[MS-0234.004.016.003]

INTEGRATION, SEGREGATION, PLURALISM

DIANE RAVITCH

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

FOREWORD

This material is reprinted from THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR, Volume 45, Spring 1976. Copyright by the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa.

The National Conference of Christians and Jews is grateful to the publisher for granting permission to print in this form for use in community education forums and discussion groups.

The author, Diane Ravitch is a historian of education at Teachers College, Columbia University.

The questions for discussion which appear at the end of this booklet have been added by the NCCJ.

The NCCJ is a national organization dedicated to the elmination of intergroup prejudice and conflict through the processes of dialogue and community education.

If you desire additional information about the extensive program services available through the NCCJ please contact the regional office nearest you. A complete listing of our network of offices is on the back of this booklet.

Donald W. McEvoy, Vice President
National Program Development

INTEGRATION, SEGREGATION, PLURALISM

DIANE RAVITCH

IN 1954, WHEN THE SUPREME COURT banned state-imposed segregation, almost two dozen states had laws that regulated citizens on the basis of their race. There were laws to prevent interracial marriage, laws requiring racially separate schools, and laws to limit access to public facilities. In most southern states, wherever interracial contact might occur, there was a law to prevent or regulate it. This legal superstructure was purposeful, not haphazard. It reinforced a caste system with a code of behavior based on white supremacy. The code's primary intent was to contain and control black people. Deviant whites could sample black life at no risk other than ostracism from their own kind; blacks who stepped outside the bounds ran afoul of the law, the police, and the courts.

The unwritten rules of caste required black deference. Law or no law, a black entered a white person's home through the back door. Law or no law, black people in the deep South stepped off the sidewalk onto the street when passing a white person. In department stores, blacks could sweep the floor but not sell merchandise, in beauty shops, they could shampoo white women's hair, but not set it in curlers. If a black murdered another black in a Saturday night brawl, the police might look the other way; a black who murdered or assaulted a white sometimes did not survive the back room of the police station.

The *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, more than any other single event, destroyed the foundation of this monstrous system. Not only did it set in motion the civil rights movement, which educated blacks about their rights and political power, but it began the process of dismantling institutional segregation. After *Brown,* the Constitution, the law, and the courts could no longer be used to prop up the caste system. However haltingly and grudgingly this elementary principle has been accepted in formerly segregated states, there is no longer any doubt that the power of the state may not be employed to discriminate against people on the basis of their color.

While it is fashionable in some quarters to scoff at the *Brown* decision and to say that it changed very little, anyone who knew the South before 1954 realizes that *Brown* launched a social revolution. Twenty years ago, few blacks voted and those who did were offered a choice among white racist candidates. Today, blacks vote and wield political power; this fact has transformed the nature of southern politics and permitted the victory of

moderate and liberal candidates. It is no longer remarkable in the South to see blacks and whites patronizing the same restaurants, the same cinemas, the same shops. Deference is dead, and little is left of the caste system other than the nostalgia of unreconstructed white racists.

Still, there is concern today that a resegregation phenomenon is under way, not only in the South, but in almost every major American metropolitan area; that we are moving inexorably toward de facto apartheid, as the nation's central cities become blacker and the white suburbs grow larger. During the past two decades, vast numbers of southern blacks have moved to the cities and whites have moved out. All of America's largest cities have substantial black minorities. Some, like Atlanta, Washington, D.C., Newark, Gary, and Detroit, have black majorities. Others, like Baltimore, St. Louis, Cleveland, New Orleans, Memphis, and Birmingham, are close to 50 percent black. The suburbs that ring these cities are generally more than 90 percent white. As a result of white flight, sixteen of our twenty largest cities now have a minority of whites in their public schools.

Why are whites leaving the cities? Benjamin Mays, the black president of the Atlanta School Board, believes that "white people are unwilling to live in the same communities with Blacks. They are afraid to raise their children in close proximity to Blacks and to have them attend school with Blacks." Yet although racism is one reason for white flight, it is not the only reason. Suburbanization started long before blacks arrived in the cities in great numbers and occurs in cities where there are relatively few blacks. Some whites move to the suburbs because it represents a step up in personal status; some prefer clean air, safe streets, and small-town life. These same motives no doubt account for the suburban exodus of middle-class blacks as well.

