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The family is both a source of society and a product of society. As a source of society the family produces individuals, values and a set of behaviors we call socialization which helps to build institutions which constitute the fabric of the larger society. As a product of society the family is highly influenced, conditioned and to a great extent determined by the forces which emanate from the institutional fabric of the larger society. Thus, what a family is, is to some extent determined by, influenced by, defined by the larger context of the society in which families function. Thus, the family is not an independent unit of society and it is not primarily a causative factor in society. It is, as sociologists term it, highly interdependent with the other aspects of society. In Black Families in White America, we have described this conception as a social systems approach to the study of childhood and family life. It calls attention to the total network of social reality within which families are structured and within which they function.¹

In earlier times during the history of our nation, the family was more of a source of society than it is today. Today the family is more a product of society than a source of it. This is due largely to the changes which have occurred in the world and in our nation over the past one hundred years in which we have moved from an agrarian society through an urban-technological society to what might be termed a post modern society where heat, light, sound, transportation and all forms of communication unknown or grossly underdeveloped a hundred years ago are everyday facts of life. The family is buffeted by all these forces. It is also aided by these forces to varying degrees depending on the nature of the family.

If the family may be perceived then as a product of the larger society, it is very important in our efforts to understand Black family structure and functioning to understand the nature of the larger society and the manner in which it impacts on Black families.

If we consider the nature of American society insofar as it influences family life, it will be necessary to observe some aspects of the society that are not commonly stressed, but which, nevertheless, have a great deal of basis in empirical analysis. First, the American society today is heavily individualistic in its orientation, heavily laissez-faire in its approach to human problems, heavily materialistic and highly adult-centered. Moreover, it is a society which is based more strongly on
competition than on cooperation. Each of these values or emphases in our society is on the increase and has important consequences for childhood and family life as we shall see later.

In his book, *The Two Worlds of Childhood*, Urie Bronfenbrenner has reminded us that:

The family is not the only possible agent of upbringing. The process typically begins in the home, but does not end there. The outside world also has major impact, as the child becomes exposed to a succession of persons, groups and institutions each of which imposes its expectations, rewards and penalties on the child and thus contributes to shaping the development of his skills, values and patterns of behavior.\(^2\)

There is, in short, something about the society, about the institutions, and about the way they work that helps produce many of the social problems that we are concerned about when we think of family life in the United States today. Dr. Bronfenbrenner in his work has pointed to one of the major causes of this societal dysfunctioning. He points to the basic values growing out of the history and culture of the dominant group in American society today.

It is noteworthy that of all the countries in which my colleagues and I are working now numbering half a dozen in west and east, the only one which exceeds the United States in the willingness of children to engage in antisocial behavior is the nation closest to us in our Anglo-Saxon tradition of individualism. That country is England.\(^3\)

In *Black Families in White America* and in *Children of the Storm*\(^4\) we have referred to the strong social pathology orientation which governs most of the work done by scholars on Black people and on poor people and particularly on Black families that are poor. The tendency is to approach poor Black families as if they are a problem and then proceed to describe this problem and the causes associated with it all within the context of the family and the Black community. This tendency among scholars is very strong. It has been described by the psychologist William Ryan in a book titled *Blaming the Victim*. He calls on some of the work of the early American sociologist, C. Wright Mills who was one of those scholars who was able to point up the manner in which social scientists have difficulty breaking out of their own conceptions of behavior as problematic because it deviates from what they consider to be normative behavior. In one of his studies he examined a series of textbooks on social problems and Professor Ryan has provided for us a summary of Dr. Mills' observations:
First, the textbooks present material about these problems, ... in simple descriptive terms, with each problem unrelated to the others and none related in any meaningful way to other aspects of the social environment. Second, the problems are selected and described largely according to predetermined norms. ... The norms themselves are taken as given, and no effort is made to examine them. Nor is there any thought given to the manner in which norms might themselves contribute to the development of the problems.

Professor Ryan continues:

Within such a framework, then, deviation from norms and standards comes to be defined as failed or incomplete socialization - failure to learn the roles or the inability to learn how to keep them. Those with social problems are then viewed as unable or unwilling to adjust to society's standards, which are narrowly conceived by what Mills calls "independent middle class persons verbally living out Protestant ideas in small town America."

What we are suggesting, then, is that social policy makers will need to look to some new sources of social science knowledge in order to develop sound and more effective programs to deal with problems associated with childhood and family life in the United States today, and particularly those which are associated with childhood and family life in the Black community.

**Family Structure in the Black Community**

Much of the concern about Black families in national policy formulations centers on a basic misconception about the structure of family life in the Black community and the causes and consequences of family structure. Students of the family, particularly in this country and in Europe generally consider the nuclear family normal and all other family forms deviant. Moreover, most of these students consider that there are only two major types of families. On the one hand, there is the nuclear family composed of the father, the mother and their children; and on the other hand, there is something which is called the broken family or the single-parent family, consisting usually of a mother and her children. The first of these family forms is considered to be functional, and the latter dysfunctional. This is a very naive conception of family life in the world. It is not even a correct assessment of American life generally, and it is grossly incorrect when it comes to an analysis of family life in the Black community.
In Black Families in White America, we have delineated twelve major types of family structures that are very common in the Black community today. First, we show that among Black families, the nuclear family is by far the most predominant pattern of family life. Secondly, we observe that extended families is still a very strong feature of Afro-American life. Thirdly, augmented families in the Black community persist partially as an expression of African communalism and partly as a mechanism of adjustment to contemporary realities. We point out that there are not one, but three sub-types of each of these family forms in the Black community today.

Robert Hill in Strengths of Black Families has found that strong kinship bonds characterize Black families and that Black families much more frequently than white families take other relatives into their household. We know, of course, that the extended family is an important historic feature of the Black community, which is still present today.

The manner in which the social context in which Black children grow up is a major handicap to them and to us. It has been described in a theoretical paper by Leon Chestang which he titles: "Character Development in a Hostile Environment." According to Chestang:

"Three conditions, socially determined and institutionally supported, characterize the black experience: social injustice, social inconsistency, and personal impotence. To function in the face of any one of them does cruel and unusual violence to the personality. To function in the face of all three subjects the personality to severe crippling or even destruction. These three crucial conditions, however, confront the black person throughout his life, and they determine his character development."

While any one of us might quibble a bit with wording and phraseology, and might add a variable or two to the basic conditions of life for Black people, I am convinced that in this work Chestang is moving toward the development of a major breakthrough in the development of social theory of a high order of sophistication which grows directly out of his own experience, and yours and mine and that of our children. He continues:

"Coping under the circumstances imposed by the society has required the development of ego-syntonic modes that are often at variance with personality trends considered normal by the majority group.... These skills include competence in a behavioral style designed to ward off the negative consequences of social inconsistency, social
injustice, and personal impotence." And further:

"The experience and condition of being black in American society has resulted in the development of two parallel and opposing thought structures each based on values, norms, and beliefs and supported by attitudes, feelings, and behaviors that imply feelings of depreciation on the one hand and push for transcendence on the other."

He concludes: "Effective social functioning and environmental reality require that Black individuals incorporate both these trends into their personalities—the one to assure competence in dealing with reality, the other as an impetus for transcending reality."

In short, Black children have to live in both the Black world and the white world. In order to do either is a full time job. To do both requires double duty and exacts a heavy toll from these children.

The Importance of Social Class

While it is important to note the distinctions of family structure, it is also important to note that these structures are themselves highly related to the social class structure in America. Thus, the larger the share of economic and educational well-being, and the more historic is the kind of community support available to the family, the more likely the family form will approach the simple nuclear type. Among Black families where there has been a history of economic security and a high level of education and a great deal of acceptance in the larger society, the family forms will more nearly approach the simple nuclear form and the incipient nuclear form. Among those families at the bottom of life's resources there is likely to be a higher proportion manifesting the various attenuated forms of family life—whether nuclear, extended or augmented.

Thus, if we consider very poor families who have traditionally had very low incomes (with a 1969 income of under $3000, a condition which nearly a third of all Black families still face), we will observe a very high incidence of attenuated family forms. Over half of the families in this income group were attenuated, most often reflecting a female head, but in a rather substantial number of cases a male head who cares for his children with the help of relatives. If we examined families whose income ranged between $5000 and $7000 a year (in 1969 dollars), the incidence of augmented families would have been reduced to about a quarter. In other words, three-quarters of the families in this still relatively low-income group, had men as
the head and stable feature.

If we examine the relatively high-income group of say, over $10,000 a year, the incidence of family forms with male heads increases to over 90 percent. To put the matter another way, the difference between white families and Black families in terms of the incidence of male heads in this high-income group is less than three percent. But among the low-income group of under $3000, the difference between low-income white families and low-income Black families is more like 28 percent.

Thus, social class can be seen to have an important bearing on the structure of family life. The lower the social class, the higher the incidence of attenuated families. The higher the social class, the higher the incidence of simple nuclear families and simple extended families as well as incipient families which have a male head. But it is important also to point out that social class does not itself account for all of the differences. The racial factor is seen in the wide discrepancy between family forms in the low-income Black and white communities.

If we can destroy some of the myths surrounding segmented families, particularly the low-income female-headed families, we would go a long way toward correctly understanding Black family life. Dr. Hill has exploded some of these myths in his findings as follows:

Contrary to the widespread belief in a "matriarchy" among blacks, our findings reveal that most black families, whether low-income or not, are characterized by an equalitarian pattern in which neither spouse dominates, but shares decision-making and the performance of expected tasks. . . .

Contrary to the belief that dependency is characteristic of most families headed by women, recent Census Bureau data indicate that three-fifths of the women heading black families work - most of them full-time.

Our study found that most assertions about widespread desertion in black families are not based on actual desertion rates. In fact, recent HEW data reveal that not even the majority of AFDC families can be characterized as "deserted": only one-fifth of the black families receiving AFDC in 1969 were so described. 8

The fact cannot be stressed too strongly that an important condition for the effective functioning of Black families is to have sufficient economic, health, housing, educational and social supports - the kind of supports that are provided by the larger
Poor Black families have a great deal of difficulty in this society whatever the family structure, and families that have more support from this society fare much better.

Joyce Ladner, in Tomorrow's Tomorrow: The Black Woman has pointed out that Black parents often are unable to offer the kind of comfort and protection for their children in the economic and physical aspects of life because of their own "vulnerability to the discriminative practices of the larger society." This kind of powerlessness in the face of a society that does not care very much about Black people, or children, or poor people - rather than the structure of family life - is the most important burden faced by Black families.

In Children of the Storm, we have examined extensively the problems affecting the well-being of Black children, and the manner in which the society has gone about providing for these children. We have pointed out that children from these augmented families are likely to be on the increase in the years ahead and are in great need of community and social services. At the same time, children from more traditional types of families in the Black community are also in great need of care. We have outlined the obstacles to full development of services to meet the needs of these children, including the problem of racism, bureaucracy, sectarianism, and sometimes professionalism.

However, it is also pointed out in this book that the tendency, so strong in American society to blame the Black family for the difficulties their children endure, and get into, is a misplaced emphasis that prevents us, as a society, from solving the problems these children face. We have called, therefore, for a new set of family policies and a new set of child welfare programs, designed more nearly to meet the needs of these children, growing out of their own historical and contemporary realities - rather than simply imposing programs that were designed by and for other people.

The Strengths of Black Families

In every likelihood the simple nuclear family will continue to be as important a feature of Black family life as in the rest of the nation for decades ahead. At the same time, however, it is fairly clear that other types of family forms will also continue to increase, and therefore, the proportion of nuclear families will be less. Some factors that help to produce attenuated families in the Black community are racism, economic exploitation, social discrimination, and political oppression. Unemployment, underemployment, lack of ownership, and job discrimination are just some of the most conspicuous indices of these conditions. These forces seem
likely to be sustained over the next decades, therefore the incidence of segmented families is likely to increase.

There is also some element of choice in the development of different family forms. In the Black community the stigma which is sometimes attached to different family forms in the white community, does not obtain. Thus, it is legitimate to have a mother or a father caring for children with the help of a grandmother, aunt, cousin, or other relative; and such families are not ostracized as they would be in the white community.

This is, in part, because the traditions of family life in the Black community are more extended than they are in the white community. The family has never been considered to be primarily a matter of a mother and a father and their children; it includes a larger segment of the community. Here the African heritage has influenced values and preferences even when they cannot be practiced because of the conditions of contemporary reality. What is not appreciated in the white community is that Black families, even low-income Black families, and even low-income Black families that are attenuated because one parent is not in the home at the time, function amazingly well, considering the conditions under which we as Black people live.

Moreover, our own research over the last six or eight years has demonstrated consistently that low-income Black families take much better care of their children than low-income white families. Often such families, headed by women of amazing strength and resilience, have been able to instill within their children values and behavior patterns that stand them in very good stead in the world at large. Many children from these attenuated family backgrounds have developed high aspirations for their own achievement in the world.

The study recorded by Robert Hill showed that 63% of the children of low-income female-headed families and 73% of the children from moderate-income female-headed families nevertheless aspired to the kind of education and preparation which would lead to high-level technical and professional occupations. Moreover, we know that the majority of today's Black college students have parents with less than a high school education, and nearly a third come from family backgrounds which are attenuated because of the absence of a father or mother from the home.

Thus despite the relative decline of the preponderance of simple nuclear families in the Black community; if the larger society can be persuaded to provide the necessary resources for family life, whatever the variety of family structure, the functioning of these families will be considerably enhanced.
Elements of a National Family Policy

A national family policy, then, enunciated by the federal government would designate the family unit, in all its variety of structure and forms, growing out of the cultural pluralism of the society and the varied and changing value systems, as the most important unit in society. We sometimes say that the family is the most important unit in society today, but there is no national policy or commitment to that view. Thus, a host of other units - corporations, individuals, markets, colleges, and others turn out to be more important in the sense that they get more attention, protection, admiration and support from the national society than families do. Another problem with our current conception of family is that we generally think only of the simple nuclear family. A family policy which sought to support nuclear families and discriminated against other family forms would not be responsive to the needs of family life in the Black community both historically and at the present time. The danger, then, is that such a family policy would still work better for white families than Black ones, and without intending to do so would have racist consequences. In this regard, as in many others, a color- or culture-blind policy is not objective, standard or fair, but may, in fact, defeat its very purposes of bringing about equity and parity in society.

The designation of the family unit as the most important unit in society would require a national commitment to use all the resources of the federal government at all levels and the private sectors of society as well, to enhance the functioning of families. Such enhancement would require a conception of adequate, optimum, and satisfactory functioning. If the family in all its variety is viewed as a subsystem of the larger society, then, the enhancement of the functioning of family life is a responsibility of the larger society more than of the individual members of the family. This is a hard conception for Americans to grasp. We are so individualistic in our value system, so prone to blame the victim, so laissez-faire in our conception of collective responsibility, and so hostile toward people who seem to be poor, weak, and relatively hopeless. Yet these approaches, and programs growing out of these approaches, have not solved the problems confronting family life in the nation today, and they do not seem likely to do so. Viewed in the context of a creature of society and a dependent unit of the larger society, it becomes fairly clear what the priorities are for the enhancement of the functioning of Black families in this society. Measures designed to enable the families to maintain their viability, that is to say, effectively meet the needs of their members, especially their youngest members must emanate from the most important systems of the larger society with a bearing on family life. Chief among these are the economic system, the systems of housing, health care and education. Others are important too, but these are critical. And, while all these systems are interrelated, a priority must be given to changes in the way the economic system functions for Black people. And, difficult as it is for white Americans to
understand and permit, the national government must take the initiative in indemnifying Black Americans.

In order for the economic system to function as well for Black people as it now does for white people, three efforts are necessary which will benefit all American families. These are the elimination of poverty, the elimination of structural unemployment and underemployment, and the elimination of economic and job discrimination based on race, region and religion. A prime requisite for the fulfillment of these goals is an expanding and diversified civilian economy with full employment. Vernon Jordan, in a recent issue of Jet Magazine observed that:

What we are trying to do here at the Urban League is create options for Black people. Right now, we have no options. We want to create a situation where Black people can choose whether they want to live in a ghetto or in suburbia and can choose the kind of job they accept. What Blacks now want to deal with is the good job, the good education and the good house. These things are not generally dramatic on a large scale, but on an individual basis, they are very dramatic.  

In short: what the average Black man wants for himself and his family is a good home, good health and a good education for his children. These are the requisites of strong and viable family life in contemporary society. Black families function better, and they can take better care of their children when there is a variety of economic opportunity, including meaningful jobs for the adults in the family. There is no mystery about that. Illness, crime, and other forms of mal-adaptive behavior go up directly in proportion to the rise in economic insecurity and unemployment. And for most of the years since the Korean War, the unemployment rates in the Black community have exceeded the depression level unemployment rates experienced by the larger society. It is hardly worth asking whether the nation would have permitted such sustained high level unemployment in the white community. And it is hardly worth speculating on whether measures to increase meaningful employment and economic investment would do more than all the law and order measures to make the streets, institutions, and communities of the nation pleasant places in which to work and play and live.

The idea of a full employment economy is not new. It has simply not been taken seriously in national policy. Back in October of 1966 a group of distinguished Americans including both the then President and a past President of Howard University, and a host of economists and other experts designed a "Freedom Budget" which called for the abolition of poverty, guaranteed full employment, adequate minimum wages, high economic growth, and guaranteed incomes for all unable to work as a part of a
basic set of guarantees in order to bring about equity and parity in American society.

Concluding that fully 40 percent of poverty could be accounted for by inadequate employment opportunity, the panel called for employment options "for all able and willing to work, and for all whom adequate training and education would make able and willing." To this day, this call has not been heeded. According to this distinguished panel, full employment would have required "an unemployment rate below 3 percent by early 1968, and preferably 2 percent."

The present unemployment rate hovers around 6 percent, and in Black communities it is more than doubled, and among Black youth it is higher still. A strong corollary to unemployment is underemployment, where men and women work only part of the year, and where they work for wages which are clearly substandard, and where they work in situations and jobs which do not utilize their abilities and aspirations to the maximum. This particular problem is more pervasive in the Black community than is unemployment. It is the lot of a large segment of the working poor who constitute, in turn, the largest segment of the poor in the Black community. In the low-income Black community most families are headed by men who work every day and still are not able to move their families above the poverty line. Clearly what is needed is not a work incentive plan but a work opportunity plan with options and rewards commensurate with the aspirations of Black men. For the work ethic and the work orientation is strong among these men, stronger, in fact, than among white men as has been shown by several recent studies of work orientations.

