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Introduction

One of the most characteristic and impressive things about the American people is their dedication to their children. Ours is indeed a "child-centered" society. Almost no sacrifice is too great for parents to make if it will benefit their children. Parents will work, scheme, attend church, buy life and endowment insurance, move from country to city, from city to suburbs, from one neighborhood to another, from south to north, from east to west — all for the welfare of their children. Divorces have been postponed and marriages maintained because of the children. Schools change their policies from traditional to progressive or vice versa in order to meet the needs of the children. Experts write books to present the latest version of the facts on the care of the infant and child. Parents buy, and sometimes read, these books in order to ensure their children a happy future. Important research projects on the causes, prevention, and cure of polio, muscular dystrophy, mental retardation, and emotional disturbances have been subsidized by parents moved by an emotional response to the picture of an afflicted child who could have been their own. American parents are intensely conscious, if not overly self-conscious, about the welfare and future success of their children. In the main, their activities in the present and their plans for the future are geared to protecting their children from want and foreseeable harm.

When mistakes are made and things go wrong with their children, parents suffer from feelings of guilt even if they did not deliberately harm their children. Often these difficulties reflect
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factors that the parents do not understand or control; therefore the parents cannot know what is the "right" thing to do.

When white American parents demand that a school board maintain separate schools for white and Negro children, and when some of these parents encourage their children to refuse to attend a school to which Negro students have been recently admitted, they do so not only as an expression of their own racial feelings but also in the belief that they are protecting their children. If these parents understood that, far from protecting their children, acts of this type distort and damage the core of their children's personalities, they would not act this way. If they understood that the opportunity for a child to meet and know other children of different races, religions, and cultures is beneficial and not detrimental; that it contributes to social competence and confidence; that it increases a child's chances for personal and moral stability — then they would demand, in the name of their children, non-segregated public education.

For these and other reasons, it is necessary to have a clear understanding of the nature of racial prejudices and the effects of these prejudices upon American society in general and upon the personality development of children.

Some scholars have pointed out that all complex human societies assign to different groups of individuals positions of different status. The pretext for the different status varies from differences in religion, region, sex, politics, or material possessions to differences in physical characteristics. In differentiating among human beings, the societies decide which are "better" and which are "worse." Then the society excludes and rejects those in the "worse" groups. Finally, these patterns become fixed and unquestioned social customs.

Racial discrimination in America is one example of this tendency to grant preferred status to some individuals and to reject others. In this case the basis for preference is skin color.

Some scholars have speculated on the reasons for prejudice, to discover which came first — the lower status or the prejudice.

In either case the stereotyped thinking almost invariably asserts the inferiority of one group and the superiority of the other. Needless to say, these explanations are satisfying to the group on top and disturbing to the group on the bottom. Some observers maintain that these forms of prejudices are irrational, that they fulfill an emotional rather than intellectual need of those who hold them. It would be difficult, however, to understand social prejudices in terms of whether they are rational. Man utilizes all of his faculties, both rational and irrational, in his struggle to establish an adequate status for himself, and in his attempt to justify his existence and his superiority to others.

Not all human prejudices have bad consequences. Some prejudices may have positive personal and social results. The aversion to poisonous food is a positive prejudice. Such a prejudice reflects the accumulated knowledge of the culture; and it is neither necessary nor reasonable for an individual to try to make a personal verification of what is already known. Moreover, there are prejudices that are neither positive nor negative — "neutral" prejudices, which do not help or harm. An example of neutral prejudice would be the rather widespread aversion to the eating of horsemeat. Horsemeat would not harm the person who ate it; but neither would his refusal to eat horsemeat damage either the horse or the abstainer (so long as he took some other food for adequate nourishment).

In addition to the positive and neutral prejudices, there are destructive and negative prejudices. Among them are racial, religious, economic, and social prejudices, which threaten the integrity of individuals and of whole societies.

Parents and other adults who care about the welfare of children must be concerned with the problem of the types of ideas and judgments transmitted to children. An important aspect of the education of all children in a democracy is teaching them those beliefs, ideas, and patterns of behavior which are most consistent with reality and with personal and social stability. An equally important aspect involves training children to recognize beliefs
that conflict with objective reality and with their own integrity — beliefs that are detrimental to themselves and others. Moral and ethical considerations are necessary aspects of sound education in a democratic society. Children cannot be encouraged to substitute personal wishes for social reality without severe risk to the stability of their personalities. Racial prejudices are indications of a disturbed and potentially unstable society.

Racial prejudice in America involves not only a pattern of preferred status for some on the basis of skin color, but also feelings of hostility and aggression sometimes reflected in barbaric cruelty. This pattern cannot exist in a democratic society without arousing deep currents of guilt and conflict.

As Gunnar Myrdal has pointed out, there is a gulf between the American ideals of democracy and brotherhood on the one hand, and the existence of racial prejudice, discrimination, and segregation on the other. The "American creed," which emphasizes the essential dignity of the human personality, the fundamental equality of man, and the inalienable rights to freedom, justice, and equal opportunity, is clearly contradicted by the denial of these to certain human beings because of their race, religion, or nationality background. The struggle between the moral forces and the manifestations of racial prejudice has long influenced American society. At times this struggle seems to have immobilized the constructive role of many of our social institutions, such as schools and churches. Indeed, during long periods of American history, it seemed possible for Americans to adjust, with little apparent difficulty, both to their dedication to the "American creed" and to their discrimination against Negroes. However, the essential strength of the democratic ideology periodically reasserts itself and demands re-examination of our racial practices. Myrdal and his associates have stated that the main trend in American history is toward the eventual realization of the "American creed" and the elimination of racial discrimina-
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1In his monumental work, An American Dilemma. (See the Bibliography at the end of this book.)
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had made the old world no longer tolerable. To American white colonizers and immigrants, the "American creed," like American technology, was accepted and sustained in order to obtain a security and integrity that had been previously denied. If this is true, it may offer an explanation of the relationship between the American ideology of equality and the American pattern of social and racial discrimination. An individual in quest of security and status may seek to obtain them not only through positive objective methods — work and personal achievement — but through the denial of security and status to another person or group. The exercise of this power over others may bring with it a feeling of security and status which equals or surpasses any satisfaction achieved by actual personal effort. The white American's espousal of the "American creed" is real and significant to him. It is the expression of his desire for equality, status, and security. His denial of these to the Negro is a manifestation of this same desire, and makes him feel he has won a superior status. Seen from this point of view, the "American creed" and racial discrimination are not contradictory but compatible elements of American history and social psychology. Each has the same motivation — an intense drive for status and security.

If the resolution of the American dilemma is in the direction of the "American creed," it will not be because of the power of the ideals in themselves, or because of their apparent contradiction with social realities, or because of guilt feelings. It will be a result of the realistic pressures of changed economic and technological developments, together with social and political national and international events, which will tip the balance in the direction of forcing Americans to adhere to our ideals as the most effective means for maintaining the stability and vitality of our society.

One must acknowledge that it has been possible for America to accept this discrepancy between its moral codes and its violations of them; but one cannot completely discount the potential significance of the ideals themselves. Americans are both practical and idealistic. A basic belief of American culture is that one can work toward progress. Up to the present, the most significant indications of social progress in America have been brought about through material and technological advances. If political, legal, economic, and international pressures demand fundamental social changes in America, the American ideals of brotherhood may help to make the transitional period less disruptive and probably even a challenging and creative period in American history.

Beyond the larger social, economic, and international aspects of racial prejudice, there exist the inescapable human costs. Racial prejudices are not impersonal social problems. A democratic society should seek to eliminate symptoms of man's inhumanity to man because they distort and dehumanize human beings. Prejudiced persons are dominated by primitive fears and hatreds, and prejudices also damage the personalities of the victims. Parents, educators, and other adults concerned with stable personality and character in our children — all those who seek to provide the opportunity for children to enrich their lives and contribute to society as fully as possible — must increase their concern with the problem of protecting children from the corrosion of destructive racial and social prejudices. It may not always be easy for adults to provide these opportunities for children, since most adults themselves grew up under social conditions that fostered racial prejudices. However, among the responsibilities and obligations that parents assume for their children is that of providing opportunities and experiences for growth which they, the parents, may not have had. This obligation is imperative not only in the family's economic and educational advancement, but in the area of social attitudes.

No normal parent would deliberately block his child's opportunity to obtain the preparation he needs in order to meet the demands of the present and the future. Racial attitudes which may not have been clearly inconsistent with the world in which the present generation of parents and grandparents grew up are clearly inconsistent with today's world. Vast changes in trans-
portation and communication have brought distant lands and peoples within easy access and close relations. Narrow, provincial prejudices are no longer appropriate. The contemporary world demands the development of cosmopolitan attitudes toward people who are different. The peoples of Asia and Africa who were seen as exotic or bizarre in the nineteenth century are now demanding the status of equal partners in a world struggling for democratic stability. Our children will not be able to play an effective role in this modern world if they are blocked by our past prejudices and if through these attitudes they stimulate resentment and hostility rather than cooperation and understanding among other peoples of the world.

These are positive reasons for helping our children to meet the demands of our times. The modern world challenges American parents and educators to re-examine educational techniques and methods in order to determine the most effective ways to stimulate and reinforce in our children positive social attitudes which are essential to moral strength and personal stability. The vitality and stability of a humane society are at stake. The concern with the dignity of the human being — with the opportunity for the development of the moral potentialities of all individuals — distinguishes a democratic society from a totalitarian one.

On May 17, 1954, the United States Supreme Court handed down a decision which ruled that state laws requiring or permitting racial segregation in public education are a violation of the United States Constitution. This decision is historic from the legal, educational, and human points of view. It may eventually rank with the great documents that have marked our progress toward the goals of democracy. In simple and eloquent words the Court stated:

We must consider public education in the light of its full development and its present place in American life throughout the nation.

Today, education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments. It is the very foundation of good citizenship. Today it is a principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. . . .

We come then to the question presented: Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other "tangible" factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We believe that it does.

. . . To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone. . . .

We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal.

This decision was the climax of a long series of legal cases which have challenged the constitutionality of various forms of racial segregation in public education and other areas of American life. The Court's decision also took into account a growing body of knowledge in psychology and the social sciences, the result of extensive research into the development of racial attitudes and the effect of prejudice on the development of American children. The research, which had been carried on by social scientists for many years, made it possible to present the Court a coherent and systematic picture of the effects of prejudice, discrimination, and segregation on personality development.

In December 1950, the Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth had dealt with the theme of healthy personality development in American children. The research staff gathered and presented the available knowledge on this general problem. The author of this book was given the responsibility for examining all available information on racial prejudice and its effects on the personality of American children. This material was presented as a manuscript, which was used as the basis for discussion of this problem at the White House conference.
In May 1951, the first case to challenge the constitutionality of segregation in public elementary and high schools was heard before three judges in a Federal district court in Charleston, South Carolina. Much of the information that had been assembled for the White House conference was used as expert testimony to show the damaging effects of racial prejudice and segregation on children. This type of testimony was also presented in three of the four subsequent cases. The Supreme Court, in its May 1954 decision, cited the original manuscript in support of its finding that racial segregation in public education deprives children of minority groups of equal educational opportunities and therefore violates the "equal protection" clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment.

In writing this clear and unequivocal decision, the Supreme Court made a major contribution to the progress of racial democracy in America. The decision itself did not, and could not, solve all of the many complex social problems which must be met as various communities seek to make the transition from segregated to non-segregated schools. This decision clarified the legal and moral grounds for non-segregated public education. It also established the legal basis for the elimination of segregation in other areas of American life.

The Supreme Court, in effect, challenged boards of education, public officials, parents, educators, and all citizens who believe in democracy to re-examine American social practices in order to determine whether they damage or enhance the human potentials of children. The legal power of our government is now clearly on the side of protecting our children. There remains, however, the problem of translating this legal decision into practical and beneficial social changes. This problem is primarily the responsibility of individual citizens in their local communities. Parents, social workers, educators, clergymen, and others must now mobilize their energies for effective implementation of this decision.

In order to do so with a minimum of social conflict and con-
PART ONE

THE PROBLEM OF PREJUDICE
1. How Children Learn About Race

Are children born with racial feelings? Or do they have to learn, first, what color they are and, second, what color is “best”?

Less than fifty years ago, some social theorists maintained that racial and religious prejudices are inborn — that they are inherent and instinctive. These theorists believed that children do not have to learn to dislike people who differ from them in physical characteristics; it was considered natural to dislike those different from oneself and to like those similar to oneself.

