

^{Negroes}
Lyndon B. Johnson, Robert C. Weaver,
Joseph P. Lyford, and John Cogley on
The Negro as an American

INSTITUTE OF INDUSTRIAL
RELATIONS LIBRARY

JAN 29 1965

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY

(AN OCCASIONAL PAPER ON THE FREE SOCIETY) PUBLISHED BY THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS



« Santa Barbara, Fund for the Republic, 1963 »

This is one of a series of Occasional Papers about significant issues involved in the maintenance of a free society. These Occasional Papers and related materials are published by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions of The Fund for the Republic, Inc. and are devoted to clarifying basic questions of freedom and justice, especially those raised by the emergence of twentieth century institutions. The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions is a non-profit educational enterprise established by the Fund to promote the principles of individual liberty expressed in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Contributors to publications issued under the auspices of the Center are responsible for their statements of fact and expressions of opinions. The Center is responsible only for determining that the material should be presented to the public as a contribution to the discussion of the Free Society.

Copyright © 1963 by The Fund for the Republic, Inc. There are no restrictions on the use of this material. Sample copy free; prices for additional copies, as well as a complete list of other Center publications, available on request.

The Center is honored to begin this Occasional Paper with the Memorial Day address at Gettysburg of the Vice-President of the United States. The succeeding papers are adapted from talks given at a Symposium held by the Center in Chicago on the subject of "Challenges to Democracy." ROBERT C. WEAVER is Administrator of the U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C. JOSEPH P. LYFORD, a staff member of the Fund for the Republic since 1955, is the author of the recent Center Report *The Talk in Vandalia*. JOHN COGLEY, author of *Report on Blacklisting* for the Fund, was staff director of the Center's Study of Religious Institutions and is currently in charge of the Center's Study of the American Character.

Lyndon B. Johnson

On this hallowed ground, heroic deeds were performed and eloquent words were spoken a century ago. We, the living, have not forgotten — and the world will never forget — the deeds or the words of Gettysburg. We honor them now as we join on this Memorial Day of 1963 in a prayer for permanent peace of the world and fulfillment of our hopes for universal freedom and justice.

We are called to honor our own words of reverent prayer with resolution in the deeds we must perform to preserve peace and the hope of freedom.

We keep a vigil of peace around the world. Until the world knows no aggressors, until the arms of tyranny have been laid down, until freedom has risen up in every land, we shall maintain our vigil to make sure our sons who died on foreign fields shall not have died in vain.

As we maintain the vigil of peace, we must remember that justice is a vigil, too — a vigil we must keep in our own streets and schools and among the

lives of all our people, so that those who died here on their native soil shall not have died in vain.

One hundred years ago, the slave was freed.

One hundred years later, the Negro remains in bondage to the color of his skin.

The Negro today asks justice.

We do not answer him — we do not answer those who lie beneath this soil — when we reply to the Negro by asking, "Patience."

It is empty to plead that the solution to the dilemmas of the present rests on the hands of the clock. The solution is in our hands. Unless we are willing to yield up our destiny of greatness among the civilizations of history, Americans — white and Negro together — must be about the business of resolving the challenge which confronts us now.

Our nation found its soul in honor on these fields of Gettysburg one hundred years ago. We must not lose that soul in dishonor now on the fields of hate.

To ask for patience from the Negro is to ask him

to give more of what he has already given enough. But to fail to ask of him — and of all Americans — perseverance within the processes of a free and responsible society would be to fail to ask what the national interest requires of all its citizens.

The law cannot save those who deny it but neither can the law serve any who do not use it. The history of injustice and inequality is a history of disuse of the law. Law has not failed — and is not failing. We as a nation have failed ourselves by not trusting the law and by not using the law to gain sooner the ends of justice which law alone serves.

If the white overestimates what he has done for the Negro without the law, the Negro may underestimate what he is doing and can do for himself with the law.

If it is empty to ask Negro or white for patience, it is not empty—it is merely honest—to ask perseverance. Men may build barricades — and others may hurl themselves against those barricades — but what would happen at the barricades would yield no an-

swers. The answers will only be wrought by our perseverance together. It is deceit to promise more as it would be cowardice to demand less.

In this hour, it is not our respective races which are at stake — it is our nation. Let those who care for their country come forward, North and South, white and Negro, to lead the way through this moment of challenge and decision. The Negro says, “Now.” Others say, “Never.” The voice of responsible Americans — the voice of those who died here and the great man who spoke here—their voices say, “Together.” There is no other way.

Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, until opportunity is unconcerned with the color of men’s skins, emancipation will be a proclamation but not a fact. To the extent that the proclamation of emancipation is not fulfilled in fact, to that extent we shall have fallen short of assuring freedom to the free.

Robert C. Weaver

I happen to have been born a Negro and to have devoted a large part of my adult energies to the problem of the role of the Negro in America. But I am also a government administrator, and have devoted just as much energy — if not more — to problems of government administration at the local, state, and national levels.

My responsibilities as a Negro and an American are part of the heritage I received from my parents — a heritage that included a wealth of moral and social values that do not have anything to do with my race. My responsibilities as a government administrator do not have too much to do with my race, either. My greatest difficulty in public life is combating the idea that somehow my responsibilities as a Negro conflict with my responsibilities as a government administrator: and this is a problem which is presented by those Negroes who feel that I represent them exclusively, as well as by those whites who doubt my capacity to represent all elements in the population. The fact is that my responsibilities as a Negro and a government administrator do not conflict: they complement each other.

The challenge frequently thrown to me is: Why don't you go out into the Negro community and exhort Negro youths to prepare themselves for present and future opportunities? My answer is somewhat ambivalent. I know that emphasis upon values and behavior that might bring me success in the dominant culture of America was an important part of my youthful training. But it came largely from my parents in the security and love of a middle-class family. (And, believe me, there is nothing more middle-class than a middle-class minority family!)

Many of the youth whom I am urged to exhort come from broken homes. They live in communities where the fellow who stays in school and follows the

rules is a "square." They reside in neighborhoods where the most successful are often engaged in shady — if not illegal — activities. They know that the very policeman who may arrest them for violation of the law is sometimes the pay-off man for the racketeers. And they recognize that the majority society, which they frequently believe to be the "enemy," condones this situation. Their experience also leads some of them to believe that by getting the kind of job the residents in their neighborhood hold is merely a commitment to hard work and poverty. For almost all of them, the precepts of Ben Franklin are lily-white in their application.

Included in the group is the third generation of welfare clients. It is in this area—where they learn all the jargon of the social workers and psychologists—that they demonstrate real creativity. It is in activities that "beat the system" that they are most adept—and where the most visible rewards are concentrated.

