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PSYCHIATRIC ASPECTS OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

I. INTRODUCTION

“A social revolution with profound implications for domestic accord and world leadership confronts this country today.

“The problem involves the dramatic legal and social adjustments facing the South as a result of the Supreme Court decision that public school racial segregation laws are unconstitutional.

“However, the tensions that have arisen in the region underscore the fact that the problem has national dimensions. And they show that the problem must be resolved in terms of the actions, attitudes and behavior of the entire country.”

Desegregation is not merely a legal problem; it is also a social problem, an economic one, and above all, a psychological one. Were it not for the irrational fears and prejudice associated with it in the minds of many Americans both in the North and in the South, the legal, economic, and social difficulties accompanying admission of Negroes to full equality of citizenship would be possible of solution. In approaching this particular problem, however, cooperative efforts at arriving at a solution are handicapped by the violent feelings which are involved.

This report is written for the purpose of discussing some of the psychological aspects of desegregation with special attention to the problems of adjustment for both races in the hope that better understanding will facilitate use of our intellectual and social skills in their solution. We cannot hope to speak with equal clarity and relevant detail to all those who are involved in this big social undertaking. Because of our own specialized professional training and experience, it seems appropriate to address ourselves primarily to

those who have professional responsibility for carrying out the Supreme Court’s decision—the educators, counselors, social workers, psychologists, and administrators of the schools. More specifically, we are writing this report mainly for those members of these professions of whom we can assume familiarity with psychological concepts and their assimilation into practice. We hope that psychiatrists and other physicians in communities that are struggling with the emotional and practical problems attendant upon desegregation will also read and make use of this report. Those parents who have been roused by the present critical issue to reconsider their own attitudes and to decide how they will participate with the schools may also find it useful.

Emphasis on psychiatric principles

In general, our emphasis will be on relevant psychiatric principles rather than on their practical application. We leave that task to those of our readers who are better qualified for it by virtue of their direct on-the-job contact with the concrete situations to be met. Nor is this a report of a research study. It represents, rather, the pooled experience of an intergroup audience of psychiatrists from different parts of the country, aided by consultant social scientists, who have worked over the years in a variety of ways in the general area of intergroup relations.  

In our view psychiatry concerns itself with the study of all human behavior, not merely with the study and treatment of the maladjusted. Such activities as community psychiatry and preventive psychiatry must be based upon knowledge of normal human development and behavior.

Before undertaking this report the authors assigned themselves to study certain desegregating situations for preparatory orientation; in a few cases the preparation was carried out as part of a systematic research project.

Desegregation as a process

School segregation has been declared illegal throughout the country. There is thus no question of whether or not desegregation will occur. It is already occurring. The authors of the report are in general agreement as to the wisdom and justice of discontinuing segregation practices of all kinds in this country. What we observe in various parts of the country are different stages in the occurrence of desegregation. In some communities changes have already taken place and the population is in the process of adapting itself to the new circumstances. More than 300,000 Negro children who for...

2The members of the Committee wish to express their great indebtedness to Drs. Stuart Cook, Marie Jahoda, and Fritz Redl who, as consultants, have been full participants in the group in preparing this report. Our thanks are also due to Dr. Gordon Hamilton and to Dr. Robert Johanson whom we have consulted during the course of this work.

Most of the members of the Committee preparing this report have treated both Negro and white patients from both the North and South by psychoanalysis and psychotherapy. Many have served as psychiatric consultants to interracial clinics, social agencies, and educational institutions. Dr. Lief, with assistance from Drs. Stevens and Handler, is engaged in an inter-disciplinary research study at Tulane University of Negro personality structure in New Orleans, and a follow-up study of “Children of Bondage.” Dr. Babcock, while on the staff of the Chicago Institute for Psychoanalysis, was a member of a multidiscipline group which studied problems of a minority group (Japanese Americans) in the process of acculturation. Other Committee members and consultants have participated in various research projects involving race relations.

erly attended segregated schools have already entered mixed classes or have become eligible to do so since the Supreme Court decision. Since Negro children are usually in the minority in desegregating schools, several times that many white children have therefore recently had their first contacts with Negroes in school. In communities where the changes are still seen as remote, or even impossible, adjustments nevertheless are being made to the new situation created by the Supreme Court's decision. Even in their opposition to desegregation, members of some communities may actually be working through one phase of the whole process. Thus, much of what will be said in the following pages should be considered in relation to the fact that different communities have different problems created by the particular stages of desegregation through which they are passing.

Many social changes in Negro-white relations had occurred in this country before the Supreme Court's decisions on segregation. In many areas trends toward "voluntary" desegregation had appeared. State and local anti-segregation legislation of various kinds had been enacted throughout sections of the North. Negroes were asserting their rights as a group. For many years they had largely followed the advice of Booker T. Washington to advance themselves individually, but not as a group. Referring to his address in 1884 before the National Educational Association, Washington writes: "... I said that any individual who ... learned to do a common thing in an uncommon manner had solved his problem, regardless of the colour of his skin. ... That the whole future of the Negro rested largely upon the question as to whether or not he should make himself, through his skill, intelligence and character, of such undeniable value to the community in which he lived that the community could not dispense with his presence. ..."55 Negroes came to learn that this wisdom was compatible with efforts for group betterment and were increasingly helping each other toward the equality of opportunity to which they felt entitled. Meanwhile, among a growing proportion of the nation's white population, opposition to segregation was gaining strength. Thus it happened that the Supreme Court's decision voiced a trend as much as it caused one. It hastened the march of events by accelerating processes which began long ago.

There is undeniably strong personal involvement on the part of those favoring and opposing desegregation. One index, although by no means the only one, to the significance of the subject of desegregation is provided by the strength of feelings aroused by the issue. What seems to an objective observer to be the immediate realistic personal interests of an involved individual may be sacrificed irrationally in the service of one or another position on the issue. Some have taken strong stands for desegregation even when this incurred economic sanctions and ensuing hardships. Conversely, others have openly defied the laws and thereby risked arrest and punishment. Moreover, people everywhere are aroused to the strongest emotions when the matter is discussed. The heat which has been engendered is not a simple, rational reaction to the desegregation issue. As usually happens with social issues, a single "cause" has served as a focus and rallying point for many kinds of grievances. These range from states' rights and the relative economic deprivation of the South, through a gamut of actual or fancied personal, social, and political inequities.

On the other hand, it would be in error to regard desegregation as a purely sectional issue with uniform sectional attitudes. Laws and customs affecting racial relationships vary in different parts of the country. But the basic issue of equal rights for Negroes and whites exists everywhere, although the related local problems to be solved vary in kind and in urgency. To speak of a Southern attitude as against a Northern attitude is incorrect. Anti-Negro discrimination and prejudice of course exist among northerners, and there are many segregated schools in the North.6 In the South there are many elements with many opinions. Among those opposed to desegregation there are many different degrees of opposition. And opponents of desegregation form only a portion of the Southern communities. Many white people in the South favor desegregation, though they may vary in how openly they express this. Southern Negroes, even though not always so acknowledged, comprise a big part of the Southern citizenry, largely in favor of desegregation. Therefore, Negro sentiment about desegregation must be included in any assessment of Southern opinion on the subject. As the late President

---


of Fisk University has said: "Of all the voices raised in this crisis the one most ignored has been that of the Southern Negro." Similarly, communities throughout the rest of the nation are composed of a number of different subgroups with differing attitudes and behavior with regard to desegregation.

**Psychosocial ills arising from segregation**

What are the psychosocial ills springing from the maintenance of segregation in the United States? They can be considered on three levels: that of the individual, that of the community group and its institutions, and that of the country as a whole.

**The individual.** Wherever segregation occurs, one group, in this instance Negroes, always suffers from inferior social status. The damaging effects of this are reflected in unrealistic inferiority feelings, a sense of humiliation, and constriction of potentialities for self-development. This often results in a pattern of self-hatred and rejection of one’s own group, sometimes expressed by antisocial action toward one’s own group or the dominant group. These attitudes seriously affect the levels of aspiration, the capacity to learn, and the capacity to relate in interpersonal situations.

For the segregating group, in this case the whites, the reactions, though less obvious, are nonetheless serious. A feeling of superior personal worth may be gained merely from the existence of a downgraded group. This leads to an unrealistic and unadaptive kind of self-appraisal based on invidious comparison rather than on solid personal growth and achievement. Further, socially sanctioned segregation is based on unproven concepts of superiority and permits and even encourages the expression of hostile or aggressive feelings against whole groups of people. It fosters a distortion of reality and provides a target in the lower status group for the projection of painful feelings from one's self or from significant people.

---


2(A). Appendix to Appellant's Briefs “The Effects of Segregation and the Consequences of Desegregation: A Social Science Statement” (United States Supreme Court, October 1953).


(D). McLean, op. cit., 159-166.
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in the immediate environment onto the members of the segregated group. Anxiety springing from unrelated personal problems may thus be combated by inappropriate displacement of the conflictful feelings to the area of race relations. Such displacement impedes more direct and mature facing and dealing with the actual anxiety-arousing conflicts.

**The community.** The social circumstances from which segregation developed produce a vicious cycle. The cultural consequences of segregation in turn serve to maintain segregation. Thus, the institution of separate schools for Negroes is both an expression of their lower cultural status and a factor in further depressing their economic and educational levels as compared to whites. Similarly, such aspects of social disorganization as high disease and death rates, some types of crime and delinquency, poor housing, substandard living conditions, and disrupted or poorly organized family life are directly related to segregation, lack of social prestige, and restriction of educational and economic opportunities.

These social ills, however, do not remain confined to the segregated segment of a population; they inevitably lower the level of well-being for the community as a whole. For example, where a local government must provide duplicate sets of "separate but equal" health, welfare, and educational services, the budget for each must be lowered by the expense of the other. If disease-conducive housing and poor health services lead to high rates of communicable disease among a town's Negroes, the white group is jeopardized as well since contact between social unequals, such as menial and boss, is just as infectious as between schoolmates. Contagiousness does not discriminate. Furthermore, segregation limits communication between the two groups. Rigid stereotypes are thus perpetuated and may promote a social climate leading to violent outbreaks of racial tension. Although some transitional intensification of racial tension is to be expected in certain quarters from the change to desegregation, it seems socially safer, in the long run, to undergo some rela-
tively limited and temporary stress than to endure a chronic state of widespread racial tension. It is important, of course, that the community use all possible means to circumscribe and reduce such stress reactions as they arise so as to prevent their extension and secondary complications.

The country. For the country as a whole, the existence of segregation as an unsolved conflict leads to a chronic state of tension. The consequent ill feeling and disunity drain off energies that might otherwise be applied to more constructive activities, both at home and abroad. The situation resembles that of a person in the throes of a neurotic conflict who is consequent hampered in productive living. In a psychiatric sense, the existence of segregation entails disintegration for the nation. The existence of a large proportion of our population in an economically, educationally, and socially underdeveloped state robs the country as a whole of a substantial part of its human resources. And segregation looms large in other countries' view of the United States. It is extremely damaging to our prestige and friendships abroad, especially among the non-white people of the world.

Yet it would be a serious error to suppose that the only emotional forces between white and Negro in our country are hostile ones. There are also very strong positive attachments between the members of the two races. The fostering of such attachments may eventually release energy now wasted in conflict for use in the betterment of both races.

Attitudes not necessarily pathological

To conceive of segregation as pathogenic—that is, contributing to maladjustment—is by no means to imply that all those who believe in and advocate segregation are themselves maladjusted or otherwise psychiatrically abnormal. Obviously, many persons in the United States who are free from psychiatric disorders strongly favor segregation for many kinds of reasons. These range from desires for economic and political power, to sincere conviction that continued segregation is the soundest solution to the problem of Negro-white relations. There are also people who manipulate forces for segregation, not from conviction, but for deliberately calculated reasons of material gain. The approach to such motivations is outside the reach of this report. When pro-segregation opinion is based on reasoning and experience, it is up to the integrationist to show why such conclusions are in error, and to point out how some inevitable short-term stresses occurring in the transition from segregation to desegregation should not be taken as evidence against the social feasibility or desirability of desegregation in the long run. It has been demonstrated that continuance of segregation creates more social ills than it cures. If such evidence can be brought to the attention of the socially-minded segregationists, it should help to modify some opinions which are not too fixed by emotional conflicts and early conditioning.

However, there is in all of us an element of the irrational. We continue as adults to hold to the prejudices with which we have been raised, and we resort to them with increased intensity under certain sets of psychological conditions. This report will discuss such psychiatric aspects of prejudice in a later section.

Finally, there are a certain number of maladjusted, seriously insecure or anxiety-ridden people who are much more completely in the grip of prejudiced thinking than the average, and who need to retain their prejudices to serve as defenses against their own inner feelings of lack of worth. From this group, on the whole, come the more irrational and violent denunciations and threats regarding the consequences of desegregation. From a psychiatric point of view, the prejudiced attitudes of this group of segregationists reflect emotional disorder, for which the most appropriate remedy would be psychotherapy.

While the existence of prejudice may be a symptom of emotional disorder and should then be treated as such, our main emphasis in this report is rather on what contributions the dynamic understanding of behavior—of individuals and groups—can make to desegregation as a part of daily living. In this context it is well to point out that desegregation problems are by no means confined to Negro-white relationships. In many regions of the country parts of the population are endeavoring to integrate with other groups in school and community living, as in California with Asians and Mexicans, or

---


11Perhaps not since the Declaration of Independence has a public federal document stressed the importance of personal feelings as an item of political consideration. The Supreme Court decision was in part based on personal, psychological, and sociological data showing that segregation constitutes a psychological and personal handicap.
in Alaska with Eskimos. In some such situations language differences provide an additional handicap. Our other main point of emphasis will be the discussion of the difficulties standing in the way of solution of such problems, together with some consideration of possible psychiatric contributions to dealing with them.

Throughout this report we address ourselves to two different kinds of attitudinal situations, with respect to public school desegregation. In order to avoid confusion it seems desirable that the distinction be made explicit. On the one hand, where desegregation has not yet begun, we attempt to analyze some of the psychological barriers and how they may be reduced, in order that desegregation can get underway. In such communities, where actual experience with racially mixed public schooling is lacking, the reactions that stir the Negro and white residents so deeply are essentially anticipatory. On the other hand, in those situations where school desegregation has been started, although at different rates and in different ways, our focus is on the psychological problems that arise in the carrying out of such programs, and on their resolution. In these circumstances, the reactions of Negroes and whites are essentially influenced by their actual experience with some form of school desegregation.