Contrary to popular belief, even in the Congress, poverty cannot be abolished by work incentives and even work opportunities alone. The Freedom Budget panel estimated that roughly 40 percent of poverty could be accounted for by persons who are unable to work because of disabilities, youth, or child-rearing responsibilities. A family policy designed to enhance the functioning of families would not insist that mothers of young children abandon them against their will and go to work at meaningless jobs in order to insure that their children are properly fed. Family solidarity would be more highly valued than work, per se. Nearly 15 percent of poor families in the country and nearly a third of poor families in the Black community are headed by women with young children who should not be forced to go out to work. The need, therefore, is for a program of family assistance which guarantees all American families a minimum income which will support a safe and sanitary standard of living. In 1972 a family of four required an income in the neighborhood of $6,500 per year.

A policy and program of guaranteed family income adequate to the family's need, must be tailored to the variety of conditions which exist in various parts of the country. By the government's own standards $2,400 a year is not
enough to move a family of four out of poverty. Indeed, it is less than half enough. A more realistic approach has been taken by the National Welfare Rights Organization. They have called for a minimum income of $6,500 a year, a position which has also been unanimously supported by the Congressional Black Caucus. A simple test of how close the President's proposals come to reality as compared with those of the National Welfare Rights Organization and the Black Caucus may be observed by reference to the following data. According to a Gallup Poll conducted in 1970, a national sample of Americans estimated that the minimum income necessary to support a family of four was $126 a week. In a similar poll conducted in 1971, the estimate was $127 a week. The federal government's own Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated in 1970 that a minimum of $136 a week was necessary for a family of four in metropolitan areas to maintain a minimum level of health and safety. The following Table shows the minimum amount needed for a nonfarm family of four according to national studies done in each of the following years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount per Week</th>
<th>Annually</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$1,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>5,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>6,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>6,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>6,604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we may observe, then, the National Welfare Rights Organization demand for a minimum income of $6,500 is much closer to the minimum needs of families.
for health and safe living conditions than the proposals of the President or the Congress. Moreover, if we consider the aspirations of families to live beyond the level of minimal existence, we may be informed by another study done by the Bureau of Labor Statistics which indicates that in 1970 in New York and New Jersey it took a gross income of $12,134 to maintain a family of four in a moderate standard of living. The Bureau published what it calls a lower budget which requires $7,183 a year, an intermediate budget which refers to the $12,134 and a higher budget which requires $18,545 a year for a family of four to live well. The following Table shows the proportion of these funds which families have to pay for food, housing, transportation, medical care, taxes, etcetera:

**TABLE II**

**WHERE THE DOLLAR GOES**

**NEW YORK - NORTHWESTERN NEW JERSEY**

Urban 4-Person Family, Three Budgets, Spring 1970

Percent of Annual Income Spent for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Clothing and Personal Care</th>
<th>Medical Care</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18,545</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,183</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be clear from the above discussion that none of the current proposals before the Congress for family assistance policies come even close to approaching the real needs of the people who live outside the American dream. It is our view that such policies are not likely to be formed or supported nationally until there is some basic change in the basic value constellation of the collective American character. The question, then, becomes not so much which specific programs should be recommended, as how to change the basic American values toward a collective concern for the common good.
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I. Introduction

As a profession frequently caught in a "middleman" role between society at large and specific client groups, social work is often charged with adjusting client behavior to societal demands, rather than working from the other end of the continuum. In terms of their relations with ethnic and minority groups, social workers are sometimes pictured as representatives of a dominant, white Protestant culture, acting, intentionally or unintentionally, as standard bearers for that culture among dissident minority groups. In light of this picture, the addition of courses like "Black [or Chicano] Culture and American Social Work" to the social work curriculum appears not as a radical change in social work education, but more like instruction in foreign dialects for the aspiring missionary. After all, one can argue, American social work was born at the time of a huge influx of immigration to the U. S. and shortly came to play a leading role in the Americanization of the problematic "new immigrant."

While the above picture has its attractions, particularly as a counterbalance to the notion of social workers as strictly objective and humanitarian creatures, there are, of course, flaws in its construction. The image of social worker as Americanizer of immigrants is frequently used as an example in the discussion of social work's identification with a white, middle class status quo. Yet this image, while made much of by historians like Oscar Handlin¹ and Richard Hofstadter,² is only, at best, partially correct. A close examination of American social workers' relations with immigrant groups at the turn-of-the-century does not reveal a dominant missionary response, but rather a number of different, sometimes overlapping schools of thought regarding the place of immigrants in American life. These reactions ranged from a call for immigration restriction, through a concern for the maintenance of "social harmony" in American communities, to an emphasis on the advantages of cultural pluralism. Further analysis of these various responses to immigration could be profitable in the general discussion of social work's current roles vis à vis various minority groups and the broader society. A look into past actions may well offer a number of models for current social work philosophy and practice.

II. The New Immigrants and the Progressive Setting

Before preceding to this analysis, we should make clear the nature of the "new" immigrant groups and the prevailing social
conditions of the America to which they came, recognizing particularly the differences between this stage of immigration and the more generally acceptable immigration which preceded it in the early and mid-1800's. American reactions to immigration in the period 1900 to 1914 can best be understood through a dual examination of the specific characteristics of these particular immigrant groups and of the economic and social conditions of America in the Progressive era.

At the beginning of this century, the United States witnessed the greatest influx of European immigration in its history. This unprecedented flow, originating largely from Southern and Eastern Europe, numbered well into the millions, and by 1910 the foreign-born constituted 14½ per cent of the American population. Certain factors about the "new" immigrants distinguished them from their Northwestern European predecessors. Fifty per cent of those employed were classified as unskilled laborers, and a third of the newcomers were illiterate. Often uprooted peasants, the new immigrants came with little experience in the process of representative government. Crowding into slum neighborhoods in American cities, straining the facilities of the existing health and welfare services, and posing a potential job-market threat to native-born workers, the new immigrants came to be defined as a problem population by social reformers concerned with the character of life in industrial America.

The social, economic, and political climate of early Twentieth Century America affected reactions of native-born citizens toward newcomers. While earlier immigrants had come to the land of an expanding frontier, those arriving in the Progressive years found a country deeply involved in a struggle with the problems of urbanization, industrialism, and organized monopoly capitalism. Those changes which had begun taking place in American life in the late 1800's had by the turn-of-the-century fostered the development of a polarization of social groups and a feeling of displacement on the part of the middle class. The rapid growth of the capitalist system had brought with it the development of a new industrial power elite, a gradually organizing urban labor class, and a more politically-aware generation of farmers. Viewed in the context of a growing collectivism on the part of business, labor, and farming interests, the concept of individual free will, prominent in the previous century, soon began to appear outdated. In addition, the serious financial depression of 1893 left a legacy of doubt regarding the effectiveness of the free enterprise system.

A symbol of the changes and problems of the times was the American city and its growing slums. The poor, both native and foreign-born, crowded into the tenements on N. Y.'s Mulberry Street or the wooden shacks surrounding the Chicago
stock yards. Here also one found the peculiar American institution of the ward boss, that political figure who gained his power not only from immigrants and other poor, but also from the wealthier classes in urban society. The tie between immigrants, political bosses, and businessmen seemed yet another reminder of the growing powerlessness of the middle class city dwellers caught between them.

Responses to these changes in American life included two major, and sometimes overlapping approaches. Both approaches were to affect reactions toward the immigrant. The first response was a strengthening of nativist thought, based on the Social Darwinism of Herbert Spencer and William Graham Sumner. The second was an increasing emphasis on economic, social, and political reform, often seen as embodied in the figures of Teddy Roosevelt and other founders of the Progressive Party. Historians have lately debated the sources of the reform movement, some seeing it primarily as the expression of a displaced middle class, others as the attempts of American businessmen and professionals to "achieve the rationalization of business through government regulation." Whether indeed there existed one distinct source of reform, or whether a number of different groups felt it necessary to promote changes in the existing system, the fact remains that a good deal of political upheaval characterized the beginning years of the century. Moreover, the situation of the poverty-stricken, unskilled, and uneducated immigrant was to occupy a significant place in reformist, as well as nativist thinking.

As in part a representative of middle class and business interests in American society, the social worker of the Progressive period reflected this interest in the immigrant. In addition, social workers, perhaps more than any other group of the time, came face to face with the difficulties accompanying the new immigration. From their experiences as settlement house residents in tenement districts and as "friendly visitors" in the homes of the poor, social workers gained a first hand picture of the effects of immigration upon the immigrants themselves and upon the society into which they entered. An orientation toward both immigrant groups and the American middle class, afforded social workers a certain potential; their attitudes and actions could have an influence not only upon the lives of the immigrants but also upon the reception of the newcomers by the American public.

How then, did social workers react to the increasing flow of immigration? How understanding were they of the foreigner's problems, and how receptive to popular nativist characterizations of the alien as an inferior being? What role, or roles, did social workers play in reaction to this vast influx of ill-prepared peoples into the industrialized America of the early 1900's?
III. Recent Historiography

Several important historians of the Progressive era have painted a negative picture in answer to these questions. Richard Hofstadter, who expounded the thesis that particularly in politics, a wide gulf existed between reformers and immigrants, had little difficulty in extending this thesis to social workers and immigrants. "More often than not," he suggested, the immigrant "rebuffed the settlement worker or agent of Americanization, and looked elsewhere for primary contacts with American political and civic life." Far more damning than Hofstadter's discussion of differences in political attitudes and style, however, is Oscar Handlin's indictment of most Progressive era social workers as Americanization agents either critical or ignorant of the immigrant's past.

Anticipating Hofstadter's "gulf" theme, Handlin found the progressive movement lacking in channels of communication with the foreign-born. Criticizing reformers for seldom, if ever, pausing "to consider ... the needs and interests of a new citizen," Handlin paid particular attention to what he saw as the failures of the social worker. Although noting that "a few dedicated social workers, mostly women, learned to understand the values in the immigrants' own lives," Handlin saw these as rare exceptions. More generally, "the sociologists and social workers who started out to do good for the immigrant, ended up by hating him because he would not allow good to be done him." Social settlements, even with the best intentions, could not help implying to the immigrant that his old customs were inferior to American ways. Thus Handlin portrayed social workers as

...made ruthless in the disregard of [the immigrant's] sentiments by the certainty of their own benevolent intentions. Confident of their personal and social superiority and armed with the ideology of the sociologists who had trained them, the emissaries of the public and private agencies were bent on improving the immigrant to a point where he could no longer recognize himself.

Recent historians, notably John Higham and Allen Davis, have begun to question this interpretation. Higham particularly has emphasized the contributions of the social settlement movement in building an awareness of the immigrant's potential. "Of all old-stock Americans," Higham notes, "settlement workers gained the fullest understanding...and respect for the new immigration." It was essentially to test Higham's assertions about the settlement workers, and to assess the strengths of similar stances among charity workers, that the present study was carried out. A systematic investigation
of the varying attitudes of social workers toward the new immigrants in the period 1900 to 1914 was undertaken. What has emerged from this study is not a unified social work approach toward the newcomers, either positive or negative, but rather a whole range of responses, representing different, though sometimes overlapping schools of thought. The following will constitute a brief summary of each approach, shown primarily through the ideas of a major spokesman for each point of view. An attempt will also be made to assess the strength of each response among Progressive social workers as a whole.

IV. Edward T. Devine: Immigration Restriction Based on Economic Reasons

The menace of immigration lies ... in the well-trodden highway which leads from the low-standard laborers of Southern Europe to the lower margin of American industry.

To some social workers of the Progressive era, the new immigration seemed to bring with it economic problems which made immigration restriction a necessity. One influential social worker particularly concerned about the economic and charity relief aspects of immigration was Edward T. Devine, General Secretary of the Charity Organization Society of N.Y.C. (1896-1910) and Director of the N.Y. School of Philanthropy. A student of economist Simon N. Patten, and an advocate of trade unionism, Devine was alarmed by what he saw as the immigrant's potential for lowering American standards of living and wages. In addition, Devine feared that the influx of cheap labor would retard industrial progress by holding back the invention of new labor-saving machinery. Part of the difficulty, he felt, lay in the backgrounds of the newcomers. The new immigrant followed a path already marked out by the friends and neighbors who had gone before, and thus had "rather less than the average initiative, independence, and courage, the qualities which are so predominant in the original settlers of a new country."15

Neither the dispensing nor the withholding of charitable relief could solve the problem. On one hand, Devine cautioned, it was not reasonable for the aged or infirm immigrant to expect quite the same degree of tenderness and consideration for him as he might have experienced in a similar ... fate in the home of his ancestors.

On the other hand, "it is not by withholding relief from individuals ... that the evil consequences of unrestricted
immigration are to be met." Social workers bore some responsibility to the new immigrants, and needed to grapple with those causes of dependence and intolerable living conditions "beyond the control of the individuals whom they ... too often destroy."16

Devine saw the solution in the enactment of restriction laws. In addition, some plan of systematic distribution of immigrants to small towns and rural areas could be set up to counteract the tendency of immigrants to gravitate to large cities. Effective restriction and distribution of immigrants would help deal with the problems of newcomers as well as maintain the American standard of living.17

Devine's concern about the economic consequences of immigration appears to have received relatively little attention from the majority of his fellow practitioners, although varieties of this concern did crop up, particularly in charity worker circles. At the New York State Conference of Charities and Corrections in 1900, for example, the meeting's President regretted that the "vigorous immigrant" soon passed on to the American West, while many of the "debilitated and destitute" remained in N. Y., a "burden on its citizens."18 At the 1905 National Conference of Charities and Correction, an economist warned of the negative affect of immigration upon wage levels, and called for immigration restriction. Interestingly, the immigration committee of the conference did not unanimously endorse his paper.19 The potential wage threat idea was also stressed by Paul Kellogg, editor of The Survey, and Robert Hunter, an influential Chicago charity worker.20 Yet while Hunter maintained a hard line on the need for restriction, Kellogg acknowledged that the newcomers brought with them ideals and cultures which might compensate for the economic problems they helped create.21

Although a concern for the economic consequences of immigration seems appropriate to those social workers whose main focus lay in the provision of financial aid to the poor, there is little evidence of a strong trend in this direction within the field of organized charity. The examples cited above appear to have been few and far between, and the chief criticism against the newcomers seems rather to have come from a body of social workers, numbering some charity workers among them, who identified with Anglo-Saxon values, and who practiced largely in the Boston area.

V. Robert A. Woods: Assimilation and Social Harmony

Social work has to do with the building up of a national federation among all our different racial groups, which will in reasonable degree preserve all that is valuable in the heredity and traditions of each type, but will link all types together into a universal yet coherent and distinctively American nationality.22
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Unlike the basically economic and labor-oriented concerns of men like Devine, the attitudes toward immigration expressed by Robert A. Woods were motivated by a stress on homogeneity and communal order in American life. Coming from a middle class, Scotch-Irish background, Woods attended Amherst College and Andover Seminary. After a short residence in Toynbee Hall in London, Woods set up the South End Settlement in Boston.23 By the early 1900's, Woods had become one of the chief philosophers of the social settlement movement in America, and as such, one of his main concerns was the preservation of a social harmony in the American community.

Woods' attitudes toward immigrants in Boston's South End reflected a combination of the Brahmin, Anglo-Saxon spirit and a belief in the tightly-knit, unified community as an integral part of democratic society. Both his stress on social harmony and his Anglo-Saxonism emerge clearly in "The Neighborhood in Social Reconstruction," an article written in 1914 for the American Journal of Sociology. Here Woods urged the study of the function of the community in our society, for the "neighborhood is a still more ancient and fundamentally causative institution than the family." As a social unit, the neighborhood could provide the most vital arena in which to begin the fight for sound democratic government in America. "It is there," Woods wrote, "... that the reverse detachments of citizenship are to be swung into the battle of good municipal administration."24

Analysing the potential of American communities, Woods pictured the community's war against political and social ills as inspired from above, with the major attack launched by outsiders of a "better class." Since racial and religious cleavages constituted a major factor in the disorganization of American neighborhoods, Woods saw these as one of the primary focuses of that attack.25 This kind of thinking is well expressed by Josiah Royce, a Boston contemporary, who spoke of

"the evil due to the presence of a considerable number of not yet assimilated newcomers in most of our communities. The newcomers themselves are often a boon and welcome indeed. But their failure to be assimilated constitutes ... a source of social danger, because the community needs well-knit organization."26

Immigrants, then, are useful as raw material to be assimilated. Unassimilated, they threaten the reunification of American society. Woods' talk about unity, however, seemed to overlay a deeper feeling about the inferiority of the non-Anglo-Saxon immigrant, a reaction quite consistent with, and
perhaps responsible for, his conceptualization of immigrants as outside threats to an already established whole. Reaffirming that whole, he warned of the sort of assimilation "which would be only a foreign composite, hardly nearer to American standards than were its original constituents."

Throughout Woods' writings one senses the typically Progressive belief in the past unity of American society, and the desire to return to this earlier harmony through a federation based primarily on American ideals and values. While not completely oblivious to the positive contributions which immigrants might make, Woods' appreciation of these contributions pales beside his warning against the indifference that fails to distinguish the danger to our standards when certain types of newcomers are left to create breeding grounds for much that is incompatible with or hostile to the best values of American life.

Responding to this danger was largely the task of the social settlements. Woods saw as a major function of neighborhood centers the imparting of American standards, ideals, and national loyalty to the newcomers. Social workers should bring the incoming foreigner "in touch ... with what is uplifting in citizenship, in education, and in industry." Although the best in race and religion were to be respected by the settlements, the ultimate goal lay always in direction of building a unified community.

The ultimate conclusion of Woods' philosophy lay in the call for immigration restriction. In his stress on working to unify disintegrating neighborhoods, he complained that "all such effort ... is made extremely difficult ... by the flooding of neighborhoods with constant streams of new immigrants." Woods found false optimism in the notion that the U.S. could easily "develop a nation out of fifty nationalities," and in 1911 he became actively involved in Boston's Immigration Restriction League. The League had been founded in 1894 by a group of "practical-minded intellectuals from well-to-do, long established families, steeped in Boston ways...." Woods now joined in its cause, thus attempting to attack America's disunity problem "at its very roots."

Woods' ideas were reflected to a certain degree by other social workers, and particularly by workers in the Boston area. Those sharing his stress on an Anglo-Saxon homogeneity included fellow social workers and philanthropists Joseph Lee, Frederick Bushee, and the Robert Treat Paine family, all Brahmin New Englanders. Although criticisms of the new immigrant on a social and moral basis could be found among social workers of other U.S. cities as well, the Boston charity and
settlement movements appear to have been more influenced by this view than their counterparts in other areas.

