Implications of Racism for Social Work Practice

Seymour Mirelowitz

IMPLICATIONS OF RACISM FOR SOCIAL WORK PRACTICE

BY SEYMOUR MIRELOWITZ*

ABSTRACT

    This paper examines school and practice issues in social
work in relationship to the concepts of ethnicity, minority
groups, racism, and institutional racism. Operational definitions
to establish conceptual clarity are also developed. The statis-
tical aspects of progression vis-a-vis cultural diversity in social
work institutions, enrollment in schools of social work, and
representation on the faculty of schools of social work are
studied. Social policy and the implementation of change in
social work practice and education are then dealt with in relation
to the current reality of the profession and the society in which
it functions.

*Seymour Mirelowitz is an assistant professor at the Jane Addams
  College of Social Work, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle.

        Introduction:

        The purposes of this paper are:

        1. To demonstrate the melting pot theory as a myth or fantasy
according to the Anglo-Conformity or assimilationist concept perva-
sive for many years in all institutions in the American society
including social work.

        2. To re-examine the concept of ethnicity as cultural plural-
ism and to examine issues in social work relating to it.

        The avowed concept of the melting pot is conceived as a vessel
or crucible wherein all "individuals of all nations are melted into
a new race of men, whose labors and posterity will one day cause
great changes in the world." [1] The melting pot theory is contra-
dicted by Anglo-Conformity concept, which postulates that immigrants

must renunciate their customs, language, dress and all the vestiges of their original culture and become absorbed in the host culture. [2] The process in not melting but bleaching-a laundry process.

The melting pot idea is an assimilationist theory. It presupposes changes in food habits, music, and dance in the host's direction. Thus the two become culturally and societally intertwined. This process should be more apparent during the first generation and the subsequent ones of the immigrants. Therefore, one no longer sees or feels any differences between the host and the immigrant groups because they are now the same. Especially is this so, according to the theory, since this is reinforced by intermarriages that occur.

Not only were there cracks in the melting pot reflected in prejudice and discrimination towards religious minorities but according to the U.S. constitution the blacks, Hispanics and Asians, for example, were not originally "intended to be included in the melting pot." [3] The government supported legal inequality until the 1860's when the constitution was amended to give the blacks some limited degree of equal rights to freedom. But it was not actually until 1954 when discriminatory laws were reversed through the Supreme Court decision of Plessey vs Ferguson. Even as recently as in the 1960's some states still practiced racism. [4] The American Indians were also not intended for the melting pot. As late as 1961, they were still segregated in schools, and denied welfare benefits in state or local government programs. [5]

Opposing the melting pot concept, we see a particularistic quality for ethnic groups in our society. There is a high degree of separatism bordering on alienation from the larger society that has surfaced in the last two decades. It is difficult to prove causation, however several associated factors bear close examination. The period of the 1960's ran the gamut from stability to instability in the body of the United States. It was a period of both optimism and extreme pessimism in regard to resolving the tension among the diverse groups in the country. It began with the election of a young President, whose religious-ethnic group had previously been kept from representation in this office.

A study of surveys conducted between 1940 and the mid 1960's showed a sharp decline in religiously based animosities, as well as a greater acceptance of policies designed to integrate Blacks in different areas of life and the use of government funds for this purpose. The political scientist Robert Lane concluded that there

was increasing confidence in government during this period. [6]

In 1964, the Survey Research Center of the University of
Michigan found that 62 percent of the American public indicated a
significant degree of trust in government. By 1970, the percentage
had dropped to 37 percent. In September 1973 the pollsters revealed
a drop to 19 percent in confidence in the executive branch of the
federal government, reflecting the highest degree of alienation from
government yet evidenced. [8]

The weakening of the national fabric, induced partly as a
result of the disastrous effects of the Vietnam war and the crisis
in the Presidency, brought with it an effort to identify or reidenti-
fy with smaller, more particularistic groups. Certainly the chal-
lenge by Blacks and other minority groups reinforced a reawakened
identification with ethnic origin. The current quest for ethnic
identity can be seen as a way of reestablishing a sense of security.

Before we move ahead, it is important to define ethnicity. The
definition derives from the two concepts of ethnic group and identity.
Weber defines the ethnic group as a collectivity that believes in its
common descent. [9] Erikson looks upon identity as "a process located
in the core of the individual and yet also in the core of his communal
culture." [10] Ethnicity represents an attempt of the ethnic collec-
tivity to keep alive some of the diffuse, descriptive, particularistic
modes of behavior that were common in the past. This communal heri-
tage is maintained through the individual, as a member of the group.
Ethnic identity then, offers the individual a ground on which to
stand and cannot be taken away from him.