Both sets of reactions—to the prospect of desegregation and to its actual occurrence—affect each other, however, and may be conceived of as really stages of a single process. For fearful and unrealistic anticipation, carried over into the new experience of school desegregation, accounts for many of the psychological problems that arise among children and adults of both races when desegregation actually begins. And conversely, initial expectations can be altered by intergroup experience in the preparatory stages even before any classroom integration has started. This is evident in those Southern communities which have decided to comply with the

---

12A fellow member of GAP, Dr. Bryant Wedge of Yale University recalls his observations, a few years ago, of the educational mixing of races in Hawaii. "There, at all levels of education, from nursery school through the university, and from the smallest country school to the fanciest private school, there existed no racial bar of any kind. The classes were mixed in most of the schools, with Caucasians, Japanese, Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians, Chinese, Filipinos, East Indians, and a few Negroes. I had considerable experience with some of these schools, both on the public school and university level, in both of which I lectured, and I can unequivocably say that the general level of school mental health compared favorably with that in any uni-racially populated school system with which I have had acquaintance."
II. PSYCHODYNAMICS OF RESPONSES TO DESSEGREGATION

A. Functions of Racial Myths and Prejudices

To better understand the problems of adjustment to desegregation which confront previously segregated white and Negro persons, it is helpful to examine some of the implications of their having lived under conditions of enforced segregation. People bring with them to the desegregation experience many beliefs and feelings that are, in part, a consequence of the type of society in which they have spent their childhoods and in which they have formed the social relationships that characterize their adult lives. Some of these beliefs and feelings are related to the real social and economic differences between Negroes and whites which have prevailed in the previously segregated community. Others are associated with the racial myths that have grown up under such conditions.

In dealing with Negroes, white Americans by and large react as an in-group to an out-group; a mythology has sprung up to rationalize and justify disparaging attitudes which, in turn, are derived from diverse sources not clearly recognized and understood. Such myths are not limited to beliefs about Negroes. For instance there are the beliefs that all French are lascivious, all Englishmen are stuffed shirts, all Jews are greedy for money, and all Scots are misers, or, from the point of view of a European, all Americans are immature. Perhaps some Americans displace on to the race issue, or the stranger, an indirect protest (which they would be ashamed to acknowledge openly even to themselves) against what they misinterpret as a requirement of democratic culture, i.e., that they must make friends equally with all neighbors, classmates, etc. on that basis alone, regardless of whether they have anything in common or not. Such people need reassurance that, of course, the choice of personal friendships is consistent with the democratic form of living, but that the selection does not depend on racial but on other qualities.

Myths as a defense

In the developmental history of the individual, and in the history of groups and larger social entities, conflictual and highly complicated situations occur which may appear insoluble. As these threaten individual or group security, they create anxiety. They then stimulate defensive reactions intended to diminish the anxiety. One common type of defensive reaction is myth formation. In the psychic economy a myth provides an apparently rational answer to an apparently insoluble problem. Such myths are maintained without regard to any demonstrable validity. Resisting change, they have deep roots in individual childhood experience and are sustained by ongoing social and economic forces.

It is a commonly observed fact, both in the psychiatric consulting room and in daily life, that a person's prejudiced attitudes and their accompanying myths may fluctuate in degree of belief and in emotional intensity with his level of anxiety, latent or overt. During times of ease or inner peace, prejudices lie quiescent, only to burst forth with renewed intensity when security is disturbed. There are many sources of anxiety, both in the individual and in the group: a feeling of helplessness, of conflict, of not knowing how to go about solving a problem, or being unable either to approach the problem because of inner defenses which forbid it, or even to acknowledge the existence of a problem because of still deeper defensive reactions.

In terms of racial myths, the Negro is often depicted as little better than a savage animal, intellectually and morally inferior, childish and irresponsible, and supposedly unable to control allegedly excessive sexual and aggressive impulses.

Effect on Negro-white relationships

These concepts both originate in and secondarily give rise to fears which then affect the relationship between Negroes and whites on three main levels. First, they affect the structure and arrangements for intergroup living with all the attendant socio-economic and political realities that these entail. Second, they enter into the dealings with each other in one-to-one relationships. Thirdly, they affect the thoughts and feelings experienced by individuals.

Group relationships. Enforced segregation of Negro and white Americans has been accompanied by a generally recognized difference in the social status of the two groups. Merely by reason
of his membership in the white group, an individual is accorded certain social privileges, and experiences the sense of being "better" or higher class. Conversely, by mere reason of membership in (or assignment to) the Negro group, one is deprived of these privileges and experiences the sense of being "second class."

This is of particular interest as it relates to the other sources of social status within the community. For example, a fairly educated Negro, accustomed to the respect of the Negro section of his community, must at times show deference on the basis of color alone to white persons who in other ways are socially inferior to him. By contrast, the white person with no special grounds for meriting the respect of his fellows other than his skin color, may still experience a sense of heightened worth in his interaction with Negroes. This is really a pseudo-feeling for the white, and there is no depth or security in it since neither the deference of the Negro nor his own superiority are entirely believable.

This difference in social status is paralleled by differences in political power and economic status, although the economic disparity is now less than it was in the past. Negroes have constituted a source of low-paid unskilled labor of particular importance in farming, domestic service, and industry. Often the use of this labor has had beneficial effects on the living standards of the white employing group. Also because, as employer or foreman (and sometimes as unskilled strawboss), the white person typically has supervised the work of Negroes, there has been a second consequence of the economic relationship: it has augmented the difference in social status. Similarly, racial mythology supports and is supported by political subordination of Negroes. Curtailment of their right to vote and the related exclusion from elective and other governmental positions of authority is rationalized by the stereotype of the inferior Negro. Their consequent inferior share of political power then helps to perpetuate the conception of their inferiority. Such a relationship between a myth and the social reality has been aptly termed by Merton "a self-fulfilling prophecy."

As a result of these differences in social, economic, and political status, the white members of our segregated society have filled practically all of the positions of leadership. To the extent that such positions bring to their occupants the social approval of their fel-

1Merton, Robert K., Social Theory and Social Structures; Chapter 7, "The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy," Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., p. 179.
stereotyped and thus minimally expressive of genuine feelings or perception, taking on aspects of ritual. Even in relationships between Negroes and whites where the myth is consciously rejected, there are often subtle anxious elements inhibiting genuine closeness and acceptance. Perhaps the myths must be destroyed before interpersonal relationships between Negroes and whites will be possible on the same terms as those of Negroes with Negroes and whites with whites. This should not imply, of course, that various forms of status difference and social role, with their own psychodynamic implications, are not part of Negro-Negro and white-white relations.

Intrapsychic processes. On the deepest personal level, prejudices and their supporting myths can be understood as a means of maintaining feelings of self-esteem and security. In this sense they serve a defensive function. Many people of any race have acute doubts about their own worth, their adequacy in their sexual roles, and their acceptability as members of their groups. Turning attention to others' deficiencies permits one to remove the focus from fears and misgivings about oneself. Relief from intolerable feelings of self-contempt may be sought unconsciously by turning the hatred away from the despised part of oneself onto another person or group who, by the distortion of racial mythology, can represent the bad self. A down-graded minority, then, can become the source of a somewhat illusory security about oneself...the basis that "I am better than they are..." But guilt feelings with associated anxiety are a frequent price for whatever psychological gains may come from such defensive dealing with inner conflicts. The use of the myth as a defense against insecurity, therefore, is self-defeating for it not only fails to reach a realistic solution of the original difficulty but also increases the original burden of guilt. The well-known vicious circle of anxiety, defense, increased anxiety, and increased defensiveness may then ensue.

It is an often unrecognized fact that the Negro may come to believe in the prejudicial myths about him and frequently be as unaware as the white person that he is reacting defensively to inner impulses in an irrational, self-destructive manner. If a child is repeatedly addressed or treated as if he were no better than a dirty, savage, stupid animal, he will accordingly react either in conformance with this belief or develop psychological defenses against it. In this way a group that is discriminated against can develop a devalued concept of itself as inferior to the dominant group (which frequently stands for parental authority). This explains the reaction of some Negroes who feel dirty because of their skin color, who feel dependent on the good graces of the white parental authority figures, and who are disturbed by attempts of Negro leaders to gain full adult democratic privileges for them. (Such anti-Negro feelings by Negroes also entail guilt feelings that set up psychological vicious circles).

Through lifelong association of specific meanings to certain colors, there is an automatic tendency to impute to those presenting a particular color, psychological qualities which they may or may not possess. These imputed qualities then serve as a very unreliable basis of evaluation and action. The emotional content of reactions to color differences are patterned differently in different cultures, and within our own culture vary with emotional conditioning within particular subgroups.

Some knowledge of the meanings of different skin colors in our society is helpful in understanding the division of concepts regarding Negro and white. For example, several studies carried out in this country have indicated that most small children of both groups preferred light dolls to dark ones, even though there is little or no antagonism discernible toward the dark ones. Attractiveness was often associated with the light dolls, and ugliness or dirtiness with the dark ones.

Skin contacts form an essential part of the important relationships from infancy through childhood, and a variety of emotional attitudes come to be associated with particular colors, forms, and textures of the skin. Dunbar describes several studies of blushing and other skin reactions which elicit specific emotional responses in interpersonal relationships. Some psychoanalytic studies show that many persons equate roughness and darkness of the skin with "wrong" or with "masculinity," while smoothness and whiteness of the skin are equated, in fantasies, with "right" or with "femininity."

---


Dunbar, Flanders, Emotions and Bodily Changes, Columbia University Press, New York, 3rd Ed.

In this culture, yellow, brown, or black tend to be associated with ideas of dirtiness or destructiveness or unpleasant smell, while light colors, especially white and pink, tend to be associated with ideas of cleanliness, purity, innocence, and chastity. Since the skin and its extensions—the hair and nails—cloak the entire body, it becomes that part of a person most quickly accessible to superficial perception and evaluation. Consequently, the association of particular meanings to certain colors and textures of skin often determines the manner in which one person relates to another. It would seem that negative associations to their skin color combine with the other reasons we have considered so far in accounting for the disesteem of Negroes in this country. That it cannot be the sole factor is shown, for instance, by the high social value placed on suntan by many white people.

Negroes are often as frightened by the mythical image of the dirty, sexually aggressive Negro as many a white person and may become severely restricted and inhibited in their development as adults. Psychiatrists and social scientists are aware that Negroes develop their own hierarchies of status based on how close skin color approaches white and how close social and sexual customs approach the supposed white middle-class standards. It is well known how much money and time many Negroes feel driven to spend on cosmetics, deodorants, clothes, and automobiles in efforts to break away from the destructive, devaluing self-concept which they have developed as the result of childhood guilt and shame. Paradoxically, even this is used as propaganda against them. The complaint is voiced that they have become “uppity,” that they do not know their place. Even some Negro leaders preach against these attempts to secure some measure of comparable status. However, such upwardly-mobile efforts are not only a defense against the negative Negro myth; they also express a positive effort toward social participation. The extra intensity of pressure toward this particular form of participation by Negroes stems from the fact that so many other channels which are open to the white population are closed to them.

**Fears related to sex**

Processes of desegregation are complicated and handicapped by widespread fears of the breaking down of traditional barriers against sexual relationships between the two groups. We have been examining the significance of racial mythology and prejudice to desegregation. Unrealistic emotions and fantasies also abound in the many conflict areas of psychosexual development and sex relations in general in our culture, quite aside from questions of race. We can therefore appreciate how acutely emotional intensity can be compounded by interconnections between these two myth-laden areas, sex relations and race relations.

In general, our attitudes towards sexuality are split; sex represents the culmination of love and tenderness, but because it is also regarded in our society as dirty and degraded, it may be used as an avenue for the expression of aggressive defiling and retaliative impulses as well. By those who look upon another group as inferior or exploitative, sex relations with members of that group are felt to express aggression rather than love.

A higher social status group commonly stereotypes a lower status group as sexually more violent primitive. This holds true for group relationships other than Negro-white, as between various class levels, for instance. Such an attitude towards members of the lower-status group is closely linked to attributing greater sexual prowess to them. Thus, according to a prevailing sort of folklore, all Negro males are thought of as extremely potent and Negro females as invariably responsive. This is unsupported by fact.

The fusion of the misconception of superior sexual potency with notions of the primitive aggressive nature also imputed to the Negro makes for a myth which has become tenaciously woven—and with formidable repercussions—into the fantasy life surrounding sex in our culture. The upbringing of every American child and the process of maturation include the conflictual tasks of harmonizing sexual and aggressive drives with social prohibitions. This always involves some repression and relinquishment of strong childhood wishes and direct forms of impulse release. How completely and in what ways individuals accomplish this—regardless of race—is highly variable, depending on complex psychological and social interacting factors within their specific life experience. Residuals of these basic sexual and aggressive conflicts persist in adulthood in varying degrees as conscious or unconscious fantasies with their related anxieties and defenses.

As a part of such sexual fantasy-life, the myth of the primitively aggressive, potency-excelling Negro is central to the attitudes and

---

Kardiner and Ovsey, *op. cit.*
emotions surrounding interracial sex relations. It provides a focus for displacement through which old repressed urges may seek covert fantasy expression, while the terror of unleashing all that was learned as bad, forbidden, and disastrous, demands even stronger defensive taboos. When dominated by such fantasies, it is understandable why interracial sex relations, for both the Negro and white person, are more expressive of hostility than tenderness.

The pattern of segregation, through suppression of all aspects of mature social interaction between Negroes and whites, does much to create the very results its fearful proponents suppose it can ward off: it converts interracial relationships into just the kind of immoral, prohibited wrongdoing that seems to carry out the fantasies so that more guilt results, for which even stronger intergroup barricades are sought.

Unacknowledged white male jealousy of the Negro male’s fantasied advantage as a sexual rival for the white female is an emotional source of power behind the extreme taboo, maintained by the white-supremacy code, ostensibly to protect white womanhood. This code sanctions the most savage reprisals for Negro male violation, or even the most realistically flimsy suspicion of it, as in the Emmett Till “wolf whistle” case. The irrational emotionality of a lynch mob reveals the terrible antisocial power of racial myth. The white-supremacy code also provides immunity to the white male from Negro resistance or retaliation for the white’s sexual freedom with Negro females. And so, fear and hate, founded and maintained by racial sex mythology, breeds even more fear and hate within members of both races.

The stereotype of the sexual Negro which we have been describing has entered deeply into the emotions of many people, especially among Southern whites, to form a psychological barrier against Negroes; this is so strong that it would outlast any sudden removal of the physical barriers of segregation. To such people this image of the Negro has intense psychological reality, although in objective reality it is groundless. This subjective reality is all the harder to correct because certain surface facts do seem to make it agree with objective reality.

From psychiatric experience and delinquency studies there is reason to believe that antisocial, precocious, and impulsive sexual behavior is more prevalent among those raised under conditions of socio-economic deprivation and disorganized family and community living. When those whites for whom the Negro sexual myth feels real cite statistical evidence of comparatively poor sexual restraint among Negroes to support their thesis, they may be right about the figures but wrong about what the figures mean. Correct interpretation of the evidence hinges on the question of cause. Such figures are actually a clue to social, not racial, differences between certain Negro and white groups. Conditions of cultural disorganization correlate with similar sexual patterns for any racial group, but in this country discrimination has caused a greater proportion of Negroes to live under such conditions. Many Negroes, whose individual life experience has not been socially damaging in these ways, not only disprove this sexual stereotype by their adherence to middle-class standards of sexual behavior but, in reaction to the myth, quite a number have developed over-compensatory psychosexual inhibitions of such magnitude that these constitute psychiatric disability.

The actuality of segregation-fostered isolation, emotional and social—as well as certain kinds of disorganized group relations—promote the very kind of sexual behavior many people fear; but greater social justice for the Negro would tend to lessen this kind of sexual activity.