In an extensive study of the relationships between Bostonians and immigrants, Barbara Solomon has noted the "proper New England" background of the men who dominated Boston's social service movement. Responding to a growing decline in political and social power Brahmins in general "resorted to ethnic criteria to explain the deterioration of American society...." Solomon's assumption that such ideas were translated into the Boston social service movement is supported by the work of historian Arthur Mann, who said of the Boston settlement workers: "behind the inductive method lay the Christian urge to do good and an imported English class consciousness." Among the Boston social settlements, Peabody House spoke out most strongly against the new immigrant. Concerned with the "moral elevation of the people in the community," Peabody House workers reported

This district is virtually transplanted from another order of civilization. Our foreign neighbors bring with them habits which cannot be followed in this country without danger to our standards.... the constituents of our districts [must] sink individuality in common neighborhood purposes.

These fears found reinforcement not only in Woods' South End Settlement, but in other neighborhood houses as well. A Boston Directory of Charities described the city's settlement workers as living and working together in an area "deficient in responsible and resourceful citizens." The focus of the settlement, the report continued, lay in the promotion of "all-round, personal, domestic, and neighborhood standards."

Key charity workers and philanthropists in Boston concurred in concerns about the new immigrant, warning about such dangers as sterilization of the old Yankee stock through "the proposed mixture of the hitherto unsuccessful races... of the Old World." Charity leaders like Joseph Lee and Robert Treat Paine, along with Woods' social survey collaborator Frederick Bushee, all believed that increased immigration helped form "a race of unknown value." The Associated Charities of Boston frequently issued public statements alluding to the social and political inadequacies of the new immigration. Within the above criticisms, stress on communal order was intertwined with, and often overshadowed by, Anglo-Saxon chauvinism.

VI. Jane Addams: Cultural Pluralism

We have persistently ignored the political ideas of the immigrants who have successively come to
us; and in our ambition to remain Anglo-Saxon we have fallen into the Anglo-Saxon temptation of governing all peoples by one standard. We have failed to work out a democratic government which should include the experiences and hopes of all the various people among us.40

While some social workers in other U.S. cities held views similar to the Boston Brahmin settlement workers and philanthropists, and while not all Bostonian social workers shared Woods' missionary fervor,41 the anti-immigrant Anglo-Saxon stance seems most typical of the New England area. Elsewhere, in Chicago, Cleveland, New York, and other cities, a quite different position toward immigrants was dominant in social work circles. This set of attitudes has been most readily recognized in the work of Jane Addams, who emerges as "champion of immigrants" in everyone's book, including Handlin's. What seems most important, then, after describing Addams' philosophy, is an assessment of how far-reaching this kind of approach was among social workers as a whole.

From her base at Hull House, Addams became involved in numerous Progressive reform movements. Behind her work in municipal reform, the push for tenement inspection, and the fight against child labor, lay a well-developed philosophy about the needs and potentialities of human society. This philosophy becomes particularly relevant in a study of her reactions toward immigration. A key to Addams' point of view was her perception of the inadequacy of older American institutions and ideals in meeting the new requirements of an industrial society. Unlike those who looked to a past harmony in America, Addams spoke of change, newness, and the coming of a higher civilization.

Seeing America's problems as related more to industrialization and economics than to politics, Addams argued that American institutions were in danger because the country had failed to adapt them to the conditions of industrial development. The country had also failed to utilize the promise of the new immigration.42 Tied to older political ideals and social concepts, Americans tended to make narrow judgments based only on past standards. By concluding that the country had come to an end of its assimilative powers, Addams asserted, "we are testing our national life by a tradition too provincial and too limited to meet its present ... cosmopolitan character."43

Addams did not rule out the possibility of unity in society, but spoke of a new unity based on synthesis rather than standardisation. Immigrants could play a vital part in this new synthesis. Expressing her belief in the coming of a community of brotherhood, Addams envisioned a cosmopolitanism which allowed for the appreciation of cultural differences along
with the recognition of commonalities based on the essential likenesses of men.

In action, Addams' ideas meant an emphasis on the recognition of "immigrant gifts" and a conception of the social settlement as mediator and interpreter between immigrant and larger society. Hull House's Labor Museum, set up to exhibit tools and processes used in the immigrants' countries of origin; the settlement's sponsorship of foreign language plays; and the stress on encouraging immigrant children to respect their parents' culture all attest to Addams' belief in the possibilities of cultural pluralism. "One thing seemed clear in regard to ... immigrants," she noted, "to preserve and keep whatever of value their past life contained."44

The creation of the Labor Museum and the Hull House stage were first steps in a larger scheme, for Addams envisioned the settlement as the major link in communication between immigrants and native Americans. She charged settlement workers with the task of interpreting American life to the newcomers and offering an alternative to the exploitation and corruption so often met by the entering immigrant. At the same time, settlement workers should interpret immigrant customs and explain their contributions to the community at large. This was particularly important since "until industrial conditions in America are faced, the immigrant will continue to be blamed for conditions for which the community is responsible."45

Thus Addams strove to allay the fear of the immigrant's threat to American democracy. In doing so, she frequently turned to the larger industrial situation for an explanation of society's ills. With such experiments as the Labor Museum, she hoped "to have made a genuine effort to find the basic experience upon which a cosmopolitan community may unite."46

In assessing the strength of these ideas in the profession as a whole, we note that a number of prominent social workers supported Addams' general position. Mary Richmond, for example, affirmed the need for a wise and sympathetic approach toward the immigrant client, concurred in the idea of immigrant gifts, and expressed a particular concern about the rift between foreign-born parents and their Americanized children.47 Others in the field, like family service worker Frances McLean, and philanthropists Cyrus Sulsberger and Judge Julian Mack, conveyed a similar spirit of respect for the newcomer.48 Various Charity Organisation Societies also saw the need for a new understanding of the alien.49

The most positive statements regarding the potentialities of immigration came from the residents of the social settlements. As one settlement worker noted of his contemporaries, these workers were "among the first Americans to appreciate the cultural heritage which foreigners bring to the new country."50 The Charities praised American neighborhood centers for their
promotion of a higher conception of the capabilities of the new immigrants.51 Later commentators have seen settlement workers as "pioneers in recognizing and appreciating the positive significance of the pluralistic nature of our culture."52

Appreciation of immigrant traditions did not remain the province of settlement workers in any one city, but extended nationwide. Notable figures and settlements included Lillian Wald and Mary Simkhovitch of NYC, Mary McDowell of the University of Chicago Settlement, Graham Taylor of the Chicago Commons, Pittsburgh's Columbian Settlement, and Cleveland's Hiram House. In an attempt to translate their attitudes toward immigration into practice, these settlements set up immigrant art exhibitions, sponsored immigrant-initiated political groups, helped establish foreign-language libraries, and promoted city-wide "immigrant culture festivals." Reaching out to the larger society, these workers also made attempts to influence such organizations as schools and city parks systems in order to win greater recognition of immigrants' talents and needs.53 A common philosophy was the conviction that settlements should seek "to interpret the best in America to their foreign neighbors, and to cultivate for America all that these neighbors have brought to her of value."54

VII. Grace Abbott: Immigrant Protection Work

The public unfortunately continues to be more interested in restriction than in the means by which the immigrants may be saved from individual exploitation.55

One final aspect of social work reactions toward the new immigration should be briefly noted: the important efforts of individuals like Grace and Edith Abbott toward legal and economic protection of immigrants in America. Generally emanating from within a cultural pluralist framework, these activities were significant in their creation of new governmental structures designed to deal with the newcomers' problems.

Social surveys and first hand experience with aliens alerted social workers to the varieties of exploitation and fraud perpetrated upon immigrants by employment agencies, immigrant banks, and managers of labor camps.56 Acting on a concern for the protection of foreigners, Grace Abbott helped found the League for the Protection of Immigrants at Hull House in 1908. Attempting to counteract "those agencies and conditions which make for the moral or financial ruin of the immigrant,"57 the League played both an advocacy and an "information and referral" role for a number of years. Recognizing the fact that a private agency could never deal with
all the ramifications of exploitation, the League looked to the State and Federal governments for help. Through Abbott's and the League's work, Illinois laws governing employment agencies were improved, and eventually an Illinois Immigration Commission was created. The need for the protection of immigrants found expression both at state and national conferences of charities and in the pages of the Charities, and several other states picked up on the immigration commission idea. The movement's impact was most concretely felt on the state level; lobbying for a Federal Bureau of Immigration did not meet with success.

In discussing national immigration policies, it is difficult to measure the relative strengths of the restrictionist vs. the protectionist social work groups. Social work members of the Immigration Restriction League could claim partial credit for the later enactment of strict immigration quota laws. Yet it would be an oversight to ignore the national effects of the Abbott and Addams schools of thought. While not strong enough to counteract public support for immigration restriction in the 1920's, these groups nevertheless contributed to certain changes in public attitudes and to increased recognition of immigrant needs and attributes. One evidence of this impact was the success of social work participation in the 1912 Progressive Party convention, which adopted by far the most positive plank on immigration of any of the three major parties.

VIII. Conclusion
Our survey of social work responses to the new immigration has thus yielded a series of reactions rather than a single dominant approach. The records of state and national social work conferences, as well as the editorial pages of journals, reveal debates between different schools of thought, rather than consensus. In this light, we might return to the work of Oscar Handlin to question the accuracy of his presentation of a ruthless, assimilationist approach on the part of a majority of social workers. It now seems likely that Handlin generalized too broadly from an awareness of the Brahmin character of social work in the Boston area. Given the currency of the views of Addams, Abbott, Wald, and others, there would seem to be little justification for Handlin's choice of figures like Woods, Lee, and Bushee as models for the general field of social work, except for the fact that Handlin derived much of his study from an investigation of immigrant conditions in the city of Boston.

We would hope, however, to gain more from this excursion into social work's past than simply the creation of a more realistic historical picture. In looking for models and insights relevant to practice today, several themes occur to us. The first concerns present social work's lack of broadly-
based analysis and goals relating to the nature of ethnicity in American society; the second draws more specifically on the insights of Jane Addams regarding larger social structural problems.

In a perceptive analysis of assimilation in American life, Milton Gordon notes the lack of attention to "problems of social structure, theories and models of 'assimilation,' 'integration,' and 'group life,'... and long-range goals... with respect to communal life in this country" on the part of human relations agencies in the early 60's. A cursory review of recent social work literature regarding racial and ethnic groups suggests that a similar charge could be leveled at the field of social work today. Unlike Addams, Woods, and Abbott, social workers currently writing on ethnicity appear to have given little thought to what sort of over-all relationship between ethnic groups and society is desirable. What this literature generally reveals is concentration on the themes of the effects of racism, the problems of political and economic inequality, and the special needs (particularly in mental health and social services) of ethnic groups. The particular strength of this literature lies in its appreciation of the important dimension of power and authority in relation to the situation of minority groups. A succinct expression of this insight is Martin Rein's statement that "the problem of race cannot be solved without a redistribution of authority, resources, and power." This understanding of power in race/ethnic relationships, as well as the emphasis on desegregation, or the removal of political and economic barriers, builds upon the kind of foundation laid by Addams, Abbott, and others. Yet unlike the work of these earlier thinkers, the present proposals do not seem to fit within a broader analytical context.

Thus we find social workers from ethnic groups suggesting that their groups have the freedom to reject dominant values in American life. Without denying the premise of such a suggestion, we note that it is unaccompanied by analyses of the possibility or ramifications of the pluralism of values in a given society. Gordon's assertion that cultural assimilation or general adoption of Anglo-Saxon behavior, values, and attitudes, is a fait accompli in the U.S., makes all the more necessary a discussion of how cultural pluralism might be carried out. In addition, we see repeatedly the image of an America divided into homogenous groups of "Whites" and "Non-Whites," without much attempt to make further breakdowns within these groups, or to discuss and evaluate the degree of structural pluralism, or divisions between religious and ethnic groups in terms of primary group relationships, in America today. In short, profitable discussion of the issues cannot proceed unless we make clearer our definitions and our long-range goals.
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In attempting to build an over-all context for present discussions of ethnicity, we might do well to reconsider Addams' and Abbott's cultural pluralism framework. While these social workers have occasionally been falsely connected with the concept of a "Melting Pot" where all citizens meld together into a common mass, often based, as in Woods' ideas, on an Angle foundation; Addams' actual message was the conviction that different groups could maintain distinct identities and yet live together in some measure of harmony and give-and-take. Addams' pluralism called for the preservation of communal life within the context of full political and economic integration into American society. Significantly, Abbott saw the protection, or desegregation of immigrants as necessary to the building of a pluralistic democracy. Addams' cultural pluralism carries deeper implications as well. What seems well worth bearing in mind is the stress Addams and others put both on the "commonalities" of all men, and most particularly on the nature of the social-structural problems with which all men in a given society must deal. In this sense the Addams model allows us to shift our emphasis away from individual minority groups and to sharpen our focus upon the nature of institutions in our society. Woods and Addams seem to symbolise fairly distant positions on a continuum between individual accommodation to the system and social change, and Woods' philosophy appears not incongruous with the attempts in the past decade to build compensatory programs like Headstart to "increase people's opportunities" to join in the main stream. Addams' thinking yields more disturbing questions about the nature of that main stream, and urges us to think not only about the unique contributions of different groups in our society, but also about the common, unifying economic and social problems which most segments of society may be facing.

NOTES

Sources for this study included the 1900 through 1914 volumes of the social work journal Charities, proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections for the same years, reprints of various state social work conferences, autobiographies and other books by social workers of the period, and directories and handbooks of charitable organizations and settlements.


Devine, "Immigration as a Relief Problem," Charities XII (1904), pp. 129-33.


Devine, Principles, p. 165; Devine, "Is Public Sentiment Against Congestion?" Charities XXI (1908), pp. 113-4.


Ibid. pp. 580-86.


32. Solomon, pp. 102, 141-3.


36. Associated Charities of Boston, Directory of Charitable and Beneficial Organizations (Boston: The Old Corner Bookstore, 1907), pp. 177.


39. See, for example, Resolution passed Associated Charities of Boston, quoted in A.A. Bradley, "To What Extent Does Unrestricted Immigration Counteract the Influence of our Educational and Charitable Work?" Charities VIII (1902), p. 325.


41. Boston social workers Vida Scudder (of Denison House Settlement) and Emily Greene Balch were notable exceptions to the Woods' school of thought. Solomon, pp. 144-5, 188-91.


43. Addams, Newer Ideals, p. 40. 44. Ibid. pp. 69-75.


46. Addams, Newer Ideals, p. 204.


49. See, for example, C.M. Hubbard, "The Scope and Limitations of Family Rehabilitation," Proceedings, NCCC (1914), pp. 129-30; even the N.Y. COS changed its attitudes toward immigrants in later years, as noted in Addams, Newer Ideals, p. 74.
63. E.G. see discussion on immigration at NCC Proceedings (1905), pp. 379-85.


68. Gordon, op. cit. pp. 76-78.
The Family as a Social Mediator

Black people, like other people, grow up in families. This simple observation is a surprise to people who are accustomed to associate the experiences of Black people with slavery, crime, delinquency, civil disorders. The Black historian, Benjamin Quarles (1967) has observed that white America tends to have a distorted perspective on Black life, and the fact of Blacks growing up in a family is a fresh approach to the understanding of socio-cultural aspects of growing up Black (cf. Billingsley, 1968).

The family is society's primary context for meeting a child's biological needs, directing his development into an integrated person living in a society, and transmitting to him its cultures (Lidz, 1974). It is also the setting in which a child's basic trust, autonomy, initiative and sense of industry toward life (cf. Erikson, 1959) are developed. The interaction between societal needs and individual wants (cf. Parsons and Bales, 1955; Winch, 1971) or between the demands of "super ego" and "id" defines the family as a mediational setting even though its structure is presently in transition (cf. Skolnick and Skolnick, 1971). Any attempt at studies of child development as an autonomous process, independent of the family, distorts as much as it simplifies the understanding of the growth process.

The family provides the earliest and most persistent influences that encompass the growing child for whom the ways of the parents and other adults in the family are the only way of life that the child knows. Subsequent experiences will modify these core influences but they can never fully reshape or replace them. These core influences are the realities for the growing child and the subsequent construction of his social world is

*An earlier version of this paper was read by Joan Wallace at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, December, 1974.
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based on these primary realities (cf. Berger and Luckmann, 1966). Among the early lessons a child learns in his family are the rewards of renouncing one's own wish for the welfare of the collective, the hierarchies of authority and the relationship between authority and responsibility. Indeed, the reality principle operates initially in a family context at an early age of a growing child.

The Resilient Black Family

Billingsley (1974) observes that "Black families are among the strongest and most resilient institutions in the nation. Were it not so, we would not have survived as a people, and the national society would be even more inhuman and inhumane than it is." The resiliency and strength of the Black family lies partly in its divergence from the patterns of family structure among the dominant group. Within the Black family, the constituents include not only people who are related and/or feel that they belong to each other in the same household, but also people who feel themselves to be closely related and live in different houses and often in different locations.

This intense feeling of being related is of course an expression of the "we-feeling" in social life, and its presence in American society is more than a reaction to the past and present repression of Black people by the dominant group. It is also an expression of Black people's African heritage in which the family is a central focus of community life (cf. Herskovits, 1958). In spite of the dehumanizing experience of enslavement, Black people have strong bonds of kinship and strong feeling of belonging to the same closely related unit, sometimes even in physical separation. Hayes and Mendell (1973) found that Blacks interact more with their kin, receive more help from their kin and have a greater number and more diversified types of relatives living with them than do white families. Social workers can recall their penniless welfare clients who made the long trip south because a relative had died or was in trouble or in need. The relentless forces of racism, poverty and violence of modern times continue to strain the Black family, but it responds with great strength (cf. Hill, 1971). The skewed presentations of Black family as weak, matriarchial, unstable, making no
substantial contribution to Black people or the nation (e.g. Moynihan, 1965) are inexcusable ignorant accounts of an important institution in the Black experience.

The Multi-faceted Black Culture

Among the many tasks performed by the Black family, probably none is more important for Black people (and for American society) than its transmission of a Black culture. It cannot be overlooked that, like white families, the Black family is both a repository of Black culture and an integral part of that culture.

The culture of a people is the totality of their way of life. It includes the basic conditions of their existence, their behavior, their life style, their values, preferences, creative expressions of work and play. Growing up in two separate and unequal Americas, Blacks and whites have no choice but to develop different ways of life within one nation. Perversely, the popular belief that Blacks do not have any distinctive culture has been advocated: "The Negro is only an American and nothing else. He has no values and culture to guard and protect." (Glazer and Moynihan, 1963:51); even Myrdal (1944) described the Black man as "an exaggerated American" whose culture is "merely a distorted development of a pathological condition" of American culture in general. Such observations are myopic, and they deny the humanity of a people (cf. Billingsley, 1968).