To examine more fully the concept of ethnicity, it is also
important to consider the operational definition of a minority
group. Relationships between minorities and the dominant group are
not only determined by numbers but by power. No one relinquishes
power easily. Wirth recognized this:

>   We may define a minority as a group who, because
> of their physical or cultural characteristics, are
> singled out from the others in the society in which
> they live for differential and unequal treatment, and
> who therefore regard themselves as objects of collec-
> tive discrimination. The existence of a minority in
> a society implies the existence of a corresponding
> dominant group enjoying higher social status and greater
> privileges. Minority status carries with it the exclu-
> sion from full participation in the life of the society. [11]

The minority groups currently facing discrimination in our society are all the non-whites-Blacks, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, and other Spanish-speaking groups, American Indians and Asians. Therefore, it is clear that race is the crucial factor in their minority status. Daniels and Kitano support the above viewpoints in referring to racism as a belief that one or more races have innate superiority over others. [12] Taking this one step further, one might say that at the heart of institutional racism in the United States is the myth of Caucasian superiority.

What has been stated up to this point seeks to provide a framework for examining ethnicity. Although, the popular rhetoric has glorified this country as a melting pot of different peoples and different races, in practice this has meant melting diversity into conformity with white, Anglo, middle-class characteristics. The goal has been acculturation.

Acculturation

The institutions in a society are there to fulfill the purposes of that society. Social agencies and schools of social work, like other institutions, have promoted the concept of the melting pot. The historial linkages of social work to the mental health movement have been well established. The pertinent issue, however, is the ideological content which undergirds this movement. The movement incorporated the dominant and mobile middle-class ethic that accompanied the Industrial Revolution. [13] The early history of settlement houses in the United States reflected the thrust of the pioneers in social work to acculturate the immigrant to the American way of life. The attitudes toward the lower class ethnic were ambivalent and swung from thinly veiled racism to egalitarianism. [14] It is possible that the society did not know how to handle pluralism. This prototype of demanding conformity to the middle-class white, Anglo patterns of behavior has permeated all the socializing institutions in our society. Social work institutions are not unique in this respect. Those who are unable or who resist the transformation have suffered from various degrees of abuse and alienation because middle-class America demands conformity before it gives acceptance.

This pattern, which occurs in social work agencies, is aptly demonstrated in the elementary schools. La Belle indicates that emphasis is placed on changing the behavior of the child rather than

on changing the institution. The child who is culturally dif-
ferent is asked to carry the burden of adjustment and change
while the school maintains the stance that the child is culturally
deprived. [15]

The process of bridging the culture gap may be viewed as
acculturation. Mirelowitz clearly described this as "an essential
factor as we look at our value system and its inherent attitudes.
If we see acculturation as the acquisition of a second culture,
which a minority group must learn from a majority group, then a
process emerges whereby the less dominant group systematically
gives up its own culture for that of another. [16]

In education, the practice of rewarding academically talented
or motivated children has, by tradition, a built-in cultural bias.
Tests used to measure the potential of pupils are skewed to favor
the white, middle-class child. With the same kind of bias, many
teachers tend to see only white children as gifted. Simultaneously,
non-academic talents are downgraded. Teachers unconsciously reward
students who are most like themselves and do well in academic
subjects.

Chestang discussed the institutionalization of injustice and
the subsequent inconsistencies that lead to feelings of powerless-
ness and impotence. In making the concept of racism operational,
he said:

> Our distinction between injustice and inconsistency
> is pertinent. It should be recalled that such a dis-
> tinction is precisely what members of minority groups
> refer to as racism, with their preference for the more
> direct discrimination in the South to the more hypo-
> critical stance of the North, to their greater comfort,
> if not ease, in dealing with the bigot than with the
> liberal. [17]

In diagnosing the concept of poverty, Warren developed the
two alternative paradigms of "individual deficiency" and "dys-
functional social structure." He referred to "institutional
thought structure," which serves as a conceptual framework to
support the first of these models. [18] It appears to us that
institutional racism places the burden of "making it" in the
system on the nonwhite individual, thereby relieving the insti-
tutions of the necessity to change.