However, research over the past thirty years has refuted these earlier theories. Social scientists are now convinced that children learn social, racial, and religious prejudices in the course of observing, and being influenced by, the existence of patterns in the culture in which they live. Students of the problem are now facing these questions:

(1) How and when do children learn to identify themselves with some people and to differentiate themselves from others?

(2) How and when do children acquire racial attitudes and begin to express these attitudes in their behavior?

(3) What conditions in the environment foster the development of these racial attitudes and behavior?

(4) What can be done to prevent the development and expression of destructive racial prejudices in children?
Until quite recently, there were differences of opinion concerning the age at which children develop and express racial prejudices. Some observers (in the tradition of those who believed that prejudices are inborn) said that even infants express racial preferences and that therefore such preferences are natural and spontaneous. At the other extreme, certain observers maintained that social and racial prejudices play little or no role in the life of the child until the early teens. They pointed out that children of different races have been observed playing together and sometimes developing close friendships; this fact, they thought, showed that young children are unaware of racial or religious differences.

Within the past two decades, social scientists have made a series of studies of this problem. They indicate, on the one hand, that there is no evidence that racial prejudices are inborn; and, on the other hand, that it is equally false to assume that the child remains unaffected by racial considerations until his teens or pre-teens.

Racial attitudes appear early in the life of children and affect the ideas and behavior of children in the first grades of school. Such attitudes—which appear to be almost inevitable in children in our society—develop gradually.

According to one recent study, white kindergarten children in New York City show a clear preference for whites and a clear rejection of Negroes. Other studies show that Negro children in the kindergarten and early elementary grades of a New England town, in New York City, in Philadelphia, and in two urban communities in Arkansas know the difference between Negroes and whites; realize whether they are Negro or white; and are aware of the social meaning and evaluation of racial differences.

The development of racial awareness and racial preferences in Negro children has been studied by the author and his wife. To determine the extent of consciousness of skin color in these children between three and seven years old, we showed the children four dolls all from the same mold and dressed alike; the only difference in the dolls was that two were brown and two were white. We asked the children to choose among the dolls in answer to certain requests:

1. "Give me the white doll."
2. "Give me the colored doll."
3. "Give me the Negro doll."

These children reacted with strong awareness of skin color. Among three-year-old Negro children in both northern and southern communities, more than 75 per cent showed that they were conscious of the difference between "white" and "colored." Among older children, an increasingly greater number made the correct choices.

These findings clearly support the conclusion that racial awareness is present in Negro children as young as three years old. Furthermore, this knowledge develops in stability and clarity from year to year, and by the age of seven it is a part of the knowledge of all Negro children. Other investigators have shown that the same is true of white children.

Some children whose skin color is indistinguishable from that of white people, but who are nonetheless classified as Negroes by the society, have difficulty in making a correct racial identification of themselves at an age when other children do so. Soon, however—the age of five or six—the majority of these children also begin to accept the social definition of themselves, even though this differs from their observance of their own skin color.

There is now no doubt that children learn the prevailing social
ideas about racial differences—early in their lives. Not only are they aware of race in terms of physical characteristics such as skin color, but also they are generally able to identify themselves in terms of race.

The problem of the development and awareness of religious ideas and identification in children involves more subtle and complex distinctions which understandably require a longer period of time before they are clearly understood.

It is much more difficult for children to know if they are Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish than it is to know if they are white or Negro. In one study (Radke, Trager, and Davis), children were shown pictures of a church with a cross, and of a building clearly marked as a synagogue. The investigators asked the children their reactions to these pictures. Only a minority of children between the ages of five and eight made stable and accurate identification of themselves in terms of religion. Less than half of the Jewish children in this age group identified themselves as Jews, while only 30 per cent of the Catholic children and only 27 per cent of the white Protestant children made correct religious identifications. The relatively high percentage of Jewish children who correctly identified themselves as Jews indicates that for these children there is an earlier awareness of religious identification and probably of minority status.

In these tests, no Negro child identified himself in religious terms. This fact probably indicates that for the Negro child at these ages the dominant factor in self-identification is skin color. The impact of their minority status as determined by skin color is so great that it precludes more abstract bases for self-identification.

A study of seven- and eight-year-old Jewish boys (by Hartley, Rosenbaum, and Schwartz) found that these boys had a generalized preference for all things "Jewish." The children responded to all questions concerning self-identification and preference with such comments as: "Because I am Jewish." "Because I like Jewish." "Because they are Jewish like me." "Because I like to play with Jewish people."

This undifferentiated preference for Jewishness was found by Radke to be appreciably less among Jewish children of ten and eleven, and even less in thirteen- and fourteen-year-olds. It is possible that as these children mature their increased contact with the larger culture results in a decreased interest in Jewishness as such. It is also possible that this tendency reflects an increase in rejection of Jewishness—indicating the children's growing awareness of the minority status of Jews in America.

The same social scientists have studied small groups of Jewish, Catholic, Negro, and white Protestant children in New York City. These children were asked to respond to the simple question, "What are you?" Jewish children on all age levels answered by the term "Jewish," rarely identifying themselves in terms of nationality or color. On the other hand, a considerable proportion of the non-Jewish children identified themselves in terms of nationality rather than religion.

Non-Jewish children between the ages of 3½ and 4½ were usually not certain what religion they belonged to. Some non-Jewish white children in this age group said that they were Jewish; the fact that they were enrolled in a Jewish neighborhood center may have accounted for their mistaken belief that they were Jewish. At this stage of development, a non-Jewish child in a Jewish setting may conceive of himself as Jewish, and vice versa. These results suggest that the problem of religious identification involves a level of abstract thinking of which pre-school children are generally incapable.

These investigators also studied the meaning of such terms as "Jewish" and "Catholic" for children between the ages of four and ten. They found that at these ages the concepts are understood in terms of concrete activities. Jewish children mentioned "Going to shul," "Not eating bacon," or "Talking Jewish." Catholic children mentioned "Going to church," "Making communion," or "To speak as a Catholic."
Certain conclusions arise from the many independent investigations of the development of racial awareness and identification in children. By the age of four, Negro and white children are generally aware of differences in skin color and can identify themselves correctly in terms of such differences. Jewish children are not consistently aware of their Jewishness until around the age of five. The average Catholic or Protestant child does not begin to identify himself in religious terms until around seven or eight. Thus it appears that the concrete and perceptible fact of skin color provides a basis for earlier self-identification and preferences in American children than the more abstract factor of the family religion.

A child gradually learns what status the society accords to his group. The tendency of older Jewish children to show less preference for Jewishness than younger Jewish children suggests that they have learned that Jews do not have a preferred status in the larger society, and that these children have accordingly modified their self-appraisal. This effect of the awareness of the status of one's own group is even more clearly apparent in the case of Negro children.

In addition to Negro children's awareness of differences in skin color, the author and his wife studied the ability of these children to identify themselves in racial terms. We asked the children to point out the doll "which is most like you." Approximately two-thirds of all the children answered correctly. Correct answers were more frequent among the older ones. (Only 37 per cent of the three-year-olds but 87 per cent of the seven-year-olds responded accurately.) Negro children of light skin color had more difficulty in choosing the brown doll than Negro children of medium-brown or dark-brown skin color. This was true for older as well as younger children.

Many personal and emotional factors probably affected the ability of these Negro children to select the brown doll. In an effort to determine their racial preferences, we asked the children the following four questions:

(1) "Give me the doll that you like to play with" or "the doll you like best."
(2) "Give me the doll that is the nice doll."
(3) "Give me the doll that looks bad."
(4) "Give me the doll that is a nice color."

The majority of these Negro children at each age indicated an unmistakable preference for the white doll and a rejection of the brown doll.8

Studies of the development of racial awareness, racial identification, and racial preference in both Negro and white children thus present a consistent pattern. Learning about races and racial differences, learning one's own racial identity, learning which race is to be preferred and which rejected — all these are assimilated by the child as part of the total pattern of ideas he acquires about himself and the society in which he lives. These acquired patterns of social and racial ideas are interrelated both in development and in function. The child's first awareness of racial differences is found to be associated with some rudimentary evaluation of these differences. Furthermore, as the average child learns to evaluate these differences according to the standards of the society, he is at the same time required to identify himself with one or another group. This identification necessarily involves a knowledge of the status assigned to the group with which he identifies himself, in relation to the status of other groups. The child therefore cannot learn what racial group he belongs to without being involved in a larger pattern of emotions, conflicts, and desires which are part of his growing knowledge of what society thinks about his race.

Many independent studies enable us to begin to understand how children learn about race, how they identify themselves and others in terms of racial, religious, or nationality differences, and

8Even at three years the majority preferred the white doll and rejected the brown doll. The children of six or seven showed some indication of an increased preference for the brown doll; even at this age, however, the majority of the Negro children still preferred the doll with the white skin color.
what meaning these differences have for the growing child. Racial and religious identification involves the ability of the child to identify himself with others of similar characteristics, and to distinguish himself from those who appear to be dissimilar.

The fact that young Negro children would prefer to be white reflects their knowledge that society prefers white people. White children are generally found to prefer their white skin—an indication that they too know that society likes whites better. It is clear, therefore, that the self-acceptance or self-rejection found so early in a child’s developing complex of racial ideas reflects the awareness and acceptance of the prevailing racial attitudes in his community.

Some children as young as three years of age begin to express racial and religious attitudes similar to those held by adults in their society. The racial and religious attitudes of sixth-graders are more definite than the attitudes of pre-school children, and hardly distinguishable from the attitudes of high-school students. Thereafter there is an increase in the intensity and complexity of these attitudes, until they become similar (at least, as far as words go) to the prevailing attitudes held by the average adult American.

The racial ideas of children are less rigid, more easily changed, than the racial ideas of adults. It is probable, too, that racial attitudes and behavior are more directly related among adults. The racial and religious attitudes of a young child may become more positive or more negative as he matures. The direction these attitudes will take, their intensity and form of expression, will be determined by the type of experiences that the child is permitted to have. One student of this problem says that, although children tend to become more tolerant in their general social attitudes as they grow older, they become less tolerant in their attitudes toward the Negro. This may reflect the fact that the things children are taught about the Negro and the experiences they are permitted to have usually result in the development of racial intolerance.

2. Society and Children’s Feelings About Race

Who teaches a child to hate and fear—or to respect as his equal—a member of another race? Does he learn from his mother and father? From his schoolteachers? From his playmates? Or does he learn from those impersonal but pervasive teachers, the television set, the moving picture, the comic book? Probably it is all of these that teach him to love or to hate. Studies indicate that such attitudes are determined not by a single factor but by all of the child’s experiences.

When white children in urban and rural sections of Georgia and in urban areas of Tennessee were compared with children attending an all-white school in New York City, their basic attitudes toward the Negro were found to be the same.1 Students of the problem now generally accept the view that children’s attitudes toward Negroes are determined chiefly “not by contact with Negroes but by contacts with the prevailing attitudes toward Negroes.” It is not the Negro child, but the idea of the Negro child, that influences children.

Rarely do American parents deliberately teach their children to hate members of another racial, religious, or nationality group. Many parents, however, communicate the prevailing racial attitudes to their children in subtle and sometimes unconscious ways. Parents often forget their influence on the formation of their children’s opinions and frequently deny that they have ever said anything to their children that would encourage race prejudice. A group of southern white children told one investigator (Horowitz) that their parents punished them most often when

1Eugene L. Horowitz (1936).
they went to play with Negro children who lived in their neighborhood. He concluded that the development of attitudes of southern children toward Negroes has its source in community pressures brought to bear upon the parents, who then transmit them to their children. The particular way in which this happens is frequently forgotten by the parents, and eventually they develop a system of rationalizations to support their behavior and the behavior they impose upon their children.

It is possible that these community pressures are transmitted to children not only through their own parents, but also, as they grow older, through their friends and their friends' parents. Some investigations suggest that the attitudes of parents have a greater influence on younger children than on older ones. From about ten years of age, the child is being more directly influenced by the larger environment; if his racial attitudes and behavior are still consistent with those of his parents, it is probably because the larger environment agrees with his parents.

There is no consistent evidence that parents always play a crucial continuing role in the transmission of the prevailing racial attitudes in their children. Studies dealing with the attitudes of Negro children show that these children generally have negative attitudes toward other Negroes. It would seem unlikely that the negative attitudes of these children toward their own group are a result of the direct influence of their parents. Although some Negro parents have mixed feelings about their own racial status, the average parent would be careful in the way he expressed such feelings in the presence of his children. But some children of a minority group may be sensitive to the unexpressed racial feelings of their parents. An occasional offhand disparaging remark, an occasional overheard adult conversation, may contribute to the development of the child's racial feelings. On the whole, however, it seems that Negro children, like white children, get their negative attitudes toward other Negroes as much from the outside community as from the home.