In fact, Black culture in America is unique, complex, and rich. It is a convergence and fusion of African, American, and European influences (Billingsley, 1974). Growing up Black in America is to grow in the context of Black culture. Within Black culture there is a diversity in the styles of individuals and families which is often overlooked and underrated in America (cf. Lewis, 1967). Perhaps the most prominent feature is the flexibility of family roles (cf. Hill, 1969; Billingsley, 1968; White, 1972). In the Black family, it is common to find that husband and wife are both employed outside the home, sharing the household chores of cooking, cleaning, caring for the children. The Black family is more accurately described as an equalitarian family rather than a matriarchy. In a single-parent family headed by a woman, she assumes the multiple roles of breadwinner, homemaker, and mother. In such households, Black men are
sometimes present in the form of "Uncle Joe," Cousin Pete," "Grandpa Moses," or the mother's boyfriend, and these men as members of the family also perform important roles. The movie "Claudine," for instance, illustrates the roles assumed by the mother's boyfriend.

**Developmental Tasks and Problems**

As indicated at the beginning of this paper, growing up is a mediational process. A Black child growing through the various stages of normal development in the Black family within Black culture has to learn a vast amount of knowledge: knowledge of his own family, knowledge of the Black community, and knowledge of the larger society. The process is highly complicated and his socio-psychological senses are well honed from childhood through adolescence. If a Black child appears slow in his "negotiation" with the white world, it is possible that he is prematurely worn out in his prior mediational tasks. In this section, some of the developmental tasks and problems facing the Black child as he grows toward adulthood are discussed.

**The Bi-Cultural Child**

The Black child is not marginal but bi-cultural (Chestang, 1972). He does not live on the fringes of a large society, he lives in both the larger society and the Black society. The experience of functioning in two cultures results in two deliberate ways of coping with life expectations.

The experience and condition of being Black and in America has resulted in the development of two parallel and opposing thought structures, each based on values, norms and beliefs of two cultures and supported by attitudes, feelings and behaviors of two people. Effective social functioning and environmental reality require that Black individuals incorporate both trends into their personalities, to assure competence in dealing with reality and to serve as an impetus for transcending reality. Thus, in the real world, the child is depreciated but must believe in himself. Growing up healthy in America is a problem for any child (cf. Goodman, 1960), but the description that Black children
who come from a background of poverty are likely to be emotion-
ally blighted is a distortion. Coles (1964) found for instance,
many poor Black children in the south and in the ghettos of the
north display resilience, toughness, ingenuity, exuberance, and
vitality. Such children come to school prepared to be active,
vigorous, perhaps much more outgoing than the average middle
class child. They quickly lose patience, sulk, feel wronged and
cheated by a world that they have learned to be impossible, con-
tradictory and uncertain. "By seven or eight, most Negro children
know the score and have been seen drawing only faintly disguised
pictures of the harsh future awaiting them."

The self-defense mechanisms that are an integral part of
the childrearing process in the Black family act to protect the
child against the external as well as the internal forces. When
a parent berates a child for not defending himself on the play-
ground when attacked by his peers, the child is prepared to use
the same defense tactics against whites who launch a similar
attack. Thus, Black children are more totally responsible for
their own protection than their white middle class counterparts.
The responsibility they are forced to exercise also lends itself
to a deeper involvement of shaping the future and ultimately to
rendering more control over their destiny. Almost by default,
these children have been forced to become a vital part of the pro-
cess that determines the kinds of individuals they will become.
Coping under the circumstances imposed by the society has required
the development of ego-syntonic modes that are often at variance
with personality trends considered normal by the dominant group.
Having acquired the ability to care for himself, a Black child is
understandably impatient and restless with the game playing atmo-
sphere in the middle class oriented schoolroom. The ineptness of
some educational practices is most ludicrous in the case of
teaching a Harlem child to cross Seventh Avenue and 42nd Street
when he has mastered the technique in his own neighborhood at
Lexington and 125th Streets, or to do simple addition and subtrac-
tion with blocks and beads when he is able to carry on business
transaction in the grocery stores in his pre-school days. A
Black child from a background of financial poverty is an artist
in self-defense by the time he enrolls in a school; he does not
depend on his parents for protection. Even in the Black middle
class the parents can never give their children the ultimate
protection from racism which whites exercise.
Black children also are subjected to the second-class citizenship of their elders. Lower class Black children have received less of the protection from the law and have been the children in the United States least likely to benefit from the general concern with child protection. The standard conception of the protected and irresponsible child has never been possible for the majority of Black children. The consequences of the powerlessness of Black parents necessitated that they devise their own pattern of child socialization. These patterns were primarily predicated upon the principle that children in the Black community must be taught to survive in a hostile society.

The Bi-lingual Child

Because of the capacity to acquire language is innate in humans and virtually all children learn to speak, the complexities of the process of learning language and the central importance of language to ego functioning are often overlooked by adults. To survive in this country, the Black child must learn the language and the heritage of his community and the language of the wider society. He must additionally learn a variety of behaviors that are acceptable within his community and behaviors that are acceptable within the wider society. As the languages and behaviors of the two cultures are not entirely and mutually acceptable, the child must know the proper context for the correct language and behavior. The bi-lingual learning of a Black child (or any children from the minority background) is a complicated and subtle task. Some children do not become bi-lingual and are able to communicate only in one language because their parents are monolingual (as are most white parents). Barred from learning the other language, e.g. de facto school segregation, some Black parents may be unable to pass on to their children what they do not possess. Adding insult to injury, some educators proceed to label the Black child as verbally destitute. Baratz and Baratz (1970), however, find that Black children of lower socio-economic background are neither linguistically impoverished or cognitively underdeveloped, although their language system is different and presents a handicap to their attempting to negotiate with the standard English, it is nonetheless a fully developed language system that is adequate for abstract thinking. Clearly, society demands more of the bi-lingual child, the child of "different"
parents, than it does of the middle class white child. A middle class child has only one language to learn; a Black child has two. Each language is the product of the cumulative experiences of an ethnic branch of the human race.

Language is the basic tool by which a child's social world is constructed (cf. Berger and Luckmann, 1966). In acquiring a language, the learner gathers in not only the symbolic referents of a vocabulary but also the value overtones of the language. Black children listen to words in standard American language which are demeaning to them and to their blackness. Burgest (1973) found for example, the word white has 134 synonyms, only ten of which appear to have negative implications and these only in the mildest sense--whitewash, gray, wand, pale, ashen, etc. The word "blackness" has 126 synonyms, sixty of which are distinctly unfavorable and none of them mildly positive. Additionally, there are combined words such as "black ball," "black death," "black flag," "black hand," "black list," "black magic," "black mail," "black market," "black sheep," and the list is extensive. So the child not only has to respond to the wider society, becoming aware that his blackness is depicted as bad, but also to transcend the negative image for his own healthy development.

Black, Female and Capable

The young Black girl growing up in this environment becomes consciously socialized into the role of a woman when she is about seven or eight years old (Ladner, 1971). She becomes cognizant of the fact early in life that she will not be able to achieve the culturally imposed goals of being soft, clinging and dependent to obtain a man who will support her, and provide for her an array of material possessions. How can she attempt to incorporate femininity as defined by the dominant culture into her own culture's definition of the female role?

In the dominant culture a sex role standard has been defined as a belief shared by members of the culture regarding the characteristics that are appropriate for males and females (Kagen, 1971). Specific behaviors have been ascribed as distinctly for females, e.g. dependency, passivity, conformity, nurturing, submissiveness, etc.
The sex role standard effects most notably the mastery of specific cognitive skills. From kindergarten through grade four, girls typically out perform boys in all areas of study. However, whenever the skills of an adolescent or an adult are tested, males consistently score higher than females. The adolescent girl, her parents, her girl friends or boy friends perceive success (as measured by objective, visible achievement tests) as antithetical to femininity. There is a growing body of knowledge that Black girls concentrate their occupational expectations toward being professional and usually reject the traditional role of housewife (Harrison, 1974).

The dilemma of being female for the Black woman is that she is urged by society in general to cultivate the traits that lend themselves to femininity. On the other hand, she is pressured by the political/economic system and the survival needs of the Black community to develop those traits which are contrary to the ideas of womanhood as prescribed by the sex role standard, i.e., independence, self assertion, persistence, etc.

Additionally, as she grows, she may be confronted with a community which may expose her to rape and violence, and neither parents nor community leaders have the power to eliminate these threats. In a similar manner, she may be forced to go hungry, without shoes and clothing and inadequate housing, due to the powerlessness of her parents who must vacillate between inadequate protection and over-protection. Some abandon the struggle in the context of an up-hill fight; others withdraw their children into the protective custody of the home. One Black mother justifies her strict supervision over her daughter, reasoning that there are too many bad people in the streets. Her experiences in the street as a growing youngster lead her to believe that children cannot adequately handle themselves when confronted by what is out there. On the other hand, the isolation of the child may stifle her and render her ineffective in handling traumas in later life (cf. Ladner, 1971). Growing up female in the Black community is a demanding task.

Black, Male and Independent

Growing up as a mediational process is most vividly evident among Black boys. Coles (1964) raises a provoking question
about growing up male in the Black community: Is the sixteen year-old boy who has lived in stark, unremitting poverty since age eight, earning a living since fourteen, married at fifteen, and soon to be a father still a child? Adolescence begins earlier for the Black child, particularly in the inner city setting or where he must deal with the dangers of the street. Although adolescence currently covers the teen-age period, its onset varies with physiological differences, and time of sexual maturation. Its duration is influenced by the social, economic and other cultural factors. The youth whose father is a laborer, who leaves school at sixteen to take a semi-skilled job and marries at eighteen has a very brief adolescence. In contrast, a graduate student who is undecided about his career at 23, and has three or four additional years of study, may be considered an adolescent even though he is biologically mature.

One of the crucial tasks of adolescence is the development and the crystallization of an ego identity (cf. Erikson, 1959). The growing boy has acquired a unique consistency of behaviors which permit others to have expectations of how he will behave and react. The achievement of ego identity usually acquires the concurrent attainment of a capacity to move toward inter-dependence with a person of the opposite sex, an intimacy that probably encompasses far more than the capacity to have sexual relations or even to enjoy orgasmic pleasure in the act. It concerns an ability to dare to form a significant relationship without fear of loss of self.*

The young adolescent Black male is confronted with a variety of problems. In one sense, he is asked to become a man. In another sense, he is told he will never become a man. The struggle for identity for instance, is hampered by the reading materials he may be exposed to in school, as in the following excerpt from Huckleberry Finn:

*The crystallization of an ego identity is of course equally important for the adolescent female. The discussion is focused on Black males because of the limitation of a short paper. Indeed, the negotiation between the sexes during the adolescent period is a highly developed art (cf. Staples, 1970).
"It warn't the grounding--that didn't keep us back but a little. We blowed out a cylinder-head."

"Good gracious! anybody hurt?"

"No'm. Killed a nigger."

"Well, it's lucky! because sometimes people do get hurt..." (Twain, 1961, p. 195).

The inhumane treatment of Blacks is common in American literature. Though Jim, the slave, is considered by many as the hero, he is a powerless, castrated Black man. For a young man in search of a role-model and an identity, the school provides him models of castrated, good slaves.

During adolescence, the youngster goes through all kinds of biological changes. The increase in bodily height and width begins to approximate him to the adult world. The subsequent maturation of the secondary sexual characteristics tends to estrange the young man from his own body and soon thereafter he experiences the upsurge of sexual feelings. Traditionally, the boy in preparation for his adult role must overcome the dependency upon the mother in order to assume a "protective role" toward a wife and to fulfill his more instrumental roles in the family and in society. Can a Black man who uses the castrated slave "Jim" as his model ever protect his wife from racism and sexism? The school is short changing Black children.

The essential developmental tasks of adolescence are complex. Their true mastery usually take an extended period of time. It is a period of dependency when the teenager is still trying out ways of living and relating to others, testing out capacities and emotional limitations. He can still assume and shed roles, and can love without expectation that it will lead to a permanent attachment. The period involves considerable trying out with an implicit understanding that one is not yet playing for keeps. Lidz (1974) states:

"The adolescent is exploring his world and learning how to know himself, but the family is still available
to offer protection and guidance. Periods of regressive dependency upon them remain possible during recuperation from defeat or disappointment."

This is however not always true for the child who has been forced to grow up prematurely. For some, especially Black teen-agers, the adolescent period is a brief interval in life.

**Growing Up Black**

Eventually, all adolescent boys and girls enter young adulthood, assuming their positions in society. For the Black man, the transition from adolescence to adulthood is a small step. Without the extended societal moratorium, he assumes the adult roles at an early age. The journey he travels from childhood to adulthood has been on tortuous and thorny roads, but he never travels alone and he is not alone. He grows up in a family, he lives in a culture, and he will overcome the obstacles in life, and grow in strength knowing that his brothers and sisters face similar odds. What is true for the Black man is also true for the Black woman, for above all else, they are both people of the Black culture and children of the Black family.
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For close to a decade, members of the social work profession, who also were members of a minority race, have been confronting the profession with their perception that social work has not addressed adequately the needs of their racial groups. The fact that members of one group (a minority race) confronted another group (the social work profession) in which they also held membership signaled the strong and serious conflict between a person's identification with two major groups. Whether the two group identifications could find a common ground, became a concern for not only the individual belonging to the two groups, but also for the profession.

Members of minority races, specifically the Black race, brought the conflict to the attention of the profession by firstly presenting 'demands' to national conferences and then organizing formally into all Black professional organizations. The profession has moved quickly to attest to its openness with respect to the minority races. Professional members, who were also members of racial minorities, were seated on many deliberating bodies of the social work profession. Agencies and schools began recruitment of social workers, students, and teachers from minority races. Social work journals began to find room for articles on issues and problems related to the minority races.

This flurry of 'reactivity', however, obscured the need for systematic analysis of how the potential conflict between the two major group identifications suddenly became a reality and what the conflict meant to the professional and to the profession.

The purpose of this article is to cast some light on the emergence of the overt struggle between the two identifications and how the conflict has been mitigated by social workers of minority races. Specifically, the subject will be pursued by scrutinizing the concern as it has related to Black social workers.

The Rise of Stress on Black Group Identification

During the latter part of the 1960's, a majority of both Black and non-Black Americans seemed shocked and perplexed by the 'new' demand--"Freedom Now." Ironically, the substance of the new demand was quite old.

In 1903, W.E.B. DuBois and members of the "Talented Tenth" had proclaimed:
We want full mankind suffrage, and we want it now. Henceforth and forever . . . We want discrimination in public accommodations to cease . . . We claim the right of free men to walk, talk, and be with them that wish to be with us . . . We want the Constitution of the Country enforced . . . We want our children educated . . . We mean real education.¹

The first members of a 1960 version of DuBois's "Talented Tenth" were Black social workers. They revitalized, organized and joined formal, as well as informal, professional associations of Black social workers. The goal of these organizations was to concentrate the education and skills of their members in helping their own people gain Freedom Now.

The first formal organization of Black social workers grew out of Black faculty and student momentum at the Columbia University School of Social Work in 1967. By 1968, the impetus was felt by Black social workers in other northern cities to gravitate toward one another and form associations of Black social workers. The month and the year that they formed these first associations coincided with the month and year of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s death--April, 1968.

Although Martin Luther King, Jr.'s death signaled the rise of all but one of the early associations of Black social workers, his death was not an immediate factor associated with the first association or with those organized later. In order to gain an adequate explanation for the emergence of formal professional organizations of Black social workers, despite the existence of the racially integrated National Association of Social Workers, it is necessary to examine the phenomena as the creation of two interacting factors--historical and professional experiences affecting the Black race, and therefore affecting the expression arena for Black Group Identification.

Historical

Isaacs observed:

The samenesses are ceasing to be the same. Like everyone else, Negroes are having to rearrange the truths and fallacies of how they see others and how they see themselves. New images are flashing back at them off the surfaces of today's new experiences. Habits of a lifetime of a whole group past have to be broken. All of it rudely, or exhilaratingly, comes up for disposal, renovation, and replacement.²

The greatest historical fact influencing the changing self-image of America's Black person was the successful rise of African Nationalism. Prior to that time, the search for racial pride in ancestry was diverted by the stereotype of the African as a subservient, cowardly, moronic savage. The credibility of this portrait began to crumble when the African people showed that they could not only govern their own countries, but also be significant players in the game of world politics.

Within the United States, Martin Luther King, Jr. demonstrated that a Black man could fight and, more importantly, lead successfully in the Black man's struggle for equity in this country. King's leadership in the non-violent fight for racial freedom took on momentum in 1955. He and E.D. Nixon organized and led the year long Montgomery bus boycott, the success of which "... emboldened other Negroes in the South to take direct action against segregation." In 1960, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical College's students initiated "sit-ins" at a Greensboro Woolworth store. Within two months, 68 cities were unwilling hosts to sit-ins whose participants now were organized and trained in non-violent maneuvers by C.O.R.E. field workers from the North. A year later, "sit-ins" were followed by "freedom rides" and two years later (1963) Blacks organized marches to protest their exclusion from the polls.

Although these struggles finally culminated in a 1964 comprehensive Civil Rights Bill, the cost in human lives was horrendous: Medger Evers, James Chaney, Andy Goodman, Mickey Schwerner, and Mrs. Violet Liuzzo.

Finally, the slogan, "Black Power," lifted Stokley Carmichael and Floyd McKissick into the spotlight in 1966. New leaders of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, (SNCC) they and others outlined a new position paper for SNCC which called on white members to leave the organization because they were handicaps in the South and their "... participation in policy-making meetings in the North was, at best, unnecessary ... " Yet, contrary to the belief that "Black Power" meant total eradication of whites' efforts in civil rights; the heart of the phrase, is that "... Negroes must develop a base of political and economic power from which to identify and define their own needs in their own terms. Black Americans must be able to demand justice and bargain from a position of strength when dealing with the dominant white majority.""}

Professional

The changing self-image of America's Black person is pertinent to the reason for a rise of Black movements within this country. Yet, particularly relevant to an understanding of Black assertion within professional
ranks is the recognition of problems peculiar to the Black professional. On the one hand, there are the unfulfilled promises of equality.