Alongside the familiar black city-white suburb dichotomy, other facts must also be considered. For one thing, four million blacks (17 percent of the black population) now live in the suburbs, an increase of 19.5 percent in the past five years alone. The suburbs *are* permeable. Second, the black migration from the South to the urban North has not only stopped, but has reversed itself; according to the Census Bureau, blacks have been leaving the North and moving into the West and South.

These are the demographic facts, but how they are interpreted depends on the perspective of the interpreter. The integrationist sees the black concentration in the cities as the onset of a new and insidious form of racial segregation. The cultural pluralist sees the great black urban migration in the same light as previous migrations, and recalls the dire predictions that accompanied the arrival of the Irish, the Jews, and the Italians.

Integration and pluralism are both versions of assimilation, and it is worth noting that in a scant quarter-century the central issue of race has shifted from whether to segregate to whether and how to assimilate. In the early 1950s, the combined power of law and tradition limited black assimilation

to those few light-skinned Negroes who "passed" surreptitiously into the white majority. This notion of passing was rather like escaping from blackness, and it fitted in appropriately with the racist belief that blackness was a curse, not a culture.

Intimations of this disparagement of black culture come through in considering both pluralism and integration. Cultural pluralism has been discussed for most of this century, but usually in relation to white ethnic and religious groups that had a distinct cultural heritage and wanted to preserve it; the unwritten assumption seemed to be either that blacks did not have a culture worth preserving or that blacks themselves wanted to flee their racial identity. Similarly, the rhetoric of integration seemed to assume that blacks wanted to merge into the white majority and lose their racial identity. It has been said, for example, that the racial problems of America will lessen as racial intermarriages increase, which is an unsubtle way of suggesting that blacks should lose their blackness and be absorbed by the white majority.

In this country of diverse groups, problems of assimilation underlie many social and political controversies. How should society balance the needs of the common culture against the needs of particular groups? What does American nationality require of Americans? Should the requirements of nationality cancel out other loyalties in pursuit of a homogeneous citizenry? Should government encourage cultural diversity? Should government have a hands-off policy where cultural preferences are involved? Is it good or bad to have neighborhoods and schools that are distinctly Italian or Jewish or black or Oriental? Is it possible to have an American community that is both integrated and pluralistic?

These questions have been agitated for the entire two hundred years of our nationhood, but only in recent years have they fully pertained to the position of blacks. Racial segregation was, in fact, the ultimate form of state-mandated nonassimilation. Segregation set blacks apart and made them easier to exploit. Every black who grew up under legalized segregation retains vivid memories of unfair treatment, of neighborhoods with unpaved streets, of schools with broken windows and leaky roofs, of calculated and systematic disadvantage.

Since state-imposed segregation is unconstitutional, the issue today is how and on whose terms blacks should be assimilated into American society. Some Americans believe that any black concentration in schools or neighborhoods suggests segregation and must be eliminated. The heritage of segregation has implanted the prejudice that every all-black school is inferior and every black neighborhood is a slum. There are black nationalists who see any kind of assimilation as a threat to black cultural aspirations, but their numbers are few. And there are cultural pluralists who sense that their perspective has been lost in the polarized verbal duels between integrationists and separatists.

These tensions have historically been played out in educational policy.

This has happened for two reasons: first, because of the formative impact that is generally attributed to schooling, as it pertains to one's attitudes, values, skills, and opportunities; and second, because public schools are nearly universal in their reach. The great breach of state segregation came through the public schools, and, just as characteristically, the only consistent public consideration of assimilation policy has been enunciated in Supreme Court desegregation decisions.

It was the Supreme Court that made segregation illegal, and it is the Court that now mediates among the competing demands of integration and pluralism. Proceeding a step at a time, each decision following logically on the previous one, the Court has moved toward an increasingly detailed definition of how blacks are to be assimilated through the public schools. At the time of *Brown*, the Court evidently believed that striking down segregation laws would suffice to bring about desegregation. For a dozen years, lower courts in the South understood the *Brown* decision to mean that the Constitution did not require integration, but merely forbade discrimination.