Of course many psychological patterns and mechanisms are involved in the psychosexual aspect of race relations. It is not within the scope of this report to attempt a full discussion of them. We have pointed out how fear and aggression predominate over affection under conditions of segregation, and how sexual attitudes and behavior between the races are based on racial myth in displaced attempts to solve personal problems. We do not conclude from this that white and Negro individuals are incapable of emotionally healthy love relationships, including its sexual component, when freed from the effects of racial mythology. We do conclude that such mythology, especially destructive in the psychosexual area, is promoted by segregation and is, therefore, a false basis on which to maintain further segregation. While the difficulties and complexities of dealing with antisocial sex behavior must not be minimized, its sources should not be falsely attributed to mythical folk tales rather than to the social, economic, and psychological forces which can be observed, understood, and constructively dealt with.
Interracial unions—marital and extramarital

The fear of intermarriage and the desire for “preservation of racial purity” against the threat of “mongrelization” are central to white arguments in defense of segregation. Let us test these fears against the facts; do they stem from objective reality or from morbid elements disguised within rationalizations? The very word “mongrelization” defines biological events in terms of white prejudiced attitudes. Its implied assumption of the genetic inferiority of Negro stock is unsubstantiated by available biological evidence⁶ so that the use of the term in this context reflects racial mythology. There are, however, many white people throughout the North, as well as the South, with deep feelings of opposition to the idea of Negro-white amalgamation. Such opposition may, of course, be claimed to be due to biological ideas about heredity. But if that were the whole story, two curious aspects of this opposition would seem inexplicable: first, the great disparity in social attitude towards marital and extramarital relations between the races; and second, the profound contrast in social attitude towards sex relations of white men with Negro women, on the one hand, and of Negro men and white women, on the other. Intermarriage challenges powerful emotional prohibitions which are enforced by law in some states and by severe social penalties in the rest. Out-of-wedlock and casual relations between the races, on the other hand, are relatively condoned in most sections and even generally expected in some. This social acceptability is rigidly limited, however, to the white male-Negro female combination, while the Negro male-white female contact arouses maximum punitive fury. How could one account for these significant distinctions if the fear of racially mixed progeny were a realistic, rather than a rationalized, basis for segregation? The mingling of Caucasian and Negro genes occurs without regard to whether the man is white and the woman Negro, or vice versa, so that emotionally-laden fantasies, rather than rational thought, seem predominant in this fear.

Since the baby’s genetic endowment depends, in an interracial union as in any other, on the sum of the parental contributions, there would be no difference, genetically, between the infant born
to a Negro mother by a white father, or to a white mother by a Negro father. Each would reflect hybridization to an equal extent. But segregationists regard the one with relative acceptance and the other with horror and condemnation. The one child can become part of its Negro mother’s household, but the other must be excluded from its white mother’s world on penalty of severe reprisal. The difference is not intrinsic to the child but to what the child symbolizes in terms of racial myth. The skin color of the interracial child is closely linked to these fears and attitudes, bearing visible proof, as it were, of the parent’s social transgression. According to the racial myth in this country, skin color correlates with personal worth on a descending scale from white to dark.

A common form of miscegenation fear is the fear of “throwback,” i.e., that the offspring of light-skinned parents may revert to a much darker skin color inherited from some Negro forebear. This fear seems to be another instance of mythical distortion and exaggeration elaborated around a kernel of fact. As far back as 1913, Charles Davenport published a study of “Heredity of Skin Color in Negro-White Crosses” and could find no cases nor theoretical evidence for throwbacks. He concluded that the idea of throwbacks was probably a myth.⁷ Davenport’s study, limited by its small sample, remains a scientific classic in this relatively unexplored area. Because, however, recognizably Negroid traits, such as hair texture, facial feature, and skin color are genetically transmitted independently of each other, it is theoretically possible, due to different genetic combinations, that an offspring may appear somewhat more Negroid, in one or another respect, than either of its Caucasian-appearing parents. This is far from the popular concept of throwback, however, and the fear that might be recognizable as Negroid because of the negative social connotations. The biological questions surrounding throwback raise a false issue that obscures the real issue: because of the severe social penalties for being a Negro, which their own white prejudice has imposed, white people dread the appearance of any recognizable Negro-ness in their own kin.

The Supreme Court decision against school segregation is opposed by many on the grounds that it will remove existing barriers to racial amalgamation. But in actuality, it was the importation of Negro slaves more than two hundred and fifty years ago,
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rather than the Court’s recent action, that was responsible for “deciding” this country on the course of racial intermingling which has been under way, for better or worse, ever since. Thus Herskovits found that 78% of the U. S. Negroes who were interviewed in his sample of 1500 testified to some Caucasian or Indian ancestry, and only 22% to exclusively African background. These figures were recently confirmed by Stern, who found that the proportion of mixed ancestry for American Negroes had even risen since Herskovits’ study over twenty-five years earlier. Those who oppose school desegregation as a prelude to racial admixture often fail to recognize that this is already an accomplished fact, to a large extent, and—as Stern has pointed out—to the same degree in regions with legal segregation as elsewhere.

The counterargument by white segregationists might be made, however, that their fear is not so much concerned with the white genetic contribution to the Negro population, but with the protection of the whites from African admixture, because of its assumed inferiority. Realistically, however, it is not possible for considerable cohabitation to go on for over two and a half centuries, as has been true in this country, with only uni-directional results. One way in which the white genetic pool has been augmented over the years by African genes is through the steady increased rate of “passing” by light-skinned individuals of Caucasian appearance who have some fraction of Negro ancestry but who do not identify themselves socially as Negroes. “Passing” is made possible by the increased white admixture to the Negro population. The intensity of the desire “to pass” is due to the Negro’s inferior place in American life. An individual’s skin color and facial appearance, which permit his “passing,” are by no means reliable indicators of his genetic endowment. Therefore, “passing” establishes a medium for the dispersal of Negro genes into the general white genetic pool. Since discrimination stimulates the incentive for passing, and passing augments amalgamation, the segregationists actually defeat their ostensible goal of preserving racial purity. This is another indication of the irrationality inherent in these attitudes.

The fear of increased intermarriage, as a consequence of desegregation, is often expressed interchangeably with the fear of genetic fusion. These are related but far from identical. The expectation, voiced by many people, that school desegregation will result in a great rise in the rate of intermarriage, seems to be an expression of their bias and fear, rather than a reliable prediction. As a matter of fact, the information on which to base predictions with regard to racial intermarriage rates is extremely sparse and rather confusing. The most authoritative current work on the subject opens with the statement: “Only limited and unsatisfactory data are available on Negro-white intermarriage in the United States.”

The many factors that determine fluctuations in the rate of racial intermarriage are far from clear. In Boston, where legal school desegregation has been in effect for decades, there was a relatively high rate in the years immediately after 1900, and a marked decrease in the next decades despite a constant ratio of Negroes to the total population. In urban New York State (other than New York City) the rate climbed between 1916-24 and then dropped steadily for the next ten years. No satisfactory explanations for these shifts have been established. The facts indicate that legal school desegregation per se does not influence the rate of intermarriage in ways that are as yet predictable.

As Merton points out, “the term interracial marriage is an insufficiently analytic statement of a complex kind of event. It fails to bring out the fact that such intermarriage involves intercaste, and sometimes interclass, as well as interracial marriage.”

In the light of available experience we cannot venture an opinion as to if, how, and when school desegregation will affect interracial marriage rates. We do recognize that those who so readily offer

---

10The ancestry of the Negro is mixed, and substantially so, as Stern and others point out. Without such corroboration however, the reliability of the Herskovits data could be subject to question since it was based on testimony rather than physical examination at a period when Negro subjects were eager to claim non-Negro ancestry as socially more acceptable.

According to a distinguished authority, Th. Dobzhansky, “Race mixture has been going on during the whole of recorded history. . . . Mankind has always been, and still is, a mongrel lot.” (Dobzhansky, Heredity, Race and Society, 1952, 115).

predictions on the subject do so for emotional reasons or from ignorance. Many complicated psychodynamic and social factors determine marital choice, but for many people, similarity of social and economic backgrounds is an influence in the choice of partner. Under the psychosocial conditions of American race relations today, such commonality between Negro and white is rare.

Integration

Perhaps the effects of desegregation should be regarded less from the standpoint of the frequency of intermarriage and more in terms of shifts in the quality of close relationships between Negroes and whites. School desegregation as a behavioral change may in the long run lead to attitude changes which can be called integration, that is, to a much greater degree of equal interaction between the races. If and when there is a shift in the direction of integration, this would show itself as a shift toward greater mutuality and breadth of shared experience between whites and Negroes in their total relationships, including psychosexual components. One might expect, therefore, that if there were eventual Negro-white integration, there would also be a shift from a preponderance of illicit interracial unions to the fuller, more enduring legalized unions of marriage. Should this occur, it would not necessarily alter the present course of biological mixing of the population, but would rather bring about a psychosocial realignment. Psychosocial realignment, then, is a foreseeable consequence of desegregation, whereas biological admixture is already in process and is not dependent on desegregation.

B. Psychodynamics of Changing Attitudes

1. SOME ASPECTS OF ATTITUDE CHANGES

The desegregation decision of the Supreme Court has met with a wide range of responses throughout the country. In many communities the new law of the land has been implemented in a matter-of-fact way, proceeding with little upheaval, while in a few, problems and opposition have arisen some time after a smooth initial phase. In other communities the very suggestion of following the Supreme Court’s order has met with violent feelings among otherwise apparently law-abiding citizens. Important as the difference between these opposed reactions is, it would be wrong to assume that an equally marked difference has come about in the attitudes of people in these varied types of situations.

Behavior change can be induced by the application of many kinds of external pressure, ranging from legal enforcement to neighborhood custom. But a genuine translation of such behavior into an enduring change in attitude is a long process involving important psychological processes.

Goals of attitude change

Ideally, one may suggest that the goal of this process is an attitude between Negroes and whites which is based on acceptance of a fundamental right of human beings to be judged as individuals and not as members of this or that ethnic group. But it would be unrealistic to expect that such a fundamental change in attitude can take place among the majority of the current adult generation. While working towards this goal, by all appropriate means, it nevertheless seems likely that the progress possible in the next few years will be more limited: change in attitude based upon acceptance by both white and Negro parents of the fact that their children are exposed to an experience fundamentally different from the one they have had themselves in regard to growing up in relation to the other group.


In September 1956, a Congressional Subcommittee investigated D. C. schools. The hearings brought out evidence of greater academic retardation among Negroes than whites. The Subcommittee majority of four Southern members issued a report recommending that the Capitol schools be resegregated, but the other two opposing Subcommittee members contended the majority report was biased. A three-month study of the Washington schools, initiated during the Congressional hearings by the Washington Committee for the Public Schools, a 31-member group of public leaders, found, as does the Hansen report, that the worst educational problems were caused by the old system of segregation and were being gradually solved by integration. This is supported by even more recent reports of the rate at which the Negro children are making up their academic achievement deficit. Since the Supreme Court rules that all public school children should be desegregated, the question of achievement level differences is a separate, though important, issue. Confusion of these issues is one of the mistakes of some of those who oppose desegregation.
Why is it Utopian to expect more radical change in many adults of the current generation? The reason for this has to do with the meaning of Negro-white relations for the psychic economy of many who have grown up in a situation where segregation was the rule. It is important to distinguish between attitude and behavior. Even when an individual strives to change a deep-seated attitude because of more recently acquired intellectual or moral conviction, he may be unable to, due to the hold of early conditioning. However, if he can admit and accept this as his limitation he can control his behavior to accord with his convictions rather than with the repudiated though retained attitude.

Psychiatric experience as well as theories of human behavior suggest that the way a person thinks and feels about himself is intimately linked to the way he feels about others. The way he thinks and feels about others depends on the place these others are assigned in the world, a set of facts which the growing child first learns from his parents and later from his own experience outside the family.

The greatest task in growing up consists of coming to terms with oneself, of learning to know who one is, what one can do, and how one stands in relation to others. Any help that the environment offers toward obtaining an answer to these questions is seized upon. In a community where there is segregation between dominant and subordinate groups, the existence of this external distinction is used by both Negro and white children in defining themselves to themselves. They learn, as one early answer to the central questions about their own selves, that they are not members of the other group. This knowledge can have both gratifying and frustrating aspects. The Negro child might feel relief in realizing that he need not make great efforts to succeed, since he is not meant to succeed. But on the other hand, he may be frustrated to realize that many opportunities are closed to him. The white child might feel gratified about at least not being a member of the inferior group and frustrated by realizing that the official assignment of inferiority carries for the Negro child some rewards unattainable by him, such as protection and less need for the same kind and degree of control.

To the extent that the adults of the current generation have used the now obsolete pattern of segregation in coming to an understanding of their own selves, their attitudes toward the other group have become deeply ingrained in their personalities. As adults, the psychological uses they have earlier made of segregation are often kept out of conscious awareness. Instead, the justification of their attitudes appears to lie in other rational or rationalized facts. Yet the balance they have found with regard to themselves and the world rests upon these earlier processes. A radical attitude change would presuppose a restructuring of their entire personalities, a task which very few adults can perform without individual psychological help.

**Intensification of hostility**

Even the more limited goal of attitude change in the current adult generation meets with considerable psychological opposition in many persons. In many communities the Supreme Court decision has led to an apparent intensification of anti-Negro hostility and has evoked violent emotions, occasionally turning into violent action.

One important reason for such strong feelings among white persons lies in their fear of Negro retaliation, physical aggression, and even role reversal of the two groups in the event of Negro acquisition of power from the outlawing of segregation. The facts, however, point otherwise. Out of several historically proposed roads in the course of American Negro movements, the road that has prevailed under Negro leadership and by Negro organization—the N.A.A.C.P.—has been that of legal and social action through due process of law and peaceful, democratic principles.

Of special significance to the white fear of role reversal is the new Negro movement through the churches which is supplementing, not supplanting, the legal and political methods. This Negro movement of Gandhi-type non-violent, passive resistance has been dramatically demonstrated by the 50,000 Negroes of Montgomery, Alabama, from all walks of life, in their effective year-long boycott of segregated buses under the leadership of the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. This movement and this type of responsible leadership are extending beyond Montgomery to other Southern areas. These Negro masses are determined to get rid of Jim Crow, but, in accord-
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ance with Dr. King's preaching of Christian faith, and with steady self-discipline, they have refrained from retaliating to provocations ranging from insult to dynamite by white segregationists. In an address at the First Annual Institute on Non-Violence and Social Change, under the auspices of the Montgomery Improvement Association in December 1956, Dr. King said, "But if we retaliate with hate and bitterness, the new age will be nothing but a duplication of the old age. We must blot out the hate and injustice of the old age with the love and justice of the new. This is why I believe so firmly in non-violence."

There is no evidence to indicate that ideas of Negro-white social role reversal are any more than fantasies which individual Negroes and whites may engage in under conditions of segregation. Most persons are able to learn from experience. A great psychological value of the desegregation decision in initiating the process of attitude change (even in localities which have so far resisted the law) lies in the fact that it has provided a chance to learn from the experiences of other communities. To be sure, some serious problems have arisen for children and teachers where desegregation has been introduced. And, certainly, serious problems also ensue where communities try to resist desegregation by mob action. But in none of these situations has role reversal occurred. This fact has not remained hidden. It should constitute an essential turning point in the process of attitude change.