Bach and Simpson have observed:

Negro's feel that the official standards of the [profession] promise them equal rewards, depending only on effort and ability, while at the same time, they are forced to adapt to the realities of being a disfavored minority.6

On the other hand, professionalism complicates the attempt to identify with one's racial group. Bowman reports on this problem:

The Negro leaders articulate a real concern about race relations but they are strongly professionally oriented, and this often seems to take precedence in their goals and activities.7

Although the professional values and norms have influence on the nature of the individual who has, at this stage of live, committed himself irrevocably to the profession, "The realities of professional segregation in the south and discrimination in the north may interfere at all points with true professional identification."8

The interaction of historical and professional experiences as an influence for the increased racial awareness of Black professionals is captured by Isaacs in the following statement:

They also need a new scheme of [their professional lives] to cope with the new conditions created by all the big facts of life and history [that] are at last working for them and not as always before, against them.9

The influence of historical and professional experiences on the emergence of associations of Black social workers must be assumed as basic to the attempt to reconcile the two fundamental identifications—one with the race and one with the profession.

Group Identification

Group identification can be defined as the acceptance of a shared sameness with a circumscribed body. The 'sameness' of a human group can

---


8Bach and Simpson, loc. cit., p. 69.

9Isaacs, loc. cit.
be viewed as the shared values and usually, but not necessarily, the specific norms for achieving those values.

**Black Group Identification**, as found in the United States, coincides with the above definition of any group's identification. That which can make the definition more specific to the Black race is the explication of the agreed upon values and then to look at the norms or means for realizing those values. For instance, all Black people share in the acceptance of the goal of achieving freedom in this country. Yet, all do not share an acceptance of the particular norms or means for achieving this valued end. Thus, it is within this area of means to the end that differences in the observed expressions of Black Group Identification have occurred over time and within any specific time. Consequently, it is within this area of means to the end, rather than the end per se, that the bases for different expressions of Black Group Identification and, therefore, for different substantive definitions of the concept can be found.

As the social work profession can bear witness, Black Group Identification can be expressed in attitudes and behavior in not only the Black person's general life but also the person's professional life. Yet, when racial identification is expressed in the professional arena, conflict may ensue.

Professional Group Identification also requires the adherence not only to the values of the profession, but also to the norms for achieving the values. Although there are several social work norms about which there is agreement, the one norm that potentially can come into conflict with the norms of racial identification is that which requires the burial of personal considerations.

Weber's *sine ire et studio*, a mark of the "ideal" type of bureaucracy has been applied also to the "ideal" type of professionalism. Greenwood, Wilensky and Lebeaux, and also Etzioni have agreed that important professional norms are objectivity and impersonality.

The freedom value of the Black race is certainly a 'personal' concern for the Black social worker. Even if the Black social worker wishes to forget the struggle of the Black race to achieve freedom, memory is stimulated constantly by the fact that the person too, because of race, is denied freedom within the profession ... a profession that then admonishes, "Don't take it personally." If the Black professional is to remain identified with both the race and the profession, the person must choose means to achieving racial freedom that does not necessitate the abandonment of a profession to which the person has committed a major part of his/her life.


The dilemma, racial identification or professional identification, can be lessened by choosing one and discarding the other, treating one as having priority over the other, or finding a way of treating each as equally important. Black social workers have responded to this dilemma according to these three general frameworks. The first framework has been adopted by few, probably because of the previously mentioned difficulties in wresting one's self from either group.13 The remaining two frameworks, which do not require the abandonment of identification with at least one of the major groups have attracted Black social workers.14

One Group as a Priority

Those who work within a framework of choosing one group as having priority over the other, without rejecting that other group, may opt to practice with race or the profession as the prime referant.

When race is treated as having priority, the Black social worker may elect to practice For Blacks Only or For Blacks Mainly. Practicing for Blacks Only requires that the Black social worker not only serve just members of the Black race, but also deny service to members of other races. This approach employs a general strategy for promoting freedom for the Black race. That strategy is to concentrate all of the talents of its racial members on the freedom task. Thus, Black social workers who have an affinity with the strategy would focus all of their professional knowledge and skills on helping members only of their race.

The second approach, For Blacks Mainly, while oriented to the For Blacks Only practice, does not necessitate a denial of service to non-Blacks but does dictate that the major effort expended be for racial members. Within this track, unlike that of For Blacks Only, is a foundation for reconciling the conflict between racial identification and professional identification. The position is that professionals do choose specialties according to their personal interests and abilities; e.g., corrections, child welfare, etc. Thus, choosing to specialize and work with one race on the basis of interest and particular abilities to communicate, does not violate professional norms. Furthermore, if a person of a different race requests needed help, the Black social worker will provide service.

Whereas some Black social workers have treated racial identification as more important than professional identification, others have done the reverse by treating professional identification as a primary consideration. The practice of these social workers is characterized by acting as an Intermediary or as an Egalitarian.

The Black professional, who functions as an Intermediary, recognizes that both Black and non-Black professionals can impede the Black client


14Ibid., pp. 36-39.
from achieving racial freedom. Since the Intermediary is aware that the one possessing an attitude or performing an act detrimental to Black racial members may be doing so out of lack of information about the Black race, the Intermediary often fulfills the role of an information giver.

The Egalitarian Black social worker closely follows the professional norms of objectivity and impersonality by behaving as if 'Blackness' was incidental to professionalism. As far as the freedom value of the Black race is concerned, the Egalitarian holds that true freedom is to be treated a a member of the human race, rather than a sub-group of the species. His/her professional practice reflects the belief that to realize freedom, one practices freedom; to realize racial equality, one practices racial equality. This Black social worker will serve all regardless of race.

Merging The Two Identifications

The third attempt at mitigating the conflict has been to embrace equally both groups-- the race and the profession. This approach does not demand that the professional's knowledge and skills be applied to the Black race only or mainly nor does it dictate that the Black social worker behave as though 'Blackness' was incidental to 'humanness.' The Cosmopolitan believes that the racial identities of all are important factors in the tailoring of practice to fit the client. Thus, this professional attempts to become knowledgeable and appreciative of the history and culture of all races, particularly minority races. Furthermore, the Cosmopolitan attempts to become sensitive to the ways in which the dominant majority race has used racial differences as reasons for denying freedom to minority races. Consequently, while helping Blacks to gain freedom, the Cosmopolitan also is helping members of other races to win freedom.

The Cosmopolitan Black social worker, while helping the Black race and other races, does not violate professional norms to any degree. Instead, this social worker calls attention to another professional norm-- adding to the body of professional knowledge.

Summary

In the foregoing pages, a phenomenon that has emerged as a dilemma for the social worker of a minority race and a problem for the profession has been analyzed. The dilemma was etched as the need to reconcile the conflict between two major groups competing for allegiance-- one's race and one's profession. By using the Black professional as the example, three structures that house ways of ameliorating the potential conflict for professionals of minority races were outlined.

Also, it was noted that some of the ways in which professional members of minority races attempted to alleviate the dilemma became a

---

15It must be noted that the term, Cosmopolitan, is descriptively defined in a context different from that used when speaking of the "Cosmopolitan vs. Local" orientations. The usage here derives from the generic definition of Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary; "having worldwide rather than limited or provincial scope or bearing ... composed of persons, constituents, or elements from all or many parts of the world."
problem for the profession. The problem was heralded by charges of 'irrelevancy' and 'inadequacy' in dealing with the concerns of clients of minority races. Yet, only the dilemma for social workers of minority races and not the problem for the profession was analyzed. In order to gain a fuller understanding of the phenomenon, a scrutiny of the profession's response would have to be made. Some of the questions that might be posed are—What were the past and immediate historical factors influencing the profession's solutions to the problem? Can the profession's attempts to solve the problem be placed into categories that would approximate the frameworks into which efforts of Black social workers to lessen the dilemma have been placed?

Whether the above questions or others are used, the analysis of the profession's response still awaits consideration.
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INTRODUCTION

Social Work Education should have two major tasks with regard to teaching about ethnicity, particularly working-class ethnics. The fostering of sensitivity to diverse cultures, and the members of such cultural groups is clearly one thrust; the architectural task of participating in the building of a society which fulfills the needs and builds the security of its people should be the second function. In the past, social work education has taught about ethnicity and often about politics with a narrow perspective limited "to single dimensions of policy". A broader gauge "megapolicy perspective" would enable practitioners to refrain from dividing ethnic

*This paper was prepared for delivery at the Annual Program Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education, Atlanta, Georgia, March 10-13, 1974.

1The arguments which are being made in regard to social work education and social work professionals can be made too in reference to many other educational programs.

group members into "good guys" (those whom we support) and "bad guys" (those whom we oppose). It also would lead to the development of a policy-oriented perspective which could help social work professionals to influence significant social reforms.3

**DEFINITIONS**

Before preceding with this analysis, it is necessary to define several key terms which will be used in this study. **Ethnicity**, implies the sense of social inter-relatedness among a particular group of people. Such groups are "...linked by complementary habits and facilities of communication."4 The term **working-class ethnics** reflects popular usage that highlights as "ethnics", wage and clerical workers of Eastern and Southern European or of Irish background. Also such ethnics tend to be of Roman Catholic or Greek Orthodox background. In addition to the Irish, major ethnic groupings include those of Italian, Polish, Greek, and Slavic background. Another term which will be utilized is **political coalition**. Political coalition, refers to active cooperation among diverse interest groups in order to achieve certain commonly desired goals.

The contention to be supported in this paper is that coalition behavior within the American political system would be enhanced if future decision-makers and other political influentials developed a **megapolicy perspective**. A megapolicy perspective is characterized by Yehezekel Dror as viewing "...discrete policy issues within a broader context of basic goals, postures, and directives."5 In other words, a megapolicy perspective takes into account goals and values, social-political realities, and the realities of governmental structure and functions. In social work education, this perspective is germane to the education of clinical students as well as community organization students. Clinical social workers are in an active segment of the civic policy in the United States. They are influentials who

---

3 For an interesting discussion of the relationship of social work professionals to the task of political action, see Daniel Thursz, "Professional Education for Expected Political Action by Social Workers", *Journal of Education for Social Work*, 9 (Fall, 1973), 87-93.

effect public policy decision-makers, either as decision-makers themselves, or as respected professional colleagues to whom decision-makers come for information. Insofar as this is clearly the reality of their influence-range, the theoretical framework they receive in school can be important in affecting the focus of social welfare decision-making. Similarly, it is as particularly useful as a theoretical perspective for students of social policy, social planning and community development.

The purpose of utilizing such a perspective in the professional education of social workers would be to foster their participation in the fulfillment of social development goals. Social development goals are being defined herein as: "...the formulation of a publicly supported infrastructure of services and income policies to insure that basic human (social and physical) needs of the citizenry are met."

**CURRENT APPROACHES TO THE TEACHING OF ETHNICITY**

Currently, many courses dealing with ethnic groups, be they American Indians, Blacks, Jews or "white ethnics", view the ethnic experience in terms of specific wrongs and grievances which must be redressed by "society". Such analyses often do not concern themselves with the nature of the social institutions which must do the "redressing". Often little attention is focused on the question of whom in society, or what groupings in society, should share in the reallocation of resources necessary to redress past grievances. Such an approach often results in a redress of some grievances, at the same time grievances are created elsewhere. If expansion of job opportunities or school opportunities for particular groups -- on

---

5 Dror, *op. cit.*, p.18.


the basis of group membership—result in a lessening of opportunities for members of other groups, a pattern of new grievance and political "coalition-splitting" is established. 8

The alternative to this political divisiveness might be provided by a megapolicy perspective to the resolution of ethnic grievances. This approach would have to take into account the inter-relationship and inter-reliance between a variety of groups in our society. Furthermore, political reform regarding social development goals must result in issue choice which allows the inclusion of a variety of racial, ethnic and class groupings. Such a perspective takes into account Robert M. MacIver's observation ". . . We have to remember that a modern society is a multi-group society. It is composed of many inter-related groups. It is not homogeneous. All the conditions of modern life make that impossible. " 9

Providing this view in a social work curriculum leads to a problem which should not be overlooked in any serious discussion of curriculum and political-social perspective. The problem which arises relates to any demand or request for new courses or new approaches in developing educational alternatives. The flexibility of the course offerings is limited by sequence requirements tied to needs for professional excellence. Clearly policy perspectives can aid in the fostering of such excellence and courses which emphasize policy questions must be provided social work students. Given these needs for a complete training of professionals in social welfare decision-making -- it would seem that two complementary courses of action are open to curriculum builders. On the one hand a megapolicy perspective regarding ethnic involvement in a meaningful social coalition can be provided in basic courses in social policy and in social policy electives. Also, courses can be developed which deal specifically with ethnicity and the role of the working class, in short courses given at many institutions between the Fall and Spring semester. This later approach has

---

the advantage of providing students with the specific types of materials not provided ordinarily in regular semester policy sequence courses. Furthermore, it enables teachers and students to ask questions and to seek answers which they often do not have the time to explore during the normal semester -- especially given the time constraints imposed by field placement obligations. This later condition of restraint an intellectual development and the development of a broad policy perspective poses a problem which could be explored elsewhere. Certainly a broader perspective with an understanding of potential political support via the traditional skills of the policy -- which include coalition building -- could foster the role of social workers in their goal of developing a better society for all Americans.

A MEGAPOLICY MODEL

A "megapolicy model" would, as do other approaches, study the needs, grievances and problems of the wide range of groups which interact within the American social-policy system. As well as looking at such groupings, a megapolicy approach would provide the framework necessary to study the inter-relatedness between groups, and the interconnections between such groups and the political system. Andrew Greeley observed this need for a broader perspective when he noted: "A considerable number of both the social scientists and the social policy makers are currently announcing that black is beautiful (whether they really believe it or not is another matter) but if black is beautiful (and it is) then so is Irish, Polish, Italian, Slovenian, Greek, Armenian, Lebanese and Luxembourger. All these represent valid and valuable cultural heritages. They all represent sources of identification and meaning in a vast and diverse society. They all have a positive contribution to a richer and more exciting community."}


10For an interesting discussion of the use of mini-courses in social work education, see Thursz, op. cit., 87-93.

A megapolicy perspective could help focus on those issues which have an appeal transcending ethnic and social class lines. Such an approach recently has been urged by Roy Wilkins, Executive Director of the NAACP. Speaking to the American Jewish Committee in New York City, Mr. Wilkins observed that Blacks, Jews and other ethnic groups had a joint interest in developing issues that are "coalition building". Such program areas might include free public transportation, improving the quality of neighborhood life and developing services for the elderly and the poor. He expressed the belief that Blacks and Jews in New York City had spent too much time and energy divided on coalition splitting issues, such as control of school boards, school zoning and busing. His suggestion also addresses itself to the possibility of building a political coalition comprising different income groups with a shared concern with improving the quality of life and the sense of well-being in urban communities.

A megapolicy perspective as an educational framework would provide greater insight for social work professionals on the importance of "lifestyle" issues to many working class ethnics. For example, the building of a national coalition for greater social development which includes working class ethnics must respect their cultural conservatism on issues such as abortion reform and marijuana smoking. A megapolicy approach must be concerned with those social development issues which would include working class ethnics in a broad coalition which includes substantial segments of the poorer and the more affluent members of society.

A narrow, particularistic approach to the study of ethnic groups by potential influential in the national policy may lead to a condition where confrontation strategy, which plays into the hands of those political forces opposed to greater social development in the United States, emerges. Kevin P. Phillips, a political strategist for President Nixon, has perceived,
in what he termed "Black Power" and "White Power" confrontations in New York State and New Jersey, a turning of the Urban, working class Catholics (particularly, the Irish and the Italians) in the Northeast to conservative Republican candidates. To some extent, the 1972 Presidential election confirmed Phillips analysis. (Despite the Nixon landslide, there is currently considerable working class discontent with current national economic policies)

Contrary-wise, a megapolicy approach to the study of ethnic problems might lead to the development of strategies based on the broadening of a potential coalition for social development. Such an approach would take into account the need to broaden political party structures to include more Blacks, Latinos and women, without excluding working class leaders. Such an approach could relate to a variety of ethnic and social class needs for improved social development: fairer tax laws, social policies related to progressive rather than regressive taxation patterns, greater universalism in social benefit policies, better health care services, decent housing, and adequate educational policies. Such social development issues are issues which have a common appeal to many among the poor, and the middle class, as well as to working class ethnics and other members of the working class.

CONCLUSION

Social work education needs to mesh the teaching of ethnic problems and culture with the relationship of such knowledge to effective political action: a unity of theory and practice. A megapolicy framework for the study of ethnic groups and their perceptions of the social order could relate the educational process to the issue of social development within American society, as well as to the recognition of cultural complexity and the richness of ethnic and class groupings within American society. A utilization of this approach would enable social work professionals to develop the necessary cultural and political knowledge, and thus a more realistic perspective to foster interaction with diverse groups and to build political support for social development policies. It also is hoped that such an intellectual frame of reference will influence social work practitioners to show a greater concern for meeting the needs of working class ethnics, and to develop the political insight that this large group of Americans is a necessary component in any effective coalition for meaningful social development.

ASSIMILATIONIST THEORY AND IMMIGRANT MINORITIES IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA: IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL SERVICES DEVELOPMENT

John M. Herrick, Ph.D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

This paper examines from a comparative perspective theories of cultural assimilation in the United States and Canada and speculates on the impact of these theories for developing social services, especially social services for immigrants and ethnic minorities.

For perspective, it is important to define what is meant by the term minority. In its functional sense, minority is defined as a social status which is relatively disadvantaged, since its members have been discriminated against and condemned to subordinate social status by institutional structures which have been largely disinterested in their ethnic or cultural uniqueness. In the United States, this has meant ethnic minority groups have historically been expected to shed their cultural baggage, to melt into the homogenizing melting pot, and emerge, as Hector St. John Crevecoeur wrote so long ago, as new men, as Americans. In recent years, the functional utility of the melting pot, with its assumptions about the blending together of diverse groups to produce an American product, has been questioned. Blacks and other minorities, self conscious about their function and place within the larger American society, have forced re-questioning of melting pot assumptions. Some scholars have concluded that the United States is a nation in which the most favored, the rich, the well-born and the powerful, have conferred minority social standing on all those who do not match the stereotypical American ideal.

Older studies which recounted the struggles of various ethnic groups to surmount the obstacles of rising above their backgrounds, usually assumed that "making it" in the United States meant becoming something other than what they were in their land of origin. Assimilation meant rising above one's ethnic background to assume a new identity and social status. Students of immigration have often marveled at the ways in which ethnic groups promoted the need to Americanize, to be born again, as it were, as new people, as Americans. Born of the self-justifying logic and rationalizations that were perhaps needed to sustain
one's risk as he or she left the old homeland and traveled great distances to find a new life in a strange environment, the metaphor of the melting pot served a positive function in assuring immigrants that if they tried hard enough they could probably make it in their adopted homeland. Despite the harsh realities of the immigration experience—incoming immigrants were sometimes forced to have their bodies and possessions fumigated at the point of entry, an action of none too subtle symbolism—immigrants hoped America would be a place for realizing dreams.