However, in the decade after 1954, the southern states were so obstinate and devious in their refusal to dismantle dual school systems that the Supreme Court was forced to take a more activist role in bringing about actual desegregation. Freedom-of-choice plans that did not produce measurable desegregation were struck down by the Court in 1968 in the landmark *Green v. County School Board* case. New Kent County, Virginia, had two schools, one white and one black, and no residential segregation. Under its freedom-of-choice plan, 15 percent of the blacks attended the formerly white school, but no whites chose to go to the black school. The Supreme Court required the local school board to develop a plan that "promises realistically to work now," one that would produce "a system without a 'white' school and a 'Negro' school, but just schools."

It was simple enough in rural New Kent County to decree the elimination of racially identifiable schools. The issue became more complex in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina, another formerly de jure segregated system. Charlotte-Mecklenburg did have residential segregation, and a neighborhood school policy produced racially identifiable schools. But, following the principle in *Green* that the schools had to produce a remedy that "works now," the Court went further in *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg*, directing district judges and school authorities to "make every effort to achieve the greatest possible degree of actual desegregation." This was measured in terms of how many blacks and whites were in the same schools. The requirement had changed from desegregation, which might leave many one-race schools intact, to a conscious policy of integration, which aims to eliminate one-race schools altogether. Accordingly, "racially neutral" assignments by neighborhood were unacceptable if they left many one-race schools. So the Court told local officials to do whatever was necessary—including the use of racial quotas, the gerrymandering of districts, and the creation of non-

contiguous attendance zones—in order to redistribute the white and black pupil populations into the same schools.

Swann was the first decision in which the Supreme Court declared that the Constitution required racial dispersion in order to achieve "the greatest possible degree of actual desegregation." This formulation was derived from the philosophy of the melting pot—of public schools that bring every element of the community together and reconcile their differences into a harmonious whole. This shift, as Alexander Bickel wrote at the time, grew out of "the original ambivalence" in the *Brown* decision. On one hand, *Brown* made it unconstitutional for the state to use racial classifications, except for remedial purposes. But on the other, *Brown* held that separate schools are inherently unequal.

"The implicit idea," wrote Bickel, "was that separate public schooling, whatever the cause of it or the means by which it was enforced, is unconstitutional because the function of the public school cannot be successfully performed unless children of all groups are taught in it together." This interpretation, which interweaves a theory of society and a theory of education, came to fruition in the *Swann* case.

After *Swann,* it would be increasingly difficult to make a valid distinction between de jure and de facto segregation. Though the Court held that not every school in every community would be expected to reflect the racial composition of the school system as a whole, it made plain that school authorities would have the burden of justifying the existence of any one-race schools.

There was no reason why the logic of *Swann* should be limited to formerly de jure segregated school systems, and the *Keyes v. Denver School District No. 1* decision in 1973 proved that it would not be. In that decision the Supreme Court took the principles that had accumulated with reference to southern schools and applied them in Denver, which had never operated legally segregated schools. The Denver School Board was found to have pursued certain policies, such as zoning, site selection, staff assignment, and neighborhood schools, that had segregated 38 percent of the black school population in identifiably black schools. Having determined that segregation existed "in a substantial portion of the district," the Court declared that Denver was unconstitutionally operating a dual system of de jure segregated schools. Neither a neighborhood school policy nor the plea that the illegal actions had occurred before 1954 was an adequate defense to the charges.

After *Keyes,* civil rights lawyers understood that diligent research was likely to produce the evidence to prove that a seemingly de facto segregated school system was actually an unconstitutional de jure segregated system. A permissive transfer policy was one such piece of evidence, for it was often used by white students to transfer out of schools that were growing blacker. Assignment of minority teachers to minority schools was another indication of a de jure policy, as was a conscious decision to build a school in a minority

neighborhood. In one northern city after another, civil rights lawyers have found such evidence. In Pontiac, Michigan, school officials and real estate agents worked together to maintain racially homogeneous neighborhoods and schools; in Detroit, school attendance zones were manipulated to keep black and white students in different schools; in Boston, predominantly white schools were overcrowded while predominantly black schools had seats available.