Racism In Academe

How is racism manifested in academic institutions, and especially in social work education? In the spring of 1968 the Council on Social Work Education conducted a survey of nondiscriminatory practices in accredited graduate schools of social work. Reichert indicated that evaluation of the results depended on the values and philosophy that determined the interpretation of the data, and the meaning of the word "nondiscrimination." The year 1968 was a significant turning point in the interpretation of the latter term, since previously non-discrimination had signified the omission of any consideration of race, color, creed, or ethnic origin in the determination of student admission and faculty selection.

In terms of the criteria for nondiscrimination of the accreditation standard, the survey showed no evidence of violation in schools of social work. However, the picture was different if one accepted the position that there was need for positive action to make educational opportunities available to minority groups and to enrich the programs of all students by providing racial and cultural diversity on the faculty. In spite of the efforts by some schools the data supported the impression by many in the field that the overall situation could be improved. In 1968 CSWE established a new accreditation standard requiring schools to give evidence of special efforts to assure cultural diversity in their student body, faculty, and staff. [19]

Despite this, figures on student admissions show little improvement for ethnic minority groups. In 1970-71 there were over 1,600 nonwhite first-year students in master's degree programs, almost 25 percent of the total first-year student enrollment. In 1972 the numbers rose to 1,771, but represented only 23 percent of the total first-year enrollment. In 1970-71 slightly over 14 percent of all first-year students were Black, but in 1972 the percentage had risen to only 15.8 percent. Similarly between those two dates, the combined-percentage of Chicano and Puerto Rican first-year students changed from 4.3 percent to 4.6 percent; for Asian-Americans, from 1.5 percent to 1.9 percent; and for American Indians from .6 percent to .5 percent. [20]

In November 1970, 17.4 percent of full-time faculty members in accredited schools of social work were nonwhite. There were 259

Black, 32 Puerto Rican, 38 Chicano, 39 Asian American, and 18
American Indian. [21]

The pattern of underrepresentation of minority groups is
reflected in academic institutions that educate for professions
other than social work. Chatterjee conducted a study of a five-
year period of enrollment at a Midwestern University, in the
Schools of Law, Medicine, and Social Work. The conclusions
indicate that student bodies in law and medicine have little or
no representation of Blacks. Student bodies in social work only
recently have had a higher representation of Blacks. The data also
show the minimal representation of other minority racial groups in
all three schools. [22] While there is no attempt here to generalize
from this study, it does indicate some trends worth examining.

The Stance of Social Work

The substantive questions raised above dealing with access to
the opportunity structure lead the author to ask: What are the
social policy issues involved for social work practice? What is
the responsibility of social work to clients, among whom a signi-
ficant number are minority group members? How can the profession
participate in changing the economic, social, and political bul-
works that breed problems for minority groups. [23]

It would appear that issues of ethnic diversity surface more
sharply in practice than in education. Ethnicity moves to center
stage when social workers encounter clients whose ethnic and racial
differences create distance and misunderstandings between them, or
when agency services are undersubscribed by ethnic minority popula-
tions because they fail to see any relevance in them.

Characteristically, the tendency is to equate ethnics with
"problematic" situations, minority status roles, a range of
deprivations, and other phenomena carrying negative connotations.
Although stresses are discernably grave and numerous in the life
situations of various ethnic populations and these logically
attract the immediate concern of social workers, there is another
perspective for viewing ethnic groups that may lead to greater
advantages for them. If one stands apart and observes what has
been occuring to ethnic minority populations at the present time,
one is immediately impressed with the rather remarkable vitality
and preservation of identity that many have maintained despite

oppressive experiences. It is conceivable that a typology of coping capacities and strategies at the level of the individual, the group, the family and the community might be productive for social workers to think about. Ethnic populations are a rich resource for just such a study. This viewpoint is expressed in two CSWE task force reports. [24]

However one cannot stop there since the denigrating and exclusionary practices of some basic systems that are necessary to meet human needs are so powerful that even larger populations, regardless of extreme attempts at self-help, cannot overcome such destructiveness through their own effort. This is especially true in the fields of employment, health, education, and housing. Therefore, in addition to recognizing strengths in populations, social workers must understand how dysfunctional systems in society can destroy human potential. Not only is it imperative that there be an understanding of such facts, but there also must be commitment on the part of social workers to remain vigilant and active in risking confrontation with social systems that subtly or otherwise endorse racism and other discriminatory practices.