John Higham, an American historian of immigration, has written perceptively that it was not until 1789, in Jedidiah Morse's widely used patriotic textbook, *American Geography*, that the word immigrant was first used to identify certain newcomers to American soil. Is it mere coincidence that the work materialized, as Higham notes, simultaneously with the creation of the American national government? Before Morse, commentators on the United States, such as Crevecoeur, had referred only to "emigrants". By 1789, the people of the United States were beginning to label newcomers with the term immigrant, identifying them with the country they entered instead of the one they had left. As Higham has noted, "the term 'immigrant' presupposed the existence of a receiving society to which the alien could attach himself. The immigrant is not, then, a colonist or a settler, who creates a new society and lays down the terms of admission for others. He is rather the bearer of a foreign culture." 3

In his textbook, Jedediah Morse drew distinctions between the newer "immigrants" and the original inhabitants of the United States, who were not the Indians, but the Dutch and the English "settler". Recall that the Dutch had settled into the Hudson River Valley by 1624 and that the English had control of these settlements by 1664. As late as 1776, Dutch was still spoken by large numbers of New York and New Jersey populations. Of course, by that time, people of English origin were the preponderant majority throughout the original thirteen states. And the English saw themselves as settlers, as founders, as planners and creators of new societies. In no way did they perceive themselves to be immigrants. They dominated their environment. Their language, their government, their culture with its attendant values, would determine the fate of newcomers—immigrants—in their society. 4

If this pattern of settlement and domination is historically accurate and serves as a correct appraisal of what transpired in the 18th century, it seems clear that at the time of the American
Revolution, the United States was very much a closed society. Those who would venture to become part of it had to risk culture, homeland and values to share in the American Experience. It also is clear that many, many immigrants of diverse ethnic origin were attracted to the promises of the United States and found the process of uprooting themselves from familiar surroundings less threatening than staying put. The hope for a better life was strong enough to compel immense sacrifice and willingness to endure hardships, especially the none too subtle demands of adjusting to a new nation.

Of course, not all Americans underwent the immigrant experience. By 1790, nearly 19 percent of the United States population consisted of slaves. Blacks were meant to be a permanent, subordinate, powerless caste. They were not expected to share in the immigrant experience. Dominated physically and psychologically by the Anglo-Saxon majority, Blacks were not expected to assimilate themselves into the mainstream of American society nor were they afforded the kinds of supportive institutional services that would smooth their entrance into the larger society. While newly arrived immigrants to the United States might find aid and comfort from immigrant protective groups, church organizations or informally from already established immigrants from their homelands, no such comforting services existed for American Blacks. Recent historical research indicates that even the anti-slavery societies which so loudly decried slavery before the American Civil War, gave little economic assistance to ease the transition of Blacks from slavery to freedom.

Immigrant protective associations formed to ease the transitions from Europe to the United States for most immigrants were based on a self-help philosophy that assistance, both material and psychological was guaranteed while the newly arrived immigrant found ways to make it on his/her own. Down to the twentieth century, the model for American social services clearly demonstrates its kinship with the self-help services primarily created to speed the assimilation of immigrants into American society. The course of American philanthropy, as Robert Bremner has shown, is the story of voluntary efforts to "help people become independent and prepared to work out their own destinies." Furthermore, such agencies as social settlement houses, Y's, boys' clubs and other character-building organizations used by immigrants, socialized users into dominant cultural mores.

The "self-help" philosophy of social service was compatible
with the American ethos of success based on individualistic effort. Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the ideal of the self-made man, exemplified by the Horatio Alger ethic, was an important construct influencing the behavior of countless American males. One need only cite the adulation and even adoration heaped on such self-made Americans as Andrew Carnegie for evidence of the strength of the self-help success ethos in shaping the American psyche.9

The concept of public responsibility for social welfare services ran contrary to societal values and never gained much headway in the United States. When such public social welfare institutions as almshouses and workhouses were created, they functioned to deter further use. Their purpose, as implicitly suggested by Coll and Mencher, was to regulate the poor.10 They were not created out of totally altruistic philanthropic impulses. They were meant to enforce the canons of the self-help success ethos by offering relief only in the harshest of circumstances and surroundings. In a society which worshipped individual effort and conversely disdained those who for whatever reason opted not to play by the rules of the system, there was only one correct way to make it. That was by hard work, thrift and sober living. Certainly, the history of America's evangelistic religions with their characteristic emphasis on the necessity for individualistic effort presents additional evidence of the strengths of self-help values in American society.11

Self-help was good and even necessary for survival in the United States. The sad record of rhetorical if not physical attacks on those who dissented from these values and opted to live collectively, serves as an important indicator of the strength of the relationship between majority power, class interests and values and the possibilities for happiness in American society.12

In the decades between the 1880's and the restrictive legislation against certain immigrant groups in the 1920's, the melting pot assumed new contours. The door to the United States was gradually closed to many immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe. In the minds of the dominant American majority, they were suspect because of supposed cultural and religious decadence, biological inferiority and in some instances, because of their beliefs in a collectivist life style which was perceived as a form of radicalism. America grew impatient with those who did not fit into the racial and cultural universe of white, Anglo-Saxonism. Nativist sentiments ran high, as historian John Higham has written, after the Haymarket Square incident of 1886. The bombings that
were part of the affair, the subsequent trial and execution of its perpetrators indicated that many Americans equated labor unrest with the influx of the newer immigrants. The infamous American Protective Association, formed in 1887, could claim over 500,000 members by the late 1890's.\textsuperscript{13} Nativism, expressed in the tracts and activities of such groups as the D.A.R., harkened back to pre-Civil War attacks on Catholics and other supposed dissidents who did not seem to fit the contours of the American dream. The Red Scare after World War I, climaxed by the Palmer "Red Raids," resulting in the mass deportation of countless supposedly radical New Immigrants, such as Emma Goldman, were part of a general mass hysteria against "un-American" behavior. More than seventy alien-sedition acts were passed by state legislatures during this period, giving further evidence of the depth of the American fear of those others who were seen as so threatening to the American social structure and its WASPish controllers.\textsuperscript{14}

Public social welfare services down to 1929 functioned to bolster the dominant Anglo-Saxon value consensus. Local and state governments could thus use public welfare services as means to implicitly enforce the status quo. With few public welfare guarantees, minorities, especially those seen as potential threats to the dominant majority, were left to fend for themselves.

Examining private social services, there is evidence that many continued to support unpopular immigrant groups. The New York City social settlement houses, for example, continued to provide programs and services for neighborhood residents from a variety of national and ethnic backgrounds, oftentimes in the face of overt hostility to their efforts. In 1919 the Lusk Committee, established by the New York Legislature to investigate radicalism, attacked the social settlements as being hotbeds of subversion. Much to their credit, the settlements, acting through their city-wide federation, The United Neighborhood Houses, took a hard stand against their detractors and continued their efforts to aid their many non-English speaking neighbors.\textsuperscript{15}

The many fraternal organizations established by various immigrant groups to provide solace and even material assistance were important sources of social welfare assistance for ethnic minorities. There were numerous benevolent and fraternal societies set up by the Slavs, for example, which appealed to ethnic sentiments and fostered a spirit of self-help among their members so
that the entire ethnic group might compete with other national
groups. Italian immigrants were told by the immigrant newspaper,
Bolletino della Sera, "We must organize our forces as the Jews
do, persist in exhausting that which constitutes gain for our
race over the Anglo-Saxon race."16

While it is relatively easy to search through immigrant news­
papers and find similar statements, such rhetoric should not lead
the unwary researcher to the conclusion that there was any sort
of concerted effort among immigrant groups to challenge the un­
deniable, admitted supremacy of the Anglo-Saxon majority. In
fact, if one looks closely at the records of various ethnic
groups, there is considerable evidence pointing to much internal
strife among them. For example, there was much squabbling among
Slavic immigrants, as attested to by Edward Steiner, an early
analyst of the New Immigrants. He wrote:

Unfortunately they have (imported) into this
country their racial prejudices which are
keenest towards their closest kin, and each mining
camp becomes the battleground on which ancient
wrongs are made new issues by repeated quarrels
and fights which become bloody at times...In a
large number of these cases these unfortunate
divisions are intermingled with religious dif­
fences, although the Slovak and the Pole do
not speak well of one another even if they be­
long to the same Church.17

Other students of immigration have pointed out that common
acceptance of one religion, for example, of Catholicism, did not
promote brotherhood among Poles and Lithuanians nor did it foster
friendship between French-Canadians and Irish.18 The variable
controlling ethnic group relationships seems to have been how
they perceived each other as competitors in the labor market.
Economics were apparently far stronger than a common religion in
determining ethnic voting patterns and patterns of social inter­
action.19 And, of course, intergroup competition prevented
coordinated assaults on social institutions perpetuating unequal
treatment of ethnic minorities.

The special problems of the twentieth century--Americaniza­
tion, family breakdown, juvenile delinquency as well as public
health problems, required new forms of treatment. A sign of the
strength of dominant American mores is the fact that welfare re­
lief was frowned upon by nearly all ethnic charitable organiza­
tions. Since their main focus was to provide aid for their own
and since they would never deliberately stigmatize recipients of such aid as unworthy unless it was "abused" voluntary assistance was meant to be temporary or "residual." It was meant to provide support while the recipient found his or her bearings and assumed his or her place in the mainstream of American society.

A clue to the function of ethnic self-help organizations is exemplified by debates within the Jewish community about the function of Jewish social agencies. They were seen as agencies of "adjustment and interpretation" for immigrants; they were meant to soften the transition of the immigrant from one culture to another. Hence, by definition, assistance given had to be temporary. Harry Lurie, an important spokesman for Jewish social welfare efforts in the 1930's, analyzing the many fraternal organizations and social clubs that were part of local Jewish communities throughout the United States, found that for the most part, those services which conformed to the ideals of self-help continued to be most favored when it came time to distribute voluntarily contributed funds. Within the Jewish social welfare community, the Depression created a new sense of urgency to create structures to make available economic and employment opportunities to the entire local Jewish population. The problems for American Jews, as summarized by Lurie, was whether or not to completely assimilate as Americans, with or without retaining religious and cultural differences. Lurie's comments on future prospects for the Jewish community have broad relevance for understanding the problems confronting other ethnic groups as they pondered their American future. He wrote: "Jewish life and Jewish group organization are conditioned by large political and economic forces. There are tendencies toward dispersion and disintegration of group interest, as well as toward centralization and cooperation. At present, outside pressures (The Great Depression) are influencing intergroup counseling and cooperation; but no true solidarity or unity has been achieved...We must not overlook the existence of powerful forces, political, economic, and cultural that negate all attempts to try to find a common program for Jewish group activity..."

It was those "powerful forces"—political, economic and cultural—those institutions and norms supported by the dominant Anglo-Saxon elite, that influenced the Jewish experience as well as that of other ethnic minorities.

In a nation sustained by belief in the efficacy of rugged individualism, social welfare services, whether public or private, most often functioned to support the national ethos of self-help
at least down to the era of the Great Depression. Thus, the history of social services in the United States must be viewed within a framework of sustaining values which, for the most part, reflect majority class beliefs in self-help — especially self-help for minority groups so they would not be guaranteed social equality by institutional fiat. The creed of self-help demanded that social services function residually so that the powerless would perceive the need to struggle to survive and thus accept the competitive ethos of the emerging social order. Thus, societal values and institutions functioned to support the social arrangements of the status quo and ethnic and/or minority groups were expected "to go along to get along".

The Canadian Experience

Throughout Canadian history there appears to be a clear relationship between ethnicity, social class and the development of social services. The popular notion of Canadian society as cultural mosaic would seem to allow diverse cultural and ethnic groups to coexist in at least some form of tolerable harmony. However, the studies of John Porter, which have done so much to demonstrate the relationship between class and ethnicity in Canada, as well as the more recent essays of Jean Leonard Elliott, demonstrate that the concept of Canadian society as pluralistic kaleidoscope may be a gross distortion. Canada, like the United States, has its dominant or majority groups as well as its subordinate groups. As Jean Elliott has written: "All Canadians at birth belong to either a majority or a minority groups. Membership in the majority group is heavily dependent upon such physical and social attributes as white skin, English speaking parents, and Christian ancestors who emigrated to Canada from a Western European industrial nation. All other Canadians belong to a variety of minority groups because they occupy a relatively disadvantaged power position in the Canadian social structure."25

Using Elliott's typology, a majority group need not be a numerically preponderant. Its status is derivative of its ability to influence decision making within society. As the dominant social force, the majority uses its powers to define the contours of Canadian culture. Its goals, values and norms become those of all subordinate minority groups. Nowhere does Elliott's thesis seem more accurate than in the case of Canada's Blacks. Robin Winks' recent monumental history, The Blacks in Canada, lays to rest the myth that racial discrimination never existed in Canada.
Despite popular opinion to the contrary, Winks reveals that even the hated institution of slavery existed in Canada and that the reasons for its relatively small scale (compared to the United States) probably had little to do with the strength of humanitarian impulses in Canada. Slavery foundered in Canada because it was impracticable as an economic institution. Furthermore, neither French nor English Canadians needed a permanent subordinate slave caste to affirm their own sense of superiority. They knew who and what they were. After slavery as an institution had proven its unfeasibility during late seventeenth century, Blacks began to compete in the labor market with other minority groups. Most often, they were accepted in communities where they were used as unskilled laborers as was true in the Western Ontario community of Amherstburg in the 1820's and 1830's, when tobacco farmers saw Blacks as valuable field hands. When Irish labor began to compete for jobs with Blacks in the same locale in the 1840's, casual patterns of racial discrimination began to appear. Some churches, Winks relates, constructed "Nigger Heavens" to separate white and Black members of their congregations. By 1850, both in what is now Ontario and in Nova Scotia, the major centers of Black settlement, separate, segregated schools had been established, thereby erecting highly visible and effective barriers to Black assimilation into the mainstream of Canadian culture. While Winks' analysis is oftentimes flawed, his history is an important addition to the small number of studies dealing with the history of specific ethnic and racial groups in Canada.

It appears that Canadians far more than their Southern neighbors were willing to admit the existence of a dominant social group, a majority, and to acknowledge that membership in that powerful group is often defined by class and racial identity. Unlike the United States, Canada has generally refrained from boasting that it is any sort of vast social melting pot. Ethnic cultural diversity within the confines of tightly drawn class lines has been promoted even though some ethnic groups have accused the federal government of deliberate attempts at cooperation when the government, through the Secretary of State's office, has attempted to fund ethnic studies or efforts to forge new ethnic awareness.

In creating social services, Canada, like the United States, generally adopted the philosophy that it was the responsibility of local jurisdictions to aid the poor. When Upper Canada (Ontario) was founded on the bedrock of British law in 1791, a deliberate disclaimer in the First Statute of Upper Canada in 1792 held that
"nothing in this Act...shall...introduce any of the laws of England respecting the maintenance of the poor." Richard Splane, writing on the history of social welfare in Ontario, found antipathy towards increased taxation was the reason for failure to incorporate English poor law measures which could have become a tax burden on the citizenry. Economic self-interest, rather than humanitarianism, seems to have influenced the course and direction of social service growth throughout English-speaking Canada.

Until confederation in 1867, Upper Canada adopted piecemeal measures for relief of the poor. As in the United States, there was a pervasive belief that individuals were responsible for their lives and that if welfare or charity was necessary, it should be given voluntarily and temporarily. In addition, there was a rich tradition of church supported welfare services in Lower Canada (Quebec) and these continued to operate alongside the haphazard social welfare system of English-speaking Canada.

Voluntary private charity tied to the principle of local control was the major characteristic of public social services in Canada down through the era of the Great Depression. As in the United States, immigrant groups formed fraternal and benevolent associations which offered informal assistance to those deemed worthy of aid. Generally, the view of Canada as pluralistic mosaic militated against strong, centralized efforts by the federal government to initiate social welfare services. Then too, confederation meant the provinces would have ultimate authority in social welfare matters, leaving the fate of social welfare services in the hands of provincial decision makers, thus allowing for provincial variations in the creation of social services.

Students of Canadian social welfare history stress the importance of rather spectacular individuals in creating social services. Usually, these "reformers" were white Anglo-Saxon males, such as J.J. Kelso, a turn of the century Toronto newspaperman who founded children's aid societies in Ontario, and Goldwin D. Smith, an Englishman transplanted to Canada and an influential proponent of a public welfare system to service Toronto. The federal government, bound by constitutional and historical precedent, made few thrusts into social services, but schemes for mothers' allowances and a pension program were created in 1929, followed in 1940 by a far-reaching Unemployment Insurance Act. Compared to that of the United States, the Canadian federal government, at least until the advent of Prime Minister Trudeau's "Just Society" programs, was very reluctant to move toward massive intervention.
in social welfare programming, leaving the Provinces much freedom to experiment with schemes to benefit their constituents.

In Canada as in the United States, social welfare services were products of a value consensus which upheld the virtue of self-help. But Canada, unlike the United States, has moved more quickly to adopt "institutional" social services at least at the provincial level. Provincial medicare schemes are the chief example.

The Canadian emphasis on localism, as exemplified by the strength of provincial government over social welfare matters, indicates how ethnic groups within provinces have theoretically been able to influence government to create social services of particular benefit to their needs. The case of Quebec, and possibly of Manitoba, illustrate that provinces with strong minority and ethnic groups have sometimes been able to establish services compatible with minority group interests. Canadian pluralism, unlike American melting pot homogeneity, has fostered a wide variety of social services delivery systems, theoretically responsive to ethnic and minority needs as long as those services do not conflict with majority group interests. This has not always been the case in the United States where, historically, ethnicity has not been fostered.

**Conclusion**

Similarities and differences exist in the emerging patterns of social services in the United States and Canada. In both countries majority power seems closely related to class composition which strongly influences behavioral norms. And in both countries, assimilationist models, the melting pot in the United States and the social mosaic in Canada, have influenced the focus of social service development. Comparisons between the two societies show that particular assimilationist models notwithstanding, social services have generally fostered creation of residual social services which are in accord with majority class beliefs in the values of individual self-help. One pragmatic suggestion may be drawn from this paper: social service planners in both nations should carefully assess racial, ethnic and class power structures in order to develop social service programs that go beyond continuation of the status quo and move towards guarantees of social equality.
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12. The history of American society's intolerance for collectivistic religious efforts is exemplified by nineteenth century attacks against Mormons and twentieth century assaults on Hutterites in several mid-western states.
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29. The author's experience as a faculty social work field supervisor at the Secretary of State's office in London, Ontario, during 1972-1973, taught him the humbling lesson that Canadian ethnic groups are often highly suspicious of federal government "offers" of assistance.