But when such evidence has been found, it is not always certain that the policy makers intended to bring about racial segregation. In some instances, educationally valid assumptions have led to policies that were segregatory. Judges have condemned school authorities for building small schools; the district judge in Detroit held that a school for three hundred to four hundred pupils "negates opportunities to integrate, 'contains' the black population and perpetuates and compounds school segregation." But educators for at least the past decade have been saying that small schools are educationally preferable to large and impersonal schools. Another reason for small, neighborhood-based schools is to maximize parent and community involvement in the schools, a goal that most educators today believe is an essential part of the educational process. City-wide integration must be planned, administered, and enforced centrally, not locally. Parental involvement, moreover, becomes more difficult when children attend school in distant neighborhoods.

Black educators generally believe that it is educationally desirable to assign black teachers to predominantly black schools. But when judges and officials at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's Office of Civil Rights look at faculty assignments for evidence of segregation, they expect that a properly integrated system will have distributed black teachers and administrators evenly throughout the schools. A western city recruited black teachers who had been specially trained to teach in inner-city schools and promised them inner-city assignments; yet HEW officials insisted that the black teachers had to be assigned evenly throughout the system in the interests of better staff integration. Similarly, a Boston judge, Arthur Garrity, rejected the argument that black teachers and black parents had requested assignment of minority staff to minority schools; the practice was unconstitutional, "whatever may be the desires of black teachers or parents."

What has become incredibly vague in the past several years is the precise meaning of "segregation," "desegregation," and "integration." In 1954, a segregated school system was one in which the state required or permitted separation of pupils on the basis of race. Black children were bused past white schools to attend distant black schools, and whites were similarly bused to white schools. Desegregation in 1954 appeared to mean that schools had to be color-blind and to accept whoever lived nearby or wanted to attend, regardless of race or color.

But since the *Swann* decision, the Supreme Court has specifically rejected a color-blind policy or any other policy that is apparently racially neutral, if such policies leave large numbers of racially identifiable schools intact. Given this standard, district courts have understood a segregated school to be one that is not racially balanced in terms of the entire district.

Thus, in Boston, Judge Garrity held that any school that deviated by more than 10 percent from the city-wide white-black pupil ratio of 61—32 percent was a segregated school. He found: "At least 80 percent of Boston's schools are segregated in the sense that their racial compositions are sharply out of line with the racial composition of the Boston public school system as a whole." A segregated school, under this definition, included a school that is 60 percent black and 40 percent white; technically, it would even include a school that was 50—50.

The logic of the racial balance definition reached the heights of absurdity in Detroit. Detroit's schools are presently 71 percent black. After the Supreme Court overruled a district court's merger of Detroit with nearby suburban school systems, the problem of desegregating Detroit itself was returned to a lower court. The NAACP proposed that every school have approximately 71 percent black children, and that any school varying by more than 15 percent would be considered segregated. The district judge turned down this plan as "rigid and inflexible...treating [pupils] as pigmented pawns to be shuffled about and counted solely to achieve an abstraction called 'racial mix.' " Under the plaintiffs' plan, he pointed out, a school that was 55 percent black would be considered a "racially identifiable white" school, while a school that was 85 percent black would be desegregated.

Massachusetts and New York states have defined a school that is composed of more than 50 percent minority pupils as a "racially imbalanced" school. State officials have taken the position that a racially imbalanced school is incapable of providing equal educational opportunity. In policy terms, this means that any school that is more than 50 percent black and/or Hispanic is an inferior school. From this perspective, real integration requires both racial balance and a white majority. Courts can order racial balance, but few major cities still have a white pupil majority.

As the black pupil population has grown in the cities, civil rights groups have urged that a segregated school is one where the racial balance varies sharply from the racial composition of the metropolitan area as a whole. When the Supreme Court refused to merge Detroit with its surrounding suburbs, it was because there had been no evidence that the suburban districts had practiced racially exclusionary policies. Civil rights lawyers believe they will be able to document segregatory practices on both sides of the city-suburban lines and will sooner or later win metropolitan-wide integration orders in northern cities. This would involve cross-district exchanges of black and white pupils and would make it possible to eliminate predominantly black schools.

The policy that the civil rights lawyers seek, and one that the reasoning of recent Supreme Court decisions appears to support, is a policy of governmentally mandated racial dispersion. During the past several years, and especially since the *Swann* decision, the Supreme Court appears to have declared that the law of the land supports the ideals of the melting pot.