All youth is insecure today. Young people in our slums are not only insecure but angry. Their horizons are limited. In withdrawing from competition in the larger society, they are creating for themselves a feeling of something that approaches, or at least serves as a viable substitute for, security. In the process, new values and aspirations, a new vocabulary, a new standard of dress, and a new attitude toward authority evolve. Each of these serves to demonstrate a separateness from the dominant culture. Ours is a middle-class society, and those who fail to assume most of its values and its general behavior are headed toward difficulties. At the same time, I recognize that the rewards for those who do are often minimal, too few to induce large numbers of these youth to "join."

I know that these youth relate with me primarily in a negative sense. They see me in terms of someone

who has been able to penetrate the color line to some degree. To them I have bettered the "enemy." If I should attempt to suggest that they surmount the restrictions of color, they cite instances of people they know who were qualified for good jobs—the relatively few boys or girls in their neighborhood who finished high school or even college—but who were ignored in favor of white youths with much less training. And in their experience these occurrences are not unique or isolated.

The example that will inspire the Negro boys and girls whose anti-social behavior distresses most whites and many Negroes is someone they know who has experienced what they have experienced and has gone on to win acceptance in the mainstream of America. When the Ralph Bunches, William Hasties, and John Hope Franklins emerge from the kind of environment that these young people know, only then will the achievements of successful Negroes like these provide models that have some meaning.

This is reflected in the occupations that offer the greatest chance for slum youth to move upward—occupations such as prize-fighting and jazz music. Here there is a well established tradition of Negroes, reared in the ghetto areas of blight and poverty, who have gone to the top. For youth in a similar environment, these are the heroes with whom they *can* and *do* identify and relate. In these fields a significant proportion of the successful are non-whites. For only in those pursuits in which native genius has a chance to emerge (if, indeed, it does not profit from lack of high-level training) does the dominant environment of the Negro make large-scale achievement easier.

The Negro middle-class seems destined to grow and prosper. At the same time, the economic position of the untrained and poorly trained Negro will continue to decline. This is, of course, true of all the untrained and poorly trained in our society, but non-whites are doubly affected. First, they are disproportionately concentrated in occupations that are particularly susceptible to unemployment in a period when our technology eats up unskilled and semi-skilled jobs at a frightening rate. Secondly, they continue to face racial job discrimi-

nation. The latter circumstance becomes a justification for not trying, for lacking an incentive for self-betterment.

The tragedy of discrimination is that it provides an excuse for failure while it erects barriers to success.

Most colored Americans not only remain outside the mainstream of our society but see no hope of entering it. The lack of motivation and the anti-social behavior that result are capitalized upon by the champions of the *status quo*. They say that the average Negro must demonstrate to the average white that the white man's fears are groundless. One proponent of this view has said that Negro crime and illegitimacy must decline and Negro neighborhoods must stop deteriorating.

In observations of this sort there is a volume on race relations. Those who feel this way fail to differentiate between acceptance that is earned by individual merit and the enjoyment of rights that the Constitution has guaranteed to everyone. Implicit, also, is the assumption that Negroes can lift themselves by their bootstraps, and that once they become brown counterparts of white middle-class Americans, they will be accepted on the basis of individual merit. Were this true, our race problem would be no more than the most recent phase in the melting-pot tradition of the nation. But in comparison to the earlier newcomers from Europe, the later ones who are colored face much greater impediments in moving from the slums or from the bottom of the economic ladder and also have fewer resources to meet the more difficult problems confronting them.

One of the most obvious examples of the Negro's lack of internal resources is the absence of widespread voluntary organizations. As we know, such organizations contributed greatly to the adjustment and assimilation of European immigrants. Both the Negro's heritage and the nature of his migration in the United States have militated against the development of similar institutions for Negroes.

Slavery and the dependence upon whites that continued after the Civil War stifled self-reliance. Movement from the rural South to northern cities was far different from immigration from Europe to the New World. This internal migration was not a real break with the past, as it was with the Europeans, nor were

those who participated in it subjected to feelings of complete foreignness. Thus, the Negro tended to preserve his old institutions when he moved from one part of the nation to another. The European immigrant, on the other hand, created new ones. Most importantly, the adjustment of non-whites to an urban environment today is happening at a time when public agencies are rapidly supplanting voluntary organizations.

Although much is written about crime and family disorganization among Negroes, most literate Americans are poorly informed on such matters. The first fallacy arises from a confusion of what racial crime figures reflect. When people read that more than half the crime in a given community is committed by Negroes, they unconsciously translate this into an equally high proportion of Negroes who are criminals. The fact is that the proportion is extremely small. Similarly, family stability, as indicated by the presence of both husband and wife, which is very low among the poorest non-whites, rises sharply as income increases.

Equally revealing is the fact that in all parts of the country the proportion of non-white families with female heads falls as incomes rise. A good, steady pay-check appears to be an important element in family stability, and those Negroes who have improved their economic position have taken on many attributes of white middle-class Americans.

But poverty still haunts half of the Negroes in the United States, and although higher levels of national productivity are a *sine qua non* for higher levels of employment in the nation, they alone will not wipe out unemployment, especially for minorities. The labor reserve of today must be trained if it is to find gainful employment. Among non-whites this frequently involves more than exposure to vocational training. Many of them require basic education prior to any specialized preparation for a job.

Of course, there are those who observe that the average income, the incidence of home ownership, the rate of acquisition of automobiles, and the like among Negroes in the United States are higher than in some so-called ad-

vanced nations. Comparisons like this mean little. Incomes are significant only in relation to the cost of living, and the other attainments and acquisitions are significant for comparative purposes only when used to reflect the Negro's *relative* position in this nation or the relative position of other nations in the world. As he has so frequently and eloquently demonstrated, the Negro in America is an American. His status, no less than his aspirations, can be measured meaningfully only in terms of American standards.

Viewed from this basis, what are the facts?

Median family income among non-whites was slightly less than 55 per cent of that for whites in 1959; for individuals, the figure was 50 per cent.

Only a third of the Negro families in 1959 earned enough to sustain an acceptable American standard of living. Yet this involved well over a million Negro families, of which 6,000 earned \$25,000 or more.

Behind these figures are many paradoxes. Negroes have made striking gains in historical terms, but their current rate of unemployment is well over double that among whites. More than two-thirds of our colored workers are still concentrated in five major unskilled and semi-skilled occupations, as contrasted to slightly more than a third of the white labor force.

Despite the continuing existence of color discrimination even for many of the well prepared, there is a paucity of qualified Negro scientists, engineers, mathematicians, and highly trained clerical workers. Lack of college-trained persons is especially evident among Negro men. These figures show why:

In 1959 non-white males who were high school graduates earned, on the average, 32 per cent less than whites; non-white male college graduates earned 38 per cent less. But non-white *women* who were high school graduates earned on the average some 24 per cent less than whites, and non-white female college graduates were practically equal to white female college graduates; they earned slightly above 1 per cent less. Also, it is significant that the median annual income of non-white female college graduates was more than double that of non-white women with only high school education.