At a parent-teacher meeting devoted to the development of racial attitudes in young children, a white mother arose to present a problem. She said that she and her husband, concerned with problems of racial justice, had sought to provide for their children the type of democratic home atmosphere that would foster a sensitivity for and appreciation of the equality and dignity of all human beings. She had friends of different racial and religious groups who visited her home and whom she visited with her children. Nevertheless, her oldest child had come home from the first grade of school with disparaging remarks about Negroes. Once he used a particularly offensive racial epithet. She and her husband were disturbed about this and wanted to know how such a thing could happen and in what ways they had failed as parents. The guest speaker at the meeting pointed out that, once her child left the sheltered environment of the home, he was naturally exposed to other social influences. This child was learning about the attitudes that existed among the majority of his playmates and a few dominant individuals in his class who had been influenced by their parents or other adults.

Certain evidence seems to indicate that parents who are primarily preoccupied with their personal status, and parents who impose upon their children harsh and rigid forms of discipline, are likely to foster in their children intense prejudices toward individuals of another race or religion. Some students claim that children who are personally secure and happy are not as likely to develop rigid prejudices. But other observers maintain that it is misleading to explain the development of prejudices in terms of the personal happiness or security of the child within his family. Many children, growing up in the normal American environment, do not have the opportunity to learn any attitude except one that stereotypes individuals of a different race.

Parents are merely one element of the complex pattern of social forces that influence the child's racial, religious, and social attitudes. The development of racial prejudices in children reflects, among other things, the complexities of his family relationships, the type of community in which he lives (including friends and
neighbors), his school experiences, and the religious influences brought to bear upon him.

Racial symbols are so prevalent in the American scene that all normal children eventually perceive them. They observe segregated residential areas, segregated and often inferior schools for Negro children, segregated recreational facilities, and in some areas of the country segregated transportation. They see Negroes often only in domestic service or in other menial occupations. Such observations contribute to the young child’s attitude toward those individuals whom the society consistently labels as “inferior.”

This is a problem even for the Negro child who grows up in a segregated Negro community. Such children have some contacts with life outside their racial ghettos; their parents frequently work in a subordinate capacity for whites, and the children see the same moving pictures, radio and television programs, newspapers, magazines, and comic books that white children see. From these and other sources they learn that they are considered by the larger society to have an inferior status. In seeking to understand the origin and source of racial attitudes in children, one should not ignore the role of the mass media of communication. Until recently, the treatment of Negro characters in the movies, over the radio, and on television has contributed to the perpetuation of stereotypes. This treatment has labeled the Negro as either comic, menial, or inferior. But it is possible to overemphasize the role of even the powerful instruments of mass communication. It is doubtful that television, the radio, and the movies can be held totally responsible for the racial attitudes of American children. Rather, the treatment of racial groups by these media reflects the prevailing racial attitudes in the larger culture. The media are mirrors of society.

One Negro father attempted to discourage his ten-year-old son from looking at a television program that presented Negro characters in stereotyped roles. The father said he would be happy if the son did not look at this program, because all of the Negroes were required to speak in a comic southern dialect. The son insisted that he liked the program because “it was funny.”

The father replied: “Listen to the way those people are talking. Have you ever heard any of our friends or relatives speak in that manner?”

The son answered in a matter-of-fact way: “Of course not. But this is the way colored people talk on radio and television.”

This episode indicates that some children may be able to make a clear distinction between reality and what is presented to them as entertainment. Radio, television, and other media do not, in themselves, determine the attitudes of children; but they may reinforce the developing attitudes of some children.

In understanding the growth and elaboration of racial attitudes in children, one must emphasize that the many institutionalized forms of prejudice are of primary importance. The various types of racial segregation that children observe — must take part in — are crucial in the formation of their racial attitudes. A white child who attends a segregated school from his earliest grades up through high school, or a child who is told that he must not play with Negro children because they are dirty or delinquent, is being taught that there are people who are “inferior” and that he himself is “superior” by virtue of race or skin color alone.

A study of 173 New York City children between the ages of seven and thirteen showed that the judgments of children are more likely to be influenced by the attitudes of their classmates than by the authority of their teacher. The investigator asked these children to estimate the length of lines, to compare one line with a standard line, and to match lines with lines of different lengths. These tasks varied in difficulty. The experiment was designed so that small groups of children were pitted against other groups, an individual child against a number of other children, and a child against his teacher. Always the majority group was instructed, unknown to the individual subject, to give
answers that were sometimes obviously incorrect. The investigator found that an individual child, confronted with the fact that the majority of his classmates were unanimous in making an incorrect judgment, tended to modify his own judgments according to the opinion of the rest. The younger children were more dependent upon the group than were the older children. On the other hand, when a teacher tried to influence the child's judgment by a clearly false opinion, not one of the children followed the teacher's judgment completely. The role of the teacher in influencing the opinion of these children was therefore much weaker than the role of their classmates. Although this particular study was not concerned directly with the problem of racial attitudes, it suggests that children of this age group are more likely to be influenced by friends of their own age than by adults.

There have been no consistent conclusions about the effect of individual teachers and the role of the school in the fostering of good intergroup relations among children. While there might be some question concerning the effects of direct attempts at indoctrination by teachers — particularly when these attempts are clearly in contradiction to observable facts — the influence by subtle and indirect means of adults on children's attitudes cannot be discounted. A school may have an excellent over-all human-relations program, but individual teachers with negative racial attitudes may present such a program in a way that cancels out the positive aims of the larger program. Allport and Kramer, after studying the racial attitudes of college undergraduates, concluded that, although many of their subjects remembered learn-

3 Only 7 per cent of the children between the ages of seven and ten maintained their own correct judgment in the face of contradiction from the group. Of the older group of children, 20 per cent were able to contradict the group judgment consistently. It should be pointed out also that the degree to which the group's judgment influenced the judgment of the individual child depended upon the clarity of the situation presented to him. When the situation was not clear, the judgment of the majority had a greater influence upon the individual. See R. W. Berenda, The Influence of the Group on the Judgments of Children.

ing something about racial attitudes in elementary and high school, they could not recall anything specific. About 8 per cent reported that they had learned some "scientific facts about race." These were generally the less prejudiced individuals.

Although many people continue to believe that schools and teachers have a direct influence on the development of racial attitudes in children, this view is not supported by any substantial body of evidence. There have not been enough specific studies of the role of the schools in the development of racial attitudes of children; the real extent of their influence is therefore unknown. A cautious interpretation of the available evidence suggests that the influence of schools and teachers is more passive than active. For the most part, educators seem to approach this problem somewhat in the way in which they approach the problem of sex education. Rather than taking the leadership in educational programs designed to develop more positive racial attitudes, the schools tend to follow the existing community prejudices. The few experiments in dynamic race-relations programs as integral parts of the school curriculum reflect the general inadequacy of our educational institutions in this area. They also show what could be done if teachers and other school officials were sufficiently alerted to their social and educational responsibility.

Given this tendency to passivity on the part of our schools and educators, episodes demonstrating the prejudice of individual teachers may become important factors in the development of negative racial attitudes in children. The following incident took place in a school in a New England city that had a reputation for good race relations. When a teacher was assembling her third-grade class after a play period in the school yard, the children did not want to stop playing and return to their classroom. The teacher was somewhat impatient in gathering the stragglers. One little boy returned breathlessly to the line just as it started to move away. It was clear that he had been playing rather hard, and his face was covered with dirt from the playground. The
teacher looked at him and shouted: "Jimmie, look at you! You are all dirty. You look just like a little colored boy." There were two Negro children in that class. As the other children laughed at Jimmie, these two children hung their heads in embarrassment and shame. Thoughtlessly, and probably without venom, this teacher had given her class a most effective lesson in ant-Negro prejudice.

Unfortunately, such incidents are not rare. A teacher in a New York City public school considered it desirable to separate the children in her class according to her estimate of their academic standing. Because this school is in a mixed neighborhood, she had white, colored, and Puerto Rican children in her class. Almost invariably the white children were placed in the first rows, the Negroes in the middle rows, and the Puerto Rican children in the back rows. The teacher insisted that this procedure was in no way a reflection of racial attitudes and she did not believe that the children in her class could be influenced by this pattern. She could not understand that children respond more to the concrete realities they perceive than to the abstract ideas and explanations they are offered. Here they were being taught by the actual classroom situation that certain children with white skin color were "superior" or were preferred by their teacher; and that those with brown skin color or with an accent were "inferior" and were being rejected by their teacher. Unquestionably these and similar situations contribute to the total pattern of children's racial attitudes. As long as such situations are not counteracted by vigorous educational programs by responsible school officials, the result will be an increase in racial prejudice. The influence of racially segregated schools is even more clear and direct. These schools are in themselves concrete monuments to the prevailing racial prejudices in a community. A child who is required to attend a segregated school is being taught that race is an important factor in his education. It is practically impossible for him to avoid including in his appraisal of himself, as this is influenced by his experience in school, the fact of his racial identity. In the case of the Negro child, his attendance at a segregated school establishes the fact of his "inferiority," since he is aware that his school is generally inferior to the one provided for whites, and that he is being rejected and prevented from associating with the other children in the community. In the case of the white child, his attendance at a segregated school demonstrates to him his "superiority" in terms of whiteness alone and teaches him in a concrete way that the rejected Negro attending the Negro school is inherently "inferior."

This situation clearly plays a major role in the total pattern of racial attitudes that these children develop. Democratic education cannot be effective in a racially segregated school. Lip service to democratic ideals is contradicted by the concrete fact of the segregation itself. These schools, therefore, stimulate, perpetuate, and reinforce negative racial attitudes in children and are powerful obstacles to the attainment of genuine democratic education.3

What is the influence of the church in the development of racial attitudes in children? One must keep in mind the fact that nearly ninety million Americans are enrolled in some church. Nearly thirty million American children are enrolled in Sunday schools. Much of the educational literature published by the major Protestant churches is designed for use with children and young people, and some of it deals directly with the problem of improving intergroup relations. The moral and religious basis for good human relationships is generally very well expressed, but there is a general vagueness about how a child is to translate these words into concrete daily behavior. The major difficulty in the translation of these moral and religious ideas into social reality lies in the fact that churches themselves are predominantly segregated institutions. There is the dilemma of how to teach children the moralities of brotherhood in racially segregated Sunday schools.

3The role of the schools is discussed at further length in Chapter 5 below.
Studies of the influence of religious training on racial attitudes have revealed a paradox. They show that individuals who profess strong religious affiliations or attend church frequently are more likely to be prejudiced than those who do not. Although these results are not entirely conclusive, consistent evidence from independent studies strongly suggests that religious training in itself does not make the individual more tolerant toward other races. There is even some suggestion that under the present pattern of religious training it might tend to make him more prejudiced.

There should be further research into this problem. The available evidence suggests, however, that churches and Sunday schools do not now play an effective part in developing positive racial and religious attitudes in children. This may be because the churches tend to reflect the prevailing racial attitudes of the larger community. For the most part the churches, like the schools, do not take the initiative in attempting to develop a systematic program for the improvement of racial attitudes in children. It is clear that such a program would be extremely difficult as long as racially segregated churches exist.

Since there is no evidence that churches actively encourage the development of negative racial attitudes, the children are influenced by other forces in society. Their racial attitudes reflect the effects of these other forces which are not counteracted — even if they are not reinforced — by the church and the Sunday school.

These findings present a significant challenge to priests, ministers, and religious educators. As long as this challenge is not successfully met by American religious education, the church must be considered still another area of our society in which negative intergroup attitudes of children are not effectively discouraged. Religion as generally practiced in America, therefore, must be seen as another passive force which helps keep prejudice alive.⁴

Some observers have studied the possible effect of the socio-economic status of the family on the racial attitudes of children. It has been said that poorer whites are more likely to express intense racial prejudice. It has also been said, less frequently, that more privileged whites are somewhat prejudiced. Different classes of whites generally express their prejudices in different ways.

Unfortunately this problem has not been studied extensively. One investigator studied the racial prejudices of seventy-nine university students whose parents owned residential property, were members of a country club, a riding club, or yacht club, and fulfilled other criteria of membership in a higher socio-economic class. He found that these individuals expressed prejudices against Jews, Negroes, and other minorities, and that their behavior was even more prejudiced than their answers to questionnaires. This behavior took the form of social snobbery and rejection rather than overt bigotry.