The melting pot has been a strong and recurrent ideal in American history. It sets forth the hope that America would take the people of all nations and races and blend them together into a new and harmonious race. This new race of people would shed their ancient allegiances, rivalries, languages, and customs. "The melting and intermixture" of diverse nations, tribes, and races, in Ralph Waldo Emerson's words, would produce "a new race, a new religion, a new state, a new literature." According to Frederick Jackson Turner, it offered "the possibility of a newer and richer civilization. . . a new product, which held the promise of world brotherhood."

The melting-pot theory has always had its critics. In recent years, they have been divided between those who contend that it never worked and those who fear that it worked all too well. The former maintain that social planners should acknowledge the persistence and vitality of ethnicity in American life; the latter hold that the homogenization of American society has bred rootlessness, culturelessness, and anomie. Nearly all the critics agree that public policy should encourage cultural diversity.

The principle of cultural pluralism is as thoroughly American as the melting-pot idea. What pluralism means in practice is that diverse groups have the right to be left alone, so long as their members fulfill the basic obligations of citizenship. The state, in other words, cannot compel people to "melt," either culturally or racially. John Dewey described the American concept of pluralism as "a complete separation of nationality from citizenship. Not only have we separated language, cultural traditions, all that is called a race, from the state—that is, from problems of political organization and power. To us language, literature, creed, group ways, national culture, are social rather than political, human rather than national, interests."

How do these basic principles—the melting pot and cultural pluralism—apply to the issue of school integration? They are at the heart of the issue, but they mean different things to different people.

To those who support a policy of racial dispersion, the alternatives available are either integration or segregation; anything less is construed as a rationale for continuing the caste system. "The newly excited self-consciousness of 'white ethnics' is nothing more than a fresh awareness of what the institutions and customs of American society, including the segregated schools, have taught them from childhood, namely that the United States of American is a white man's country," wrote a white NAACP official recently. "Desegregation is not the answer. It merely brings the races together; it does not supply the cement for a single society." The goal is "a pluralistic unitary society." From this perspective, the ideal school system would be one in

which blacks and whites were evenly dispersed throughout a large metropolitan area so that no school could be stigmatized as a one-race school. This was the Supreme Court's assumption in the *Swann* decision, and it is the principle that the NAACP hopes to establish eventually in northern cities as well. The underlying social ideal is the melting-pot theory, the belief that in a truly free and nondiscriminatory society people would tend to settle in racially and ethnically mixed neighborhoods. Wherever they have not, runs the argument, it is only because of the workings of overt or covert patterns of discrimination, which government must remedy.

The pluralist response is that people must be permitted to cluster in whatever way they choose, even if it results in some one-race schools. So long as distinct neighborhoods and racially identifiable schools are not the consequence of any state action, argues the pluralist, then neither the schools nor the neighborhoods should be considered segregated in a legal sense. It is government's role to assure equal access to housing and schools and to remedy particular instances of discrimination, but it is not government's role to require specific percentages of racial mixing in neighborhoods or schools.

Each side believes the other to be racist, and both are at least partly right. The pluralist argument could be exploited by those who just do not want blacks to live in their neighborhood or go to their children's schools. The dispersionist argument is popularly understood to mean that predominantly black schools are inferior and that black students cannot learn unless they are in a predominantly white milieu. Unhappily, in a country with a history of slavery and Jim Crow institutions, either a policy of mandatory racial dispersion or a policy of color-blindness has racist overtones; that is the burden of the past.

When Americans urge one concept or the other on the public schools, they usually have in mind a certain kind of society that the schools are supposed to produce. Since American society is made up of hundreds, perhaps thousands, of different cultures and subcultures, the schools are incessantly torn between pressures to enforce unity and pressures to reinforce diversity.

The danger of extreme versions of either cultural separatism or monism must be recognized. A society in which pluralism reigns supreme verges on disintegration and anarchy, while a society that employs its schools to stamp out diversity moves toward totalitarianism. Reconciling these values is difficult but not impossible. Public schools should not become the vehicles for particular racial, religious, or ethnic groups. Those who want to teach the superiority of their cultural heritage should do so voluntarily. The public schools, as Robert Hutchins has written, "are dedicated to the maintenance and improvement of the public thing, the *res publica;* they are the common schools of the commonwealth, the political community." It is their primary task to prepare citizens who are capable of reading, thinking, discussing, participating, and voting.