The absence of economic rewards for higher education for men goes far in accounting for the scarcity of male college graduates among non-whites and the

high rate of drop-outs. It also accounts for the fact that in the North, where there are greater opportunities for white-collar Negro males, more Negro men than women are finishing college, whereas in the South, where teaching is the greatest employment outlet for Negro college graduates, Negro women college graduates outnumber men.

There is much in these statistics that reflects the continuing matriarchal character of Negro society. This had its roots in the family composition under slavery where the father, if identified, had no established role. The subsequent economic advantages of Negro women, who found steady employment as domestics during the post-Civil War era and thereafter, perpetuated the pattern. This, in conjunction with easy access of white males to Negro women, served to emasculate many Negro men economically and psychologically. It also helps to explain, in part, the high prevalence of broken homes, illegitimacy, and lack of motivation in the Negro community.

Many white Americans are perplexed, confused, or antagonized by the persistent pressure of Negroes to break down racial segregation. Few pause to consider what involuntary segregation means to its victims.

To the Negro, as an American, involuntary segregation is degrading, inconvenient, and costly. It is degrading because it is a tangible and constant reminder of the theory upon which it is based—biological racial inferiority. It is inconvenient because it means long trips to work, exclusion from certain cultural and recreational facilities, lack of access to conveniently located restaurants and hotels, and, frequently, relegation to grossly inferior accommodations. Sometimes it spells denial of a job; often it prevents upgrading based on ability.

But the primary disadvantage of involuntary segregation is its costliness. Nowhere is this better illustrated than in education and in housing. By any and all criteria, separate schools are generally inferior schools, in which the cultural deprivations of the descendants of slaves are perpetuated. Enforced residential segregation, the most stubborn and universal of the Negro's disadvantages, often leads to exploita-

tion and to a pattern of neglect of public services in those well-defined areas where Negroes live. Residential segregation restricts the opportunities of the more successful as well as the least successful in the area. Its most obvious consequence is that the housing dollar in a dark hand usually commands less purchasing power than one in a white hand. Clearly, this denies a basic promise of a free economy.

For immigrant groups in the nation, the trend toward improved social and economic status has gone hand-in-hand with decreasing residential segregation. The reverse has been true of the Negro. Eli Ginzberg, in his book, *The Negro Potential*, points out:

"It must be recognized that the Negro cannot suddenly take his proper place among whites in the adult world if he has never lived, played, and studied with them in childhood and young adulthood. Any type of segregation handicaps a person's preparation for work and life. . . . Only when Negro and white families can live together as neighbors . . . will the Negro grow up properly prepared for his place in the world of work."

Residential segregation based on color cannot be separated from residential segregation based on income. Both have snob and class appeal in contemporary America. Concentration of higher-income families in the suburbs means that many of those whose attitudes and values dominate our society do not see the poor or needy. More importantly, cut off by political boundaries as they are, it is to their interest *not* to see them.

Yet there are over 30,000,000 Americans living in poverty today. For the most part, we resent them and the outlays for welfare services required to help them. They are a people separate from the majority of Americans, for whom the majority accepts only the minimum responsibility. Thus, for the first time in the United States, we have *class* unemployment.

What are the responsibilities of Negro leadership? Certainly the first is to keep pressing for the status of first-class citizenship for all—an inevitable goal of those who accept the values of this nation. Another is to encour-

age and help Negroes to prepare for the opportunities that are now and will be open to them.

The ultimate responsibilities of Negro leaders, however, are to show results and to maintain a following. This means that they cannot be so "responsible" that they forget the trials and tribulations of those less fortunate or less recognized. They cannot stress progress—the emphasis that is so palatable to the majority group—without, at the same time, delineating the unsolved business of democracy. They cannot provide models that will have any meaning for their followers unless they can bring about social changes that will facilitate the emergence of these models from the *typical* environment of the Negro community.

Negro leadership must also face up to the deficiencies that plague the Negro community. Although crime, poverty, illegitimacy, and hopelessness can all be explained, in large measure, in terms of the history and current status of the Negro in America, they do exist. We need no longer be self-conscious in admitting these unpleasant facts, for we know enough about human behavior now to recognize that anti-social activities are not innate in any people.

For many successful older colored Americans, middle-class status—the American standard—has been difficult to attain. Restricted for the most part to racial ghettos, they have made great efforts to protect their children from falling back into the dominant values of that environment, values that are probably more repugnant to them than to most Americans. This is understandable in terms of their origins. They have come largely from lower-middle-class families, where industry, good conduct, family ties, and a willingness to postpone immediate rewards for future success are stressed; their standards of conduct have been those of success-oriented middle-class Americans.

It is not that these Negroes fail to feel shame about the muggings or the illegitimate births among other Negroes. Many of them, in fact, feel too much shame and either repudiate the "culprits" in terms of scathing condemnation or try to escape from the problem lest it endanger their own none too secure status. Few

Negroes are immune from the toll of upward mobility. Their struggles have usually been difficult, and the maintenance of status exacts a heavy toll. As long as this is true, they will have less energy to devote to the problems of the Negro subculture.

But these attitudes are shifting. Younger middle-class Negroes are more secure, and so place less stress upon the quest for respectability. It is significant that the sit-ins and Freedom Marches in the South have been planned and executed by Negro college students most of whom come from middle-class families. Middle-class Negroes have long led the fight for civil rights, and today its youthful members are not hesitating to resort to direct action. In so doing they are forging a new solidarity in the struggle for human dignity.

There are today, as there always have been, thousands of dedicated colored Americans who do not make the headlines but are successful in raising the horizons of Negroes. Teachers, social workers, political leaders, ministers, doctors, and an assortment of other indigenous leaders at the local level are familiar with the environmental factors that dull or destroy motivation. They are involved with the total Negro community. They demonstrate—rather than verbalize—a concern for the problems of Negro youth. They are trying to reach these young people, not by coddling them or by providing excuses for failure, but by identifying themselves with them and helping to develop their potentialities. Both genuine affection and sufficient toughness to encourage the development of self-reliance are in these local leaders.

When these people—white as well as black—suggest thrift, good deportment, greater emphasis upon education and training, as proper goals to seek, they do it pragmatically. It is not a matter of proselytizing but of identifying those values and patterns of behavior which will help young people to move upward in contemporary American society. This practical, sophisticated approach also enables them to identify the deviations from dominant standards that can be left undisturbed because they are not inconsistent with a productive and healthy life in modern urban communities. The adjustment of values and concepts need only be minimal for eventual full social participation.

However, if emphasis upon self-betterment is employed indiscriminately by Negro leaders, it is seized upon by white supremacists and their apologists to support the assertion that Negroes — and they mean all Negroes—are not ready for full citizenship. Thus, because of the nature of our society, Negro leadership must continue to stress *rights* if it is to receive a hearing for programs of self-improvement. Black Muslims, who identify the white man as the devil, emphasize — with a remarkable degree of success — morality, industry, and good conduct. But the Negro leader who refuses to repudiate his own Americanism or that of his followers can do so effectively only as he does clearly repudiate identification with the white supremacists. This he indicates, of course, when he champions equal rights, just as the Black

Muslims indicate it by directing hate toward all white people.

