

1953

# The Effects of Segregation and the Consequences of Desegregation: A Social Science Statement

Minn. L. Rev. Editorial Board

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.umn.edu/mlr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Editorial Board, Minn. L. Rev., "The Effects of Segregation and the Consequences of Desegregation: A Social Science Statement" (1953). *Minnesota Law Review*. 2710.  
<https://scholarship.law.umn.edu/mlr/2710>

**THE EFFECTS OF SEGREGATION AND THE CONSEQUENCES OF DESEGREGATION: A SOCIAL SCIENCE STATEMENT\***

*Foreword*

THE EDITORS of the Minnesota Law Review greatly value the opportunity to make this brief available to the profession. It is the Appendix to Appellants' Briefs filed in the *School Segregation Cases*, in the Supreme Court of the United States, October Term, 1952: *Brown v. Board of Education, Topeka, Kansas*, No. 8; *Briggs v. Elliott*, No. 101; *Davis v. School Board of Prince Edward County*, No. 191.

Only the formal portions of the brief are omitted.

I

The problem of the segregation of racial and ethnic groups constitutes one of the major problems facing the American people today. It seems desirable, therefore, to summarize the contributions which contemporary social science can make toward its resolutions. There are, of course, moral and legal issues involved with respect to which the signers of the present statement cannot speak with any special authority and which must be taken into account in the solution of the problem. There are, however, also factual issues involved with respect to which certain conclusions seem to be justified on the basis of the available scientific evidence. It is with these issues only that this paper is concerned. Some of the issues have to do with the consequences of segregation, some

---

\*This statement was drafted and signed by the following sociologists, anthropologists, psychologists and psychiatrists, who have worked in the area of American race relations:

Floyd H. Allport, Syracuse, New York; Gordon W. Allport, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Charlotte Babcock, M.D., Chicago, Illinois; Viola W. Bernard, M.D., New York, New York; Jerome S. Bruner, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Hadley Cantril, Princeton, New Jersey; Isidor Chein, New York, New York; Kenneth B. Clark, New York, New York; Mamie P. Clark, New York, New York; Stuart W. Cook, New York, New York; Bingham Dai, Durham, North Carolina; Allison Davis, Chicago, Illinois; Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Berkeley, California; Noel P. Gist, Columbia, Missouri; Daniel Katz, Ann Arbor, Michigan; Otto Klineberg, New York, New York; David Krech, Berkeley, California; Alfred McClung Lee, Brooklyn, New York; R. M. MavIver, New York, New York; Robert K. Merton, New York, New York; Gardner Murphy, Topeka, Kansas; Theodore M. Newcomb, Ann Arbor, Michigan; Robert Redfield, Chicago, Illinois; Ira DeA. Reid, Haverford, Pennsylvania; Arnold M. Rose, Minneapolis, Minnesota; Gerhart Saenger, New York, New York; R. Nevitt Sanford, Poughkeepsie, New York; S. Stanfield Sargent, New York, New York; M. Brewster Smith, New York, New York; Samuel A. Stouffer, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Wellman Warner, New York, New York; Robin M. Williams, Ithaca, New York.

with the problems of changing from segregated to unsegregated practices. These two groups of issues will be dealt with in separate sections below. It is necessary, first, however, to define and delimit the problem to be discussed.

#### DEFINITIONS

For purposes of the present statement, *segregation* refers to that restriction of opportunities for different types of associations between the members of one racial, religious, national or geographic origin, or linguistic group and those of other groups, which results from or is supported by the action of any official body or agency representing some branch of government. We are not here concerned with such segregation as arises from the free movements of individuals which are neither enforced nor supported by official bodies, nor with the segregation of criminals or of individuals with communicable diseases which aims at protecting society from those who might harm it.

Where the action takes place in a social milieu in which the groups involved do not enjoy equal social status, the group that is of lesser social status will be referred to as the *segregated* group.

In dealing with the question of the effects of segregation, it must be recognized that these effects do not take place in a vacuum, but in a social context. The segregation of Negroes and of other groups in the United States takes place in a social milieu in which "race" prejudice and discrimination exist. It is questionable in the view of some students of the problem whether it is possible to have segregation without substantial discrimination. Myrdal<sup>1</sup> states: "Segregation \* \* \* is financially possible and, indeed, a device of economy only as it is combined with substantial discrimination" (p. 629). The imbeddedness of segregation in such a context makes it difficult to disentangle the effects of segregation *per se* from the effects of the context. Similarly, it is difficult to disentangle the effects of segregation from the effects of a pattern of social disorganization commonly associated with it and reflected in high disease and mortality rates, crime and delinquency, poor housing, disrupted family life and general substantial living conditions. We shall, however, return to this problem after consideration of the observable effects of the total social complex in which segregation is a major component.

---

1. Myrdal, G., *An American Dilemma*, 1944.

## II

At the recent Mid-century White House Conference on Children and Youth, a fact-finding report on the effects of prejudice, discrimination and segregation on the personality development of children was prepared as a basis for some of the deliberations.<sup>2</sup> This report brought together the available social science and psychological studies which were related to the problem of how racial and religious prejudices influenced the development of a healthy personality. It highlighted the fact that segregation, prejudices and discriminations, and their social concomitants potentially damage the personality of all children—the children of the majority group in a somewhat different way than the more obviously damaged children of the minority group.

The report indicates that as minority group children learn the inferior status to which they are assigned—as they observe the fact that they are almost always segregated and kept apart from others who are treated with more respect by the society as a whole—they often react with feelings of inferiority and a sense of personal humiliation. Many of them become confused about their own personal worth. On the one hand, like all other human beings they require a sense of personal dignity; on the other hand, almost nowhere in the larger society do they find their own dignity as human beings respected by others. Under these conditions, the minority group child is thrown into a conflict with regard to his feelings about himself and his group. He wonders whether his group and he himself are worthy of no more respect than they receive. This conflict and confusion leads to self-hatred and rejection of his own group.