SOME IMPLICATIONS OF ETHNIC DISPARITY IN EDUCATION FOR SOCIAL WORK
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EDUCATIONAL DISPARITY AND THE JUST SOCIETY

The increasing attention to the institutional nature of social problems is a significant emphasis in social work. Many of the personal troubles of individual clients are the products of a social system which operates to keep them in trouble, and an awareness of the institutional nature of social problems is a prerequisite for effective solution of personal troubles (cf. C. Wright Mills, 1959).

Among the social problems in contemporary America, the unequal and unjust treatment of various ethnic and racial groups continues to be a crucial and potentially explosive issue. The basic conclusion in the Kerner Report (1968:203), that "our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal," is as real today as it was first reported. The troubles experienced by ethnic persons in America are primarily a consequence of their living in an unequal and unjust society.

In an unequal society, some people will fare better than others but all people have the same opportunity in life and they may be able to move into desirable social roles. In an unjust society, some people will fare better than others but all people do not have the same opportunity and not all of them are able to move into desirable social roles.

Social roles in a complex society usually have unequal training requirements and some roles require more years of formal training than others. As an incentive for its members to assume the demanding roles, society graduates its social rewards according to the formal training requirements. Roles requiring many years of formal training generally have a higher reward, e.g., higher income, and roles requiring a few years of formal training, a lower reward. The positive association between training and reward is quite evident in America. In 1968, the annual mean income of men 25 years old and over with an elementary education was $5,467; with a high school education, $8,148;
with a college education, $12,938 (U.S. Statistical Abstract 1971, Table 167). The multiplicity of social roles, their inherently unequal training requirements, and the consequently unequal rewards are partially responsible for the emergence and maintenance of an unequal society (cf. Tumin, 1967).

An unjust society, however, is different from an unequal society. In an unjust society, the opportunity for formal training is not equally available to all segments of the population and one segment is consistently barred from equitable training. The denial of equitable training, the restriction of available social roles, and the consequently limited rewards for the same segment of population are the marks of an unjust society. In America, this segment comprises the people with dark skins.

To construct a just society, a necessary (though not sufficient) condition is the provision of equal opportunity for training for all members in that society. Under the present educational system, American youth has ten to twelve years of compulsory school attendance, and the parity of education among the various ethnic groups at the high school level would provide a firm foundation for building a just society. However, available data on educational achievement of four ethnic groups (White, Black, American Indian, and "Other")*, collected by the U.S. Department of Commerce as part of the 1970 Census of population, show that educational parity at high school level is absent among the ethnic groups. As the completion of a high school education is essential for college attendance, i.e. further training for more desirable social roles, the educational disparity at the high school level has effectively restricted some people from moving into the more desirable social positions. Thus, the task of constructing a just society has hardly begun, and the personal troubles of ethnic persons cannot be solved effectively unless the institutional problems are also resolved.

* Our use of the term "ethnic groups" is more inclusive than its usual connotation of national groups within a racial category (cf. Greeley, 1969) because the available Census data are "prepackaged" in four racial-ethnic categories. As the "Other" category includes essentially and substantially Chinese and Japanese, with a small number of Eskimos and Aleuts, we will label this category "Asian" in our subsequent discussion. Persons of Spanish heritage are not included in our discussion because we do not have data classified according to comparable age-groups and nativity (See U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1970, Subject Reports, Final Report PC (2)-IA, "National Origin and Language"). The data of our paper are drawn from the Census of Population, 1970, Subject Reports, Final Report PC (2)-5B, "Educational Attainment."
In this paper, the concept of "parity in education" will be discussed in three ways:

(1) The equality between the proportion of ethnic high school graduates in an age group and the comparable proportion of ethnic persons in the population. Thus, if the proportion of White high school graduates in the 14-15 age-group is 79% and the proportion of White youth in the 14-15 age-group is also 79%, we can state that educational parity has been achieved for white youth in this age group. If the proportion of high school graduates is more than the comparable proportion in the population for a specific age group, we can state that the high school graduates are over-represented in that age group. If the proportion of high school graduates is less than the comparable proportion in the population for an age group, we can state that the high school graduates are under-represented in that age group.

(2) The equality of proportions of high school graduates in the ethnic groups. Thus, if the proportions of high school graduates are identically 76.4% for Whites, Blacks, American Indians, and Asians in the 25-29 age group, educational parity can be said to have been achieved for that age group.

(3) The equality of median school years among ethnic groups. Thus, if the median school years completed by Whites, Blacks, American Indians, and Asians are identically 12.8 years in the 20-21 age-group, we can state that educational parity has been achieved for the 20-21 year olds in the four ethnic groups.

As Blacks and American Indians are essentially Americans of native parentage, we will delimit our discussion to Americans of native parentage and exclude persons of mixed parentage or foreign birth. This delimitation will provide us a set of more refined data for comparison.

PATTERNS OF EDUCATIONAL DISPARITY

Since population distribution is the criterion for assessing parity in education among the ethnic groups, we shall first present the population distribution of Americans born in this country, of parents who are also born in this country. Table I shows the population distribution of Whites, Blacks, American Indians, and Asians in 1970. Among the 14 and 15 year olds, there are 8.3 million people of which 79.2% are White, 13.2% are Black, 0.4% are American Indian, and 0.5% are Asian.
Among the 16 and 17 year olds, there are 7.8 million people of which 79.5% are White, 12.6% are Black, 0.4% are American Indian, and 0.4% are Asian. The population distribution of these ethnic groups at these and other age levels provides the basis for comparing educational parity among them.

Table II presents the distribution of Americans with at least four years of high school education. Among these high school graduates are persons with college education. In the 14-15 age-group, there are 15,000 high school graduates of which 73.1% are White, 13.1% are Black, 0.5% are American Indian, and 0.5% are Asian. In the 16-17 age-group, there are 146,500 graduates of which 73.1% are White, 13.9% are Black, 0.3% are American Indian, and 0.5% are Asian. The proportionate distribution of high school graduates among these ethnic groups at different age levels provides a measure of educational parity among them.

Table III presents the comparison between the proportion of high school graduates and the proportion of available persons at the various age levels for the four ethnic groups. Of all Americans 18 and 19 years old, 79.8% are White. Of all high school graduates 18 and 19 years old, 83.6% are White. In this age group, Whites are over-represented among the population of high school graduates. The comparable proportions for Blacks are 11.9% of the total population and 8.3% of the population of high school graduates; Blacks are under-represented among high school graduates. For the American Indians, the comparable proportions are 0.3% for the total population and 0.2% for the high school graduates. American Indians are also under-represented among the high school graduates. Among Asians, educational parity is achieved in the 18-19 age-group; the proportion of high school graduates is identical with the proportion of Asians in the total population.

It should be noted that while the difference in percentage points between the total population and the population of high school graduates for each ethnic group is often quite small, the real percentage difference at each age level is considerable. For example, among the 18 and 19 year olds, the difference between the White population and the White high school graduates is 3.8 percentage points and the percentage difference is 4.8% (3.8/79.8); the difference between the Black population and the Black high school graduates is 3.6 percentage points and the percentage difference is 30.3% (3.6/11.9). Among the American Indians, the percentage difference is usually 50% which means only one-half of their population at a particular age level has
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>AMERICAN INDIAN</th>
<th>ASIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>8,317,437</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>7,814,018</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>7,264,408</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>6,650,156</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>9,449,344</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>13,393,662</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>11,445,183</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>23,138,727</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>23,170,050</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>18,650,143</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>12,432,097</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 &amp; Over</td>
<td>7,669,072</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percentages do not add up to 100 because persons of mixed parentage and foreign birth are excluded from the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>AMERICAN INDIAN</th>
<th>ASIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>15,015</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>146,547</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>4,243,405</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>5,252,302</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>7,408,216</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>9,888,823</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>7,869,041</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>14,287,094</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>12,546,664</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>7,533,705</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>3,633,294</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 &amp; Over</td>
<td>1,849,870</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*High school graduates include persons with college education. The percentages do not add to 100 because persons of mixed parentage or foreign birth are excluded from the table.
### Table III

**Per Cent Comparison of Educational Achievement of Four Ethnic Groups with Their Distribution in the Population by Age Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>WHITE TOT. H.S. GRAD.</th>
<th>WHITE TOT. H.S. GRAD.</th>
<th>AMER. INDIAN TOT. H.S. GRAD.</th>
<th>ASIAN TOT. H.S. GRAD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>79.2 73.1 (-)*</td>
<td>13.2 13.1 (-)</td>
<td>0.4 0.5 (+)</td>
<td>0.5 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>79.5 73.1 (-)</td>
<td>12.6 13.9 (+)</td>
<td>0.4 0.3 (-)</td>
<td>0.4 0.5 (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>79.8 83.6 (+)</td>
<td>11.9 8.3 (-)</td>
<td>0.3 0.2 (-)</td>
<td>0.5 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>79.4 82.1 (+)</td>
<td>11.3 8.8 (-)</td>
<td>0.4 0.3 (-)</td>
<td>0.5 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>79.5 81.9 (+)</td>
<td>10.2 7.9 (-)</td>
<td>0.4 0.3 (-)</td>
<td>0.4 0.5 (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>77.5 80.2 (+)</td>
<td>10.2 7.6 (-)</td>
<td>0.4 0.2 (-)</td>
<td>0.4 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>73.6 76.7 (+)</td>
<td>10.6 7.3 (-)</td>
<td>0.4 0.2 (-)</td>
<td>0.3 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>68.7 71.8 (+)</td>
<td>10.1 6.1 (-)</td>
<td>0.3 0.2 (-)</td>
<td>0.2 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>64.3 67.9 (+)</td>
<td>8.8 4.2 (-)</td>
<td>0.2 0.1 (-)</td>
<td>0.1 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>60.9 66.6 (+)</td>
<td>8.5 3.3 (-)</td>
<td>0.2 0.1 (-)</td>
<td>0.1 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>57.5 65.1 (+)</td>
<td>8.3 2.9 (-)</td>
<td>0.2 0.1 (-)</td>
<td>0.1 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 &amp; Over</td>
<td>56.9 67.1 (+)</td>
<td>6.8 2.6 (-)</td>
<td>0.2 0.1 (-)</td>
<td>0.1 0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (-) Indicates under-representation, (+) indicates over-representation.

Tot. Pop. = Total Population  
H. S. Grad. = High School Graduates.
a high school education.

As we examine each ethnic group, we find that Whites are over-represented in the population of high school graduates in almost all the age-groups; the exception is among the 14-17 year olds. Blacks and American Indians, in contrast, are under-represented in all but one age-group, and Asians have attained parity at almost every age level and the exceptions are over-representation among the 16-17 and 22-24 age-groups.

The under-representation of Blacks and American Indians among the population of high school graduates places these ethnic groups at a disadvantage. If all the high school graduates go on to college, Whites and Asians will have an initial edge over the Black and American Indian populations. However, in a recent government report (Monthly Labor Review, September 1974:50), we find the disparity between White and Black high school graduates going on to college ranges from 4 to 30 percentage points prior to 1972. In 1973, 48% White and 35% Black high school graduates went on to college. Thus, the initial disparity in high school graduation and the differential rate of college attendance will ensure a continuing inequality among Whites, Blacks, American Indians, and Asians.

Changing our focus on analysis, we now examine the proportion of high school graduates within each ethnic group at different age levels. Table IV shows that in the 14-15 age-group, there is no difference in the proportion of high school graduates in each ethnic group. In the 16-17 age-group, Blacks and Asians have a slightly higher proportion of high school graduates within their respective populations than Whites or the American Indians. Among Blacks of 16 and 17 years of age, 2.1% are high school graduates; among Asians of similar ages, 2.0% are high school graduates. The comparable percentages for Whites and American Indians are 1.7% and 1.4%, respectively.

These youngest age-groups, 14-17 years old, are made up primarily of people who are not expected to have completed high school, as 18 is the usual (average) age of high school graduation. If a child enters first grade at age six and progresses at the normal rate of one grade per year for twelve years, he will graduate from high school at age 18. Thus, the small proportions of youth in the 14-17 age bracket who have completed high school represent deviations from the norm. We may speculate that these are talented and/or ambitious youth who probably come from supportive families. Also, it is possible that a small proportion graduate at age 17 because of
the month in which they were born, e.g. an individual could graduate from high school in June at age 17 and become 18 years old in July, the following month.

The patterns of apparent educational parity among the four ethnic groups at 16-17 years old are an encouraging sign for the future. The educational gap (or more accurately the differential proportion of high school graduates) among the ethnic groups is quite small, and the continued and increased attention to the educational development of minority students of younger school ages should enable a high proportion of them to complete their high school education and to proceed to post-secondary education. The possibilities for ethnic parity in higher education are present, and the construction of a just society is possible.

At the 18-29 age levels, the proportions of high school graduates among Asians are higher than the comparable proportions among Whites, and the proportion of high school graduates among American Indians is lower than the comparable proportion among Black Americans. Both the American Indians and Blacks have lower proportion of high school graduates than Whites in the under-30 age-groups. The difference in the proportions of high school graduates between Blacks and Whites is about 20 percentage points, between Indians and Whites, 23 to 27 percentage points, both in favor of Whites. The difference between Asians and Whites is two to six percentage points, in favor of Asians. As this age bracket includes people who were born in 1941 or later when increased opportunities for publicly-supported schooling were theoretically available, one would expect to find that most of the 18-29 year olds in the U. S. have completed high school. Table IV shows that only Whites and Asians have reached relatively closer to the goal of "universally" achieving a high school education.

Finally, we examine the question of educational disparity using the data on median school years completed by the four ethnic groups. As the median divides the population into two halves one of which has completed an education below the specific number of school years and the other half has completed an education above the specific number of school years, the median school years completed by a people can be a relative measure of the educational achievement among the ethnic groups.

Table V shows the Asians either match or surpass Whites in the median school years completed among persons below 35 years of age. In the 35 and older age-groups, Asians rank after Whites in median school years completed. Contrastingly, Blacks and American Indians rank after Whites and Asians in educational
TABLE IV

PER CENT OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES IN FOUR ETHNIC GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>AMERICAN</th>
<th>ASIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 &amp; Over</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE V

**MEDIAN SCHOOL YEARS COMPLETED BY FOUR ETHNIC GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>AMERICAN</th>
<th>INDIAN</th>
<th>ASIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 &amp; Over</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
achievement in every age-group. In the under-45 age-groups, Blacks have a slight edge over American Indians; in the 45 and over age-groups, American Indians fare better than Blacks. This pattern of educational disparity is quite clearly a complement to Table IV, and its presentation here is not only to reiterate the disparity in education among the four ethnic groups but also to highlight the absence of educational opportunity for many people 45 and older.

If a twenty-year interval is accepted as a reasonable time gap between two generations, we can approximate the Americans in the 45-54 age-group as the parents of the 25-29 year olds, and the Americans in the 55-64 age-group as the parents of the 30-34 year olds. Among Whites, the proportion of high school graduates in the 45-54 age-group is more than twice the comparable proportion among Blacks, more than 76% of the comparable proportion among American Indians, and more than 33% of the comparable proportion among Asians (See Table IV). Similarly, a disparity exists in the 55-64 age-group in which the proportion of White high school graduates exceed the Blacks, the Indians, and the Asians by 180%, 90%, and 60%, respectively. In other words, during mid-1910s and 1930s, Whites were disproportionately over-represented among high school graduates. By virtue of their higher educational achievement, these White parents of the Americans in the 25-34 age-group were able to provide the necessary conditions for their children to have a head start in education over the children from other ethnic backgrounds.

The educational deficits of previous generations show that the present educational disparity among the ethnic groups has a historical determinant, and society was primarily responsible for it. The Plessy v. Ferguson decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, for example, made separate schools for Blacks legal in the nation. These separate schools were usually not comparable to schools provided for White children. The Plessy decision was essentially to Blacks' disadvantage from 1896 to 1954 until it was overturned by the Brown v. Topeka decision in 1954. The former decision affected the educational opportunity of at least four generations of Blacks negatively (cf. Bond, 1970). Thus, the construction of a just society requires the provision of not only an equal access to educational opportunities for all ethnic groups at the present time, but also the reparatory efforts for balancing the historical inequality. In the immediate future, both Blacks and American Indians need to have not merely equal representation but over-representation among high school graduates in order to have the resources for further training.
OBSTACLES AGAINST EDUCATIONAL PARITY

How do we explain the differences in high school completion rate among the four ethnic groups? What factors explain the Black-White and Indian-White disparities and the apparent parity of Asians and the dominant group? The juxtaposition of the relative educational achievement of four ethnic groups makes it difficult to explain their difference in educational parity in terms of genetic endowment of the races (cf. Fox, 1968; Jones, 1973). A simpler explanation may be found in the social factors which maintain racial-ethnic disparity in education.

Black-White Differences. In 1965, 87% of all Black first graders in public schools attended predominantly Black schools and 80% of White first graders attended predominantly White schools. School segregation and its consequently unequal provision of educational facilities are a key factor for the Black-White disparity in education. Another obstacle against their parity is the higher incompletion rate among Black high school students. In the 18 and 19 age-group, 60% Blacks in 1970 have not completed four years of high school. In the 20-21 age-group, 38% have not finished four years of high school. In the 22-24 age-group, the incomplete rate is 39%, and in the 25-29 age-group, it is 45% (See Table IV). Thus, over one-third of the Black population 18-29 years old are high school dropouts or pushouts.

Dropouts. Under the compulsory attendance laws, some students are able to leave school at age 16 in most states and at age 17 in a few states. Thus, a Black youth can leave school legally at age 16 or 17 if he feels powerless, alienated, or unwanted in the high school. Sometimes, a Black student drops out of high school because he is unable to read competently enough to experience academic success, or he lacks motivation or the necessary material resources for school attendance (cf. Fantini and Weinstein, 1968; Tannenbaum, 1966). Also, he may drop out to supplement the inadequate family income. Some Black students leave their high school because of their increased awareness of their powerlessness in America and the virulent injustice in society. They feel that opportunities are not available to them even though they may possess a high school diploma. Hence, they quit.

for alternate social roles.
Pushouts. While dropouts leave high school voluntarily, pushouts leave against their own desire. Some public schools have developed insidious practices for pushing out Black students by suspensions and expulsions for relatively minor infractions of school rules. In a desegregated school district, with no private schools available in the community, it is impossible for pushouts to complete a high school education unless their parents move to another community or send the child to some relatives in another city or state. Such push out practices by principals, teachers, and counselors are common in the South but they are not confined to the South. In Prince Georges County, Maryland, for example, Black students are being suspended and expelled from the school system greatly disproportionate to their number in the system (See Washington Post, November 5, 1974 A-1, and November 7, 1974 C-1).