Most of the studies in this area have concerned themselves with individuals of the middle class, such as college students, or public-school students in middle-class neighborhoods. There have been relatively few studies of the racial attitudes of white individuals in the lower and the extreme upper socio-economic groups.⁵

The studies dealing with the effects of the relationship between political beliefs and racial attitudes provide no more definite conclusions than those dealing with the socio-economic factor. One early study found that students of the average Republican and Democratic families did not differ in their attitudes toward the Negro, but that members of liberal socialist groups were more liberal and tolerant in their racial attitudes, at least verbally. Ten years later, a study indicated that members of the traditional
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⁴The role of the churches is discussed at further length in Chapter 7 below.

⁵One may speculate on this absence of adequate studies of individuals outside of the "middle class." Does it reflect the degree to which students of this problem have functioned in terms of the American assumption of classlessness — believing that all Americans belong to the middle class?
wings of the Republican and Democratic parties were most conservative and most likely to have negative racial attitudes, that more progressive wings of these parties were less prejudiced; and that socialists were the least prejudiced.

In spite of the meager evidence, it appears that the political point of view of the family may bear some relationship to the racial attitudes of the individual. It is possible that a liberal political point of view tends to correspond with a greater likelihood of positive racial attitudes. Yet how far do these more positive attitudes actually influence children? It is conceivable that children of politically non-conforming parents are more intensely indoctrinated in social attitudes. This may result in an intensely protective loyalty to the family, and to its beliefs.

The available studies, then, indicate that children get their racial attitudes from a number of interrelated social influences, which begin to affect the child even before he enters school. This pattern of social and cultural forces from which the child learns how to evaluate himself and others may include his family, his playmates, his neighbors, his school, the socio-economic status of his family in the community, and influences of the church and the mass media of communication. The impact of any single influence may vary according to the age of the child, and some of these influences are more direct than others.

However, there is no concrete evidence that any one of these social forces, or any combination of them, generally exerts a significant restraining force on the development of negative racial attitudes in American children and adolescents. In fact, it seems clear that these forces, rather than counteracting the development of negative racial and religious prejudices, reinforce the prevailing racist ideas, encourage rejection, and teach the child to think of people in stereotyped terms. These attitudes are acquired as a natural part of the daily life of the child, as he comes to know the existing values, norms, and attitudes which are essential for his acceptance in the outside world.

3. The Negro Child and Race Prejudice

"I got a sun-tan at the beach this summer," a seven-year-old Negro boy repeated over and over again to a psychologist. His mother, he said, was white and his father was white and therefore he was a "white boy." His brown skin was the result of a summer at the beach. He became almost plaintive in his pleading, begging the adult to believe him.

His story unfortunately is not uncommon. If society says it is better to be white, not only white people but Negroes come to believe it. And a child may try to escape the trap of inferiority by denying the fact of his own race.

The measure of a social injustice is its consequences in the lives of human beings. Over and above the political, economic, sociological, and international implications of racial prejudices, their major significance is that they place unnecessary burdens upon human beings, sometimes even distorting and damaging the individual personality.

As recently as twenty years ago many scholars believed that a discussion of social problems in terms of moral and human values was outside the competence of the social sciences. Today, however, there is general recognition that it is impossible to exclude moral judgments and human considerations from research in the social sciences. The exclusion of such considerations is a sign not of real objectivity but of a subjective incompleteness.

Of course, the acceptance of the need for moral judgments presents certain difficulties; it requires that the social scientists take
certain social risks. Yet, as Louis Wirth, one of America's most distinguished social scientists, has said, "Without evaluations we have no interest, no sense of relevance or significance." And the social psychologist Theodore Newcomb has written:

Medical research is not hampered by the assumptions that pain and disease are bad. Prejudice and discrimination are also bad. By directing our research to the practical end of eliminating them, I think we may find not only that our research is better, but also that we have moved from illusion toward social reality.

Many contemporary social scientists are no longer afraid that moral guidance based on objective research need be arbitrary, elusive, or abstract. Whenever behavior involves two or more people, moral implications are inevitable. The social sciences must recognize that one of their major goals involves a search for description and verification of moral laws. Judgments are inevitable in man's quest for truth and understanding.

Moral judgments on the part of social scientists frequently require courage, especially when their judgments conflict with those of men of authority. The same was at one time true for the physical scientists — but it did not stop scientific progress. In this area the relentless, independent, and courageous pursuit of knowledge brought about changes in the judgment and perspective of the more "practical" men of affairs. Today there is a new concern among physical scientists about whether their knowledge will be used to help or to harm mankind.

It is impossible for social scientists, midway in the twentieth century, to deny their moral responsibility to society, without at the same time denying all claims to scientific responsibility. Such denials would mean asking society either to shackle social scientists as intellectual peons; or to indulge them in a luxurious preoccupation with irrelevant or futile abstractions; or to ignore them as intellectual eccentrics who piddle with sophistries while more practical men grapple with the real and immediate problems of society.

This does not mean that social scientists should do research on practical problems only. This restriction would also limit freedom of inquiry and imagination, which are essential to creative thought and science. Much of our knowledge about the effects of prejudice, discrimination, and segregation on the personality of Negro children came from research that had not been done for any immediate practical purposes. This knowledge has come from a group of independent students who chose to do research on the problems of personality and society — though these students were probably not oblivious to the social and human implications of their findings. Their interest in these problems reflected a basic concern with the stability of society and the enrichment of human experience.

Two researchers, Deutscher and Chein, questioned more than five hundred social scientists in anthropology, sociology, and social psychology who had done work and published scientific articles in the field of race relations. The investigators found that 90 per cent of the social scientists who replied believed that segregation has had psychological effects on members of the segregated group, even if equal facilities are provided. The majority based their opinion either upon their own professional experience or on the research of other scholars. They said these were the detrimental effects on members of the minority group.

1. Segregation puts special burdens upon members of a minority group by the clear discrepancy between democratic ideals and the actual practice of enforced segregation.
2. Segregation is a special source of frustration for persons who are segregated.
3. Segregation leads to feelings of inferiority and of not being wanted.
4. Segregation leads to feelings of submissiveness, martyrdom, aggressiveness, withdrawal tendencies, and conflicts about the individual's worth.
5. Segregation leads to a distortion in the sense of what is real.
Some of these social scientists said that segregation leads to a vicious cycle: the harmful personality patterns arising from segregation are in their turn used to support arguments for further segregation. A few said that some individuals could be helped by being members of the segregated group; but most of these social scientists maintained that segregated individuals suffer from being segregated.

What of the persons who impose the segregation? What happens, for instance, to whites when they discriminate against Negroes? Of the social scientists who replied to the questions of Deutscher and Chein, 88 per cent maintained that racial segregation has detrimental psychological effects on members of the privileged group. A number of the scholars maintained that segregation harms those who enforce segregation even more than the victims. Although there was less certainty about these results, they may be summarized as follows:

1. Segregation is a symptom of some psychological maladjustment in those who demand segregation.
2. There are pervasive and elusive harmful effects of segregation on members of the majority group — increased hostility, deterioration of moral values, the hardening of social sensitivity, conflict between ideology and practices, the development of rationalizations and other techniques for protecting one's self.
3. Segregation results in inner conflicts and guilt feelings among members of the group enforcing segregation.
4. Segregation leads to disturbances in the individual's sense of reality and the relation of the individual to the world around him.

This study by Deutscher and Chein has had considerable influence. Its findings were cited in a brief presented to the Supreme Court by the Solicitor General and the Assistant Attorney General of the United States in a case involving the segregation of a Negro in interstate transportation on a railroad.¹

The study was also cited in the social-science appendix submitted to the United States Supreme Court in the segregated-school cases. In addition this was one of the studies cited by the Supreme Court itself in the famous footnote 11 of the May 1954 decision, which ruled that state laws requiring or permitting racial segregation in public education are unconstitutional.

In spite of the well-deserved reputation of this study, one must recognize that it presented only the opinions of social scientists — not the actual data upon which they based these opinions. How did such a large proportion of students arrive at the same conclusions?

Allison Davis, a cultural anthropologist, maintains that high racial status protects the individual against restriction, punishments, frustrations, and taboos to which individuals of low racial status are required to submit. High racial status also gives an individual the right and the opportunity to be paternalistic and to give or withhold favors and protection. Low racial status, on the other hand, requires the individual to show deference and restricts his open aggressiveness against the dominant group. Davis contends that the effects on the personality become more marked as the individual grows older, and as he comes into contact with larger spheres of his environment.

As we have seen, a child's personality is influenced by racial considerations at the same early age at which he learns about racial differences and begins to express racial preferences. In kindergarten and the first and second grades, children from minority groups have already developed negative feelings about themselves and personal conflicts concerning identification with their racial or religious groups. "Negro children" says Davis, "revealed most vividly and often the feelings of insecurity resulting from anticipated rejection or insult from white children." Negro children are bombarded with opposing forces — including ac-

¹Henderson vs. United States of America (October 1949).
quired negative ideas that tend to increase their rejection of themselves as Negroes; the normal healthy forces that give rise to the need for self-acceptance and self-esteem; and finally the forces that result in the understandable, if futile, desire for aggressive retaliation against whites.

An even more specific report stated that Negro children of this age group react to an awareness of their inferior racial status by escape and the conscious search for revenge. American adults might find it difficult to accept some descriptions of the reactions of children between five and seven; but evidence from independent investigators supports these findings and describes similar reactions among even younger children. Negro children between the ages of 3 and 4½ in a Boston nursery school were studied by Mary Ellen Goodman, a Wellesley anthropologist. Asked questions about their racial identification, they generally reacted with uneasiness and with tense and evasive behavior. Such responses were not found among the white children studied. A study by Ruth Horowitz of nursery-school children, two to five years old, in New York City, showed that the ability of these children to identify themselves with their own racial group was part of their ability to identify themselves. The individual child develops an awareness of his own personality through recognizing his own physical characteristics and learning what value others in the society place on those characteristics. This becomes an important part of what he thinks about himself.

The study of the development of racial awareness, preference, and identification in Negro children made by the author and his wife\(^2\) throws more light on the personal and emotional consequences of race and the meaning of race for the Negro child. In addition to the “dolls test,” these children took a “coloring test.” The investigator gave each child a sheet of paper with drawings of a leaf, an apple, an orange, a mouse, a boy, and a girl, plus a box of twenty-four colored crayons which included

---

\(^2\)See Chapter 2 above.

brown, black, white, yellow, pink, and tan. Each child was tested alone and asked to color the leaf, apple, orange, and mouse. If the child responded correctly, it was assumed that he knew what colors things really are. If the child was a boy, the investigator then said: “See this little boy? Let’s make believe he is you. Color this little boy the color that you are.” After the child responded, he was told: “Now this is a little girl. Color her the color you like little girls to be.” (If the child being tested was a girl, the questions were altered accordingly.) Of the responses to the “coloring test,” only those of the children between five and seven seemed consistent enough to be analyzed. There were 160 children in this age group.

These children generally made spontaneous comments as they colored the little boy or the little girl or as they reacted to the questions asked during the “dolls test.” (In view of the discovery that children are sensitive to many racial nuances and may have their responses influenced by the skin color of the observer, it may be important to point out that the person who conducted these experiments was of medium-brown skin color.)

In the “coloring test,” all of the Negro children with very light skin color colored the figure representing themselves with the white or yellow crayon; these children were reacting in terms of the color they could see that their skin was. These responses were interpreted as accurate. But 15 per cent of the children with medium-brown skin color and 14 per cent of the dark-brown children also colored their “own” figure with either a white or a yellow crayon or with some bizarre color like red or green. Yet these same children were quite accurate in their ability to color the leaf, the apple, the orange, and the mouse. Their refusal to choose an appropriate color for themselves was an indication of emotional anxiety and conflict in terms of their own skin color. Because they wanted to be white, they pretended to be.

When these children were asked to color the child of the opposite sex the color they preferred, 48 per cent of them chose brown, 37 per cent white, and 15 per cent a bizarre or irrelevant color.
It is significant that 52 per cent of these children refused to color their preference either brown or black. This finding supports the conclusions of the "dolls test," in which 60 per cent of these children preferred the white doll or rejected the brown doll.

The discrepancy in the percentage of Negro children who rejected the brown doll compared to the percentage who refused to color their preference brown may be due to the fact that the "coloring test" required a greater effort from the child. It subjected him to a greater strain in indicating his preference. In the "dolls test," he could solve the conflict merely by pointing to a certain doll. In the "coloring test," he not only had to choose a crayon of a certain color, but also had to use this crayon long enough to color the drawing. Many of these children spent a long time in looking at all of the different colors before making a deliberate choice. Some of them picked out one crayon, looked at it, put it back, and chose another one — usually of a lighter color. Their behavior revealed how deeply embedded in their personality is the conflict about what color they are and what color they want to be. Some of these children, who colored the leaf and the fruit and the mouse rather carefully and correctly, revealed their inner turmoil by coloring the picture representing themselves with a scribbling vigor. Others, even when making an obviously wishful, evasive, or inappropriate response, colored the picture with great tenderness and care.