Whether or not a person is able to learn from experience depends largely on the degree of his inner tensions and insecurities. Those who are ridden by irrational fears will learn less than those who can master their anxiety in constructive ways. It is the latter group—undoubtedly stronger in number and prestige—who will carry on the process of learning from experience. It should be pointed out, however, that the new experience need not be the result of a firm sentiment in favor of Negro-white equality. Repeatedly, civic and educational officials from Southern communities that embark on desegregation declare their continued belief in white supremacy and segregation, but state that they will implement desegregation to obey the law. Sometimes the financial factor involved in having to send Negro children by bus to the nearest Negro school in another town has tipped the balance in favor of desegregation. Political or other economic motives have had the same result in other communities. Thus exposure to new learning situations coming from experience with school desegregation has in some cases been brought about from motives which have little to do with favorable attitudes towards desegregation itself.

Stages in attitude change

Learning from experience starts a new series of stages in attitude change which need not follow a simple course of gradual improvement. The nature of the experience as well as inner forces in a person will combine to create many ups-and-downs and in-between stages. We do not yet know well enough all the possible stages that can occur. A few, however, have been observed and studied and deserve to be identified.

Compartmentalization. There is, first, the stage of compartmentalization. In Northern public housing projects it has been observed that Negro and white persons living as next-door neighbors have learned to get along with one another. One white woman, for example, describing how deeply prejudiced she had originally been against Negroes and how she had changed so that Negroes now called her by her first name when she met them in the project, added: "but of course I'd faint if they did this to me in the main street of town." A study of a mining community showed that the easy companionship of Negro and white miners on the job ended abruptly when they came to the surface. With school desegregation this compartmentalization may express itself in a variety of ways. In faculty or parent meetings people may still feel more at ease with segregated seating arrangements or may recoil from sharing a meal or toilet facilities. Mixed classrooms may be accepted by parents who would not permit a child of the other group to visit their home. Such compartmentalization may be deliberately and consciously established, or may just "happen" without anybody planning it. Whatever the case, it is clearly an in-between stage in the acceptance of desegregation.

Denial of differences. Another in-between attitudinal stage consists of denying all difference between the two groups and of completely ignoring the special historical, psychological and social conditions under which Negroes live throughout the United States. In practice, this attitude seems to be quite widespread in various  
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school systems in the North, to the detriment of many deprived Negro children who may need but do not receive the special care and attention from school authorities to which their precarious social and economic position entitles them. This attitude is actually fostered by many minority group organizations which have for a long time insisted, as a defense against the crudest forms of discrimination, that no public record be kept of whether a school child is white or colored. Knowing the child’s race, like other factual information about him, such as his age, sex, and health, can enable schools to better recognize and meet whatever his special educational needs may be; this should be an educational goal for both Negro and white children. Constructive acceptance of realistic differences between individuals is by no means the same as the use of differences to justify disparagement or inferior treatment.

“Mascot” attitude. A third in-between stage has been observed in the North as well as in the South. White people in this stage will often overdo their admiration for the cuteness of minority-group children; they will emphasize the Negro’s gift for music and dance, his gaiety, carefreeness, and the like. They will feel proud about having once invited one Negro to their home, etc. We may call this stage the “mascot” attitude to Negroes. There is a parallel to this attitude on the part of the Negro who may regard the white person as magically endowed with glamour or power and who may draw some spurious self-esteem from acceptance by such a being which is as false and unreliable as the white person’s sense of worth for his “tolerance.”

In this stage beliefs and action orientation have apparently changed. For practical purposes this means a step forward. But the attitude still overlooks the real attributes of members of the other group, both positive and negative ones, and implies a fantasied acceptance of the other, or the taking of a position which is in accord with one’s ideals of tolerance, without real-life experience to back it up.

What we have referred to as the realistic, though limited, prospect of constructive attitude change for the current adult generation differs in an essential way from this “mascot” attitude: it is free from the compulsive pretense of acceptance. The attitude change will be completed only when the adults genuinely accept the fact of a fundamental difference in the life experience of their own generation compared to that of the new one.

When one identifies an individual or a group as being at any one of these mentioned in-between stages in the process of attitude change, the question arises of how to handle these stages so as to promote further changes.

Essentially, there are two routes open: to aim at increased awareness of the transitory nature of the in-between stage, by drawing attention to it in individual or group discussion; or to leave matters as they are, on the assumption that each stage has its own specific function in the process and needs to run its course before people are ready to move further. In other words, are non-directive or directive approaches more indicated? Non-directive or directive methods are applied by group leaders who have theoretical convictions on the point and professional experience to support them. A change from one method to the other is dictated by a full understanding of the balance of forces at play at any moment, and timing of the change is the result of careful examination of the needs of the group.

Examples are available of the success or failure of either method. Drawing attention to the fact of segregated seating arrangements, for example, may lead to a disturbing extent of self-consciousness about it which can interfere with the learning experience. On the other hand, pointing out in a different group that a common snack at a meeting might help to break the ice may turn out to be an acceptable step forward.

Factor of timing

No hard and fast rules can be established about the more promising method, which will always depend on the concrete situation and the persons in it. All that can be done is to point out in a rather general way, that the right thing done at the wrong time will lead to failure as much as the wrong thing done at any time. As a guide, then, to this extremely important factor of timing one will do well to consider whether the group is solidly committed to common goals or in danger of breaking up at a slight provocation; whether its leading individuals are the more stable or the more shaky members with regard to attitudes toward the other group. One must consider these and similar problems before deciding on interference with the established adaptations. In each of the in-between stages identified here, there is a certain amount of readiness to move toward the limited realistic goal we have here sug-
gested for the process of attitude change. The speed and thoroughness with which adults reach it will then affect the manner in which their children absorb their entirely different experience of developing a new orientation toward the other ethnic group rather than changing an old one.

2. EFFECT OF GROUP PROCESSES ON ATTITUDES

In addition to the more specifically personal forces and dynamics which play a role in acquiring and in changing attitudes, other important factors that enter into the choice of sides in an issue come from the influences of various groups in the community. Each person belongs to many groups, which are of varying importance to him, for instance, a political party, a church, a trade or professional organization, a social group, a family, and so on. These may differ greatly from each other in their attitudes on any important local or national issue. Moreover, even the groups to which a person does not belong exert an influence upon him, both in terms of possible reprisal from an opposing group and in terms of his wish for approval by a group in which he may desire membership.

Need to belong

A sense of belongingness is of crucial importance to the average person's sense of well-being. Such extreme types as the genius, the reformer, and the seriously maladjusted may live in apparent independence of family and community group pressures. Yet even here there is often a somewhat hidden need for approval which is expressed in a roundabout manner. The reformer may be making great efforts to carry group opinion with him in a new direction; the creative genius may be dependent on the appreciation of his audience for recognition and encouragement of his creativity; the maladjusted person may have withdrawn from group relationships in despair of acceptance. But for most of us, the attitudes and opinions of those groups which are of importance to us exert powerful influences in shaping our own.

At the present time, many groups split on the issue of desegregation. For example, the ruling element in a given community may be resisting the general trend toward desegregation which the nation as a whole has begun. But within the same community there may be other, perhaps smaller or less vocal, groups, such as a church group, which favor it. In the members of these smaller groups conflicts may arise between attitudes toward desegregation and the wish to be identified with the entire local community; equally in the dominant group there may be conflicts between national and local values.

Taking a stand

What determines why some people take a stand which supports the national and opposes the dissenting values of the dominant local group while others do not? The ability to take an independent position is often equated with personal maturity. However, the completely mature man possessed of total independence of judgment, is a somewhat illusory ideal. At best the independence is relative—that is, a mature person may be more resistant to group opinions, or he may be more selective of the groups whose opinions he accepts, or he may be less inclined to adopt group opinions without criticism. He may be more aware of the ways in which he adapts to group pressures, or he may be more able to tolerate without too much insecurity a certain degree of difference from the group. On the other hand, personalities who are exceedingly immature can often be seen to take positions that are dissident from the majority opinion in the local group. Such examples as the criminal or the eccentric or the childish rebel may be used as illustrations. It is necessary, therefore, to recognize that a person’s agreement or disagreement with a group cannot by itself be made a criterion of maturity. An attitude must be viewed in the context of the functioning of the total personality before such an appraisal is legitimate.

In addition to the question of what degree of independence of judgment is possible for a given person, other factors which enter into decisions may be mentioned. First, an inability to conceptualize the nation with its larger purposes and goals may make it difficult for a person to identify himself with national values. Poorly educated people usually have a more constricted view of the nation, and identification with national attitude and policies becomes difficult because these are meaningless abstractions without impact. Second, a person making up his mind on an issue will often be more influenced by the wish to gain or preserve the approval of those with whom he is in actual contact than to gain or preserve the approval of distant and depersonalized authorities. Similarly,
those who fear reprisals from opposition groups are likely to be more influenced by fear of persons in the local community than they are by the support coming from remote sources, even when this support may express national values and federal authority.

Those who reach beyond the values of the dominant group in the local community to accept the values of the region or of the nation usually have a higher education and a wider interest in regional and national affairs than their fellow citizens whose attachments are more local. In addition, such persons must also derive some support from a group of like-minded people inside the community. This group may be as small as a family, or may include a substantial band of firm enthusiasts for a particular point of view. The members of this smaller group are fortified by the support which they give each other as well as by their adherence to what they believe to be the goals and ideals of the larger group, such as the region or the nation. The attachment to these larger goals and ideals in the abstract without some support from people close at hand is rarely enough to sustain a heresy against the doctrines of the dominant local group. It seems to be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for most individuals to take sides on an issue against the overwhelming majority of the local community unless they have some direct personal support from at least one or more members of the local community.

Mixed motives

In considering motivations underlying attitudes and behavior toward desegregation, what needs emphasis is the almost universal existence of mixed motives. In different persons there will be various mixtures of rational and irrational motives, of self-interested and group-interested motives, and of conscious and unconscious motives. Many people may resist changes in the social institutions because of the discomfort evoked when they are called upon to relate to members of another group in a different way. Frequently, reluctance to change social roles may contribute to the attitudes toward desegregation on the part of many members of Southern communities, both white and Negro. Each group has something to gain and something to give in the traditional relationship. Each may be loath to risk the loss of present security by trying to adjust to a new relationship. And in both groups, this reluctance to change may exist alongside a realization of the advantages and fairness of desegregation and a wish to bring it about.

Motivations quite unrelated to the issue of desegregation may influence the adoption of a particular position on desegregation to an extent rarely realized by the person himself, or even by most untrained observers. For example, a person unable to adjust to the customs and authority of his community may adopt the values and attitudes toward desegregation of a group outside the community and thus satisfy a vengeful motive against the local community. Or someone who believes himself to be an underdog in his own family may vigorously take up the side of the underdogs in the community when he is really mainly serving his own needs.

Private and public attitudes

Personal motivations influence also the important distinction between the private attitudes of a person on the issue and his public statements of his attitudes, as well as the equally important distinction between his expressed attitudes and his behavior when confronted with a new situation. A number of studies have demonstrated wide discrepancies between a person's public avowals, his private sentiments, and his actual behavior. In situations, for instance, where prevailing local feeling against desegregation has been whipped up, people who feel desegregation to be morally right are afraid to claim this publicly and dare only support it on grounds of upholding the law. Comparably, in Northern circles, many people typically feel under social pressure to conceal whatever pro-segregation feelings they may have, from public utterance, or even from themselves. Or to cite another example, many of those who beforehand express strong opposition to desegregation may actually do nothing to interfere with it when it takes place in the schools. Indeed, they may even come to endorse it after a time. A person's public avowals are influenced by his perception of his immediate interests. These perceptions will naturally change with the situation. He may see that it is in his own interest to abide by the law or adhere to a new attitude taken up by the majority of a group. Such factors account to some extent for the influence of one com-

---

8Cook, Stewart W., op. cit.

munity on another and for the occurrence of “bandwagon effects” in changing patterns of behavior.

When one person presents his attitudes on the issue to another person, he is influenced by a wish to appear rational. To this end, he assembles ostensibly plausible arguments which seem to him to justify his decision and which he hopes will make his decision appear sensible to his listener. Such arguments may have little relation to the sentiments and values underlying the decision. Nor are they usually related to the more rational reasons that might be given for adopting a particular side of the issue. Thus many of those who oppose desegregation voice dire predictions of the far-reaching disasters it will bring, in an effort to account for their opposition. Fewer people discuss in a commonsense fashion the handling of the real difficulties which must be anticipated in the transition phase.

Besides wishing to appear rational, the person explaining his attitude usually seeks approval by appearing altruistic, and he disclaims personal benefit from his decision. According to his point of view, he may appeal to ideals, to the law, to Christianity, to the facts of human nature, to the good of the community, etc. Rarely does he acknowledge that he has acted for what he believes to be his own good. Nor is he usually even willing to attribute selfish motives to the group he joins. To do so would implicate himself in some of that corruption. So he also attributes to the group unselfish, rational behavior serving the interests of great ideals or still larger groups.

Finally, the presentation of reasons for a decision is strongly influenced by the speaker’s perception of the person to whom he is talking. He wishes to appear rational and laudable not only in the eyes of the members of the local group to which he adheres, but also in the eyes of the opposition. The wish to convert or raise doubts in the mind of the opposition is reinforced by his human wish to be well thought of by everyone. Accordingly, the speaker will adapt his arguments to suit his current audience. For example, if he perceives the listener as an educated person, he may advance arguments based on “scientific evidence” seeming to justify the decision, which has actually been made on entirely different grounds. If he sees the listener as a religious person, he may cite arguments that try to reconcile his choice with the ideals represented by the listener.

When the issue of desegregation is brought close to a community, the opinions of the groups within it crystallize gradually as the issue grows in significance. What eventually forms as the attitude of a particular group may begin as an inchoate collection of poorly defined individual attitudes. As the members of the group clarify their attitudes and announce their decisions, more and more people find it possible to take a definite stand on the issue. There results a “bandwagon effect” in that the rate of joining a side accelerates.

A great many persons, motivated by a desire for group approval or perhaps by fear of reprisals, base their decisions on what they imagine to be the attitude of a given group. The attitude which they attribute to the group may in fact reflect very inaccurately the real opinions of its members. A person’s perception of the group may be markedly distorted by his lack of information and by his unverbalized wishes. The result of these distortions may be that the person responds to his conception of the group will rather than to the actual wishes of the majority. A false picture of the group will may stem from outmoded wishes of the group or from wishes of comparable groups in other places.

Reinforcing convictions

Once a person has made his decision, the mere fact of having done so severs his connections with the other side. Now he stands to lose face by the failure of his side in the issue. Thus a personal investment in being on the winning side tends to reinforce convictions. Moreover, the wish to win or the fear of losing may distort perceptions of the situation so that the strength of a particular side is quite unrealistically evaluated.

Other events besides the act of taking a definite stand on the issue may reinforce convictions. Of these the most important is probably the crystallization and expression of opposition. Such opposition reminds the partisan that his side may ultimately lose. It also reminds him that his side may be wrong. Both of these thoughts may arouse doubts in his mind about the wisdom of his attitude, and these doubts may be suppressed by a strengthening of original convictions and a more vigorous combatting of the opposition. These factors are relevant to the problem of “outside interference” which is frequently complained about in communities grappling with the problem of desegregation.