The detection and analysis of these forces need to be built into the social work curriculum in field practice, in social policy, and in human behavior courses where the effects of destructive and depriving environments on socialization, self-image, and coping capacities have been well-documented in theory. [25] Some educational programs have given major support to theories that have overemphasized the exclusiveness of intra-psychic explanations for human action and social phenomena and have devalued environmental and situational input. As Gordon has so ably stated, "what the organism is usually in contact with, rather than below-the surface structures which are inferred to be responsible for the nature of what the human organism usually confronts," are the kinds of understanding that social workers need. [26]

This line of reasoning should lead to some refurbishment of the value base of social work, to a redistribution of power, and to operational changes in alliances. Social work needs to demonstrate its interest in human dignity and freedom of choice by helping individuals and groups realize their potential and by supporting environments that promote growth. In so doing, the

social work professional needs frequently to transfer leadership
or share it with client populations and, finally, to form coali-
tions with consumer/client groups and take firm stands against
dysfunctional elements in the environment. These activities imply
that social work cannot remain detached even in problematic situa-
tions. To be able to empathize with human unhappiness and depriva-
tion requires subjective responses and unambiguous decisions about
what is required. This, in the final analysis, leads to an
"advocate" role. To work effectively with ethnic groups, skills
in advocacy and belief in consumerism are imperative.

Advocacy

     To take the consumer advocate role within agencies can pose
very knotty problems for the social worker. In large bureaucratic
structures that are not open to change except through formal and
laborious processes, a social worker needs to possess skill in
negotiating. This may presuppose an understanding of the art of
manipulation, a capacity for compromise, or taking calculated
risks. Where do social workers learn such skills? If they adopt
a purist philosophy and naively believe that goodwill and trust
shall overcome all, they might find themselves and their clients
losing out at both ends. Social workers need to learn political
sophistication that can, in the long run, strengthen their skills
in intervention strategies. It also would be sanguine to begin
to deal pragmatically and openly with notions such as "manipula-
tion" and "conflict." There has been a shying away from such
value-laden terms in an effort to become increasingly scientific
and "objective." But theory building itself is subjective. [27]

Available Body of Knowledge

     The focus on ethnic diversity requires the use of certain
bodies of knowledge that are now being regarded with interest by
a number of social work educators. These deal with theories about
conflict, decision making, social systems, social change, and the
nature of action. In particular, social systems concepts such as
open and closed boundaries, interfaces between systems, changing
relationships within systems, balance and conflict, feedback
processes and others have tremendous viability in identyfying
problems on a broad base and deciding on which level to intervene.
Conflict theory offers explanations for growth and change. This
body of knowledge is adaptable to all areas of the curriculum.

It has relevance at the individual, group, family, community, and societal levels. [28] It might be sanguine to test in practice the viability of these generic models in searching for understandings of intra and interethnic relations. As Schermerhorn noted, "prejudice is a product of situations, historical situations, economic situations, political situations; it is not a little demon that emerges in people simply because they are depraved." [29] Social workers do not consider these factors as much as they should. They are more inclined to view discrimination and prejudice as independent variables.

An approach to cultural pluralism using a system's model may provide richer understanding of how ethnic groups can continue to maintain their identities in certain segments of community living and still accomodate and participate in certain other features of the dominant society (work situations, politics, etc.).

Awareness of ethnic variables comes with knowledge of the history, culture, life-style, social network, and so on of a people who share to some degree, common backgrounds. The intellectual component of ethnicity is transmitted through the written word and through visual and auditory accounts but the affective component must usually be experienced and learned through social encounters. Social work requires both: knowledge and feeling. In the academic ambience, the intellectual tradition is much more familiar, and affective learning must be structured into the curriculum more purposefully.

Students from ethnic minorities have much to contribute to affective learning, although this may only be tangential to their educational goals. Difficulties sometimes arise with this, however. Ethnics do not always wish to share reactions and insights with so-called "outsiders" and they can feel that they are being exploited when they are approached for help in clarifying misunderstandings. Sometimes ethnic minority enclaves wall themselves off, in some ways repeating the societal act of alienation in reverse. There are possibilities and confront them as they arise. Allowing group hostilities to fester becomes a microcosm of the problems found in the wider social arena. The opportunity for face to face encounters and a chance for sharing experiences and thinking as freely as possible within a neutral milieu can help students with their identity struggles as well as with their more generalized irrationalities and stereotypes. Field experience with

ethnic minority populations similarly provides opportunities
for insights. In short, there needs to be a much more purpose-
ful structure of learning about ethicity for all students.