How do northern Negro children differ from southern Negro children in this respect? Nearly 80 per cent of the southern children colored their preferences brown, whereas only 36 per cent of the northern children did. Furthermore, over 20 per cent of the northern children colored their preferences in a bizarre color, while only 5 per cent of the southern children did. A record of the spontaneous remarks of the children showed that 82 per cent of the southern children spoke as they worked, but only 20 per cent of the northern children did so. Most of the remarks of the northern children were concerned with the desirability of one or another skin color. While the same was true of the south-

ern children, a substantially higher proportion of them supported their color preferences by remarks relating to the ugliness or prettiness of one or another color. The only two children who made spontaneous remarks indicating a derisive rejection of the brown color were southern children. On the other hand a substantially higher proportion of the northern children made evasive remarks.⁸

Some of the children reacted with such intense emotion to the "dolls test" or to the "coloring test" that they were unable to continue. One little girl who had shown a clear preference for the white doll and who described the brown doll as "ugly" and "dirty" broke into a torrent of tears when she was asked to identify herself with one of the dolls. When confronted with this personal conflict, some children looked at the investigator with terror or hostility. Many of these children had to be coaxed to finish the tests.

The only children who reacted with such open demonstrations of intense emotions were northern children. The southern children when confronted with this personal dilemma were much more matter-of-fact in their ability to identify themselves with the brown doll which they had previously rejected. Some of them were able to laugh or giggle self-consciously as they did so. Others merely stated flatly: "This one. It's a nigger. I'm a nigger."

On the surface, these findings might suggest that northern Negro children suffer more personality damage from racial prejudice and discrimination than southern Negro children. However, this interpretation would seem to be not only superficial but incorrect. The apparent emotional stability of the southern Negro child may be indicative only of the fact that through rigid racial segregation and isolation he has accepted as normal the fact of his inferior social status. Such an acceptance is not symptomatic of a healthy personality. The emotional turmoil revealed by some

⁸Trager and Davis also found a greater tendency for northern children to evade as much as possible this threatening and seemingly painful area of racial identification and preference.
of the northern children may be interpreted as an attempt on their part to assert some positive aspect of the self. 4

On examination of the various studies of this subject, a number of important facts emerge. As children develop an awareness of racial differences and of their racial identity, they also develop an awareness and acceptance of the prevailing social attitudes and values attached to race and skin color. The early rejection of the color brown by Negro children is part of the combination of attitudes and ideas of the child who knows that he must be identified with something that is being rejected—and something that he himself rejects. This pattern introduces, early in the formation of the personality of these children, a fundamental conflict about themselves.

Many Negro children attempt to resolve this profound conflict either through wishful thinking or by seeking some form of escape from a situation that focuses this conflict for them. One attempt to escape this dilemma was that of the northern Negro boy who insisted that he had a "sun-tan."

The finding that these fundamental conflicts about the meaning of race appear at such an early age is significant. Another important discovery is that these young children begin to develop techniques for self-protection in an effort to cope with developing racial conflicts and threats to the personality.

As children grow older, they become more sensitive to larger aspects of the environment. The pattern of their responses and accommodations to these larger social pressures becomes increas-

4 The conclusion that the future personality adjustment of the northern Negro is healthier than that of the southern Negro may be supported by an examination of the statistics of admissions of Negroes to a northern state hospital for the mentally ill. These figures show that the annual rate of admission of northern-born Negroes is 40 per 100,000, compared to 186 per 100,000 for those Negroes who were born and lived in the south. These figures, striking in themselves, become even more significant when they are compared with the annual rate of admission of 45 for northern-born whites. See B. Malzberg, "Mental Disease among American Negroes," in Characteristics of the American Negro, edited by O. Klineberg.
cerning racial status. One investigator who studied Negro children between the ages of nine and twelve in a segregated school found that they generally preferred light skin color. The significance of this preference may be seen in the fact that these children (like the younger Negro children tested by other investigators) tended to judge their own skin color as lighter than adults would have judged it. The nine- and ten-year-olds were more definitely committed to the assumption that light skin color was of superior value than the eleven- and twelve-year-olds. One wonders whether these older children were actually learning to accept themselves without apology or whether they were merely developing better techniques for protecting their self-esteem. This study also found that eleven- and twelve-year-olds attending a non-segregated school were more likely to prefer light skin color than children of the same age attending an all-Negro school; this suggests the possibility that the greater social pressures inherent in a segregated setting demand an earlier development of self-defense. Similar conclusions from a study of younger children also suggested that the need for self-protection is not lessened by racial segregation, because there are still some contacts with the outside world, and conflicts in self-esteem are thus inevitable.

A study of older adolescents (by Eli Marks) revealed a tendency among Negro college students attending a southern Negro college to express a preference for light-brown skin color, and to ascribe unfavorable characteristics both to white skin color and to black or very dark-brown skin color.

From these and similar studies the following general conclusions may be drawn: Negro children from three through six tend to have an uncritical preference for white skin color; from seven through ten this choice diminishes somewhat; eleven- and twelve-year-old children, particularly those in a segregated group, tend to say they prefer brown skin color; and the preference for a light-brown skin color persists through adolescence. It appears that this spoken preference for an intermediate skin color may resolve for the Negro the basic conflict between his need for self-esteem and his awareness that a darker skin color is a basis for rejection by society. Negro children and adolescents generally rate their own skin color lighter than it actually is.

Even though older children are more likely to say they prefer their own color, does this represent a fundamental change in their feelings? Observation of the behavior of many Negro adults seems to indicate that this indication of preference is a form of self-protection rather than a fundamental change in the ability of the individual to accept himself without apology. The often-observed tendency of successful Negro men to marry very light Negro women — and the less conspicuous tendency of successful or famous Negroes to make interracial marriages — are pertinent here. For the adult Negro the association of higher status with lighter skin color tends to persist, regardless of what he says.

Clinical studies support these general observations. General studies of a thousand Negro psychiatric patients in a mental hospital and detailed case histories of eight of them revealed that Negro patients frequently had delusions involving the denial of their skin color and racial ancestry. Some of these patients insisted that they were white in spite of clear evidence to the contrary.

As the Negro observes the society in which he lives, he associates whiteness with superior advantage, achievement, progress, and power, all of which are essential to successful competition in the American culture. The degree of whiteness that the individual Negro prefers may be considered an indication of the intensity of his anxiety and of his need to compensate for what he considers the deficiencies of his own skin color. The various terms prevalent among Negroes to describe different shades of skin color indicate the degree of emotionality involved in the skin-color conflict. Warner, Junker, and Adams contend that various physical characteristics of the Negro have been given an exaggerated importance in American society, “and consequently

---

5 These terms include “pink” and “ofay” for whites; “high yaller” for very fair Negroes; “dunk” and “blue” for very dark Negroes.
are bound to have far-reaching consequences on the formation of personality."

These various studies and interpretations contribute to an understanding of the problem of self-hatred among Negroes. As has been shown, self-rejection begins to occur at an early age and becomes embedded in the personality. This self-rejection is a part of the total pattern of ideas and attitudes that American Negro children learn from the larger society. It demonstrates the power of the prevailing attitudes, and their influence on the individual even when these attitudes run counter to his need for self-esteem. Self-hatred is found among individuals who belong to any group that is rejected or relegated to an inferior status by the larger society. Kurt Lewin has systematically described this pattern among Jews. Other students have observed and discussed patterns of self-hatred among the children of voluntarily isolated religious sects and among children of first-generation immigrant groups.

An extensive study of two thousand children of Italian-born parents in New York City revealed that these children, between eleven and fifteen years of age, suffered from feelings of inferiority and self-hatred which showed they knew that they and their parents occupied an inferior social, economic, and educational status. Although group self-hatred is not restricted to Negroes, it is clear that the problem may be a more difficult one for Negro children. Disadvantaged white groups have a greater chance of increasing their economic status and being assimilated into the dominant culture. The barriers against such assimilation are more formidable for the Negro child and are further complicated by the fact that everyone can see what his color is.

Younger children, as we have seen, tend to express their self-hatred by concrete and direct rejection of brown skin color. Older Negro children and adolescents express their self-hatred in more devious forms. J. A. Bayton found that Negro college students were not unlike white college students in the pattern of their negative stereotypes about the "typical Negro." These students tended to mask their self-hatred by referring contemptuously to the "typical Negro" — a category from which they excluded themselves. In interpreting his findings, Bayton concluded that the stereotype of the "typical Negro" as held by other Negroes is indicative of low morale within the group, and that this pattern of self-hatred among Negroes must be seen as a part of the total pattern of negative feelings toward whites as well as other Negroes. In the deep south, for example, Negro students reveal a basic pattern of distrust and suspicion of white Americans. Other studies of this problem suggest that Negro adolescents are basically antagonistic to white people (whom they see as fundamentally hostile) and that they develop a virtually impenetrable wall to protect themselves from meaningful contacts with whites.

The problem of self-hatred among Negroes must be understood as one aspect of the total pattern of feelings and attitudes of minority-group members toward all other members of the society which relegates them to an inferior and humiliating status. Self-hatred is not an isolated phenomenon. It cannot be understood in terms only of the minority-group member's reactions to other members of his group. It is in fact a reflection of the Negro's reaction to all of the negative pressures that bombard him. It is a symptom of a social disease and must be seen in the context of the Negro's relationship with whites and as a result of his hostility toward whites. As he learns from the whites the stereotypes about himself which form the substance of his self-hatred, he begins at the same time to resent the whites for imposing this stigma upon him. If there are to be significant changes in the Negro's attitude toward himself, these changes can come only from positive and fundamental changes in the way in which the larger society views and treats the Negro.

Hostile and aggressive reactions to the inferior status imposed upon the Negro have sometimes received over-dramatic description in the public press and in novels. Richard Wright's Native Son — as well as other descriptions of Negroes who react to racial frustrations by blind expressions of hostility and aggres-
sions toward any convenient person in the environment — may stimulate the interests of the laymen and make him aware of the high human costs of racial prejudice. At the same time dramatic and sensational descriptions of violence and other negative responses to racial frustration are often cited as proof of the inferiority and barbarity of the Negro race, and used to justify and reinforce existing patterns of prejudice, discrimination, and segregation. Regardless of how they are interpreted, these patterns of reaction to racial frustration exist; they are a part of the high human and social costs of racial oppression.

Statistics show a disproportionately high rate of crime and delinquency among persons of oppressed minorities, whether based on racial, economic, or nationality factors. The meaning of hostile, aggressive, and anti-social behavior among Negroes should be considered in the light of the following question: Are Negroes as a group subject to a more general condition of social isolation, rejection, and frustration than other groups in America? Although the condition of the Negro in American life has been steadily improving during recent years, this question unfortunately must still be answered in the affirmative. To the extent that Negroes as a group are still bombarded with negative social pressures, to this extent a relatively large minority of them will be driven to express their humiliation and defiance in self-destructive and anti-social behavior. The importance of race as a factor is that this is the basis upon which Negroes are oppressed.

The case of an adolescent Negro boy who participated in the 1943 Harlem riot shows some of the complicated personality problems involved in an aggressive reaction to racial frustration. This eighteen-year-old Negro male, who had always lived in New York City, was a product of a broken home and lived alone in a furnished room, although he occasionally visited his mother. He attended a vocational high school irregularly. His clothing, speech, and manner fitted into the basic requirements of the "zoot suit" styles. After the Harlem riot he talked freely and with some pleasure about his part in it. He showed no guilt feelings as a result of his participation in the riot, which involved destruction of property, looting, and random physical violence. In his speech he showed an habitual and seemingly deliberate disregard of the most basic rules of grammar. In his ordinary conversation he used profanity excessively; the frequency of profane words suggested that they had become emotionally meaningless to him, and were being used merely as a symptom of social defiance and cynicism. He showed no evidence of sympathy, sorrow, or concern for other human beings, regardless of race, as he almost gleefully reported acts of brutality he had seen inflicted upon them. He was without apparent feeling even when describing brutality directed toward himself. In general he tended to engage in exhibitionistic exaggeration of his role or his observations; these exaggerations at times were indistinguishable from fantasy. There was clear evidence of his rejection and defiance of the larger society — a repudiation of prestige figures, public authorities, Negro leaders, and the police. This rejection of the larger society seemed to be a reaction, fundamentally unconscious and inarticulate, against society for its isolation, rejection, and chronic humiliation of himself.