Whatever people’s anticipatory feelings and behavior may be,
it is important to note that reports from those areas which have already desegregated their schools are generally favorable. There has been a minimum of substantial or sustained opposition, and many fears and predictions of dire consequences have proven groundless. As of May 1956, desegregation in public elementary and high schools had occurred in nine Southern states and the District of Columbia, but not in eight states of the South. However, the Southern Regional Council’s inventory of the seventeen Southern and border states for the two-year period since the Supreme Court decision (May 1954-May 1956) reports that Negro children began attending additional Catholic grammar and high schools, formerly all-white, throughout the South, including three of these eight resolute or defiant states, and that the merging of most of the remaining white and Negro schools on military bases in the South—including “Deep South” states—proceeded smoothly. Reports have indicated that desegregating the schools has engendered a more accepting attitude toward it among many people. It has also been demonstrated by experience that many of the difficulties which were anticipated did not occur. Nevertheless, there have been many real problems. On these, many school officials have expressed themselves as feeling that they were not of such kind and degree as to appear insoluble.

In those communities where there has been violent opposition after desegregation has been started, the instigation seems to have had multiple determinants, many of which were unrelated to desegregation. In one such place—Hoxie, Arkansas—studied by members of this committee and also reported in the Southern School News,8 the violent opposition to the onset of desegregation was led by a farmer—himself relatively uneducated—who seemed to be driven to assume leadership by personal motivations extraneous to the issue. The emotions he played upon in winning a following among many of the white residents were largely unrelated to convictions about desegregation. In addition he was strongly supported by a barrage of propaganda from professional white supremacists in other states, augmenting his poorly conceived religious and “scientific” biases and other rationalizations.

Parallels are to be found in the Clinton, Tennessee situation. Desegregation there had been a subject of litigation and a topic for discussion for several years prior to the fall of 1956. At this time, as a result of a court order, the high school was integrated, peacefully, if not enthusiastically. The arrival of an out-of-state, pro-segregation agitator sparked explosions of violence which required the use of the National Guard.9

As in Hoxie, the inflammatory role of a single pro-segregation crusader was conspicuous, in this instance John Kasper, who too was reinforced by out-of-state extremists. The likelihood that Kasper’s activity is also driven by contradictory personal motives—unrelated to the social realities of school desegregation—is suggested by apparently documented accounts of his active participation in Negro-white socializing only one-and-a-half years before.10 This has been corroborated by Kasper’s own testimony elicited at a Florida Legislative Committee hearing.11

Where there has been minimal turmoil in the preparatory and early phases of school desegregation, there has been maximum acceptance of it and an increased community pride. Such has been the case in Louisville, Kentucky, where intelligent preparation of the community has resulted in a system of voluntary desegregation which has been accepted peaceably and cooperatively by those involved.12 In Washington, D.C., school superintendent Cornig’s desegregation plan was formed out of group process, including inviting suggestions from the community, planning-meetings by school system staff, and an in-service program for intercultural education.13

---
8Southern School News, September 1955 and November 1956. A suit springing from the Hoxie situation has recently been heard by the U.S. Court of Appeals. The School Board was granted by the U.S. District Court a permanent restraining order enjoining the defendants (some citizens of the community) from interfering with the desegregation of the schools. The restraining order was appealed, but the U.S. 8th Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the injunction, ruling on October 25, 1956 that administrators of desegregating public schools had a right to be free of "direct and deliberate interference."

---
9 Ibid., pp. 57-58; 97-98.
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13Miracle of Social Adjustment, Hansen, op. cit.
When there has been maximum turmoil at the outset, as in Hoxie and the University of Alabama, there has been a continuation of increased resistance, intensified hostility diffusely expressed to anyone even remotely connected with the issue, and consolidation of the opposition on the basis of shared hostility. When leadership has been divided or has failed to cope with the confusion and uncertainty which is a natural expectation of the initial phase, more anxiety and defensive anger are bred in a vicious circle. To formulate this principle more positively; available studies agree that firm, clear-cut policies by educational leadership and careful planning that includes all levels of the school system and general community play a major role in effecting smooth transitions from segregated to desegregated schools.14

3. ROLE OF AUTHORITY IN CHANGING ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR

Conflicts regarding types of authority

The citizens of those states where school segregation has been required and enforced by the authority of law are now confronted by the reverse situation, whereby the highest governmental authority of the land has ruled that segregated schooling be abolished. The Southern citizen—Negro or white—especially in the deep South, is thus caught up in an open conflict between these two types of authority, both of which he traditionally recognizes. Now he is faced with the dilemma of choosing which to obey or defy by the position he takes on desegregation. This inevitably entails some


Miracle of Social Adjustment, ibid.


(B). The Fisk University team of social scientists who studied the first Clinton crisis included three suggestions about preparation as "Lessons from Clinton's Experience": 1) Preparation should take in the functional community or the total area affected by desegregation. (Preparation had been focussed on one school and one town, whereas the court order to desegrate was county-wide; 50% of Clinton High School pupils came from outside Clinton, and Kaspar's responsive audience was from the whole county.) 2) Community preparation should reach groups at all economic, educational, and social levels. (The lower socio-economic and educational level groups were left out of Clinton's preparatory planning. Much of the trouble came from people in these groups.) 3) Preparation of students and faculty proved to be very valuable and important. (Students responded excellently to being given responsibility.)

degree of personal conflict, since whatever stands he adopts will involve him in real difficulties with at least some of the important people in his life, as well as with opposing psychic elements within himself. Because these authority conflicts have intense emotional bearing on the grave problems posed by the violence and vehemence of some protests against desegregation, it is important to try and understand their psychodynamic implications.

Levels and radius of authority

For individuals and for groups a close connection exists, psychologically, between their ways of response to desegregation and their characteristic attitudes and reactions to authority in general. Authority relationships are maintained on several levels of experience: political, social, intrafamilial, and intrapsychic; dynamically, these levels of authority relationships have interconnections. There is also a distance factor in attitudes toward authority. Everyone is subject to control and regulation by multiple authorities in a successively widening radius out from himself, beginning in the home and extending on to those who exert immediate power over his daily life, such as the "boss" and beyond to the local and then state officials, and thence to the more distant federal government. The emotional meaningfulness of governmental authority, for many people, varies with its perceived Closeness and remoteness, so that when the commands of the near and the far authorities clash, many individuals obey the near because it feels more compellingly real for them. Some of the factors that influence whether federal government is perceived as an abstraction or a vital component of one's own felt world have been discussed above (B-2). An additional factor is the degree to which a sense of political participation is experienced with its accompanying feeling of identification with one's own government. According to Dr. Johnson,15 for instance, "The Southern Negro viewpoint is more broadly national than regional. . . . In philosophy the Southern Negro identification is with the nation and not with the Southern region, which is, in spirit, separatist."

Responses to implied coercion

Legislative control over the interracial schooling of children entails enforcement, whether for legal segregation or desegregation.

15Johnson, Charles S., op. cit.
And enforcement implies authoritative coercion. Parenthetically, it it might be pointed out (because it is so frequently overlooked) that it has been just as coercive to legislate into segregated schools those Southern Negro and white citizens who were opposed to segregation, as it is now to legislate into desegregation those other Southern white and Negro citizens who are opposed to desegregation. The public's responses to such authoritative coercion can include a wide range of alternative variations and combinations of willing or unwilling compliance or disguised and open defiance.

Factors in authority acceptance

But an oversimplified view of the citizen's psychic conflict as due to opposing local and federal mandates fails to take into account sufficiently the following four factors: the intricate and conflicted nature of everyone's authority alignments, at least in this society; the universality of conflicting motives and attitudes pertaining to desegregation, and the relationship of these to conflict-solving by means of authority; variables of leadership; the question of the citizen's own participation in the authority of government through the democratic processes.

Conflicting authority alignments

If the law forces a citizen into segregated behavior despite his conscious or unconscious objections, his response will involve the dynamic interaction of his whole particular and complex system of external and internalized authorities. Perhaps this accounts for his heightened susceptibility to the influence of leadership, either for or against desegregation, at such a juncture, since the authority of the leader may be so timed and of such a nature as to tip the scales of a precariously balanced equilibrium of the other forces of authority operating within and upon him. All of us have developed some of our attitudes toward authority out of a conflictful series of life events. As adults we have not neatly abolished those conflicts; instead we normally evolve a working balance of psychic forces.

Development of attitudes to authority

An explanation for this is to be found in the psychology of development. The foundation of conscience, values, and ideals is formed in early childhood on the basis of the need for love and approval and the fear of punishment from the parents or parent substitutes who are the primary authority figures. At this stage the child does not accept or reject parental values and standards because of how reasonable they may or may not be, but because of his emotional needs and fears. The mixture of loving and hostile feelings which a small child normally develops towards his parents out of his dependency and their power to protect and to harm is felt towards their power of authority over him as well. These double feelings affect and cling to the values and attitudes he assimilates from them. This process of authority-derived attitude-formation continues on through childhood and adolescence for similar emotional reasons, although the range of influential authorities progressively widens to include such persons as ministers, gang-leaders, etc. Only with maturity can the rational and intellectual content of an attitude become the main basis for its adoption and repudiation. Even then the attitudes acquired through the operation of fact and reason must always struggle against residual, unconscious emotional attitudes formed in our childhood relations with authority figures. This stems from the nature of our child-rearing, even when the parents themselves are normally reasonable individuals.

Vicissitudes of responses to authority

These buried irrational attitudes are present throughout a person's life, ready, if reactivated, to overthrow or encroach on his rational attitudes in unexpected and disguised ways. We can not expect, therefore, an absence of conflict in our attitudes toward authority, but rather at most, preponderant attitudes which are the resultant of contradictory feelings. These general principles apply significantly to the desegregation situation, where the individual must cope not only with the conflict in his relations with various social and governmental authorities, which may themselves be in conflict, but also with his internalized amalgam of parental and other authorities who were significant in forming his racial attitudes.
Authority and conflict-solving

Closely related to the universality of conflictful authority feelings is the universality of some degree of mixed motives and conflicting attitudes toward desegregation. We have already emphasized how mistaken it is to ascribe undivided feelings on this issue to individuals or to blocs of people (Northern, Southern, white or Negro). Therefore, people's reactions, both in attitude and behavior, to authoritative enforcement of desegregated schooling largely depend on the varying reasons for their manifest and latent feelings on the subject, as well as on the intensity and relative proportions of their mixed feelings which may not be apparent, even to themselves. Maslow\textsuperscript{17} has pointed out, for example, that prejudice and discrimination are differently motivated and therefore respond to different social treatment. Many people conform to the discriminatory practice of segregation, not because of prejudicial attitudes, primarily, but from their compelling need to conform to dominant group patterns. Such individuals can smoothly readjust themselves to desegregation when this is the course firmly prescribed by authorities whose protection and approval they require. Perhaps this is illustrated by the impressive success of desegregation in institutions with a strong authority tradition like the army and the Catholic church. The effects of these instances of military and religious authority, however, entail other psychological considerations as well.

As explained above, the manifest position of an individual with respect to his system of authorities is maintained as the preponderance of continuously opposed psychic forces. Similarly, his overt position about desegregation depends on the balance of conflicts: between his sense of what is right and what is wrong—of what is safe and what is dangerous—between his more mature rationality and his more childish irrationality. When the march of events, as at present, pushes these latent conflict constellations closer to the surface, the individual is especially receptive to authoritative influence on two counts: the external authority can free him from the deadlock of his opposing inner authority forces, as well as help tip the balance of his conflicts about desegregation.


Timing, surfacing of conflicts and trust

The factors of timing, surfacing of the conflicts, and confidence in the authority are significant to its role of shifting attitudes about desegregation: the Supreme Court decision came at a time when nation-wide gains in public opinion against segregation had been well underway as a sizeable encroachment on pro-segregation sentiment. The moral and legal authoritative impact of the decision has driven the segregation controversy to the foreground and shaken up established patterns regarding it. It would seem as though conditions were present that are conducive to leadership by those authorities in whom the public has confidence for improving the patterns of race relations in this country. The effectiveness and timeliness of such authoritative action is not refuted by its evoking some transitional turbulence if measures are taken to keep it within tolerable bounds. This is part of the process of change and is socially healthier than the calm maintained at the price of harmful suppression. By way of concrete illustration: many white Americans have to keep fighting down their own ideals of brotherly love and fair play in order to feel themselves in the right about segregation.

External authority, in the form of church, or military establishment, or through a body of social law, or a respected leader, can provide extensive support to bolster these existent latent ideals and share the responsibility for them, while the security and satisfactions obtainable from such authorities may replace some of the psychological need to segregate. Thus the individual's own psychic pressure against segregation can become stronger and his emotional impetus to segregate weaker, bringing about a shift in his previous position. According to this concept, the Supreme Court decision does not force an allegedly homogeneously opposed segment of the population to behave against its will and conviction, but rather provides reinforcement to those ingredients of public attitude which, though entangled and smothered by conflict, are prevalent throughout this land and are in accordance with its professed ideals, as well as with fact rather than myth.

As we have already seen in some instances in the South, this principle can work in either direction, depending on whether the accepted external authority takes its stand in the conflict for or against desegregation, although the latent attitudes and wishes supported by the pro- and anti-segregation leaders are opposite. In
either case a timely shift in the position of the external authority sets psychodynamic realignments in motion whereby attitudes and behavior may be modified. Like any other form of power, this can be constructive or destructive depending on how well the process is understood, to what purpose it is used, and the extent of safeguards against abuses of power.

Leadership

The dynamics of leadership, so important to all phases of social organization, are far too complicated for any attempt at full discussion here. However, the functions and role of leadership have such relevance to the social change-over to desegregation that some remarks, at least, are in order.

There are many kinds of leadership, varying as to aims, results, and modes of operation. Some of the differentiating factors between effective and poor leadership for enhancing group efficiency and morale, include the type of relationship patterns between group and leader, the leader's motivations and values, his attributes and abilities, and how these fit the needs and character of the group.

Leader-group relationship patterns

Manifold and complex patterns of relationship are possible between leader and group. For instance, leadership may be carried out on an authoritarian basis or on reciprocal terms with the group. In the authoritarian type, the leader's role fulfills for the group an unrealistic father-image—whether benevolent, stern, or tyrannical—misconceived as all-wise and/or all-powerful. This form of leadership is maintained by fear, and the leader is separated from his group by the height of his position above it. But the leader, who as focal point for his group is in front of it rather than above it, remains part of its membership on terms of mutual respect and interchange. Such a leader can serve as catalyst for mobilizing group strengths and as synthesizer and channel for their expression and implementation. The feedback between the leader and the group in this type of leadership, which is lacking in the authoritarian form, constitutes a critical difference between the two patterns. Other

decisive differences between leader-group interaction patterns lie in the extent to which it is the socially cohesive or socially disruptive tendencies and purposes within the group that are selectively reinforced and implemented by the leader, as well as how closely the leadership meets the realistic needs of the group.