Most Negroes in leadership roles have made clear that they and those who follow them are a part of America. They have striven for realization of the American dream. But they cannot succeed alone. Sophisticated whites realize that the status of Negroes in our society depends not only on what the Negro himself does to achieve his goals and to prepare himself for opportunities but, even more, on what all America does to expand these opportunities. The quality and character of future Negro leadership will be determined by how effective those leaders who relate to the *total* society can be in satisfying the yearnings for human dignity that lie in the hearts of all Americans.

Joseph P. Lyford

According to my census, there must be about three dozen small children who live on West 105th Street between Central Park and Manhattan Avenue. In June they take over the block, and for the rest of the summer they spend most of their time racing up and down looking for something to do. Since they have no equipment for the usual games, they invent their own, which is a misfortune for the city. The major emphasis is on breakage, with the result that all through July and August the sidewalks glitter with broken glass. Experiments with fire and water are also popular. These include setting trash cans afire after sunset, the generation of small explosions, and the opening of hydrants. Since these episodes frequently bring fire trucks and policemen around, the hot months are fairly lively in our neighborhood.

With all their rushing, the children rarely venture beyond the four corners of the block. Whatever travels they take are imaginary ones inside the hulk of an abandoned car that periodically turns up along the curb. I don't recall ever seeing a child leave 105th Street to climb the big rocks that loom up on the edge of the park a few hundred feet to the east. The children cling to their island as if each moment in the neighborhood were their last. Eventually such a moment does arrive, when their families are forced to move out of the way of some civic improvement

or housing accommodation designed for other people's tastes and incomes. Then the children are taken, along with the furniture, to some other temporary encampment on a similar street where they will help fill up another ancient tenement and another school. This is the way childhood ordinarily proceeds for most of the Negro boys and girls who come and go on 105th Street. It is also likely that this is the way things will develop, in turn, for their children.

Our neighborhood is one of several West Side "communities," as they are sometimes called. Negroes averaging about \$3,000 annual income live in all of them in greater numbers the farther north one goes above 86th Street. About 11 per cent of them are unemployed, as against a 7.3 per cent average for whites. The Negroes are intermingled with Puerto Ricans, who earn even less as a rule and who have even greater difficulty getting employment. Since the two minority groups are poor, pay higher rents on the average than whites, are frequently on welfare, and are jammed into housing which is generally in the last stages of decay, they tend to be transients who have no opportunity to ripen into full-fledged inhabitants of any area. Their individual arrivals and departures go unnoticed. The established residents are only aware of the fact that there seem to be more or less of them this year than last.

Many parts of the West Side, especially the cross-town streets, have the atmosphere of vertical waiting rooms built above transportation systems from the South, from the city's lower East Side, and from as far away as San Juan or Hong Kong. Of those families which find themselves in the path of the vast urban renewal program between 87th and 96th Streets the lucky ones escape to a housing project. It is difficult to discover what happens to most of the other D.P.'s and impossible to trace the single

This paper, adapted from Mr. Lyford's talk at the Center's Symposium in Chicago, is a preliminary report on a study of Manhattan's West Side, to be completed next year as part of the Center's Study of the American Character. The study deals with an area of roughly sixty square blocks, from streets in the low Eighties to those in the low Hundreds, between Riverside Drive and Central Park West. The area's population of about 100,000 includes a large minority of Puerto Ricans and a smaller minority of Negroes, most of them concentrated in the eastern section, which is the site of a large urban renewal program.

males or females who drift into the area and live in \$20-a-week apartments off rotting hallways until the buildings are pulled down around their ears. Since 1945, Western civilization has not allowed people to be buried in the rubble of their homes; therefore they are required to go somewhere else. In recent months the city's Department of Relocation has announced plans for humane transportation of these subject peoples. Meanwhile, the Negro and Puerto Rican are shunted from place to place, because, being unemployed or poor, they have to make way for those who are not.

Many white people concerned about this state of affairs have made efforts to draw the Negro and Puerto Rican into some part of their community life. Some of the parent-teacher associations have tried to get more Negro and Puerto Rican mothers to their meetings, but the efforts usually peter out and the white parents continue to dominate the P.T.A.'s while the Negroes and Puerto Ricans work during the day, if they have jobs, and try to tie up the family's loose ends at night. The reform Democratic political clubs in the area began life with a strongly social service cast to their activities, but they could not attract members from the low-income groups; now more and more of the clubs' time is devoted to organizational politics. The churches' efforts to bring more Negroes to Sunday service and church membership have also been a disappointment. While the Catholic parishes have managed to replace their original Irish constituency with the Spanish population, other local institutions seem to have found no way of convincing the Negroes that there is any point to community activity.

What is there really to talk about? The Negro inhabits a Malthusian world of subsistence living, enforced idleness — either partial or total — acute physical discomforts, and an abundance of disillusionment. This is not to say the world of the unemployed and unemployable is a totally black one in New York City. The Negro shares it not only with his Puerto Rican neighbors, but also with a substantial minority of whites. His preoccupations are sufficiently remote from those of a middle-class family on Central Park West to prevent any regular communication even where there is a desire for con-

tact. A family able to take hot water and a comfortable income for granted can plunge very easily into political affairs, books, peace movements, and the trials of getting a child into Bronx High School of Science and Columbia or Harvard; on the black side streets a broken toilet can precipitate a crisis that will disrupt a family's life for weeks. A multiplication of such disasters can reduce families to the point where they become insensible to the outside world.

The name slots in hallways off a street like West 93rd are usually empty or carry the almost obliterated names of people who moved away years ago. Since the buzzers, like the occupants, generally do not work, the insertion of new names would seem to be superfluous. Some of the occupants are so isolated that the only mail they receive is a welfare check or an eviction notice.

To find some hope in the situation, one always returns to the public schools. Unfortunately, there is no way of letting more than a fraction of a worried public look through the classroom doors of one of the better, integrated elementary schools on the West Side. The unrehearsed activity inside might rid even a childless taxpayer of his suspicions. Most of the teachers I have observed show an ability to sustain the instinctive urge of children to group themselves without regard to color and even to uncover common interests between children with pronounced differences in learning capacity and family background. The informality and freedom are symbolized by the irregular clusters of movable desks in which the slower child or the new arrival gets some unofficial help and encouragement from children who have already picked up the pace. Sister Mary Francilda, head of the girls' branch of Holy Name School, is trying to further this type of pupil-to-pupil assistance by discarding the old system of grouping classes according to speed of learning and introducing classes, after the second grade, where the bright and slow children are mixed together. This seasoning experiment has worked pretty well so far, Sister Francilda reports, and the nuns seem to like the idea.