Generally accepted social values have significance for accepted individuals, but little meaning for those who are rejected and involuntarily isolated from society's benefits. The rejected individual must either construct for himself or acquire from his narrow environment new values appropriate to his restricted and inferior status. These new values may be anti-social. But they strengthen his ego. They tend to give him some security, prestige, and status within the caste to which he has been relegated. It is possible that his disregard for property rights stems from a basic desire for revenge and aggression against something considered so important by the society which has humiliated him.

It is important not to oversimplify the reactions of the Negro to racial frustrations. Because of the dramatic impact of aggressive and violent reactions, it is all too easy to lose sight of the fact that only a small proportion of Negro adolescents react in
these ways. One study of the attitudes of Negroes toward the 1943 Harlem riot revealed that a very high proportion of younger Negroes rejected violence as a method for improving the condition of the Negro in America. The younger Negroes for the most part reacted to this display of mass racial frustration with a revulsion which reflected their acceptance of the middle-class values of the larger society. They expressed the belief that violence and other indications of bad manners were not likely to help the Negro in his struggle for racial advance. In short, they recognized the self-defeating nature of open aggressive behavior.

One study suggested that a large number of Negro youths engage in boxing as a form of racial compensatory behavior; it was implied that boxing is an activity that symbolizes mastery and also offers few barriers to the Negro. The same explanation could also be used for the success of Negroes in other sports from which they have not been excluded. However, one should realize that the field of boxing is one in which a majority of the contestants come from underprivileged socio-economic strata of society; since a high proportion of Negroes are found in these lower levels of society, one would expect a high proportion of Negroes to be aspiring prize fighters. In addition to the compensatory factor involved, the minority status of the Negro makes it easier for him to be exploited by white managers and promoters. In this regard, sports like golf and tennis, which do not have mass appeal, continue to exclude Negroes.

It cannot be denied that the outstanding success of some Negro professional fighters and baseball players offers the mass of Negro people a basis for identification. The intensity of this identification partly reflects generalized racial frustration, feelings of hostility toward whites, and the need to compensate. For the oppressed Negro the exploits of Joe Louis, Jackie Robinson, and (more recently) Willie Mays have become the symbols of the breaking of racial barriers and demonstrations of the equality of Negroes.

In his need for racial heroes the Negro in America today is not likely to accept uncritically any Negro who catches the fancy of the white public. The modern Negro hero must be generally free of the usual stereotyped behavior and personality; he must not present himself to the white public as meek, subservient, unreliable, or comic. His personal behavior must be such as to demand respect from even reluctant and prejudiced whites. He must carry himself with dignity as an individual and accept the role of racial ambassador. When these conditions are met, these individuals are acclaimed by their group; they are able to serve as rather complex symbols of compensation for the Negro people and as leaders in the continuous cold war for status.

The various compensatory mechanisms of the Negro are not always clearly conscious or articulate; but they are almost always present. Sometimes the Negro compensates by exaggerated dominant behavior in his relations with whites, particularly under conditions where he is not dependent upon them. At other times his compensatory reactions take the form of an exploitation of the racial guilt feelings of a given white or group of whites, in demanding constant demonstrations of lack of prejudice. More recently, as the economic status of the Negro has been improving, his compensatory techniques have taken the form of the traditionally American demonstrations of conspicuous consumption, such as large and expensive cars, houses, and other materialistic symbols of success. These are his demands for the attention and recognition which he has been denied because of his race and which he believes he deserves as a human being.

Hortense Powdermaker, a social anthropologist, has studied the factors involved in the Negro's handling of his aggressive impulses. She maintains that, in view of the social reality in which whites have superior power and generally are in control of political and law-enforcement agencies of the community, Negroes are rarely able to express their hostility and aggressive impulses directly against them. In his relations with whites, therefore, the Negro is required to adopt substitute or indirect
forms of aggression. The larger culture frequently encourages — or certainly does not discourage — the substitution of other Negroes as victims of the repressed aggressions against whites. The relatively large incidence of violence within the Negro group itself tends to support this observation. Other ways in which the Negro may disguise his aggressions are: a retreat to an ivory tower; an identification with his white employer, particularly if the latter has great prestige; a diversion of his aggression into witty and humorous observations on his racial status or on the behavior of whites; or an assumption of the role of the meek, humble, and unaggressive Negro who makes a point of being deferential to whites. He learns what role is expected of him by observing and participating in the larger culture.

However, the culture changes — and the behavior of the Negro alters accordingly. Among the most significant changes is the tendency of the younger Negro to refuse to assume the role of the meek, unaggressive, and ingratiating individual in his relations with whites. These younger individuals have accepted the same goals as whites, and are demanding the attainment of these goals now rather than in the future. The methods by which they seek to attain these goals are the methods characteristic of the American culture — mainly competition and aggressive assertion of individual worth rather than meekness and subservience. Hortense Powdermaker made these observations more than twelve years ago; yet they still provide a sound basis for understanding the role of the Negro in stimulating much of the progress in race relations that has since occurred.

Is it possible to discover what types of individuals are most likely to react anti-socially to their minority status? F. D. Watts studied whether it was possible to differentiate between delinquent and non-delinquent Negro boys in terms of their academic potentials, emotional stability, social maturity, or differences in habits, interests, and attitudes. He measured all of these factors by standardized tests. He found that it was not possible to distinguish between delinquent and non-delinquent boys, nor was it possible, on the basis of these factors, to predict which boys were likely to become delinquent. When age and intelligence were the same for both groups, Watts found that the essential difference was the fact that the delinquent group seemed to be subject to less parental or adult control than the non-delinquent group. This observation points up need for further study of the role of the immediate home environment of the individual child or adolescent in determining whether his reactions to minority status will result in anti-social behavior. It is possible that a stable family pattern, parental love, and adequate control are particularly necessary for the Negro child if he is to be kept from displaying the more violent and anti-social symptoms.

Allison Davis and his colleagues have made important contributions to an understanding of how differences in social class influence the way in which a given minority-group child adjusts to the larger society. These social scientists maintain that in order to understand how the individual reacts to the larger social forces it is important to understand specific social and economic class pressures, because the child is trained primarily by his family, by his family's social clique, and later by his own peer-group clique. Much of the behavior of children and adolescents is influenced by factors of social class. Deviant sexual, educational, and aggressive behavior by some Negro adolescents may therefore be understood as a reflection not of racial but of class factors.

A comprehension of the effects of minority status upon the personality of Negro children and youth, according to these observers, requires an understanding of the fact that the majority of Negro families belong to the lower social and economic classes. Lower-class Negro children are taught by their families and by contacts with the white society that they must not display open aggression toward white people. Because of this fact and because their inferior status leads to frustration and a need for the expression of aggression, they are required to adopt defensive methods of aggression toward whites, which are acceptable
within the bounds of the racially established role or caste. Examples of these defensive aggressions characteristic of lower-class Negro individuals are exaggerated patterns of slowness, clumsiness, simulated ignorance, and general apathy and indifference in contacts with whites. Although the lower-class child is generally taught that he must be subservient to whites because he must work for them, when pushed beyond the accustomed or accepted limits of deference he is more likely than the middle- or upper-class Negro to become openly aggressive toward white people.

It has been observed that lower-class children are more likely to react with violence and anti-social behavior, since they are generally taught to defend themselves by striking first. Aggressive patterns of behavior are a part of the struggle for survival within the lower-class pattern of living. The self-destructive implications of overt aggression and violence in reaction to minority status are less threatening to lower-class Negro adolescents and adults, because they have less to lose than middle- or upper-class Negroes.

The middle-class Negro parent in preparing his child for life teaches him — at least in words — that in spite of racial restrictions and taboos he is in fact equal to whites. Children of this class are trained to control their impulses, to adhere strictly to the demands of respectability, to avoid negative contacts with whites — in short, to keep out of trouble. This parent-child relationship would not be consistent with direct expressions of aggression, overt violence, or anti-social behavior.

The major parental pressure upon the middle-class or upper-class Negro child is the demand that he be a living refutation of the stereotyped picture of the primitive and inferior Negro. Parents sometimes attempt to conceal from their children the lower status of the Negro people in American society. They believe that they thus protect their children from the deep psychological scars resulting from an awareness of belonging to a rejected minority group. However, this tendency is not without its high human costs. These parents often require that their children behave with unrealistic virtues; that they be compulsively clean; that they repress normal aggressive impulses or sexual curiosity; that they assert racial equality by over-compensatory academic, artistic, or athletic achievements. Sometimes this results in exceptional achievement. At other times, when the particular child is not endowed with the necessary intelligence or talent, it results in a psychological casualty.

Margaret Brenman made an intensive study of a small group of Negro girls in order to determine the effects of social class on their personal adjustment; her findings confirm those reported by Davis and his collaborators. Lower-class Negro girls give more open expression to aggressive feelings in their relationships with whites. Among their characteristics are acceptance of the assumption that the Negro is inferior; acceptance of the usual stereotypes of the Negro, which are rejected, at least verbally, by middle-class Negro girls; and rejection of the usual middle-class standards that regulate sexual behavior. The fact that the lower-class Negro girl is not likely to win approval by accepting middle-class standards in restraining her impulsive behavior makes it possible for her to behave with a greater degree of personal freedom.

Middle-class and upper-class Negro girls, on the other hand, closely resemble white middle-class girls in that they accept the same restraints and social demands which they believe will aid them in the attainment of a higher social status. Margaret Brenman noted that these girls not only observed the conventions of the dominant middle-class society in respect to speech, clothes, and general etiquette, but also reacted against the stereotyped concept of the Negro by rigidly controlling their own behavior and at times maintaining almost unrealistically high standards of personal and sexual conduct. A specific manifestation is sexual rigidity in the middle-class Negro girl, which Margaret Brenman believes results from the pressures of well-meaning Negro mothers who demand that their daughters refute the stereotype of sexual promiscuity among Negroes.
There is, then, convincing evidence of the significance of social and economic class status as important factors in the personality adjustment of Negro children and adolescents to their minority status. However, one must be cautious about accepting these interpretations too literally. Class lines among Negroes, although in many ways distinct, are not static, absolute, or rigidly drawn. The process of upward social and economic mobility among Negroes is probably greater than among whites. More and more working-class Negro families are making progress through the usual American techniques of upward class mobility. More of them are sending their children to college; are entering occupations from which they had been previously excluded; are buying houses outside of the Negro ghetto; are becoming a part of the American middle-class pattern. This increasing number of Negroes in the middle class may in itself speed up further positive changes in race relations in America.

As the number of middle-class Negroes increases, the more overtly negative, aggressive, and anti-social reactions to racial frustration will necessarily decrease. One may expect that racial feelings and anxieties in the aspiring middle-class Negro will take different forms. He may seek to cope with his racial conflicts not through self-destructive and anti-social patterns of behavior but by concentrating his energies on overcoming the remaining barriers of his acceptance by the larger society. As he does so, he necessarily identifies himself with the values, methods, and goals of the larger society and seeks to function within its framework. He rejects anything that is contrary to his identification as an American. He tries to attain success and status in ways that are acceptable to the dominant society. In the pursuit of these goals and in their successful achievement, he hopes to demonstrate his equality and his acceptability as an American. Political movements that seek to exploit the grievances of the Negro tend to fail because they do not understand the desire of the Negro to be accepted as an American, rather than to place himself in the role of an antagonistic outsider. The conspicuous failure of the Communist party in its attempt to enlist mass support from Negroes in America indicates this lack of understanding. The Communists' most specific blunder was their promise to provide Negroes with a "separate but equal" nation in the south. All classes of Negroes revolted against this policy of "self-determination" as the ultimate expression of racial segregation.

The extraordinary achievement of individual Negroes in various aspects of American life must be understood not only in terms of their exceptional ability, but also as manifestations of racial compensatory behavior. The pride that Negroes feel not only in sports figures but in such leaders as Ralph Bunche and Marian Anderson is related to the profound currents of racial frustration and aspirations of the masses of Negro people. The psychological value of these individuals is their demonstration that racial oppression need not result in a distortion or dehumanization of human personality. Racial oppression may under certain circumstances stimulate individuals to an extraordinary success unusual for individuals of any group. The fact that such achievement cannot be accepted or understood in purely personal terms demonstrates the degree to which minority racial status involves almost every aspect and every level of personal adjustment. These individuals achieved success because of superior intellect, talent, or abilities; but as they made their contributions to the larger society, their racial status was always a factor in describing or evaluating them.

The recognized achievements of some Negroes, despite rigid racial barriers, indicate that society by its prejudices may be depriving itself of valuable contributions from many others. It is now doubtful whether America can afford the luxury of such a waste of human resources.