The school can respect group differences while enabling its students to perceive the common concerns that transcend group and sectional barriers. The school will be better able to teach common understanding and shared values if it is not homogeneous. To the extent that it is demographically feasible, schools should bring children of different backgrounds together. This could come about if the education profession considered intercultural comity as vital a goal as small classes and good test scores, and if government agencies developed long-range policies to encourage and maintain stable, integrated neighborhoods. Ingenious educators, relying more on persuasion and incentives than on coercion, could devise a variety of special programs to connect public and private schools, city and suburban schools. No one should be made to feel, as a result of government action, that his school and his community are "no good."

In this murky period, while courts ponder and politicians quaver, there is a political consideration that has not escaped some black leaders. If blacks were distributed evenly across America and made up approximately 12 percent of every city, town, and hamlet, they would have little political power. Blacks, like the Irish and Italians before them, have won political office where there are sizable black concentrations. Blacks are aware that other groups have used political power to attain economic power. To be dispersed is to be placed in the role of a permanent dependent, a perpetual minority.

This realization, plus a growing awareness that desegregation is not necessarily linked to higher academic achievement, has caused many black politicians, leaders, and scholars to criticize the civil rights lawyers' single-minded pursuit of city-suburban mergers. Atlanta's black leadership, now in control of the city government and the school administration, has no interest in diluting its base of political power. Charles Hamilton, a professor of political science at Columbia and successor to integrationist Kenneth Clark as president of the Metropolitan Applied Research Center, testified against busing before a congressional committee; Hamilton believes that blacks need economic and political self-sufficiency more than they need racially balanced schools.

Derrick Bell, professor of law at Harvard and a former civil rights lawyer, has written that civil rights lawyers have not adjusted their tactics to take into account the demographic changes since 1954. While they press unswervingly for racial balance, the cities get blacker and the educational needs of black children are ignored. Ronald Edmonds, director of the Center for Urban Studies at Harvard's Graduate School of Education, has complained that desegregation orders frequently deny black parents the right to make educational choices for their children. Howard University's Kenneth Tollett, while approving of desegregation initiatives in elementary and secondary schools, fears that the next legal onslaught will imperil black colleges and

universities, which continue to serve important educational, psychological, and cultural functions for blacks. Economist Thomas Sowell of UCLA holds that it is untrue that black schools are inherently unequal; he maintains that excellence has nothing to do with ethnicity.

Those blacks who are critical of the current thrust of the integration movement are not separatists; they are professionals who move in a racially mixed world and who value integration. They share a common fear that black institutions will be stigmatized by the implicit insult that whatever is black is inferior. They have been groping for language to express their views without giving aid and comfort to the George Wallaces and Louise Day Hickses of America. The idea that blacks should reject black institutions has been so deeply ingrained that most of the critics feel they must apologize for appearing to be disloyal to the spirit of *Brown*. Each in his own way has been trying to evolve a pluralist position for blacks that grants black institutions and organizations the same legitimacy as is accorded those of other ethnic groups, without in any way diminishing the opportunity for full interracial contact. "We will not be free," says Charles Hamilton, "until we have freed ourselves of the mentality of dependency. We must no longer be white America's permanent ward and favorite cause."

The emergence of thoughtful dissent among blacks is perhaps the healthiest trend in the evolution of race relations in America. So long as the question of assimilation is resolved by whites on behalf of blacks, then blacks remain in a subordinate, unequal position. It is blacks who must decide on what terms they wish to relate to other members of American society. The present debate among blacks about how, when, and whether to be integrated is likely to end not in unanimity but in a diversity of responses. Some will want to live in predominantly white worlds, others will not. The role of government must not be to choose a "right" answer, but to preserve the same options for blacks that are now available to everyone else.

EDUCATING NCCJ FOR BROTHERHOOD

Questions for Group Discussion

1. How does the concept of racial segregation imposed by the State violate the constitutional guarantees of equal protection of the law? How does it violate freedom of speech? How does it violate freedom of movement?