Comparison of two types of leader-group situations arising out of the desegregation issue, which have been referred to in this report, may serve to illustrate these points. Kasper and White Citizens Council leadership came into Clinton as outsiders. As self-appointed town leaders they played on dormant local fears, fantasies and hostilities to the point of mob violence and social chaos. By contrast, Rev. King and other leaders of the Montgomery Negro bus boycott were pulled into the leadership by the activation in process within their group and its need for direction. The group members' feelings against segregation, which Dr. King voiced and strengthened, were not "stirred up" by him but had been astir among them for a long time. His influence not only reinforced the group urge for social justice but also the group morality of brotherly love and control of violence and retaliation. The result has been group unity and stability, with perseverance for group goals by orderly social means.

Motivations and attributes of leaders

The leader's own values and mixed motivations, conscious and unconscious, for assuming leadership and using it for or against desegregation, affect his mode of leadership and consequently his impact on social action and public opinion. The motives in this area seem to range from the most socially altruistic to the crudest personal aggrandizing, with many forms, gradations, and combinations of these. Leaders, like all individuals as stressed throughout this report, may fool themselves as well as other people by the gap between the ostensible and actual reasons for their attitudes and behavior.

Leadership varies too with the attributes and abilities of the leader. Leaders are persons who are actually or apparently endowed with qualities which the follower admires and would like to add to himself. Leaders generally make up their minds on an issue ahead of the majority, which waits for cues from them. They have the drive and the know-how to map and carry out a course of

\footnote{The term "authoritarian" connotes dictatorial power over people, entailing irrationality, such as magical awe for the leader. It should not be confused with rational authority based on competence. (See Erich Fromm, 
\textit{Man for Himself}, Rinehart & Co., New York, 1947, p. 9.)}

\footnote{Barrett, George, \textit{New York Times Magazine}, op cit.}
action. They are usually also more articulate in the expression of their views and have acquired more of the available avenues for such expression than are open to the average citizen. The ability of leaders to move ahead of others in making decisions and acting on them, or in being more vocal, may be prompted by judgment and foresight, by their wish for the profits of leadership, by the need to defend and maintain leadership, by a strong sense of responsibility, and by firm convictions on the issue. They are apt to have the vision to see broader implications beyond the immediate.

Although we can identify many of the personal motives and values and personal attributes and abilities that make for leadership, whether constructive or destructive, there are personality intangibles, as yet unstudied, or that elude study, which enter into the talent for leadership. In any case, leaders depend on the group’s acceptance and approval for maintaining their power, while the group relies on the authority and support of the leader.

The participation of citizens in government

We may extend the last statement regarding the interdependence of leader and group to government and the citizenry. The psychological position of an individual with respect to governmental authority is basically different in a dictatorship than in a democracy, because the latter provides for his political participation through the franchise and other means. As one of the authors of this report has previously stated, 29 "Our body of laws and judicial institutions, devised by common consent and agreement, may be conceived of as our society’s methods of self-regulation by carrying out functions of group conscience. Thus, they provide instrumentality whereby citizens can reach collective decisions between right and wrong on the basis of as much fact, reason and justice as they are capable of at any given period. These judicial decisions that regulate social behavior, then, stem basically from the citizenry from whom they also derive the delegated power for enforcement." But when we consider the use of governmental authority in enforcing segregation or desegregation we must take into account at least two highly relevant features of the situation.

One has to do with the disenfranchisement for the most part of Negroes in the deep South, so that despite the Fourteenth and Fif- 


teenth Amendments they do not share in the wielding of political authority, the power of which is retained by white people. As one of the gaps between American political theory and practice, Negro citizens in the deep South live under an undemocratic regime and are excluded from holding governmental positions of authority. They have been subject to coercive segregation laws without political voice or representation in their enactment. Although it has often been said of them that they prefer this, such occasions for the direct expression of their opinion as the past year’s Montgomery bus strike belies this. The southern Negroes, therefore, have been denied the psychologically important sense of control, through legal means, over their governmental authorities whose regulations for intergroup behavior they are compelled to obey.

The other important point is the need to identify the political and social units under discussion when attempting to think through some of the psychosocial implications of legally enforced desegregation. Do we refer to the whole nation or to one of the states or counties in the deep South?

For some white Southerners, the authority conflict implicit in the issue of states’ rights versus federal rights has a significance which is not easily understood by the average Northerner. The vigorous defense of states’ rights has, since before the Civil War, carried the meaning of self-assertion, independence, and self-respect to many Southerners, who have seen in this position a way of combating domination by the North through its greater economic resources, larger population, and consequent superior political power. Disregarding the rights and wrongs of this philosophic position from the point of view of the welfare of the country as a whole and its regional subgroups, the fact remains that self-respect has become intricately tied up with the philosophy of states’ rights for many white Southerners. While it may, then, do violence to their self-respect from one point of view to relegate the Negro to a deprived and subservient position, it also does violence to feelings of self-respect to be (as they view it) "given orders" by a dictatorial or self-righteous North. In this situation many white Southerners can not look at the human rights issue with regard to the Negro because they are too immersed in the human rights issue which they feel exists with regard to their own status as second-class citizens of the United States who must not be dictated to by an arrogant majority. This is related to the reactions of some white.
Southerners, as expressed by the Southern novelist William Faulkner, who have worked hard to improve Negro-white relationships but when “told to do so” by outsiders feel impelled to take a defiant position.

Many apparently reasonable defenders of segregation cite an unquestioned psychological truth when they state that authoritative decisions are better accepted when they have been arrived at by some citizenry participation than when imposed. They feel that race relations were gradually improving so that it would have been better psychologically to wait than to have desegregation imposed upon the South. The applicability of this psychological truth to the desegregation situation depends on one’s interpretation of the social unit concerned, and in political terms, on the states’ rights issue. For the United States as a whole, the Supreme Court’s decision was made through the democratic machinery of self-government at a time when it reflected the country’s gradually changing mores and the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the population. It was made in the light of increasing reports, from both the North and the South, of successful experiences of integration. From the standpoint of the deep South, however, the decision was contrary to the most conspicuous views of the white Southern majority. The decision was out of keeping, therefore, with the majority wish of a segment of the nation’s population, i.e., some white citizens of some Southern states. An important question of democratic process relates to what limitations should be placed upon majority coercion of a minority, in this instance, the majority of Americans and the minority of segregationists. In recent times we have all seen the monstrous example of denial of rights to component minorities by totalitarian states. A big difference between this, however, and the exercise of federal judicial authority by the Supreme Court decision is not only that the decision was made in accordance with the democratic principle of timely legalizing of changes in majority mores, but that the minority “right” in question entails injury to others. If, in the name of safeguarding minority rights, the segregationists should remain legally empowered to go on damaging their fellow citizens—and the evidence of psychological damage from school segregation is considerable—it would seem as absurd and unthinkable, socially, as guaranteeing the freedom to kill or steal.

Closely related to this distinction between the socio-political units under discussion is the need to differentiate between the levels of governmental authority—national, state, and local—when considering their application to desegregation in the South from the standpoint of their subjective effects. Local and state authority in the deep South is in the control of those who have vested political and power interest in the segregationist status quo. Many public officials and civic leaders in that region feel obliged, for fear of reprisal from those on whose power the preservation of their own power and personal safety depends, to oppose desegregation even when they might privately prefer to lend the authority of their office to implementing it. The danger of such reprisal is indeed real. Economic pressure, threats and acts of violence, and various forms of personal harassment have been used against those considered insufficiently segregationist. Political penalties to candidates for elective office for opposing segregation are too conspicuous to require documentation. Negro school teachers are being discharged in some Southern communities for failing to sign statements that they do not advocate mixed schools. A white woman physician was discharged from a Southern State Department of Health for lurking with a Negro woman staff member. Resignations of state and municipal white professional employees are being forced, through the creation of untenable working conditions in order to circumvent tenure, as punishment for even suspected traces of pro-desegregation sympathies. The known and unknown instances of reprisal could be multiplied many times over.

Many of the citizens of the deep South, and many of the local officials, school superintendents, and members of school boards who feel their hands are tied by the local white power situations, welcome with a sense of relief whatever authority the federal government can bring to bear in the situation. Since for the most part, those who feel this relief dare not openly express it, their attitude is seldom recognized, concealed as it is behind the more vocal protests of the segregationists against “outside intervention.”

22 U.S. Supreme Court opinion, May 17, 1954 (see footnote eleven of the decision).
23 The term “outside intervention” has often been used as a slogan to stir up anti-Negro violence in the South and to displace the blame for it. This technique of agitation plays on the deep feelings of Southern pride and defensiveness which we have referred to earlier.
ally, federal and state authority can greatly support the morale and strengthen the hand of many local authorities who dare not otherwise act in accordance with their own convictions as to their responsibilities. In a number of situations of mob violence around desegregation in the South, federal authority has been appealed to. In such instances it has been regarded as an aid to local authority rather than a threat to it. Thus, in the two Clinton crises, within a few months of each other, responsible officials and citizens sought and obtained needed help from the Federal District County Judge in Knoxville for restoring and maintaining law and order. On the second occasion Clinton citizens and officials also called upon the federal District Attorney in Knoxville for assistance, and the School Board wrote to the United States Attorney General for aid. Action by these federal authorities enabled the state and town authorities, and the local educational authorities, to reopen the school under orderly conditions.

C. Responses of Various Groups to Desegregation

What are the psychological consequences of school desegregation for the various groups most immediately involved? Of primary concern, of course, are the children themselves. What is the impact upon them of this new experience? What are the positive experiences and what are the new conflicts aroused? How do the changes in school and community affect the educators who are in charge and upon whom, therefore, much of the responsibility for success or failure lies? And how are parents affected, both via the changes in the community at large and the changed attitudes in their children? Much of what will be said in this section is grounded in experience with mixed racial groups in the North and in those Southern communities where desegregation is now under way.

1. THE CHILDREN

In many communities it has happened that a relatively small number of Negro children have appeared in some originally white classrooms, or that a small number of white children have found themselves in a school which is predominantly Negro. Desegregation also means that, irrespective of racial proportions, many children find themselves in new groups. In all these instances the reactions of the individual who finds himself a stranger in a group, as well as the reactions of the group as it tries to cope with the newcomers, assume great importance.

The newcomer and the group

Some students will experience an increase of actual rejection. The student previously sensitized to rejection may re-experience the pain of former rejection as well as the new one, and old patterns of handling such feelings may reappear. Any marked disparity in cultural backgrounds will also fortify such feelings. In line with the distinction between desegregation and integration referred to earlier, some evidence suggests that at first, friendship ties and social interactions of a minority group of newcomers will be greater on a within-group than between-group basis. However, as soon as educators achieve a favorable school climate through resolution of their own conflicting attitudes and provision of strong objective leadership, the children's racial loyalties can be expected to give way to school, team, and class identifications and loyalties.

Projection of family role

There will, in the initial stages of new-group adjustment, be a number of possible individual reactions depending on a particular child's specific personal history. For example, a child who feels unloved and unjustly dealt with in its family will often identify strongly with children in the larger "school-family" whom it perceives as also unloved and unjustly dealt with. Thus unconscious feelings and conflicts associated with emotion-laden family relationships may underlie marked tensions and conflicts over racial problems. On the other hand, a child who is striving toward identification with parents perceived as highly principled and assertive may identify with those teachers who are similarly perceived and then will actively take sides in school with such teachers.

The child takes a role in social issues in a manner which parallels the tendencies shown in the home but which also strives toward resolution of problems in the larger social-family which were not satisfactorily solved in the home-family unit. New experiences with the important adult figures at school may do much toward putting a child on the pathway toward resolving old conflicts and developing a better integrated concept of his self.

Adjustment mechanisms under stress

Becoming a member of a new group often stirs up in the newcomer a whole sequence of behavior mechanisms by which he tries to cope with this experience. Under the impact of such experiences, even otherwise normal and well adjusted individuals will often suffer temporarily a distortion of their social perception, and processes similar to those described under the term “emigration neurosis” will often occur. Some individuals react to the impact of their newness in the group by overexpectation of acceptance, thus making many mistakes in group behavior which they would not have made in their old groups. Others tend to develop near-paranoid interpretations of the behavior of the members of their new group, expecting rejection even where none occurs, or producing fantasies of being mistreated by the new group because their own need to accept the new group threatens their inner loyalty to the old. At the same time, under the impact of newness and stress, many individuals use already existent defense mechanisms such as over-talking, excessive assertiveness, overcompliance to the wrong subgroup demands, or producing such a strong cloud of shyness, isolation, withdrawal, that even friendly gestures toward participation by the new group fall on non-perceptive ears. The adults on the staff of desegregated schools will benefit in their own adjustment to the new staff-group situation by being aware of these processes in themselves, and they need also to be aware of, in order to be able to help, the same problems when they affect the children in their classrooms.

The conscious and unconscious fantasies of each educator and of each pupil will be important determinants of individual attitudes and emotional reactions. Individual problems in relating and communicating with each other usually have such a basis. A teacher or pupil may fantasy a loss of status with the home social group through “fraternizing” with a different racial group at school. All too frequently such fantasies, when verbalized, are regarded as though they were founded in reality, which they are not. An educator at a planning level may find his work complicated by fantasies of threatening mass response or unfavorable publicity.

The group’s reception of the stranger

In addition to the adjustments required of the individual when coming into a new group, the group itself reacts to the stranger with a variety of responses, and must eventually re-integrate itself to make a place for the new addition. Among the more common and important responses of groups in general to newcomers the following can be mentioned:

The group may temporarily exclude a newcomer, banding together to ignore him. After some time—a sort of initiation period—he then may be accepted as a part of the group. This behavior can be seen whenever a child moves into a new neighborhood, or even, though less blatantly, when an adult becomes a member of a new group.

There may be an overacceptance of the newcomer, with temporarily a great deal of special attention being given to him, and a corresponding overexpectation of exceptional behavior from him. This may be followed by a rejection phase, initiated after the newness has worn off, because the newcomer has not lived up to the grandiose expectations focused upon him.

In a group which is already under pressure because of some previously existing tensions—such as, for example, the pressure of a feared autocratic leader—the new member may be cast for a role on the basis of the group’s pathology whether he fits in the role or not. A new child can then be cast as rebel, enemy, or suspected teacher’s pet, depending on the specific tensions already existing in the group, irrespective of how the group actually feels about the newcomer.

The group may accept a newcomer easily and socialize with him amicably, and yet his newness may continue to be a fact remembered about him for a prolonged period. There may be a withholding of complete trust and acceptance shown by the fact that he is not elected as officer or selected as representative by the group. Or he may be assigned jobs or roles that the old members of the group would prefer to avoid, a condition of the acceptance then being his taking on an undesirable job.

These few illustrations of the dynamics of group reaction toward the “newcomer” or the “stranger” may suffice to remind ourselves how important it is for teachers and parents in desegregating schools to become aware of these processes. Many such group processes

Educators do have long experience with situations in which all the children are new to the school at the same time, i.e., kindergarten and the entering class of Junior High School. When everyone is a stranger, aside from groups or pairs who have been friends in prior settings, the interactions between group and individual will doubtless differ in some respects from what has been described. Educators can bring to newly formed interracial classes their familiarity with the initial group insecurities of these entering classes.
occur without becoming conscious to the individuals involved. Neither the bully who pesters a new child in order to protect the old group from his intrusion, nor the new child who is suddenly up against rejecting behavior—even though he had little reason to expect it—knows what is motivating him. In interracial camping it has long been known that one of the most important skills of a counselor is the ability to umpire wisely in fights among children in the early days. For many such fights have nothing to do with real hostility or even racial issues, but are merely the customary neighborhood ritual in which a newcomer is tested. Far from being a sign of rejection of a new child, challenges to this type of fight are often the very signal of potential acceptability. The differentiation between a personal squabble, an incident of scapegoating against a minority group, and a ritualistic test is one of the most important tasks of the adult in charge.