A different kind of push out occurs with Black children who are diagnosed as "handicapped" and are sent home to await special school placements that never come. Victims of these push out practices and dropouts continue to account for the educational disparity today between Blacks and Whites.

The Interrupted. Among the older Black population, many attended segregated schools in the South. In some rural areas, schools were not provided for Blacks beyond the 8th grade. Where schools were available, the school term for Black children was shorter than the school term provided for White children, and often a split-term arrangement was in effect. Blacks attended school in-between the planting, cultivation, and harvesting of crops; schools were closed when the labor of Black children and youth was needed in the fields by White land owners. This educational arrangement was a policy formulated by White superintendents and school boards and foisted upon Black principals, teachers and students. In urban areas, many Black youth had to drop out of school to work to supplement the family income. Therefore, neither rural nor urban Blacks in the older population were able to obtain substantial numbers of high school diplomas (See Bullock, 1970; Bond, 1970).

Indian-White Differences. Historically, the policy of forced assimilation for American Indians since 1871 has included the educational program planning for Indian children and youth. When the Indian child reached school age, the typical pattern was to remove him from his tribal home and place him in a boarding school where the practice of Indian ways and use of Indian languages were forbidden. The boarding school, as a rule, was located geographically far from home and the contacts between the
young and older family and/or tribal members were rare. The curriculum of the schools was a carbon copy of that of the White schools, without any adaptation for the particular needs or interests of the Indians (cf. Marden and Meyer, 1968; McWilliams, 1964).

Under these educational arrangements, Indian youth and their parents and tribal leaders were unhappy but they were powerless to change the circumstances. Many Indian youth left the boarding schools at the earliest possible time to escape the intolerable situation; others turned to alcohol as an alternative to coping with the repression. Moreover, until 1952, it was commonly expected that Indians would remain on the reservations, and what they learned in school was ill-suited for the practical demands of making a living or improving the life on reservations.

The desire of American Indians to maintain their own culture and identity in the face of White opposition leads them to desiring a lesser amount of learning in school which was "White learning" for many decades. It is no wonder, then, that educational achievement among Indians suffered under these circumstances.

Asian-White Differences. Chinese and Japanese, the component groups in the Asian category, possess a long cultural heritage which stresses learning and a traditional family heritage which emphasizes filial obligations and places a high value on education (cf. Petersen, 1971; Kitano, 1969; McWilliams, 1964). Strong family ties coupled with parental discipline have aided the school in U. S. in accomplishing its task since the family values and behaviors reinforced the authority and purpose of the school. Chinese and Japanese children are expected to master academic learning, and they have lived up to the expectation, in general. The accomplishment, however, is achieved in spite of institutional prejudice and discrimination in the past.

It was common for an older Asian to be under-employed or to be employed below his educational qualifications. The deliberate exclusion of Chinese immigrants in the early 1880s after they had made valuable contributions to mining and railroad construction, and the detention of Japanese-Americans in World War II in outrageous violation of their Constitutional rights are some of the glaring incidents of discrimination against the Asians. Little Tokyos and Chinatowns are but exotic slums in America today.
Living in an atmosphere of economic and psychosocial oppression, Asians were somehow able to instill into their younger members the sense for achievement, perhaps as a vindication of the injustices they had experienced. The apparent parity of younger Asians with Whites in educational achievement does not ensure their subsequent equal treatment in society.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL WORK**

We have suggested that personal troubles of ethnic people are institutional in nature and ethnic disparity in education is one of the institutional problems. The patterns of educational disparity and the obstacles against parity have some implications for America and for social work.

On the individual (micro) level, the awareness of educational disparity among the ethnic groups should enable a social worker to adjust his attitudes toward the ethnic clients and to adapt his practices to meeting their needs. He should also be more cognizant of his own class-specific perspective and practices. The changes in awareness, attitude, and practices can be illustrated as follows. In his dealing with a client who is unable to get a job, a social worker might reason: "My client is unable to get a job because he lacks the skills for the job (and not because he is lazy). He lacks the skills because he is under-educated. He is under-educated because he is Black." In other words, the social worker is more aware of the impact of social forces on his client's trouble. An awareness of the nature of personal troubles among ethnic people and the subsequent changes in attitude toward them requires individual efforts which all social workers can expend without undue difficulties.

On the societal (macro) level, the awareness of the obstacles against educational parity should motivate change in the system of unequal access to educational opportunity. The task is colossal and it requires not merely equal-representation of ethnic people in the educational world at present, but an over-representation of them to compensate for the accumulated deficits in the past. The adjustment of ethnic representation in education is a political and moral question and its answer will affect the lives of millions of people.

As the concern for social welfare is a dominant motif in social work, the construction of a just society in which all people have equal access to educational opportunity is
within the professional and personal interests of social workers. Anderson (1974) has rightly suggested that the systems in which a social worker performs his services are as much his clients as the persons with whom he works. A society that continually denies a reasonable life chance to a segment of its population is as much in need of "behavioral modification" as the individual who terrorizes his family. The question is: What can and must be done?

(1) America must continue to work toward equal access to educational opportunities for all people. This means social workers within the educational systems must assert greater efforts in assisting students of minority background to attain their educational goals. The efforts may include keeping the school personnel from pushing students out, helping them to understand the cultural differences of their students; serving as their counselors for minority difficulties; providing financial assistance to needy students; making available tutorial guidance to students; creating a congenial school atmosphere for students to achieve; and assisting their parents to understand the school culture through family-school contacts.

(2) America must commit itself to an uninterrupted program of equitable education so that injustices of the past can be redressed. This means social workers as professionals should apply their influence on state and federal governments for educational policies that are consistent with the principles of justice. They should be active in the policy formulation process, be alert to the impact of changing appropriations in the state and federal budgets on minority students, and guard against the use of minority education as pawns in a political game, e.g. the various attempts in Congress to undermine the enforcement of Civil Rights in schools.

These two tasks do not exhaust the range of necessary remedies, but they are crucial for the achievement of educational parity among ethnic groups. Ethnic disparity in education is certainly not the only institutional social problem, but it may well be the root cause of other social problems. While the relative educational achievement of a people may not be the professional concern of most social workers, it is a key element of ethnic experiences in America. The removal of the obstacles to educational parity will provide a condition in which social workers can be more effective in their professional activities, and the removal of such obstacles should be the professional activities of some social workers. The tasks are urgent for our time. "A mind is a terrible thing to waste!"
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OVERVIEW

Human service delivery systems get criticized by both "users" and "providers" of the services, regardless of countless reforms, evaluations, models, decentralization efforts and re-evaluations. In order to determine directions for the future, this article will discuss past policy initiatives, and review the literature which links human service needs to ethnicity and social class in a neighborhood context.

A bewildering array of social legislation was passed by Congress in the 1960's. A preliminary review of American social policy from the New Deal to the present indicates that never before had domestic policy been so explicitly selective in programs and services directed toward a particular group of citizens. The litany of new legislation directed at problems of race, delinquency, urban and rural poverty, unemployment and physical deterioration of inner cities included the Area Development Act, amendments to the Social Security Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Voter Registration Act, the Juvenile Delinquency Act, amendments to the Housing Act, the Civil Rights Act, the Economic Opportunity Act, and the Model Cities programs incorporated in the Demonstration Cities Act. The 1960's witnessed the federal government becoming explicitly committed toward countering poverty and racial discrimination through the utilization of a vast new array of social services. This was readily enforced as public and private expenditures for health, education and welfare services grew more rapidly than the general growth of the economy between 1960-1968. S. M. Miller notes that from 10.6%
of the Gross National Product in 1960, services grew to 17.7% in 1964 and 19.8% in 1968. In terms of dollar expenditures, services doubled between 1960 and 1968, with the public sector growing more rapidly than the private. Martin Rein points out that the emerging prominence of social services was not only because of the expenditure level. He states:

"The primary factor that thrust the social services into prominence during this period was a reinterpretation of their mission and the unobtrusive inclusion of this new function in diverse types of social legislation directed toward different problems and populations."3

Distinct conceptual frames of references appear to have influenced the development of the human services, and the way in which they subsequently emerged through the War on Poverty. The policy and ideological basis for these programs emerged from the Ford Foundation Grey Areas Project, the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, and the amendments to the 1962 Social Security Act. The Foundation's Grey Areas Project, followed by the President's Committee work, provided the theoretical rationale for the subsequent Community Action Program. This approach to human services represented a significant departure from the traditional view of how services should be delivered. The explanation of poverty offered was that social structural aspects of society were the causes of the problem and radical reform of the institutions was necessary. The President's Committee came under the influence of Ohlin's and Cloward's "opportunity theory." This theory offered operational suggestions for the elimination of delinquency but also provided the conceptual basis for focusing on how institutions within the social structure perpetuate deviance and poverty.

On the other hand, the 1962 amendments created a strategy aimed toward helping families become self-supporting, rather than dependent on welfare checks. Ellen Winston notes that these amendments attempted to make public welfare a more constructive instrument in preventing and reducing dependency by emphasizing individual rehabilitation through a quasi-therapeutic approach.4

However, in late 1969, the entire social service system was caught in a web of politics. The White House, through HEW, had established a host of inter-agency task forces, whose mission was to reconceptualize the administration of human services. A summary
of task force reports indicated the following were seen as long-standing problems:

1.) Services were unfocused and lacking in clear priorities;

2.) Services were forced upon persons unwilling to accept them;

3.) Services were inaccessible to persons wanting and needing them;

4.) Services were unresponsive to those needs felt most urgently by states, communities & neighborhoods;

5.) Services were fragmented with inadequate accountability and poor quality control.

Under the guise of administrative reform, the first Nixon administration began to dismantle the service reform initiatives taken during the early 1960's.

The working alliance between social and political scientists, policy analysts, politicians, foundation executives, federal bureaucrats and others, attempted to forge together a national effort that would master the complexities of social, economic and regional problems. However, by the end of the decade these alliances broke down and judgments from ideological camps were negative. Policies originally conceived as selectively oriented toward serving the poor, were soon to be perceived with even greater selectivity— as programs for poor blacks. However, support for these programs even diminished among minorities. For example, Tom Wicker noted that the policies somehow managed to end up alienating many of the black and the poor, as well as white conservatives...and members of Congress. Lee Rainwater claimed that these programs made promises to the black community and, through a pseudo-radical rhetoric, angered and insulted the working class, while at the same time delivered no more than symbolic resources to black people.

Perhaps the pessimism of Alfred Kahn best summarizes the harsh judgments of what happened during the sixties:
"To review the history of service reform initiatives from the early 1960's is to discover that there has been very little effort to reconstruct the basic delivery system, as a system. There have been styles and fads. There has been rhetoric and ideology. Much has been accomplished that has validity in the domains of political and social action and social change. Much has been accomplished elsewhere in the social sector: employment and education programs, income maintenance, housing. But there has been little systematic learning about this, about organization for personal social services--after millions of dollars of service and research investment. In fact, few good questions have been asked."

THE NEED FOR NEW DIRECTION

What went wrong, and why did the significant reforms and many important research efforts carried out in the sixties and early seventies result in such failure? Perhaps more important are questions related to where we go from here. Currently the human services are being reassessed. However, policy analysts, academicians and others are defining the problem in the context of administrative reform with an emphasis on such issues as coordination, regulations and funding arrangements. Others are engaged in debate about the relative merits of a universal or selective policy approach to the human services.

Our contention is that reassessment in these areas will not lead toward the desired and necessary change. There is a belief that planners and researchers who pursue changing the system by placing emphasis on such issues as effectiveness, innovation, comprehensiveness, rationality, accessibility and accountability are doomed to repeat the experiences of the past.

A recurring theme in social welfare has been the search for new models for the delivery of services. However, the emphasis has not been on generating an understanding of how different groups of people solve problems and cope with crises. In the past, service systems have been developed without regard to the unique elements of community life. Although important work has been carried out with regard to linking service delivery to neighborhoods, little consideration has been given to neighborhoods which reflect a multi-ethnic population. There has not yet developed a full understanding of the intercultural dimensions of neighborhood life, particularly
as it relates to service delivery. Too often delivery systems bypass those neighborhood-based cultural and organizational networks which may have the potential for support of services. More specifically, it is not fully understood the impact different ethnic and subcultures have on issues related to prevention and treatment. Finally, the problem is made more complex as we do not yet have a "handle" on the interdependencies existing between race, ethnicity, social class and well-being.

ETHNICITY, SOCIAL CLASS AND WELL-BEING

Human service delivery systems are usually organized according to the perceptions of "what is needed" by the providers. These people for the most part do not live in the neighborhoods where the service centers are located, nor are they likely to reflect the same socio-economic or cultural make-up as their "consumers." Therefore, it seems logical to assume that there is a difference in the professional and client perceptions of need. This difference doesn't lend itself to the sensitivity necessary to understand not only the relationship of utilization patterns of human services to social, religious and ethnic factors, but also to what degree and in what ways are they linked.

The relationship between well-being and ethnicity builds on the work of Mead, Benedict, Kluckholm, as well as Sullivan, Horney, Ferenczi and Kardiner, all of whom stressed the influence of social and cultural environment in normal and deviant behavior. The work of Kolodny, Spiegel, Barrabe and Von Mering and Zborowski suggest that various ethnic groups differ in their responses to health, illness and treatment. However, there is a lack of empirical evidence which links utilization patterns to ethnic variation.

Only recently has there been an understanding of the interrelationships between social class and mental health. The classic work of Hollingshead and Redlich bridged the gap between mental health and class by raising two fundamental questions: 1.) Is mental health related to class? 2.) Does a patient's position in the status system affect the treatment she or he receives? One conclusion drawn from the Yale study was that occupation is a potent force in determining a person's general life adjustments and the ways of coping with problems. This conclusion is also supported by the Midtown Manhattan Study, and the Gurin, Veroff and Field nationwide survey of 2,400 adults. Further, Gurin and Srole's work along with Leighton and Phillips has shown that as many as 50% of those who have emotional problems never seek and receive any kind of help.
Finally, it can be concluded from these investigations that the world of semi-skilled and unskilled blue collar workers produces a life situation of deprivation, insecurity and powerlessness resulting in fear, frustration and a sense of helplessness and low self-esteem. The work of Kornhauser, Mills and Fromm support the aforementioned conclusion and strongly imply the work people do has important consequences for their ego strength.

In summary, this brief literature review provides some empirical evidence that various ethnic groups differ in their responses to health, illness and treatment; and that by utilizing occupation as a principal indicator of social class we move closer to establishing a causal relationship between work and behavior. However, the relationships between ethnic variation, occupation and utilization rates are not clear. For example, can it be assumed that a large majority of workers identify themselves as ethnic? If so, which variable (ethnicity or occupation) has the more powerful impact on the prevention and treatment. Giordano's review of the literature responds to the latter question and suggests that ethnicity has at least as powerful impact on mental health and mental illness as social class. He points out that the influence of ethnicity becomes particularly significant in those studies where social class is held constant. However, he notes that while professionals have already accepted class differentials, ethnic variation is still often ignored or worse, denied outright.

CULTURAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL-BASED NETWORKS

Another body of literature shows the importance of neighborhood-based networks. Our point here is that it is imperative to know how people solve their problems, and cope with crises when they are outside the system of professional agencies. Myers and Bean, in their study of social class and mental illness, point out that for those in the professional system, the effectiveness of help received will depend on the social supports or lack of support in a person's neighborhood. The importance neighborhood-based cultural or organizational networks have on assisting professionals deal with the physically and mentally ill has been noted by several scholars. Slater, Glazer, Warren, Litwork and Breton present the issue in a similar way. For example, Glazer notes that a significant contribution to the present crisis in public social policy and service delivery is due to the breakdown of "traditional" organizations and ways of dealing with problems. Breton analyzing the issue from the ethnic dimension points out that greater attention should be
given to the social organization (fraternal organizations, ethnic clubs, etc.) of ethnic communities particularly to the wide variation which exists among them. Our argument is that by avoiding existing neighborhood-based networks we are making it more difficult for people to utilize professional expertise in effective and differentiated ways. Therefore, the important questions relate to how people who are not a part of neighborhood service delivery systems cope with their problems. What neighborhood-based formal and informal networks of service delivery are being used? What rearrangements of the formal delivery systems are necessary so that the social organization within the neighborhood is strengthened? Will a delivery system which is culturally compatible with the neighborhood increase utilization and reach people earlier in their illness?

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

The ontological basis for the policies and programs of the sixties evolved from the convergence of macro social and economic forces. The result was the belief that poverty was the central issue and innovations were needed which would reform social institutions and provide mobility opportunities for poor people and more particularly, poor blacks. Subsequently, the rationale for dismantling the Great Society programs are related to the issues of administration and organization. The assumptions and belief systems underlying the service initiatives of the sixties and early seventies, as well as the theoretical systems, have not been directed toward the micro aspects of problem solving in a neighborhood context. Nor were these past efforts explicitly directed to the universal problems of inequality, social injustice and exclusion. In the sixties these issues were given attention, but only within the context of poverty; in the seventies they are not even discussed.

Our contention is that deprivation and need must be defined in a multi-dimensional context. Thus, ethnicity and class must become critical factors in any discussion of how services must be reorganized or rearranged. This also means that equal attention needs to be given to the non-economic aspects of inequality, those aspects which all groups feel vulnerable to at one point or another. The importance of neighborhood, as a whole, must be emphasized as the base from which linkages can develop between the services and those people seeking services.

With the development of this new "neighborhood model," a commitment should be made to employ neighborhood residents as service workers. This could prove successful if the neighborhood people fulfill the role of the "generalist workers" whereby they would be accountable to specific individuals and their families to meet as many of their needs.
as possible. Employment of neighborhood residents more closely assures an earlier recognition of problems, needs and available solutions from any given number of resources, including those outside the professional systems. The visibility of community people working in the service centers provides an incentive for those who may need some type of services, but haven't utilized what is already available. Workers from the community may be able to determine more clearly than the "traditional professionals" what the relationship is between social class, ethnicity and well-being with utilization patterns of human services.

Finally, human service organizations linked with cultural and organizational networks within a neighborhood, staffed and controlled by its residents may provide the model needed to promote dual accountability--where consumers are accountable to providers and the providers are accountable to consumers.

FOOTNOTES


13) See Annotated Bibliography on Ethnicity and Ethnic Groups, edited by Richard Kolm. (Rockville, MD, NIMH, 1973)


20) Mills' viewpoint is established in *White Collar, the American Middle Classes* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1951); *The Power Elite* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), and *The Causes of World War II* (New York, 1960).