2. How has the United States Supreme Court decision in the case of Brown v. Board of Education (May, 1954) changed racial practices in public education?

3. How have the courts varied in prescribing for the way by which school desegregation is to be achieved?

   a. What is the "elimination of racially identifiable schools"?

   b. What is racial balance?

   c. What is racial dispersion?

4. What is the difference between "de facto" segregation and "de jure" segregation? Under what conditions have the courts decided that "de facto" school segregation is actually "de jure" segregation?

5. Is it true, as some observers of the social scene contend, that "de facto" segregation is on the increase in America?

6. How does residential segregation (the movement of black and Hispanic peoples to the inner cities and the movement of whites to the suburbs) affect the trend toward "de facto" segregation? What are the reasons for these population shifts? How do they affect the racial composition of the school population in an area?

7. How does the theory of cultural pluralism differ from the "melting pot" theory?

8. What are the implications of these terms for the desegregation-integration of public schools?

9. The author of this article has posed a series of provocative questions of her own. They are:

a. "How should society balance the needs of the common culture against the needs of particular groups?"

b. "What does American nationality require of Americans?"

c. "Should the requirements of nationality cancel out other loyalties in pursuit of a homogeneous citizenry?"

d. "Should government encourage cultural diversity?"

e. "Should government have a hands-off policy where cultural preferences are involved?"

f. "Is it good or bad to have neighborhoods and schools that are distinctly Italian or Jewish or Black or Oriental?"

g. "Is it possible to have an American community that is both integrated and pluralistic?"

10. How does racial dispersion affect the socio-economic, political power-base of minority groups?

11. What are the criticisms of current school desegregation trends which are voiced by *some* black professionals who are committed to the achievement of civil rights for all people? What do you think of the validity of these criticisms?

WHAT IS THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS?

The NCCJ is a non-profit human relations organization engaged in a nationwide program of intergoup education to eliminate prejudice and discrimination. Founded in 1928, the NCCJ works to build bridges of understanding among all groups, to bring the forces of enlightenment and education to bear upon racial and religious prejudice, and to achieve implementation of the moral law: giving to others the same rights and respect we desire for ourselves. It enlists all those, who without compromise of conscience or of their distinctive commitments, work to build better relationships among persons of all religions, races and nationalities.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

43 West 57th Street **New York, N.Y. 10019**

NATIONAL CHAIRMEN

Irving Mitchell Felt, Chairman, Executive Board
Chairman of the Board,
Madison Square Garden Corp.

William F. May, Co-Chairman
Chairman of the Board
American Can Company

Robert D. Murphy, Co-Chairman
Honorary Chairman of the Board
Corning Glass International

Nicholas V. Petrou, Co-Chairman
Executive Vice President
Westinghouse Electric Corp.

Oscar S. Straus II, Co-Chairman
General Partner
Straus Minerals

Dr. David Hyatt, President
National Conference of Christians and Jews

Oscar M. Lazrus, Secretary
Business and Civic Leader

Lawrence H. Bober, Treasurer
Senior Vice President, Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company

Walter W. Craigie, Sr., Vice Chairman and Chairman-Finance
Craigie, Mason-Hagan

ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. 87110
P.O. Box 3165

ATLANTA, GA. 30303
1022 First Federal Bldg.

BALTIMORE, MD. 21202
300 Equitable Bldg.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA. 35203
1720 City Federal Bldg

BOSTON, MASS. 02108
88 Tremont Street, Room 610

BRONX-WESTCHESTER
175 Main St.
White Plains, N.Y. 10601

BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11201
105 Court Street

BUFFALO, N.Y. 14202
235 Hotel Statler-Hilton

CHARLOTTE, N.C. 28204
P.O. Box 4436
1709 Fountain View

CHICAGO, ILL. 60601
203 No. Wabash Ave.

CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202
1331 Enquirer Bldg.
617 Vine St.

CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114
304 Investment Ins. Bldg.
601 Rockwell Ave.

DALLAS, TEXAS 75206
401 Merchant State Bank Bldg.

DENVER, COLO. 80202
466 Insurance Exchange Bldg.

DES MOINES, IOWA 50309
1002 Fleming Bldg.

DETROIT, MICH. 48202
150 W. Boston Blvd.