It is a mistake to believe that personality patterns found among Negroes indicate inherent racial tendencies. Whenever a group is placed in a position involving disadvantages or stigma, the individuals within the group express comparable symptoms of
personality conflicts. This is true of many other groups besides Negroes. One study of the adjustment of Amish children found that these children tended to feel that they were being persecuted. They also betrayed feelings of inferiority as reflected in the belief that they were not as smart as other children, and that other children were stronger and did things better. This study is significant in showing that even the voluntary segregation of a group has negative effects on the personality development of its children. The feelings of these Amish children were similar to the feelings observed in Negro children subjected to involuntary segregation.

J. W. Tait in his study of children of Italian-born parents found through personality tests and personal interviews that prejudice and rejection resulted in such character defects as feelings of inferiority, awareness of rejection, poor social adjustment, introversion, and emotional instability.

Guy V. Johnson made an extensive field study of the personal adjustment of the Croatan Indians of Robeson County, North Carolina, in order to determine the nature of their accommodation to the dominant white and Negro world. The Croatans are not accepted by the whites as equals, and at the same time they desire to escape the stigma of being classified with Negroes. Johnson maintains:

The Indian, then, is forever on the defensive. His wish to escape the stigma of Negro kinship, and thus be identified with the white man is uppermost in his mind. . . . The child learns that the ultimate insult that anyone can give an Indian is to intimate that he has Negro blood. . . . So intense is the feeling on this subject that one can conclude that there is present in many persons a certain "sense of guilt" which arises from the observed reality (Negroid physical traits) and which calls for constant denial of the reality.

In seeking to resolve this basic conflict, these Indians withdraw among themselves and have as little contact as possible with whites and Negroes. Under the constant pressure of frustration and tension, they develop patterns of aggressive behavior often directed against themselves. Some display displaced hostility and self-hatred. Most violent crimes are committed against fellow Indians.

Similar examples can probably be found among the Mexicans in the southwest portion of the United States, and among the more recent Puerto Rican immigrants in New York City.

When one examines the theoretical discussions and systematic studies of the effects of rejected minority status upon the personality development of children, and when one tries to organize all of this material into a total pattern, certain conclusions and suggestions clearly emerge. Rejected minority status has an unquestioned detrimental effect upon the personality of children. No systematic study or theoretical article dealing with this problem suggests that a human being subjected to prejudice, discrimination, or segregation benefits thereby. There is convincing evidence that the personality damage associated with these social pressures is found among all children subject to them, without regard to racial, nationality, or religious background. The resulting personality distortions therefore must be understood as the consequences of social pressures rather than as reflections of any inherent group characteristics.

As minority-group children learn the inferior status to which they are assigned and observe that they are usually segregated and isolated from the more privileged members of their society, they react with deep feelings of inferiority and with a sense of personal humiliation. Many of them become confused about their own personal worth. Like all other human beings, they require a sense of personal dignity and social support for positive self-esteem. Almost nowhere in the larger society, however, do they find their own dignity as human beings respected or protected. Under these conditions, minority-group children develop conflicts with regard to their feelings about themselves and about the value of the group with which they are identified. Understandably they begin to question whether they themselves and
their group are worthy of no more respect from the larger society than they receive. These conflicts, confusions, and doubts give rise under certain circumstances to self-hatred and rejection of their own group.

These children are forced at an early age to develop ways of coping with these fundamental conflicts. Not every child reacts with the same patterns of self-protection. A particular pattern depends upon many interrelated factors, such as the stability and quality of his family relations; the amount of genuine love, support, and guidance he receives from his parents and other important adults in his environment; the social and economic class to which he and his family belong; and the values, attitudes, and aspirations of his friends and associates; the cultural and educational background of his parents; the traditions and patterns of adjustment of the particular minority group to which he belongs; and, finally, his own personal characteristics — his intelligence, his special talents, his unique personality.

Some children, usually of the lower socio-economic classes, may react by overt aggressions and hostility directed toward their own group or less frequently toward members of the dominant group. Anti-social and delinquent behavior may often be interpreted as this kind of reaction to racial frustrations. These anti-social reactions are self-destructive in that the larger society not only punishes the individuals involved, but often interprets aggressive and delinquent behavior in minority-group members as justification for continued prejudice and segregation. The higher proportion of delinquency among minority-group members must be explained in terms of the psychological burdens inherent in racial restrictions.

Middle-class and upper-class children of a minority group are more likely either to react to their racial conflicts by withdrawal and submissive behavior, or to seek a resolution of their racial problems by over-compensatory methods and the attainment of personal success. These children and their families may seek to mold their lives in rigid conformity to the prevailing middle-class values and standards, in order to offer themselves as living refutations of unjust racial stereotypes. They channel their aggressive energy toward this goal with a strong determination to attain personal success in spite of the handicaps of their minority status. While some children in this group have the intelligence and other characteristics to achieve this kind of success, others do not. And all of them are required to pay a high price in emotional tension.

Minority-group children of all social and economic classes often react to their group conflicts by the adoption of a generally defeatist attitude and a lowering of personal ambition. Many of these children also tend to be hypersensitive and anxious about their relations with the larger society, and to see racial hostility and rejection even where they may not actually exist. Although the range of individual differences among members of rejected minority groups is as wide as among other peoples, and although a large proportion of these children develop into constructive and socially useful adults, the evidence suggests that all of these children are unnecessarily burdened by arbitrary racial prejudices.
4. The White Child and Race Prejudice

A normal American parent would resent a description of his child as having the following characteristics — characteristics that a group of University of California social scientists have ascribed to what they call the "authoritarian personality".

He worships the strong and despises the weak.

He has strong impulses toward cruelty toward others and sometimes toward himself.

He is incapable of genuine feelings of love.

He is rigid, compulsive, and punitive in his ideas and behavior.

He is constantly striving for superficial social status; he is willing to grovel before those whom he believes to be his superiors while he is contemptuous of those whom he considers his inferiors.

Even his feelings toward his parents and others in authority are not without deep conflicts; on the one hand he subjugates his own desires to their demands while on the other hand he hates them.

Because he cannot face his negative feelings toward parents and other authorities, he takes out his frustration by aggressions against those whom he considers weak and acceptable as victims.

This description is based on studies of the personality patterns of a group of prejudiced individuals — children, adolescents, and adults.
resorted to rebellion against society. Because they were basically more secure in their family relationship they could express their disagreements with their parents without fear of retaliation or the loss of love. This did not leave them without some anxieties, conflicts, and feelings of guilt.

Unprejudiced or non-authoritarian persons are more likely to be openly rebellious against other authorities, since they do not need to fear the expression of their opinions about their parents. But unprejudiced individuals are more likely to express their aggressions against relevant and appropriate objects or persons. Unlike prejudiced individuals, they do not feel compelled to find a scapegoat and to vent their repressed hostility and aggression on weak and convenient individuals or groups in society. Dr. Frenkel-Brunswik concluded that in our culture unprejudiced individuals are generally more creative and imaginative than prejudiced individuals. Children growing up in a situation that encouraged the development of intense prejudices were found to be less popular with their classmates, less frequently mentioned as best friends, more talkative and demanding of attention, more concerned with being the boss, more frustrated and complaining, less trustworthy and less helpful.

These findings, however, do not support the view that unprejudiced children are necessarily well adjusted socially and personally. In fact, such children were found to have “more open anxieties,” “more conflicts,” and “more directly faced insecurities.” This observation touches on some of the problems involved in this kind of approach to the understanding of prejudices in children and adults. In a society where prejudice, discrimination, and segregation are the normal social behavior, it is questionable whether an individual who does not conform to this pattern can be wholly adjusted to that society. Nonconformity associated with social sensitivity and creativity may be maintained only at a high personal cost.

The studies of the “authoritarian personality” contribute to an understanding of the childhood and adolescence of intensely prejudiced persons. These individuals are seen within a family setting in which parental attitudes, striving for status, anxieties, conflicts, and rigidities of the parents are transmitted to their children and thus influence the manner in which they see and react to other individuals. These findings would be more meaningful if they showed how the problems reflected in this type of family setting stem from the many and complex pressures of the larger society. The studies of the “authoritarian personality” have not produced adequate explanations either for what determines prejudice or for the consequences of prejudice on the personality. They do show that there is a certain type of personality (with similar childhood experiences) common to some intensely prejudiced individuals. It is still important to discover why one individual reacts to this type of family pressure by the development of intense prejudices, while another individual reacts with less prejudice or even by identification with the victims of prejudice. Another problem raised rather than solved by these studies is whether the “authoritarian personality” always expresses itself in prejudice, or whether intense prejudice is merely one facet which may or may not be present. As we have seen, each individual who develops in a culture in which racial discrimination plays a crucial role necessarily develops some degree of racial prejudice as a normal part of social learning.

The novelist Lillian Smith has written extensively on the problem of racial prejudices in American life. She contends that they result from the same pattern of social forces that influence children’s attitudes in such areas as religion, sex, and social status. She has arrived at conclusions strikingly similar to those of the social psychologists who have studied the problem more systematically. She contends that the major forces responsible for the development of prejudices in American children are the anxieties and pressures that parents impose on their children in order to foster the values of respectability and conformity. Conflicts and anxieties in the areas of religion, sex, and social values
are part of the context within which the child develops conflicts and anxieties about race.

Some psychologists have approached the problem of the nature of racial prejudice by conducting experiments of the laboratory type. They have concluded that the more prejudiced an individual the less he will be able to modify his behavior when objective conditions require it; that prejudiced individuals have a more constricted range of general interests; that they show less interest and originality in their thinking; that they demonstrate a lower capacity to understand the problems of others; that they have a smaller range of emotional response; that they show less insight into themselves; and that they are generally more inhibited.

There have been a number of psychoanalytic explanations of the origin and nature of intense racial prejudices: that they result from the continuation of infantile patterns of repressed resentment and hostility toward a younger brother or sister; that they are the manifestations of unrealistic and irrational thinking which reflects deep frustrations and repressed hostilities; that they reflect the tendencies of human beings to protect their own self-esteem by ascribing to others the negative characteristics that might apply to themselves. This view explains the stereotyped view of Negroes as an attempt on the part of whites to idealize their own egos by projecting onto Negroes all of the undesirable and negative characteristics that might be found in any group of human beings.

These interpretations offer a fascinating basis for further speculation and research. However, in view of the fact that most of these observations have come from the study of emotionally disturbed individuals, it is a question whether they can be considered as proven. J. F. Brown advises caution in the evaluation of the various psychoanalytic explanations of racial prejudice. He maintains that, because racial prejudices are pervasive and latent throughout the American culture, one should question the value of a search for distinct characteristics in the individual personality that may lead to the development of prejudice. A culture that predisposes the individual to develop some form of prejudice would exert its influence to a certain degree on all individuals — with little regard to their traits of personality or their infantile experiences. It is now widely recognized that human behavior is influenced by repressed and unconscious motives, and that one of the ways in which these motives express themselves is in hostility toward other races and religions. It is equally true that this applies to all types of personalities. Therefore, racial prejudice in the American culture should probably be examined in terms of the problems of the larger society rather than in terms of the difficulties of the individual personality.

Allport and Kramer maintain that approximately 80 per cent of the American population have some appreciable degree of racial prejudice. This estimate raises serious questions about the approach to racial prejudice in terms of the individual personality. It is not reasonable to maintain that four-fifths of the American population have disturbed personalities — unless one assumes that the total culture is unstable. It must be emphasized, however, that the studies attempting to demonstrate an association between prejudice and the personality pattern have dealt primarily with extremely prejudiced individuals. Furthermore, the type of prejudice measured was necessarily based on verbal expression rather than observed behavior. It is not clear whether intense verbal prejudices are necessarily associated with such intense negative racial behavior as incitement to violence. Individuals who take an active role in opposition to the granting of rights to minority people — for instance, leaders in anti-Negro activities — may thereby reveal a fundamental emotional instability. But these individuals, who are a minority in the total population, have not yet been studied.

The individuals who have the normal, respectable, genteel, and acceptable forms of prejudice constitute another large group that has not yet been studied. These individuals cannot be un-
nderstood simply by classifying them as unstable personalities. They are considered respectable members of society and would understandably be outraged at the spectacle of overt and violent expressions of the racial prejudices of the small number of extreme bigots. If these individuals saw injustices of a non-racial variety perpetrated against other human beings — or even against animals — their concept of their own respectability would be so outraged as to demand vigorous expressions of disapproval. However, studies of racial tensions reveal that these individuals rarely take an active role in discouraging or demanding punishment for the excesses of the bigots. Usually they stand by passively and in effect lend encouragement to the fanatical racists by remaining silent. It does not add to our understanding to explain this type of passive form of racial prejudice in terms of a disturbance of personality.

