can hope for, in terms of stumbling around in our international politics, is to look at our situation here at home. In a far more ineffable way, this world condition is accessible to the impact of our American behavior here.

It's the only existing model in the world. We should cease stumbling as we begin to legitimize some of the kinds of facts and concerns that have been expressed today. The Rabbi asked a very important kind of question. In our American society there is no journalism; there is no forum; there is no political language; there is no newspaper language;

there is no educational language – to deal with the intercultural imperative of American life.

We argue about terminology – even the name of this meeting. We're very uncomfortable. The word "ethnic" drives people crazy, "first-generation", "heritage" and so on. We don't have the language to describe ourselves, and America has no national sense of identity, no national sense of purpose. America is in the business, like everywhere else in the world, of redefining itself. Who am I and who are we as Americans? What has been our experience?

Taking the documents that we have – the Constitution and Declaration, Bill of Rights – and finding those experiences, can help us to accommodate the diversity.

But much isn't there. There's no commission, nobody in Government, nobody in the media showing us the state of the art. They want to exacerbate the fights between group, but nobody is giving us examples of how to deal with them. I met with Filer of Aetna, and he says, "My people in the insurance company don't know how to talk to neighborhood people, be they black, be they Hispanic, be they ethnic, be they Indian, be they whatever."

We talk different languages. We have no mechanisms to talk to each other. We have no kinds of forums to assure all people who are Americans the equality of status and opportunity which in theory all are supposed to enjoy.

We're engaged in trying to see whether the common holdings shared by Americans in all our diversity can provide a setting in which different kinds of people can coexist with decent mutual respect and acceptance, instead of tearing each other from limb to limb. In short, we're trying to see whether we can finally create a "one" that will preserve "the many."

Now, it is one of our greatest soft assets, that the goals and the values of our society - modern, egalitarian, humane - are to pacify almost everyone who comes here and who still looks to the future rather than to the past for human betterment.

The totalitarians keep calling themselves "democratic." I watched even Khomeini claim that he's ruling, "in the name of the people," and it looks like another Jimmy Jones.

But, anyway, as limited and qualified as our achievement might be, the American society has come closer to realizing these goals than any other society.

Now the question is: Where do we go from here? Where do we go? What are the kinds of things in our soft quality of American life that we'll take along with the hard stuff, i.e., our size, our strength, and our energy to shape the American position in terms of dealing with our diversity? I think that is the most important single thing that will shape

the American position in world affairs, and that the shape of much of the rest of the world's politics will be influenced in critical measure by what we make of our own.

So we're at a critical point – the melting pot is gone; the myth lingers. I was at a meeting at Harvard this weekend with people from the Kennedy School. There were many young people and many people from neighborhoods – black, Hispanic, white, and other. All kinds of people were trying to struggle with ways in which people can deal with each other.

This Commission should take up some of the suggestions that Mr. Marciniak and others made and take a look at America. Or do we need a new Commission to answer the questions about the cultural dimension of American life? What is the meaning of diversity and pluralism in American life? What is the meaning of the intercultural imperative of American life, and what is the meaning of America's racial, ethnic, cultural, and religious life-style diversity? What are those implications in terms of the Constitution, Bill of Rights, Declaration of Independence? That's a new kind of agenda in terms that will serve the purpose and mandate of the Commission from its beginning.

One of the things that we felt many times as ethnics is that many "liberal friends" would be dumping on us although perhaps they live next to blacks and Hispanics in older neighborhoods; and that's how many of us got into this.

We got into this because we saw what the Kerner Report said. The inevitable group conflict between rising aspirations of minorities and others, and the anxious fears of many lower middle-class Americans who happen to be white.

What's an alternative to that inevitable group conflict? What's an alternative to that? What mechanisms do we have? What kind of coping do we have, and why don't people in Government look at this? I think the reason is that we have not legitimately defined our society in a way that includes all people and in a way that legitimizes those of us who want to respect the cultural and racial diversity of others and who want to deal with equality and justice for all.

I think underneath all of these complaints and all of our concerns and all of our anxieties about being blamed or put down is that fundamental belief that the American system and its mechanisms and its institutions can be the model. If the Commission can't take the lead, then who can? Do we need to ask for a new vehicle in the 1980's to look at this kind of question?

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING: Thank you very, very much.

I'm sure that I express the views of my colleagues when I say to both of those who have provided us with this roundup that we're deeply grateful to you for the issues you've identified.

We definitely will keep them in mind as we review the record of this hearing and decide our next steps.

I like the emphasis that has recurred time and time again – Monsignor Baroni has underlined it a good many times – mainly, that we are a pluralistic society and that we must work out ways and means of carrying on our life with that fact in mind and do it within the framework of the Constitution of the United States.

There is no question at all in my mind but that this is a very relevant subject for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, and we will see just where we go from here.

I do want to express for all of those who are still here and who participated in this consultation my – our very deep appreciation for the contributions that you have made.

My colleague writes me a note; he says he has a word to substitute for Euro-ethnics.

Mr. Ruiz, what is it?

COMMISSIONER RUIZ . Every day new words to characterize an event or a situation are being coined within our constantly growing vocabulary. The Department of Census is at a loss to identify ethnics.

It has been stated that none of the experts can idle up to the word "Euro-ethnics." For example, the words "United Nations" never existed until recently. We can see that if we look back just a few years.

If we can include a thousand languages under the umbrella of "United Nations," why could we not characterize what we are groping for as "United Ethnics of America?"

We are looking for a category, for unity within American ethnics. I believe that that probably merits some consideration.

CHAIRMAN FLEMMING. For all of us, certainly the Commission, this has been a very stimulating and challenging experience, and we're indebted to all of you.

Thank you very, very much. This consultation is adjourned.

U. S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20425

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE \$300

**FOURTH CLASS MAIL
POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
PERMIT NO. G73**