**The development of attitudes and behavior patterns**

Under the impetus of a wide variety of pressures and motivations, people of all ages are constantly modifying their attitudes and behavior patterns. Such modifications have been discussed in section B of this report. With children, the more immature the child, the more completely the goals of gaining immediate pleasure and avoiding pain govern the development of patterns. With maturation, considerations of current and future reality increasingly influence attitude and behavior. A child at the age of four may assume a specific attitude and behavior in a social situation in order to gain the approval and love of those around him, or, if he feels rejected and hostile, may assume attitudes and behavior in opposition to those desired. The same child at a later stage in his development, say at the age of seven, may adopt the attitudes and behavior patterns of a revered adult by a process of incorporating them into his own character, and in so doing may have quite different goals and use quite different psychological processes than at the earlier age. The direct one-to-one correspondence between attitude and behavior which is found in small children also changes with development, until at the adult level behavior patterns may be quite different—even diametrically opposite to—conscious or unconscious attitudes. It is necessary, then, in dealing with children's behavior and in planning learning experiences for them, to take cognizance of their stage of emotional maturation. Methods of presenting new material as well as recognition of underlying attitudes which affect learning will vary according to developmental level.

**Practical problems**

On a practical level, the adults in charge of newly desegregated groups of children encounter innumerable specific situations which are the resultant of all the pressures impinging on the new group. Elements in the final behavior come from each member's character make-up, the attitudes and actions of the school adults, and the various influences of the parents and the wider community. Some of the problems in behavior which can be expected to arise are discussed below.

**Racial conflict as a screen**

In areas where desegregation occurs without too great resistance and parental objection, the first results may be astonishingly good. The children accept each other and begin working and playing together without untoward incident. Yet as the novelty wears off and the daily routine sets in, a variety of difficulties may occur. The children may experience hostile and aggressive impulses toward each other. After an early stage of smooth sailing, groups of children may gang up against each other in aggressive warfare. The fighting itself may reinforce prejudiced attitudes, as well as affect the adults—parents or teachers—with disappointment and discouragement as to the workability of desegregation. They may fail to remember that children are characteristically prone to gang up in groups and to regard others as strangers and enemies. Even among children of the same ethnic group it frequently occurs that similar children in the next block are stereotyped as "outsiders." Differences in skin color may provide a convenient focal point for such ganging up and may for a time suggest to the more inexperienced that prejudiced attitudes are unchangeable.

Prejudices can also be used by children, as well as adults, as serviceable rationalizations for other difficulties. In some summer camps, for instance, it was noted that Negro and white children cooperated amicably in activities together, but that when difficulties arose the reasons given by the children for the trouble would draw in the racial difference, whereas in similar trouble between two children of the same race, resort would be made to some other characteristic as an explanation. This easy use by children of racial
rationalizations for their quarrels may lead many of the adults to the unjustified conclusion that prejudice is the primary motivation for all of them. In a similar vein, it should be remembered that racial invectives are often used in everyday conflicts among children in anger. Such use is frequently based on the perception by the angry child of a sensitive spot in his opponent, rather than being an indicator of specific racial hostility on his part.

The impact of the surrounding atmosphere

Further disillusionment may arise if one does not recognize that the ability of children to be free from the prejudices with which they were originally imbued depends to a large degree on the support they get from the atmosphere of the immediate environment in which they live. Thus, in some camps with a high degree of racial integration, it was observed that even children who came from neighborhoods with heavy racial tensions were quite capable of living happily with each other without having to resort to the display of prejudicial behavior. Some of these children, however, upon return to their old neighborhoods and under the impact of environmental pressures, resumed their old patterns of prejudiced action. The same observation has been made with soldiers who worked and fought together harmoniously but who returned to old stereotypes when they resumed civilian life.

Does this then mean that people—both children and adults—will always return to such attitudes when the setting demands it and when psychological stress rises beyond a certain threshold? Perhaps there is a critical level of stress for each person, beyond which he will revert to defensive processes, such as calling upon prejudicial attitudes to boost his own security. It is for this very reason that the moral support of the law of the land, as well as its more obvious enforcement power, plays such an important role in actually making real and workable a social change. It strengthens and supports the other social forces which initiated the change and which still operate to make it effectual. It also must be realized that in a sufficient period of time—and under certain favorable conditions—children's new experience of the others as persons like themselves will render prejudiced attitudes obsolete. That is, the others will be taken for granted.

Another challenge which may have to be met in the early phase of desegregation is that of helping children with some problems of loyalty conflicts that may arise. A child may, for instance, be happily included as a member in a mixed group. In consequence of this he may, however, find himself reproached for being a renegade, or he may come into conflict with parental attitudes. This is not too dissimilar to some of the conflicts that children of immigrant parents are known to go through.

Since local community standards and values influence the behavior of the children, it is to be anticipated that with the existence of a desegregated school environment and the co-existence of a segregated community environment, conflict may arise. For instance, the same child who is expected to conform to and feel comfortable in desegregated patterns at school functions, may find himself confronted with the demand to conform to a segregated pattern in social activities outside of school. Such a double standard may well lead to confusion in the child. It will not necessarily, however, produce conflicts of unmanageable severity. Human beings quite commonly live under conditions of varying standards, as the situation of many women in our society illustrates.

The problem of “compatibility”

Unfortunately, at present the achievement levels of white and Negro children of the same age vary widely in most communities. The quality of teaching and school equipment have been inferior for the Negro child. This has been coupled with a poorer educational level of the parents, as well as less developed intellectual and cultural interests. Consequently, children in Negro schools are at a disadvantage when compared with children of the same grade from white schools. I.Q. levels in the two groups may also be different. Proponents of segregation point to this as evidence of innate inequality, while integrationists attribute it to inferior opportunity. The consensus of expert opinion, as expressed by leading scientific organizations and the vast majority of recognized social science authorities, is that there is no scientific evidence of inborn difference in intelligence between Negroes and whites. There is general recognition that the school achievement of Negro children, especially from segregated schools, is lower on the average than white
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Recently a psychologist took a different position in a magazine article. This article was widely publicized. A statement was issued shortly thereafter, signed by eighteen of the country's leading psychologists and other social scientists, resuming the more widely accepted scientific thinking. See: "Does Race Really Make a Difference in Intelligence?" U. S. News and World Report, October 26, 1956.
children, although some Negro children do better than the average white child. The fact of the difference brings still another problem both to the children and the adults in a desegregated school system. Since the lower I.Q.4 and achievement levels seem due to life circumstances, a transition period of varying length will be expected in the resolution of these differences. Louisville’s Superintendent of Schools Omer Carmichael, when interviewed on TV in September 1956, agreed that the one-and-a-half year educational gap between Negro and white sixth graders presented a problem, but “not as great as many people feel. For example, if you will take any standard test you please, the spread of children from high to low on that standard test will be much greater than the spread between the median for the Negro and the Median for the white.” In the meantime, both the stress involved for the slower child and the handicaps to the faster child must be taken into account in the organization and management of classes from the points of view of size, scholastic goals, methods of teaching, and so forth.

A final source of difficulty which may be mentioned is the fact that in some desegregated schools groups of children may be thrown together who, because of socio-economic differences and incompatibilities of personality type, would not mix regardless of their ethnic origin. For instance, middle-class, conforming children, whether white or Negro, will have trouble integrating with pre-delinquent, aggressive children from an underprivileged group. Such troubles may be falsely explained as racial when they are primarily social and psychological.

2. THE EDUCATOR

The creation of a desegregated school where there previously was segregation offers the educator a rich inventory of new opportunities. Many of the problems which have been created or accentuated through the pathogenic impact of the segregated atmosphere will no longer hamper him in the pursuit of educational ideals.

There is moreover a strong probability of increased enthusiasm and vigor in educational programs with increased pride and com-

petition in achievement. Currently, there is a stronger focus of interest on educational systems than has ever occurred in the past. Community interest and activity, although motivated by the emotion-laden desegregation issue in some areas, will certainly uncover many areas of inadequacy and complacency and result in effective pressure for improvement.

On the other hand, it is obvious that while transitional periods have in them the blessings of a gradual liberation from what was pathogenic before, they also force all people involved to go through the difficulties of transition. During the breaking up of previously ingrained patterns, and before new ones are firmly established, not only individuals but whole groups, too, develop symptoms of tension, insecurity, and confusion and call forth all available normal or pathological mechanisms in order to cope with them.

Educators must face new challenges in two directions in a newly desegregated school system. They must themselves integrate with colleagues of the other race and, while forming themselves into a harmoniously functioning organization, must concurrently recognize and deal with the adaptation problems of their pupils.

Much of what has been said as to processes in Negro-white adaptations (Section B) has relevance here. Certainly teachers are not immune from the conflicted attitudes which beset the rest of the population in regard to race relations and desegregation. It is particularly important to emphasize that well-intentioned efforts to overlook the problems for the sake of surface harmony are likely to prove harmful in the long run. Children are particularly sensitive to conflicts in basic attitudes between adults. In the home, such conflicts between parents are observed by a child and lead to disturbed behavior even when the parents fondly believe they have concealed them by “never quarreling in front of the children.” So, too, in school, conflicting attitudes in a teacher, or opposing attitudes between teachers, even when kept from open expression, may cause loyalty struggles in the children which will interfere with learning. Wise leadership in the school must, therefore, provide opportunities for airing and resolving the inevitable differences which realistically can be expected to arise. To reach this goal open channels of communication are essential. Although frankness about mutual sensitivities and criticisms may lead to transiently increased tension between educators, it can be expected to facilitate the achievement of a really integrated working relationship in the long run.
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4I.Q. values are vastly overrated as measures of intelligence in general and in particular with regard to these measures of Negro intelligence. Florence Goodenough and Dale Harris have stated that “the search for a culture-free test, whether of intelligence, artistic ability, personal-social characteristics, or any other measurable trait, is illusion.” “Studies in the Psychology of Children’s Drawings: II, 1929-1949,” Psychological Bulletin, 1950, 47: 369-433.
Troubles during the transitional phase

In dealing with the children, educators will encounter special problems in the transitional phase. There is danger that many problems which arise from other sources will be thought of as due to the desegregation process itself. It is a human weakness, in times of social change, to be on the one hand overly optimistic about the disappearance of old sores, or on the other, to ascribe old problems which continue, to the process of change itself. Among the more obvious sources of such confusion the following should be mentioned:

Desegregation, like any other change in a school, will provide opportunities for rationalizing deficiencies. The teacher who has perpetually experienced difficulty in handling the task of group leadership and in developing a child-oriented atmosphere of discipline in the classroom, will continue to have problems during desegregation and may find it convenient and popular to point to desegregation as the cause of troubles she would have had anyway.

Classrooms which are badly composed—e.g., those with distance between achievement levels much too great, age range of children way beyond what a given group can take, ill-advised mixtures of types of children which would create trouble in any case, and tensions on the basis of socio-economic class, etc.—will automatically produce severe teaching and behavior problems. Where desegregation occurs without anything being done about the already pathogenic group composition of such a classroom, all the so-called predictions of problems made by the opponents of desegregation may very well come to pass. The problems were already there to begin with. It is important for the educator to be skillful in his recognition of the sources of these problems, and it is his task as well as that of the community to do away with pathogenic grouping—including wrong size of groups—if desegregation is expected to work.

Lack of auxiliary services which classrooms need, especially in underprivileged areas or in neighborhoods where social tension is rampant anyway, such as leisure-time clubs, adequate group life experience for teenagers, psychological counseling and guidance work, will always create additional casualties in learning as well as in personality development. Lack of social services to work on pathological home conditions, of foster homes and institutional placements for children with disrupted families, will, of course, produce child behavior in schools which will negate many of the otherwise well-developed school-and curriculum-designs. Disruption of the learning process and the failure of the educational tasks in terms of character education, etc., will remain a problem of such schools, segregated or not. It is important that communities keep this in mind, instead of viewing as potential desegregation dangers what in reality were problems of unmet social service needs to begin with.

Constant community pressures, publicity, and controversies outside of school are apt to keep teachers temporarily overly sensitive and reactive to differences in appearance and performance of children. This, while present, may limit individual teachers in their capacity for free and comfortable work with students in mixed classes.

Unconscious extraneous motivations, such as the devaluation of a superior or of a rival, may strongly influence the behavior of an individual teacher in adopting an attitude and taking a stand. None of these reactions will be new for the teachers using them. They will most frequently be the habitual unconsciously employed, built-in personality patterns which have been used by the individual teacher for years.

Another frequent temptation to which human beings are known to fall victim under the impact of social change is that of exchanging one set of prejudicial stereotypes for another more acceptable one. In the area of racial integration, the most frequent form this takes is the exchange of racial prejudices for prejudicial attitudes toward socio-economic classes, or neighborhood styles of behavior. It frequently occurs that the white as well as the Negro teacher, when surrendering his original prejudicial defenses, increases his demands for middle-class behavior and conformity to social mores from both the children of his own group as well as those of the other race. From this some of the Negro children visibly gain. If they come from educated homes or socially upward mobile families, they will find themselves free of the great amount of previously experienced discrimination because their “Negro-ness” will now not count. Their less economically privileged or less well brought up contemporaries, however, will find themselves in double jeopardy, for they will not only remain unacceptable to the whole school population because of their unacceptable social forms, but
they experience an additional conflict. They may discover that even other Negro children of more middle-class background may be embarrassed by their behavior, or that even “their own” Negro teachers will feel the same way. In fact, the teachers may even put increased pressure of expectations on them because they have to prove how wrong the pessimistic expectations of the segregationists had been to begin with. The same Negro child with a learning problem in a mixed class may present a completely different problem to different teachers. A white or colored teacher might reject the child simply because he serves as a roadblock to his efforts at progress for the class as a whole; or he may reject the child as a verification of strong feelings of Negro inferiority, or he might identify with the child as an underdog and devote more effort and sympathy to that child than to others. No generalization would cover all cases. The reaction will be that which is characteristic for the individual teacher.

To broaden the point, it can be said that in general both white and Negro teachers will interact with some students in a manner designed to confirm their personal opinions or will push certain children to achieve lofty goals inspired by personal wishes. The destructive effects of this on the children are just as great when the behavior is to all intents and purposes benign and friendly as when it is overtly hostile and critical, since in either case it overlooks the child’s needs. This kind of teacher approach can be expected to yield to efforts at teacher training and consultation, since a major step in learning to cope with it is developing the insight to recognize the presence of such attitudes.

Among the most clearcut forms of confusion the educator may fall prey to is the phenomenon referred to as “mascot” cultivation in Section B. This is experienced by the educator himself as a benign attempt to be especially nice to the poor kid of the minority group and is therefore expected to produce all the signs of gratitude and positive response in the victim. In reality, such singling out of the special merits, advantages, and good sides of the discriminated-against minority group is still only the reverse side of a prejudicial coin, and is experienced as such by the group of children involved. For, while benign in intent, it still tells the children: “I am not looking at you as persons. To me you are primarily something that reminds me of your race.” Whatever good things are then said of this race, the fact that the child involved

finds himself shorn of his individual personality and seen only as a symbol of a group remains deeply disturbing.