Hopeful developments in even an ideal school can be quickly extinguished by the swelling of class sizes,

the inability of the city to provide proper teaching materials, and the instability that besets most Negro and Puerto Rican children in almost every phase of their life outside school. Next year, because of family reasons, hundreds of them will move to other schools in very different parts of the city, where they will be looking at new teachers and struggling with new versions of the customary privations. The dislocations occur so rapidly that some teachers lose their pupils almost as soon as they begin to understand their personalities and educational aptitudes. Some of the children are frequently transferred two or three times a year; others will average a new school every year all the way through elementary and junior high school.

A child has been known to go to unbelievable lengths to hang onto a particular school or teacher. His family may conceal a change of address in order to avoid the child's transfer. One youngster, whose family moved to Yonkers, commutes to Junior High School 44; officially, he "lives" with an aunt in Manhattan. Principals are aware that such skulduggery takes place, and teachers are instructed to question children periodically about their current address. But in cases where the child is a good student he has little to fear; the teacher will join in the conspiracy.

Although Negro parents rarely show up at school functions, they have absorbed some of their children's enthusiasm to the point where they express a generalized but favorable opinion of the local school based largely on what their children have to say about it. This is true particularly of Negroes who have recently arrived from the South and whose children display the effects of a shockingly inadequate schooling, often being nearly illiterate after several years of "separate but equal" education. If these children improve in their school work and show signs of ambition, there is a tendency for the parents to transfer their hopes to their children and to look to education as the only way out of an eternal labyrinth of family frustration. Their concern is whether the child is learning to read and write, whether he has a teacher who likes him and has taken the trouble to acquire some knowledge about his family. The tremendous but unspecific

ambitions of many Negro parents for their children sometimes frighten the teachers. A large percentage of children will drop out, others will not be able to keep up the pace after high school, and most who would be qualified for college will not get there because of a myriad of misfortunes. What will happen inside the family, teachers ask, to children who fail to measure up to their parents' expectations?

There is also fear for the child who manages to compete successfully only to find himself trapped by an economic system in which jobs are disappearing as people increase and in a society which, despite everything that has been said and done recently about equality, has institutionalized its prejudices beyond the possibility of immediate repeal. Even when law or other pressure has brought racial discrimination under some effective control, the probability has to be faced that technological changes will soon make it impossible for 50 per cent of our high school graduates, white or black, to find employment of any kind. The young people who take at face value current propaganda about the need for an education and are thus disappointed can hardly be expected to take the education of their own future children very seriously.

In view of the civil rights organizations' preoccupation with education it is of some interest that the question of racial percentages in the local schools was never brought up by the Negro and Puerto Rican parents whom I interviewed. When I introduced the subject, it evoked little interest. I found no feeling that school authorities were, either through intent or through neglect, maintaining school districts to keep certain schools predominantly white or non-white, or that the teachers in the so-called "difficult" schools were incompetent or biased in their attitudes—charges that have been made overtly or privately by some integration "spokesmen."

It was the middle-class white families that often displayed an extreme sensitiveness to the matter of racial percentages. Explanations for this sensitivity can be contradictory. For instance, some white parents with children in mixed schools become highly agitated when other white children are withdrawn,

but it is generally impossible to find out whether they react this way because they believe strongly in integration or because they are upset that the school is becoming more and more non-white. One white parent I know proclaims the value of racially mixed schools, but privately says he would take his child out of school if the boy were to be removed from an all-white IGC (intellectually gifted children) class and put into a regular one where there is a much higher proportion of Puerto Rican and Negro children.

Another type of white parent who irritates principals is the "school shopper." This individual insists on making a cellar-to-ceiling investigation of the school in his district and on subjecting the principal to a careful inquisition prior to deciding whether to send his child there or to a private school. In view of the constant criticism which seems to be the public school's daily ration in New York City, the school shopper has some justification for his misgivings; it is also understandable, however, that the principal and staff thus being investigated are highly irritated by such inspectional tours. To them the school shopper is a by-product of the attacks on public education.

These types of apprehensive white parents do not ordinarily have their counterpart among the Negroes and Puerto Ricans, who seem to assume the schools are doing as well as they can unless there is proof to the contrary. To some Negro leaders such an attitude is regarded as the result of deplorable ignorance or as the kind of over-adjustment to segregation considered characteristic of many Southern Negroes. Whatever his reasons, the low-income Negro on the West Side is not as quick as some of his spokesmen to assume that the quality of his child's school is directly related to the extent to which it is white.

I have found it difficult to discover support for proposals for a massive shifting of Negro and white children out of their own districts in order to bring about some sort of racial parity in the various sending and receiving schools. The reasons are not difficult to find. It is apparent that almost all parents are determined to keep their children as near home as possible, especially when they live in such a turbulent area as the upper West Side, where narcotics

peddlers, alcoholics, prostitutes, and other varieties of sick and criminally inclined people abound. There is also the customary distaste for distant neighborhoods based on all sorts of folk tales and rumors about the terrible people who live in them. Whatever possibilities might exist for closer parent-teacher contacts are practically eliminated for those who do participate in the open enrollment program. Also, the child who has a long route home by bus from a distant school has less chance to participate in local after-school activities sponsored by the city and by the settlement houses.

Another comment I have heard from white parents and school staffs is that the children who are bussed to another school under this program tend to be the better students and their parents the more sophisticated in their community; thus, the sending school loses its better students and the local community is deprived of its best prospects for Negro leadership.

These points are not introduced as an argument against the purpose of the open enrollment program but to explain why it has worked out disappointingly. Had the sponsors of open enrollment questioned the intended beneficiaries of the matter thoroughly they would have discovered, for example, that most West Side Negro and Puerto Rican families want to stay in Manhattan, preferably where they are if their housing can be improved or if they can get into a nearby housing project. They do not like the prospect of moving to Queens, Brooklyn, or the Bronx even if housing projects are available. It is therefore even less likely that they want to ship their children to these boroughs for long hours of schooling and transportation to and from.

The extent to which the official pronouncements on education by the Urban League and the NAACP are familiar to most Negro families is negligible. It is doubtful that even if these opinions were more widely known they would be taken seriously, for they seem to have almost no relevance. One example is the view expressed by the director of the Urban League, Whitney Young, that public schools henceforth compensate Negro children for past deprivations by discriminating educa-

tionally in their favor, presumably at the expense of the Spanish children and "others" (the Board of Education euphemism for "white") in the same classrooms. I doubt that any such proposal could be voiced by someone who had seen very many West Side classrooms or who had an elementary understanding of the teaching profession. Educational experiences are not customarily parceled out in doses or in various-sized pills, the larger being automatically distributed to special ethnic or racial groups.