The widely disseminated belief that social workers from the
same ethnic background as their clients are able to form more
helpful relationships with them is far from conclusive. [30] It
is possible that such formulation may reflect more of a political
than a professional reality. The observation that ethnic popula-
tions contain people with a wide range of differences despite
common origins mitigates against the possibility that an "ethni-
cally/racially qualified" social worker is the most effective.
It is true that the internalization of ethnic and racial symbols
are deeply ingrained in the process of socialization but the
subjective meaning that individuals make of such symbols is
ultimately the decisive force in developing personal values and
interpersonal relationships.

There has been too little thought given to ways in which
ethnic communities might exert influence on social agencies and
contribute to the enrichment of social work knowledge.

Accompanying the poverty and minority status of the ghetto
and barrio is a government welfare bureaucracy which has a mani-
fest purpose of helping clients adapt to and cope with the diffi-
culties of their minority status. However, the massiveness of
the bureaucracy creates an impersonality and dehumanization of
the client. It seems as if the bureaucratic organizations see
the self help systems in various ethnic communities as threats
to their existence. Would it not be more sanguine to develop
better understanding of the ethnic culture and to structure
relevant services through input from such ethnic communities?

Various models for offering content on ethnicity and race
have been explored by schools of social work. A special sequence
of courses on selected minorities with a full spectrum of content
ranging through history, lifestyle, practice, and service systems
have been adopted by some schools; others have programmed for
electives open to all students or noncredit seminars. Many com-
binations are being tried. Ethnicity and race being such vital
themes in social work, it would appear much more sanguine to
introduce these into all areas of the curriculum. Despite the
uniqueness of each ethnic population there are common experiences

hared by all minority groups, such as poverty, prejudice, aliena-
tion, discrimination, minority status, identity conflicts,
positive and negative adaptive responses, coping strategies
and so forth. As basic themes these are fundamental for all
students.

This would appear to be the only logical and manageable
approach for handling a rapidly proliferating body of knowledge
in an overcrowded curriculum. Ethnicity cannot logically be
restricted to the racial dimension, although this certainly has
been a most pressing issue. "White ethnics" are now pushing for
reaffirmation of their traditions and rights. In view of such
expansion there appears to be a need for social work to recon-
ceptualize some of its basic assumptions and approaches within
a broader frame of reference. Borrowing concepts from social
systems and power conflict theories may offer a way to structure
a large amount of data on the organizational and internal pro-
cesses of the ethnic minority experience and interethnic conflict.
In approaching an understanding of ethnicity in this way, educators
are constantly faced with the challenge of balancing the unique
with the more universal aspects of the ethnic experience and it
may still be necessary, in certain environmental contexts, to
proceed with an in-depth study of a specific ethnic group.
Racial discriminatory practices have been, without doubt, the
most arrogantly oppressive in American society, but the subtleties
of other types of discrimination (religious, class, sex, occupation)
have been tragically damaging to individual and group identities
and have all too often gone uncontested.

When one begins to identify problems and processes within
a system's model, one moves from psychological definitions to
include more social and situational variables. This helps to
redefine the elements of the problem and demands a different set
of intervention strategies. Prejudice, discrimination, and
hostility then become dependent variables arising out of certain
historic, economic, and political conflicts between groups, in
addition to interiorized and personalized psychological mechanisms.
Group and individual processes then become dynamically interrelated
in the struggle for identity. Forceful aggression can be viewed
as a group's response to internal overloading of tensions and a
need to reenquilibrate the inner and outer balance; on the other
hand, a group's conformity can be an expression of fitting into
the system and maintaining a homeostasis at great cost to the

utilization of human capacities.

In system's terms, alienation is adaptive to a deeply
felt sense of incompetence and a history of social and personal
failures. One can go on at some length in mapping out ethnic
experiences in terms of a system's mode. This is the generic
approach, which helps preserve the common themes and which avoids
fragmentation of a curriculum. Even with such generic ideas it
is still necessary to introduce notions of diversity, dissonance,
conflict, and change. There are many bodies of knowledge that
provide a baseline for teaching and learning about ethnicity.
This can provide the framework through which students can begin
to understand the ethnic experience and to identify what is
idiosynchratic to a particular population.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Milton M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life. New York,
Oxford University Press, 1964, p. 116.