The college official who tacitly accepts racial and religious quotas for the admission of an individual student to a graduate or professional school, the school superintendent who condones a pattern of gerrymandering of school districts that leads to segregated schools and who closes his eyes to inferior educational standards in the schools attended by underprivileged children; the church official who preaches the virtues of brotherhood while he bows to his congregation's coldness to Negroes or exclusion of them from his church — these people are in general respected members of their community. They are often admired and their opinions sought on important social issues; they may even be active on the boards of interracial and intergroup agencies. Nevertheless they contribute to the entrenchment of racial and religious prejudices by their acceptance of — and at times involvement in — the existing patterns of discrimination. The personality approach to the understanding of this type of passive prejudice is necessarily an oversimplification. It is an academic abstraction of a difficult practical problem.

It is important to know more about the motivation and role of these respectable, non-violent supporters of the racial status quo. On the whole, such individuals have more influence on the developing attitudes of children than the small group of emotionally unstable bigots who openly spout vulgar anti-Semitic and anti-Negro remarks. Whatever influence the fanatical racist exerts in a given community, he wields it only through the tolerance and passive support he receives from the more respectable members of the community. The bigot can easily be curbed by existing laws and police power. When he is not so curbed it is because the government authorities, the police, and the respectable members of the community express their own latent conflicts and prejudices by refusing to deal with him as a criminal. They thus deny to members of minority groups the protection against criminal assault and conspiracy that are guaranteed to more privileged citizens. Unfortunately there is no evidence that this "normal" expression of racial prejudice, this ability to tolerate and function in terms of a double standard of social decency, is peculiar to any particular type of personality in American society.

A realistic understanding of the problem of prejudice and personality concerns itself with the larger social climate within which children develop and within which their families seek status and security. Children who are taught the basic, conventional middle-class values of the American culture are at the same time required to learn the appropriate attitudes and patterns of behavior expected of them in their relations with the various groups at different levels of the social hierarchy. While American children of respectable parents are being taught to pursue the symbols of status and success, they are at the same time being taught to compete with others — and to exclude from the area of meaningful competition those who are "obviously inferior." These attitudes are subtly and effectively taught to children from before the time they are required to compete with their classmates for the highest marks, through the inevitable status competition of the adolescent period, up to the time when
they are taught the essentials for successful social and economic mobility which should end in a “good marriage” with the “right person.”

This total pattern of striving for status and success which characterizes American middle-class life provides the context in which one should seek for an understanding of the origin and nature of hostile attitudes toward other groups of individuals. Anxieties about success and status seem necessarily associated with the need for conformity and the need to deal with those anxieties either through personal achievement or through finding some scapegoat. In a society that provides convenient and socially approved groups as scapegoats, many members of that society uncritically direct their hostility toward these groups. It is, therefore, important to determine under what conditions it is possible for an individual to avoid having some form and degree of racial prejudice in such a culture.

A number of social psychologists have emphasized not the instabilities of the personality but the psychological advantages that prejudices confer on the individual who has them. For instance, Bohdan Zawadski sees a danger in the assumption that prejudice is the result of a neurotic personality structure, or that prejudice may be understood in terms of the simple “scapegoat” theory. He emphasizes that prejudiced individuals gain economic, sexual, and political status. Although he does not deny that some forms of racial prejudice reflect frustrations of members of the dominant group (for frustrations are found among all human beings), he contends that it is necessary to realize that some prejudices are maintained because they appear to be advantageous to those who hold them.

One of the most satisfying advantages derived from prejudice is the feeling that the minority group provides an “excuse” for one’s own shortcomings and failings. Prejudiced individuals may substitute wishful ideas of racial grandeur for the realities of personal mediocrity. They may feed their own personal vanities at the expense of members of the rejected minority group, without regard to reality. In order to do this, they must see in their own racial group chiefly virtues and desirable characteristics, while they see in the minority group chiefly vices and infantile characteristics. The feeling that they can identify themselves with the “superior” group and look down upon the “inferior” group provides them with the rationalization for their own wishes for personal superiority. All of this may be done without running the risk of being considered paranoid — provided the delusions are restricted to the area of race. For example, a white shopgirl may with social impunity and sanction play the role of a duchess or privileged debutante in her contacts with a Negro artist or intellectual; a Negro of superior intelligence, talents, and achievements is expected under such circumstances to be deferential in his associations with a mediocre white person merely because of color differences. A white gentile of average intellectual attainments is privileged to behave in a condescending and patronizing manner toward an outstanding Jewish scientist.

These are illustrations of the pattern of relationship between members of a minority and a majority group, which must be satisfying to the egos of the latter. Without such convenient objects for gratification of the ego, the mediocre member of the dominant group would be left in the intolerable predicament of being required to satisfy his vanity by realistic achievement. To fail in this would be to face the stark reality of his own personal inadequacy. Under these conditions, his attitude toward the minority group provides him with the possibility of evading what might otherwise be the devastating realization of his own social, economic, sexual, or intellectual inadequacies.

The evidence of the effects of prejudice on the personality of white children is not so conclusive as that dealing with the effects on Negro children. There are many reasons for this. One is that white children have been less thoroughly studied. Systematic investigations of the personality of the prejudiced in-
individual have only recently been attempted. In addition, it is more difficult to extract the factor of prejudice from the total complex of social pressures and forces which influence white children and to which they react. However, it is possible to use the available findings as a basis for further research into the likely effects of discrimination on the personality of members of the dominant or privileged group.

There appears to be a complex relationship between the total personality structure of an individual and the quality and intensity of his racial feelings. Although this relationship has not yet been stated in precise and definite terms — and might not be any greater than the relationship between total personality structure and attitudes toward sex, religion, war, or politics — it is axiomatic that such a relationship exists. All of the individual’s ideas, feelings, and behavior are a part of his total personality and in some ways reflect it. There are some individuals who are extremely prejudiced and at the same time show symptoms of personality disturbances; this would suggest that there is a certain relationship between extreme expressions of prejudice and personality problems. On the other hand, some individuals who show symptoms of extreme personality disturbance are not extreme in their racial or religious prejudices. Furthermore, there are no indications of a relationship between average amounts of prejudice and personality disturbances.

There are indications that certain neurotic symptoms may be used by a prejudiced individual to support or express his prejudices. Conversely, some neurotic individuals may express their neuroticism through the absence of racial prejudices — which may reflect a deeper need to rebel against the prevailing norms of their society.

For the present we must be satisfied to see prejudices as the product of many related factors. A prejudiced individual may be expressing, through his prejudice, displaced hostility stemming from some unrelated source of frustration. He may be using his prejudice as a means of expressing unresolved guilt feelings, anxieties, sexual or other conflicts which arise from sources related or unrelated to the objects of his prejudices.

Like other aspects of the personality, racial prejudices reflect basic motives that differ in intensity, quality, and method of satisfaction among human beings. Among the more significant of the complex motives that might be related to prejudices are the need for adequate social status; the need to identify oneself with those who have high status, power, and prestige and to feel a sense of “belonging with” these individuals; the need to conform to the norms, values, attitudes, and behavior patterns that prevail in the society in which acceptance and approval are sought; the need to disassociate oneself from those who are seen as lacking power, prestige, and status; and the need to express hostile and aggressive impulses particularly on a socially approved and convenient object or group. These needs are found in normal and apparently stable individuals as well as in neurotic individuals. The mere existence of them in a person is not enough, at least in American society, to justify diagnosing him as unstable. The intensity of those needs, the factor of whether they can be satisfied in a socially approved manner, and the anxiety and guilt associated with the method of satisfying them might be the basis for distinguishing the neurotic from the normal personality. It has not been clearly demonstrated that individuals with the normal range of prejudices are therefore neurotic.

In observing normal forms of expressions of prejudice among average Americans, one observes certain types of reactions which, if demonstrated in relations with other members of an individual’s own race, would be considered symptoms of emotional disturbance. Anti-Negro prejudices are usually associated with unrealistic and irrational fears and hatreds of Negroes. A child who developed unrealistic and irrational fears and hatreds in other areas would be recognized as emotionally disturbed. Anything in an environment that contributed to the development of such symptoms would necessarily be considered detrimental to the child.
The social influences responsible for the development of racial prejudices in American children at the same time develop deep patterns of moral conflict, guilt, anxiety, and distortion of reality in these children. In order to understand the basic and probably inevitable personality problem which the learning of racial prejudice imposes upon the child of the dominant group — who ironically enough is supposed to be the beneficiary of the segregation and discrimination imposed upon children of the minority group — one must understand that such a child is faced with a social situation containing inherent contradictions. The same institutions that teach children the democratic and religious doctrines of the brotherhood of man and the equality of all human beings — institutions such as the church and the school — also teach them to violate these concepts through racial prejudice and undemocratic behavior toward others. It is difficult for the young child to resolve the contradictions when he is taught the importance of justice and fair play by the same persons and institutions who punish him for playing with a child of a different color, or who hold up other children to ridicule or humiliation.

For the white child this poses a fundamental moral conflict, which becomes as much an aspect of his personality as the feeling of inferiority is an aspect of the personality of the Negro child. Just as the Negro child is required to use and adjust to various techniques for the protection of his self-esteem, so must the white child fall back on various techniques of adjustment in his attempt to cope with his profound moral conflict, which soon becomes a personal one. Some children react by a rigid repression or a refusal to recognize the contradiction of the democratic creed inherent in racial prejudice. Others fall back upon partial or temporary repression of one or more of the contradictory ideas. Others begin to accept the rationalizations or excuses that their parents or other adults offer in the attempt to resolve this moral conflict. The uncritical acceptance of the "superiority" of one's own group and the related assumption of the "inferiority" of the rejected group may be considered one way of dealing with this basic problem. Some of these children may develop intense guilt feelings; others may become more hostile and more rigid in their stereotyped ideas in order to protect themselves from recognizing the moral confusion in which they are placed.

It is conceivable that this basic moral conflict imposed upon children of the dominant group influences their adjustment in other areas of society. It is possible that this confusion may express itself in a confusion of the moral and ethical aspects of social and interpersonal relations in general. Moral cynicism and disrespect for authority may arise in the child of the dominant group as he observes what he may consider the hypocrisy and deceit of his parents and other respected adults in their handling of the racial problem. As alternatives to a repudiation of the parents and other figures of authority, the individual child may seek to resolve his moral conflict by the development of the morally convenient ideology reflected in such assumptions as: "Everyone should look out for himself." "The strong should dominate the weak." "Get what you can while you can get it." "The end justifies the means."

Such manifestations of moral expediency might eventually be expressed in such social problems as political corruption; unethical manipulation in business, sports, and government; a high incidence of criminality and delinquency; and other indications of a general moral breakdown. The uncritical idealization of parents — and then of strong and powerful political and economic leaders — which was described in the studies of the "authoritarian personality" may be seen as an attempt on the part of some children to erect strong defenses against surrendering to the more negative manifestations of the fundamental moral conflict which has been imposed upon them. As we have seen, these individuals, at the same time that they despised the weak, obsequiously conformed to the demands of the strong whom they turned to for moral guidance by fiat — and whom they also hated subconsciously.
The moral quandary and inner stress that racial prejudices impose upon members of the dominant group in a democratic society may express themselves in devious and peculiar forms. Some individuals may express their conflict and guilt by becoming converted to the cause of racial justice. Many such individuals have made valuable contributions to progress in race relations. Others bring to this crusade an intensity and complexity of personal problems and confusions that make it difficult for them to be effective. It is not uncommon for some of these individuals to seek a resolution of their basic racial conflict and guilt by self-conscious attempts at friendliness with members of a minority group — repeating over and over again, as if needing to convince themselves, their protestations that they are free of all racial and religious prejudices. It is difficult to predict how reliable such individuals would be if an issue of human rights were to present itself in their community and if they were required to take an unpopular stand. It is questionable whether such individuals would be able to run the personal risk inherent in taking a strong stand against the prevailing mores.

Undoubtedly the particular way in which a white person reacts to the conflicts aroused by racial discrimination depends upon many factors. Middle- and upper-class whites do not react in precisely the same way to Negroes — nor do they have the same threats and anxieties — as working-class whites. Variations in intelligence, personal stability, integrity, social sensitivity, and experience with different types of human beings are all factors that would influence the particular way in which a given individual handled his attitudes and reactions to Negroes. However, it seems clear that, under conditions of pervasive racist thinking in a society, all of the individuals within that society are in some ways influenced by racial considerations.

Although there is no conclusive and systematic evidence that white children are damaged by racial prejudice and segregation to the same extent as Negro children, there is suggestive evi-