With the inevitable exceptions, most of the teachers I have observed deal with their children from moment to moment and day to day as needs make themselves apparent, and they try to group their children in such a way that they can get the most out of their experience. It seems preposterous to request a self-respecting teacher to build some sort of discriminatory bias into her attitude about her children. It is obvious that some children gain more of their teachers' attention than others, but this happens because the teacher has made her own estimate, partly intuitive and partly by testing, of the need, and not because she has indexed the need according to the pigmentation of the child. As things work out, notably in the "Special Service" schools, the presence of large numbers of Negro and Puerto Rican children critically affects the direction of the school program, but this is a natural result of intelligent educational policy. All that recommendations like Mr. Young's accomplish is to build up the disquieting idea among some white parents that their children are not getting their share of attention, an idea that can be depended upon to accelerate the withdrawal of white children from the schools and to encourage the departure of white families for the suburbs.

The lack of rapport between the low-income Negro families and the NAACP and Urban League prevails in other areas. Frequently I asked families what individual or agency they felt they could turn to if they needed help with a housing, health, financial, or personal problem. The civil rights organizations were never mentioned. When a respondent did hazard an opinion, he gave the name of a person on the block who was supposed to have "influence with the city," of the Strycker's Bay Neighborhood Council (with forty-five member organizations), the fam-

ily welfare investigator, a social worker from the settlement house, or the like. Most seemed to feel that there was no one who could or would help them in their difficulties. The civil rights groups were not the only ones ignored as a source of assistance. The churches (except for the local Catholic parishes which are closely tied to the Puerto Ricans), political parties, office-holders, and even local city agencies—if my respondents think about them at all—seem to have been invented for other people in other worlds.

Such a lack of faith in official institutions and leadership is obviously not peculiar to the impoverished families of the West Side. In fact, their attitudes would seem to be mild compared to the contempt and cynicism of the suburbanite for politicians and institutions in general. And it should be said that at least some politicians, notably the district's ebullient and energetic congressman, William Fitts Ryan, deserve credit for trying to do something about the depression and disorder that darken life on the side streets.

The NAACP has some justification for its failure to involve itself directly in West Side problems. Percy Sutton, former head of the Manhattan NAACP, says, "We are a volunteer group; and we can't do everything at once. We have to pick the worst situations and the places where we can get the most volunteers. That place is Harlem." I doubt that the Urban League, which has a paid staff of some size and has publicly represented itself for many years as working with racial minority problems on the community level, can offer the same justification.

The third of the "big three" groups now acting as "spokesmen" for the Negro, CORE, would seem to be the most remote from the every-day interest of the West Side Negro. Although the organization has been successful in attracting public attention by its demonstrations at City Hall and its frequent press statements attacking discrimination, it has shown little disposition to work on the neighborhood level at the day-to-day business of helping Negro and Puerto Rican families figure out practical ways of dealing with their immediate health, housing, and educational problems. In the field of education CORE's troops seem to be concentrated solely at the top, in the publicity department. I have found no

evidence that its official representatives are taking an active part in local efforts to learn more about neighborhood schools and their special problems and to provide concrete suggestions for improvement. It may seem extraordinary that an organization which lays so heavy an emphasis on education has not taken the trouble to conduct a school visiting program or solicit the views of principals and teachers, yet this is exactly the case on the West Side. Perhaps this failure in the field accounts for CORE's preoccupation with balancing racial percentages of pupil population to the point where more urgent educational needs are given no emphasis whatsoever.

The recent prominence of CORE's Rev. Gardner Taylor of Brooklyn as a fiery speaker on such subjects as education and employment opportunities for Negroes has provoked a number of wry comments from educators who remember him as a member of a notoriously ineffective city Board of Education that was finally asked in 1961 to resign en masse by Mayor Wagner because it could not face up to a crisis of overcrowded classes and underpaid teachers—issues of direct concern to every West Side parent.

Another example of the discrepancy between the preoccupations of Negro "spokesmen" and the low-income Negro occurs in the field of housing, where segregation begins. Although housing is the chief concern of low-income West Side families, especially of the Negroes and Puerto Ricans who are subjected to special discrimination and exploitation and end up in the worst accommodations, neither the NAACP nor the Urban League has made any real effort to attack the problem in the area. In fact, it was not until the summer of 1963 that the Urban League reconstituted its housing division after a lapse of several years.

When hearings were held on the city's vast urban renewal program, affecting twenty blocks in the West Side area populated by low-income Negroes and Puerto Ricans, the Urban League did not even present testimony, and the NAACP's national office formally supported the final city plan providing only 1,500 units of low-cost housing, despite the fact that most of the people being displaced could hardly

afford to live in low-cost housing much less in the alternative middle-income housing. It remained for an unparalleled coalition of a minority of the local Democratic reform club, several members of Strycker's Bay Neighborhood Council, the Americans for Democratic Action, the leadership of the two Catholic parishes in the renewal area, various Puerto Rican leaders, Theodore Weiss, the local City Councilman, and Congressman Ryan to fight the city plan and to force changes for more low-income housing. Today the plan, as finally revised, provides for 2,500 units of low-cost public housing. One Puerto Rican leader, commenting on the history of the urban renewal fight, declares bitterly, "The other minority group leaders not only didn't help us, they were on the other side opposing us." A local clergyman who supported revision of the city plan says the national NAACP and the Urban League behaved as they did because "they are part of the establishment."*

The effective work—and it seems pitifully inadequate to meet the swelling need—for low-income families of all descriptions is being done rather quietly by people and organizations that have their roots in the area. One of them is Fred Johnson, a bony-faced social worker from the Goddard-Riverside Settlement House who, with his group of four assistants, works with the street gangs (or "clubs" as they are now called), visits hard-pressed tenants, advises them of their rights, helps them fill out the forms, organizes recreation activities for their children, and refers them to the agencies that can help with their problems.

Two other troublesome defenders of the less privileged are Father Henry J. Browne of St. Gregory's Church, who has been president of Strycker's Bay Neighborhood Council, and the Council's executive secretary, Esta Kransdorf. They have represented the neighborhood's interests in repeated engagements with the city's hydra-headed bureaucracy. There are school teachers like Nancy Brigham, who spends her spare time checking up on cheating landlords as head of the Council's housing committee, and unaffiliated individuals like Aramis Gomez, a jeweler, who got into politics to protect his home and who has been

*Unanimity on such issues as housing does not exist even within the NAACP. Mr. Sutton, representing the Manhattan branch, supported over 2,000 low-cost housing units in contrast to the policy of the national office.

representing his fellow Puerto Ricans ever since. There are Ralph Acosta, the house detective of the Hotel Endicott, who helped found a recreation center, and the Irish nuns of the parochial schools of the neighborhood, who have come to feel that teaching Puerto Rican children (their school populations are 80 per cent Spanish) is the most rewarding educational experience they have ever had.