[2] Ibid, p. 85.

[3] Melvin Steinfeld, Cracks in the Melting Pot, Glencoe Press,
Beverly Hills, 1970, p. 182.

[4] Ibid, p. 183.

[5] Ibid, p. 64.

[6] Seymour Martin Lipset, Group Life in America: A Task Force
Report (New York: The American Jewish Committee, 1972), p. 3.

[7] Ibid.

[8] The New York Times, 3 December 1973, p. 34.

[9] Max Weber, "The Ethnic Group" in Theories of Society, ed.
Talcott Parsons, et al. (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1961), Vol. 1,
pp. 305-309.

[10] Erik H. Erikson, Identity, Youth and Crisis (New York: W.W.
Norton, 1968) p. 22.

[11] Louis Wirth, "The Problem of Minority Groups," in Minority Responses, ed. Minako Kurokawa (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 34.

[12] Roger Daniels and Harry H.L. Kitano, American Racism: Explorations of the Nature of Prejudice (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970), pp. 2-3.

[13] For a fuller discussion see Kingsley Davis, "Social Values, The Mental Health Movement and Mental Health, "Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, Vol. 286 (March 1953), pp. 15-24.

[14] Alvin Kohut, "The Settlements and Ethnicity 1890-1914," Social Work, Vol. 17, No. 3 (May 1972), pp. 22-31.

[15] Thomas J. La Belle, "What's So Deprived About Being Different?" Elementary School Journal, Vol. 72, No. 1 (October 1971) pp. 13-14.

[16] Eugenie R. Mirelowitz, "An Investigation of Attitudes Toward Inner-City Children Among Closed Circuit Television Teachers in a Chicago Inner-City Community," (Master's paper, Northeastern Illinois University, 1973), pp. 11-19.

[17] Leon W. Chestang, Character Development in a Hostile Environment, Occasional Paper No. 3 (Chicago: School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, November 1972), pp. 4-7.

[18] Roland L. Warren, "The Sociology of Knowledge and the Problems of the Inner-Cities," mimeographed (Waltham, Mass.: Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare, Brandeis University, 1970).

[19] Kurt Reichert, "Survey of Non-Discriminatory Practices in Accredited Graduate Schools of Social Work," in Ethnic Minorities in Social Work Education, ed. Carl Scott (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1970), p. 50.

[20]Data gathered from a comparison of figures in Arnulf M. Pins, "Changes in Social Work Education and their Implications for Practice," Social Work, Vol. 16, No. 2 (April 1971), p. 12; and Margaret Purvine, ed., Statistics on Graduate Social Work Education in the U.S. (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1972), p. 17.

[21]Pins, op. cit., p. 12 and Purvine, op. cit., p. 43.

[22]Pranab Chatterjee, "Recruitment in Law, Medicine and Social Work: Some Comparative Trends," Social Work Education Reporter, Vol. 31, No. 1, (December-January 1973), pp. 24-27.

[23]Dolores G. Norton, "Why Minority Group Studies in Social Work Education?" Report of a seminar on Social Work Education and Minority Groups, mimeographed (Bryn Mawr, Pa.: Bryn Mawr College, The Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research, September 1972), p. 1.

[24]Kenji Murase, ed., Asian American Task Force Report: Problems and Issues in Social Work Education (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1973), p. 41; Juliette Ruiz, ed., Chicano Task Force Report (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1973), p. 4.

[25]E. Aracelis Francis, ed., Black Task Force Report: Suggested Guides for the Integration of Black Content into the Social Work Curriculum (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1973), pp. 4-8.

[26]William E. Gordon, "Basic Constructs for an Integrative Conception of Social Work," in The General Systems Approach: Contributions Toward an Holistic Conception of Social Work, ed. Gordon Hearn (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1969), p. 8.

[27]For a full discussion of this see Bryan Magle, Popper (New York: Fontana, 1973), Chapter 5.

[28]See a variety of articles supporting this opinion in Hearn, op. cit.

[29]R.A. Schermerhorn, Comparative Ethnic Relations (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 6.

[30]See Emelicia Micio, "White Worker-Minority Client," Social Work, Vol. 17, No. 3 (May 1972), pp. 82-86; and Alfred Kadushin, "The Racial Factor in the Interview," in the same journal, pp. 88-99.