EASTERN, PA.
43 West 57th St.
New York, N.Y. 10019

EL PASO, TEXAS 79902
409 Executive Center Blvd.
Suite 202

FORT WORTH, TEXAS 76102
1803 First United Bldg.

GREENSBORO, N.C. 27401
515 Southeastern Bldg.

HARTFORD, CONN. 06103
111 Pearl Street

HOUSTON, TEXAS 77027
4848 Guiton

INDIANAPOLIS, IND. 46206
P.O. Box 971

JACKSONVILLE, FLA. 32208
2100 Grand St.

JAMESTOWN, N.Y. 14701
11 Dewey Place

KANSAS CITY, MO. 64106
306 E. 12th St., Suite 530

KNOXVILLE, TENN. 37919
5305 Kingston Pike

LANCASTER, PA. 17602
508 N. Duke St.

LAS VEGAS, NEV. 89109
4220 S. Maryland Pkwy., Suite 304

LITTLE ROCK, ARK. 72201
950 Tower Building

LONG BEACH, CALIF. 90815
6711 East 9th St.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF. 90010
3460 Wilshire Boulevard
Suite 1012

LOUISVILLE, KY. 40202
305 West Broadway, Suite 407

MANCHESTER, N.H. 03101
323 Franklin St., Suite 1151

MEMPHIS, TENN. 38103
512 Falls Bldg.

MIAMI, FLA. 33156
9300 South Dadeland Blvd.
Suite 511

MILWAUKEE, WISC. 53202
759 N. Milwaukee St.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN. 55402
413 National Bldg.
527 Second Ave. South

NASHVILLE, TENN. 37215
3716 Hillsboro Rd.
Room 305, Coleman Bldg.

NASSAU-SUFFOLK REGION
249-12 Jericho Turnpike
Bellerose, N.Y. 11426

NEWARK, N.J. 07101
50 Park Place, Suite 1040

NEW ORLEANS, LA. 70130
612 International Bldg.

NEW YORK, N.Y. 10019
43 West 57th St.

NIAGARA FALLS, N.Y.
330 Niagara Street
Lewiston, N.Y. 14092

NORFOLK, VA. 23509
701 Roland Drive

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA. 73102
2025 Liberty Tower

OMAHA, NEB. 68105
423 The Center Bldg.

PHILADELPHIA, PA. 19102
1411 Walnut St.
Suite 925

PHOENIX, ARIZ. 85003
11 West Jefferson, Room 624

PITTSBURGH, PA. 15219
525 William Penn Place
Suite 3614

PORTLAND, ORE. 97204
506 S. W. Sixth
Suite 901

PROVIDENCE, R.I. 02906
221 Waterman St.

QUEENS, N.Y.
249-12 Jericho Turnpike
Bellerose, N.Y. 11426

RENO, NEVADA 89501
150 North Center, Room 202

RICHMOND, VA. 23230
2317 Westwood Ave.
P.O. Box 6501

ST. LOUIS, MO. 63101
721 Olive St., Room 915

SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS 78205
118 Braodway, Suite 623

SAN DIEGO, CALIF. 92101
Suite 541 U.S. Grant Hotel
326 Broadway

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF. 94103
703 Market Street, Suite 809

SAN JOSE, CALIF. 95112
601 No. 1st St., Room 203

SARASOTA, FL. 33577
605 Sutton Place

SEATTLE, WASH. 98101
1411 4th Ave. Bldg., Suite 620

SHREVEPORT, LA. 71106
519 Huron St.

TACOMA-PIERCE COUNTY CHAPTER
10921 Greendale Dr. S. W.
Tacoma, WA. 98498

TAMPA, FLA. 33602
308 Tampa St., Rm. 341

TULSA OKLA. 74127
309 Center Bldg.
630 W. 7th

UPPER NEW YORK STATE
43 West 57th St.
New York, N.Y. 10019

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005
1425 H St., N.W.
735 Southern Bldg.

WICHITA, KANS. 67202
512 Insurance Bldg.
212 N. Market

WILLIAMSPORT, PA. 17701
2151 Loyalsock Drive

CANADIAN COUNCIL OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS
229 Yonge St., Toronto, Canada

HAR-2M (11-76)