So far the constructive forces at work in the area only suggest how to deal with its difficulties. The enormity of the poverty and frustration which spin out their tragedies every day of the year is too much for such efforts unaided by something else. Nor will things be changed very much by angry demands for city officials to "do something quick." The tragedy of the poor in this West Side "community" is the hopelessness of their position because society still will not face the fact that it has exiled the poor from national and local life. As far as the Negro of the city is concerned, the achievement of every remaining civil right will not solve the fundamental misery that is the white man's special gift to

him. The fact is that the republic has little use for the people whom, through design or neglect, it has prevented from getting a decent education. The Negro has joined a new and integrated race of Americans, the race of the poor. In some ways this affiliation is of more importance than the fact that he is black.

There is a final fact to be faced. Our troubles with each other are not likely to end with the signing of a compact between the white and Negro American that simply guarantees coexistence in the same nation with equal protection of the laws, each in his own world. The doctrine of "separate but equal" applied to races is as full of future disorder and tragedy as it was when speciously applied to our system of public education. Simply to know that other human beings can vote, pray, and exercise every other constitutional right as freely as ourselves is not enough. If a free society is founded on the proposition that people shall learn from each other and share in each others' trials, it seems reasonable that we must reach a state where it will be natural and desirable to engage in a social relationship embracing every aspect of human existence.

John Cogley

I would like to begin by quoting from the final words of Gunnar Myrdal's monumental study, *An American Dilemma*:

"The treatment of the Negro is America's greatest and most conspicuous scandal. It is tremendously publicized, and democratic America will continue to publicize it itself. For the colored peoples all over the world, whose rising influence is axiomatic, this scandal is salt in their wounds. . . .

"The bright side is that the conquering of color caste in America is America's own innermost desire. This nation early laid down as the moral basis for its existence the principles of equality and liberty. However much Americans have dodged this conviction, they have refused to adjust their laws to their own license. . . . What America is constantly reaching for is democracy at home and abroad. The main trend in its history is the gradual realization of the American creed.

"In this sense the Negro problem is not only America's greatest failure but also America's incomparably great opportunity for the future. The century-old dream of American patriots, that America should give to the entire world its own freedoms and its own faith, would come true. America can demonstrate that justice, equality, and cooperation are possible between white and colored people.

"... This is what the world needs to believe. Mankind is sick of fear and of disbelief, of pessimism and cynicism. It needs the youthful, moralistic optimism of America. But empty declarations only deepen cynicism. Deeds are called for. . . . *America is free to choose whether the Negro shall remain her liability or become her opportunity.*" (Italics, Mr. Myrdal's)

An American Dilemma appeared two decades ago at a time when the second World War still raged. Though it was written by a Swedish citizen, there may

be in it a touch of Fourth of July declamation—a sense of everything-is-possible-in-the-great-day-coming—that was characteristic of wartime writing. But it is not merely a fervorino. The quotation appears on page 1021 of a fact-packed, scrupulously researched report on "The Negro Problem and Democracy." It is a conclusion reached after five years of earnest sociological study by a famous scholar.

Today, twenty years later—years of fantastically swift change in scientific, social, and political life—what can we say about these paragraphs, except that Mr. Myrdal might have written them yesterday? To be sure, there has been progress in race relations. When Mr. Myrdal wrote, the American armies fighting for democracy around the world were still segregated. In Washington, at the Department of State itself, Negro and white employees still ate their lunch in separate dining rooms. Our federal laws still upheld the cruel fiction that the separate school systems of the South were equal in quality. Twenty years ago, I was a GI in a southern town, and I remember clearly marked White and Colored sections in the church I attended. That kind of outrage has been largely corrected by ecclesiastical directives.

In northern cities, twenty years ago, the ungentlemanly agreements known as restrictive covenants were still legally enforceable. In the years since, public parks and facilities, public carriers, and many private services have been democratized. FEPC laws have been written. Lynchings have ceased. The offensive word "nigger" has been just about banished from the vocabulary of civilized Americans. A few fortunate Negroes hold high public office. One Negro airman is an astronaut, and there are rumors that the

next Justice appointed to the Supreme Court will be a colored man. We have made progress.

Our progress, however, does not do credit to our present so much as it points up the shamefulness of our past. We of the white community have no reason yet to be self-satisfied. Negroes have no reason to be content. And, as is made clearer every day, in every city and town of the nation, American Negroes are not content. Their phenomenal patience has finally been exhausted. The God-given sense of their own dignity, which belongs to them as surely as it is the endowment of all peoples, has reached a new level of acuteness. Most of them are angry, especially the young. Many of them are dangerously bitter. Some of them are recklessly desperate. We talk about the present crisis in race relations, but the better word might be showdown. We have, in short, come to the moment of truth in the history of Negro-white relations in the United States.

The facile rationalizations of white America are being torn away by the sheer insistence of the Negro's cry that he, too, is a man. "I am no nigger," James Baldwin told a television audience recently. "I am a man, a human being, and you are my brother." The Negro has stopped lying to the white man in the hope of winning small favors. The time has come when the white man can no longer successfully lie to himself in the hope of gaining favor from his conscience.

This, stripped to essentials, is the heart of the current crisis. To quote Jacques Maritain: "What we witness . . . is the spectacle of a nation which struggles doggedly against itself, or, more accurately, against large segments of its own people, against a certain legacy of evil in its own mores, and against the demons of the human heart—in order to free itself of abuses which are repellent to its own spirit, and to raise its entire practical behavior to the level of the tenets and principles in which it believes. . . ."

I would like to use my time here to state what I believe to be the basic issues, the inescapable issues — the problem that confronts all of us. I am not sure that I can do this successfully, for I am not a Negro. Whatever there is of accusation in the ap-

proach I have chosen to make must be *self*-accusation. I cannot point to wounds of my own—or to the wounds of my children. I cannot convincingly express a longing for opportunities that have always been mine. Like a Christian studying his crucifix, I can only point to the wounds of another. But there is a certain anguish in looking at wounds that you yourself helped cause. That anguish will have to be enough.

The problem is, first of all, a question of justice; then, a question of community; then, a question of charity.

In justice, we owe the Negro his rights, not because they are ours to give but because they are his by natural claim. I am not speaking of remote, metaphysical concepts when I speak of rights but of hard realities—the Negro's right to live where he chooses, breaking the bonds of the black ghetto; his right to raise his family with dignity, to earn a living at any job for which he is qualified, and to compete fairly with all other Americans; his right to education and human fulfillment; his right to participate not only in the democratic government of the United States but in the daily democratic life and culture of America.

In this moment of crisis, this moment of truth, we are being forced to answer yes or no to the question of whether we agree that the inalienable rights mentioned in our patriotic scriptures belong not only to white Americans but to all Americans. Our federal laws say they do. Our official documents say they do. Our official propaganda says they do. At the same time, our tradition, our history, the way we have treated Negroes in the past and the facts of our current life, all belie the claim.