Complications in professional life

For many educators, there are emotional similarities between their own childhood family structure and the hierarchy of authority and the relationships between colleagues in the school system. Devaluation or overvaluation of the principals or supervisors is common, as are rivalrous feelings toward colleagues on the same status level. Administrators and supervisors, too, are confronted with the obligation to be fair and not play favorites. In situations of emotional stress or crisis it will be easy to ascribe the success of some educators and the failure of others to favoritism based on race. Additionally, where separate school systems with duplicated jobs for white and Negro teachers must be fused into a single system, many persons will be relegated to assistant roles in departments which they previously headed. There will in such instances inevitably be feelings of reduced status and a revival of old sibling rivalry conflicts. Some members of the group may feel initially threatened by working with outstanding people of the other race. It is a further strain on Negro teachers’ stability to distinguish truly unavoidable administrative problems of transition from administrative pretenses for discrimination. Both are taking place. In Maryland, desegregation has proceeded in Baltimore and other parts of the state without incurring the dismissal of any Negro teachers. In some other states desegregation has brought about discharges of Negro teachers. There are localities said to employ large numbers of untrained and inexperienced white teachers and to leave vacancies unfilled rather than employ available experienced trained Negro teachers. Such practices not only do injury to the Negro teachers, but in depriving children of good teachers, reduce their opportunities for sound adjustment to desegregation.

The demand of the present period of transition on the patience, insight, and skills of school personnel cannot be overemphasized. For all present school personnel as well as for those responsible for teacher training and school counselor training, increased exposure to the techniques and insights developed in the field of
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5Educators may find some useful guidance through reviewing the experiences of social workers in interracial agencies. See Isabel Burns Lindsay, “Race as a Factor in the Caseworker’s Role,” Journal of Social Casework, 1947, 29, pp. 101-107.

group dynamics seems important. Much insight into the processes that go on in groups and their impact on individuals is available and should begin to contribute an important part of teacher training as well as of in-service training of personnel on all levels.7

3. THE PARENTS

Although children are the direct participants in the process of school desegregation, their attitudes and behavior are largely affected by parental attitudes. There is little doubt that where the parents as a group approved of desegregation, the problem of transition has been uneventful. However, an individual's role as a parent is not isolated from his role as an adult member of a community. Many negative attitudes toward desegregation have been gained by the parent as an individual and have little, if any, bearing on his role as a parent. Certainly there is no reason to believe that the fact of parenthood changes an individual's personality in any way which causes a significant lessening of his social prejudice.

Parents in our society are immensely concerned about the welfare and future of their children. According to the general mores, almost no sacrifice is too great to make for their benefit. Even in families with modest means, money is often saved from marginal incomes for college education; life and endowment insurance are purchased; and much social scheming takes place—for the benefit of the children. Certainly parental love and fear are most powerful psychological forces. It is this very dedication of parents to their children that has been utilized as a major force against desegregation. The threat of damage to children implicit in the alleged dangers of intermarriage effectively prevents a realistic appraisal of the evidence for and against segregation by many parents. Such fears


have been discussed in Section A of this report. Many parents are also concerned about the possible psychological damage to their children, of whichever ethnic group, by the conflicts which they fear will be engendered in the mixed group. And further, both sets of parents are apprehensive about the educational problems which must be solved in a newly desegregated school.

Concerns and anxieties

White parents may fear that academic standards will be lowered by the admission of Negro children, that the child or family will lose status in the community, that their children will be exposed to lower moral standards and to communicable diseases. White parents may also have fears in regard to relatively direct contact with Negro parents, such as at parent-teacher meetings.

Negro parents, having no less concern for the welfare and future of their children, are also affected by doubts and fears regarding desegregation. Will their children be able to compete satisfactorily in a desegregated school with higher standards? Will they receive fair and impartial treatment from the teachers? Will the white children hurt them physically or emotionally? What indignities should they, the parents, anticipate in attending a parent-teacher meeting?

Some of the apprehensions of parents are realistic, at least in part, but the evidence provided by studies of areas which have been desegregated indicates that some of these fears dissipate quickly when experience demonstrates either that they were ill-founded or that the new problems can be solved. For example, research studies of desegregated housing in previously segregated areas suggest that there is an initial feeling of loss of status on the part of white tenants which corrects itself rather quickly. After an initial sense of loss of status, the tenants' individual feelings adjusted themselves to the realities of everyday living (as had happened throughout their lives in other situations). The signs of a sense of loss of status disappeared.

White parents with fears of loss of status may also be reassured by reports from areas where school desegregation has taken place, which indicate that status problems may be lessened by making attendance at desegregated schools not a matter of personal decision, but requiring desegregation of all the schools of a given
community. Partial desegregation apparently encourages resistance. When all schools are desegregated, no child has a special advantage or handicap.

The fact that many Negro children will be relatively backward academically is primarily a problem for the school teachers and administrators and is discussed in another section of this report. Educators will need strong support from parents in meeting this problem. Gifted children of either race need not suffer academically from desegregation unless overcrowding, poor teaching, or other educational handicaps are present.

Similar considerations should lessen fears of white parents that their children may suffer a lowering of moral standards or catch communicable diseases from the Negro children. Neither delinquency nor communicable diseases are primarily related to race. Both are directly related to the complex social, psychological, and economic forces that form the ingredients of the pattern of inferior status of the Negro. Positive changes in these forces should lessen delinquency and improve the health of Negro children.

Sources of support

The parent-teacher meeting is a point at which white and Negro parents come into relatively direct contact with each other in a desegregated school. The beliefs and feelings many adults bring to meetings have been discussed elsewhere. However, the fact that contact in these meetings is on a basis of equal status as parents is unusual and leads to apprehensions. The parents attending these meetings, however, have a common bond and purpose which will assert itself positively in the direction of cooperation when the parents come to realize that irrespective of race they all want the same things for their children.

Whether the fears of Negro parents are realistic will vary from community to community and will be influenced by the social climate and the quality and character of the teachers. Some teachers, even though they know that present achievement is related to past educational and living experience as well as native ability, will have difficulties. Supplementary teacher training and constructive support from the parents will lessen these difficulties.

There are, of course, many parents who, being aware of social change, will desire that their children have experiences with desegregation which they themselves missed as children. The essence of education is to equip the child with skills and experience which may be effectively utilized and drawn upon in later life, among them the ability to get along with different people. Thus, while desegregation in schools will pose new problems for some parents for a period of time, it will at the same time relieve them of other problems incident to segregation.
III. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

As emphasized at the outset of this report, we recognize that the ruling of segregation as unconstitutional has meant that the process of desegregation is now definitely under way, although it proceeds at very uneven rates in different localities. Indeed, the resistance is so great in some communities that desegregation is only evidenced so far in the form of intensified opposition and efforts to circumvent it.

The anticipation of school desegregation arouses many mixed reactions of relief, hope, fear, and hostility, depending on the multiple constellations of racial, social, political, and psychodynamic variables discussed in this report. We have recognized that these reactions may be centrally or tangentially concerned with desegregation per se, for the individual, and that he may express them through manifold permutations and combinations of overtly or covertly going against or with the tide (however it may run for him); of floundering in its cross-currents or adding to its swell by his own energies.

We know that those whose intransigent resistance to desegregation serves irrational or unscrupulous purposes will not react to objective evidence of its workability by a change in their opposition. But there are more psychologically flexible people at every level of most communities' preparation for desegregation, who are responsive to reality-testing as a guide for their decisions and actions, even though it may not alter very much feelings that persist from their lifelong conditioning by the mores of segregation. For such people, reliable and informative reports of successful methods and results with desegregation elsewhere can help to modify misconceptions and disprove needless fears.

As the number of areas desegregating their schools increases, the opportunities and need for large-scale systematic psychosocial research study of this dynamic change become even greater. Research designed for application to the process of desegregation could have obvious immediate value. Long-term research, as well, using the "natural laboratory" of educational desegregation holds promise of advancing the basic knowledge of behavior. It is strongly advisable that both types of research be undertaken.

Incoming reports by social scientists of desegregation case histories have some admitted limitations, such as the lack of uniform methods of data collection and analysis. Nevertheless they have great value as the record of a growing body of actual experience with desegregating by some communities from which others can learn. Although no locale can wholly take over the modus operandi of another, because of the characteristics specific to each, certain principles and techniques, found to be useful in the desegregation process, are transposable from one setting to another, with suitable modifications to fit the special circumstances. (Many of these principles and techniques have been referred to in this report.)

In preparing this report we have tried to bring together some facts and principles drawn from general knowledge of human behavior as well as from special experience in this particular aspect of it. We have tried to show the bearing of these on the processes of behavior and attitude change which must accompany desegregation. No law can by itself bring about a fundamental alteration in personal and group attitudes and their underlying feelings. The legal regulation can change external behavior; for a lasting change in attitudes and mores there must be long-term exposure to new experiences together with opportunities to develop new insights as the result of those experiences. If one approaches a new situation with a viewpoint already determined by a deeply-ingrained prejudice, the possibilities of learning from it are greatly reduced. It is for this reason that conceptions of Negro inferiority—intellectual, moral, and social—play such a crucial role in preventing attitude change. We have pointed out that the concept of the Negro as inferior intellectually is partly derived from observations of Negroes who have lived as a deprived group, economically, socially, and politically; that educational opportunities in the schools and cultural enrichment in the home have both been lacking. Since the environment of most Negro children is so markedly different from that of most white children, there is no valid basis for comparisons of the

potentials of the two groups. A common fallacy is to compare achievements, for example, in school, and to assume that achievement differences mean potential differences. Even the supposedly reliable I.Q. figures do not lend themselves to simple comparison where background differs so widely.

We have also pointed out that beliefs in Negro inferiority are made a matter of intense feeling and in flexibility because of the numerous irrational emotional factors which focus around this issue. Such irrational forces range from unconscious guilt feelings springing from the long exploitation of Negroes by whites, to the use of feelings of superiority by whites to bolster up self-esteem and combat problems of insecurity or anxiety coming from other aspects of their own lives. We have discussed the general principle that conflicted feelings or wishes in all human beings may be kept out of conscious awareness and displaced onto some other, seemingly rational, issue which can then be reacted to, while the more basic, inner sources of turmoil are avoided. Conflicts survive in all of us as remainders of childhood difficulties with parental authority and the necessity of adapting our wishes and drives to life as it is. Therefore none of us is immune to the use of defensive rationalizations. Vigilant recognition of the possibilities of being misled by rationalizations is incumbent upon all who are dealing with problems of interracial relationships.

We have discussed the intensely emotional issue of intermarriage, pointing out that racial mixing has not so far been prevented by laws forbidding intermarriage. Irrational fears and superstitions are especially prevalent in this area and are particularly hampering to reasoned efforts to find a way of living and working together which suits the needs and wishes of both races.

We have also discussed the changes attendant upon desegregation from the point of view of group processes in the community. Powerful forces can be mobilized, both constructive and destructive, by the interactions of people in groups. Results of constructive group action may be seen, for example, in Louisville’s carefully-planned and relatively calm transition to desegregation, while the disturbances in Clinton, Tennessee exemplify the way in which group feeling can be stirred and channelized by fanatic leadership and how such effects can snowball once the process is under way. We believe that adequate recognition of the strength and dynamics of group forces is needed in order that wise leadership may assist in chan-

neling them constructively. In every human being, with the possible exception of seriously maladjusted persons, there is a vital need for a feeling of belonging, of recognition and acceptance by the various groups to which he belongs. Leaders, too, are not independent of the groups which they lead. Recognition, approval, and a reciprocal relationship of opinion-formation and action-taking require involvement of the leader in the group mores as fully as the group members themselves. Training leaders in recognition of the important elements in their roles can help in establishing and maintaining constructive action.

We have discussed the dynamics of people’s attitude toward authority in the process of social change. In many areas of the South, citizens of both races are caught in the open conflict between local authority which forbids compliance with the Supreme Court ruling and federal authority which requires it. In most people there are quite complex attitudes towards authority based on remnants of childhood conflicting attitudes toward parental authority, conflicting attitudes toward the very inconsistent admonitions of external authority throughout life, and conflicting attitudes toward one’s own inner codes of right and wrong. These personal struggles are inevitably heightened in the present intense clash between the local and federal governmental authorities. In addition, even religious authority has not been able to take an unequivocal position on the desegregation issue. These serious differences between external authorities, plus internal conflicts over attitudes toward authority, coupled with intense feelings about desegregation springing from other sources, put many Southerners into situations of conflicted loyalty and conflicted sense of right and wrong which make rational action extremely difficult. It is of vital importance that those who stand in positions of authority recognize both the existing state of conflict and their opportunity and responsibility to do something about it by exercise of leadership, wise timing, and dynamic understanding of the total situation.

And finally, we have discussed in considerable detail the various aspects of desegregation as they affect the main participants—the children, the educators, and the parents. The children’s attitudes with regard to race are largely determined by those of their elders and by the mores of the group in which they live. It can be strikingly demonstrated that in a neighborhood where the mores are those of racial discrimination and strife the children will behave
in a similar fashion, while in a camp setting where there is no significance given to racial differences the same children accept those of other races as being without importance differences. Disturbance in the classroom can come from hostile or fearful attitudes about desegregation brought from home. It can also come from tensions in the group or in the children individually which have sources other than racial ones. Teacher leadership here must be responsible for correct identification and handling of classroom tensions. However, the teachers too will have processes of change and adaptation to go through. In aiding in these adaptations school supervisors and principals will be most effective if they recognize the need for constructive assistance to teachers in clarifying their own viewpoints as well as in understanding the processes which are going on in the children. The school leadership must carry not only this responsibility but also that of bringing the parents into a working relationship with the school on the new problems arising out of desegregation, just as they have on other aspects of their children’s education.

We have tried to avoid in this report the use of global generalizations on a problem which is experienced differently in different communities and by different individuals. As psychiatrists we know from our work with individuals the dangers and difficulty of proceeding according to oversimplified, arbitrary rules. We have tried to present a way of looking at desegregation in schools as a human problem. The principle which has governed the production of this report is our belief that insight and understanding—that is, a rational approach to the profoundly irrational forces which move man—are the only appropriate ways of dealing with the issues of desegregation. We hope that we have demonstrated that problems attendant upon desegregation require for their solution not only an understanding of the social situations in which these problems occur, but also an insight into the complex motives—rational and irrational, conscious and unconscious—which influence attitudes toward these problems. We hope that this report will prove useful to those who are professionally involved in the problems arising from desegregation and that they will be aided by it in the task of translating understanding of psychodynamic processes into practical application.

IV. ANNOTATED READING LIST

The following reading list includes literature of particular relevance to the student of desegregation and of Negro-white relations in general. It does not claim to be comprehensive. Items which are quoted in the body of the report are so identified in parentheses citing the section of this report in which reference is made to them.
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A survey of research on problems of ethnic, racial, and religious group relations, together with a formulation of the important research issues remaining to be solved.
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A historical review of the development of segregation since Reconstruction and of the more recent moves toward desegregation.
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