The problem is, second, a problem of community. What we are being required to face, at this moment of truth, is whether we are ready to share the good life of America, not with those in far-off lands who are the objects of our cold war propaganda but with one out of every ten persons in our own land. Some things cannot be accomplished by law but only by a resolve on the part of the people themselves to open their society to all. At this moment of truth, we whites are being asked whether we are willing to make this resolve. Under this heading, I would put entry into

all the institutions we list as “social”—clubs, associations, fraternities, business firms. I do not say that all such private organizations should be open to *all* Negroes. I believe, rather, that they should not be *closed* to all Negroes. If a person is excluded because, and only because, he is a Negro, if he would qualify on every other count, his exclusion, however it is rationalized, is a manifestation of racism. And America, by definition if not in practice, is anti-racist. We can change the definition to fit the fact, or we can change the fact to fit the definition, but at this moment of truth we can no longer have it both ways.

Finally, there is the problem of charity. And charity may be the greatest of all the three elements I have listed. By charity I simply mean brotherly love. I do not mean gracious giving, or impersonal benefactions, or contributing to drives, but person-to-person contact and concern. Charity is not a political concept. It is a theological term. Its secular name, for the ancients, was “friendship.” But without it, there is a sickness in the political community that affects all of us.

From time to time we hear that one Negro spokesman or another is obsessed, or unbalanced, or hysterical in his approach to the race problem. I have no doubt that there are such cases. But all of us are more or less guilt-ridden, lacking in health, our characters corroded by living in a caste society. If it is hard to be Negro in such a society, it is also hard to be white. For to be a white man in a segregated society, at least today, is to live in nameless fear and isolation and withdrawal from a whole section of one’s fellow-citizens. Segregation means that the holding-back of friendship has become institutionalized. The spiritual unhealthiness in it derives from the fact that it is easier in such a society to withhold love than to give love. This is the definition of a serious sickness. It afflicts all of us.

We are schizophrenic about the claims put forth as our “American” philosophy. Our deed does not match our creed; our history does not fit in with our doctrine; our moral claims do not jibe with our actual traditions. If, in textbooks, there is a kind of

man known as an American who lives in a land where freedom and equality are the heritage of all, the *fact* is that no such man has ever lived, North or South. This much we have to admit.

But now that the moment of truth has arrived, what will be our reaction? We whites can perhaps learn to live in fear of the violence that may spring up at any hour—and in time our fear will inevitably turn to hate. Negroes can perhaps live with resentment eating away at their natural friendliness. They may even learn to comfort themselves with the strange, foreign doctrines of a reverse racism. They can perhaps learn to live without hope but with a certain fierce private pride in a land peopled by “White Devils” and satanic forces. But who calls that living? Hatred can be swollen on both sides. We can, both groups, learn to live with each other in a state of permanent hostility. We can, in a word, exist in a kind of racist hell. “Hell is not to love any more.” (George Bernanos)

But what, in our best moments, do we seek? The *status quo* is clearly unacceptable. A return to the ugly past is out of the question. We have no choice but to change. How such a change will take place, and what the nature of it will be, depends on leaders, colored and white, working together to lead the people, colored and white. It is not easy for the dominant whites to acknowledge their ancient guilt, a guilt borne more or less by all. It is not easy for the oppressed Negroes to forgive. But what other choice do we have?

The Negro spokesmen—political leaders, professional men, the clergy, authors, newspapermen, artists—have to keep repeating, each in his own way—from writing novels to marching in picket lines—the essential message: “We are men like you. We live, we suffer, we take our pleasure, we weep, we sin, we are lost or we are saved, like you. Your needs are our needs. Your joys are our joys. Your pain is our pain. Listen to us, for we too are flesh and blood.”

For the whites, listening must not be just hearing words but breaking barriers, changing institutions, enforcing laws, recognizing in fact the brotherhood that we in America have always proclaimed in theory.

In the course of this dialogue, there will be many non-essential but significant factors to blur the basic issues. Human pride, ambition, and plain cussedness will manifest themselves on both sides. Human failings will be present, each mote a beam in the brother's eye. We will be sidetracked by sociological considerations, political power-plays, by motives less than pure. The irrational and the emotional will not be absent. Still, the essential stands out in clear relief. We cannot turn for salvation to the sociologist, or to the historian, or to the political thinker, or even to the philosopher or theologian. We cannot put our trust in tradition, which will betray us; or in the history of America, which will

shame us; or even in the doctrines of the nation's founders, which may strike us as hypocritical. We cannot look to our forefathers, or wait on our progeny. At this moment of truth, our only turn must be inward; we are reliant on ourselves alone.

The essential question is: Are we, whether we be black or white, willing to call all men brother and to match this proclamation with our acts? If the answer is yes, we will save the honor of America, which from the beginning has been tarnished by a native, corrosive racism. If the answer is no, and perhaps it is, then only darkness lies ahead. But, at the moment of truth, one thing is sure, the time for self-deception and hypocrisy has passed.

Commission on Race and Housing Books

Under a grant from the Fund for the Republic, the Commission on Race and Housing, headed by Earl B. Schwulst, President and Chairman of the Board of the Bowery Savings Bank, spent three years studying racial discrimination in housing. The study resulted in six books, which were published by the University of California Press and may be purchased from the Press or through a bookstore (not from the Center). The price of each book, except for the first title (which is out of print), is \$6. The books are:

- *Where Shall We Live?*, Summary Report of the Commission.
- *Residence and Race*, Final and Comprehensive Report to the Commission by Davis McEntire, director.
- *Studies in Housing and Minority Groups*, edited by Nathan Glazer and Davis McEntire.
- *Privately Developed Interracial Housing: An Analysis of Experience*, by Eunice and George Grier.
- *The Demand for Housing in Racially Mixed Areas: A Study of the Nature of Neighborhood Change*, by Chester Rapkin and William G. Grigsby.
- *Property Values and Race: Studies in Seven Cities*, by Luigi Laurenti.

Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Box 4068, Santa Barbara, California

Board of Directors, The Fund for the Republic, Inc. HONORARY CHAIRMAN: Paul G. Hoffman CO-CHAIRMEN: Elmo Roper, William O. Douglas VICE-CHAIRMAN: George N. Shuster Ralph E. Ablon, Harry S. Ashmore, William C. Baggs, Bruce Catton, Patrick F. Crowley, Edward P. Eichler, Mrs. Marshall Field, Crane Haussamen, Alfred E. Heller, Robert M. Hutchins, Francis J. Lally, Edward Lamb, Morris L. Levinson, M. Albert Linton, J. Howard Marshall, Seniel Ostrow, Jubal R. Parten, William M. Roth, Louis Schweitzer, Henry Pitney Van Dusen

Consultants to the Center A. A. Berle, Jr., Harrison Brown, Scott Buchanan, Eugene Burdick, William O. Douglas, Robert Gordis, Clark Kerr, Henry R. Luce, John Courtney Murray, S.J., Reinhold Niebuhr, Isidor I. Rabi, George N. Shuster

The New York Office of the Center and the Fund for the Republic: 133 East 54th Street, New York 22, New York