The report goes on to point out that these children must find ways with which to cope with this conflict. Not every child, of course, reacts with the same patterns of behavior. The particular pattern depends upon many interrelated factors, among which are: the stability and quality of his family relations; the social and economic class to which he belongs; the cultural and educational background of his parents; the particular minority group to which he belongs; his personal characteristics, intelligence, special talents, and personality pattern.

Some children, usually of the lower socio-economic classes, may react by overt aggressions and hostility directed toward their own

---

2. Clark, K. B., *Effect of Prejudice and Discrimination on Personality Development*, Fact Finding Report Mid-century White House Conference on Children and Youth, Children's Bureau, Federal Security Agency, 1950 (mimeographed).

group or members of the dominant groups.<sup>3</sup> Anti-social and delinquent behavior may often be interpreted as reactions to these racial frustrations. These reactions are self-destructive in that the larger society not only punishes those who commit them, but often interprets such aggressive and anti-social behavior as justification for continuing prejudice and segregation.

Middle class and upper class minority group children are likely to react to their racial frustrations and conflicts by withdrawal and submissive behavior. Or, they may react with compensatory and rigid conformity to the prevailing middle class values and standards and an aggressive determination to succeed in these terms in spite of the handicap of their minority status.

The report indicates that minority group children of all social and economic classes often react with a generally defeatist attitude and a lowering of personal ambitions. This, for example, is reflected in a lowering of pupil morale and a depression of the educational aspiration level among minority group children in segregated schools. In producing such effects, segregated schools impair the ability of the child to profit from the educational opportunities provided him.

Many minority group children of all classes also tend to be hypersensitive and anxious about relations with the larger society. They tend to see hostility and rejection even in those areas where these might not actually exist.

The report concludes that while the range of individual differences among members of a rejected minority group is as wide as among other peoples, the evidence suggests that all of these children are unnecessarily encumbered in some ways by segregation and its concomitants.

With reference to the impact of segregation and its concomitants on children of the majority group, the report indicates that the effects are somewhat more obscure. Those children who learn the prejudices of our society are also being taught to gain personal status in an unrealistic and non-adaptive way. When comparing themselves to members of the minority group, they are not re-

---

3. Brenman, M., The Relationship Between Minority Group Identification in A Group of Urban Middle Class Negro Girls, *J. Soc. Psychol.*, 1940, 11, 171-197; Brenman, M., Minority Group Membership and Religious, Psychosexual and Social Patterns in A Group of Middle-Class Negro Girls, *J. Soc. Psychol.*, 1940, 12, 179-196; Brenman, M., Urban Lower-Class Negro Girls, *Psychiatry*, 1943, 6, 307-324; Davis, A., The Socialization of the American Negro Child and Adolescent, *J. Negro Educ.*, 1939, 8, 264-275.

quired to evaluate themselves in terms of the more basic standards of actual personal ability and achievement. The culture permits and, at times, encourages them to direct their feelings of hostility and aggression against whole groups of people the members of which are perceived as weaker than themselves. They often develop patterns of guilt feelings, rationalizations and other mechanisms which they must use in an attempt to protect themselves from recognizing the essential injustice of their unrealistic fears and hatreds of minority groups.<sup>4</sup>

The report indicates further that confusion, conflict, moral cynicism, and disrespect for authority may arise in majority group children as a consequence of being taught the moral, religious and democratic principles of the brotherhood of man and the importance of justice and fair play by the same persons and institutions who, in their support of racial segregation and related practices, seem to be acting in a prejudiced and discriminatory manner. Some individuals may attempt to resolve this conflict by intensifying their hostility toward the minority group. Others may react by guilt feelings which are not necessarily reflected in more humane attitudes toward the minority group. Still others react by developing an unwholesome, rigid, and uncritical idealization of all authority figures—their parents, strong political and economic leaders. As described in *The Authoritarian Personality*,<sup>5</sup> they despise the weak, while they obsequiously and unquestioningly conform to the demands of the strong whom they also, paradoxically, subconsciously hate.

With respect to the setting in which these difficulties develop, the report emphasized the role of the home, the school, and other social institutions. Studies<sup>6</sup> have shown that from the earliest school years children are not only aware of the status differences among different groups in the society but begin to react with the patterns described above.

Conclusions similar to those reached by the Mid-century White House Conference Report have been stated by other social scientists

4. Adorno, T. W.; Frenkel-Brunswik, E.; Levinson, D. J.; Sanford, R. N., *The Authoritarian Personality*, 1951.

5. Adorno, T. W.; Frenkel-Brunswik, E.; Levinson, D. J.; Sanford, R. N., *The Authoritarian Personality*, 1951.

6. Clark, K. B. & Clark, M. P., Emotional Factors in Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children, *J. Negro Educ.*, 1950, 19, 341-350; Clark, K. B. & Clark, M. P., Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children, *Readings in Social Psychology*, Ed. by Newcomb & Hartley, 1947; Radke, M.; Trager, H.; Davis, H., Social Perceptions and Attitudes of Children, *Genetic Psychol. Monog.*, 1949, 40, 327-447; Radke, M.; Trager, H.; Children's Perceptions of the Social Role of Negroes and Whites, *J. Psychol.*, 1950, 29, 3-33.

who have concerned themselves with this problem. The following are some examples of these conclusions:

Segregation imposes upon individuals a distorted sense of social reality.<sup>7</sup>

Segregation leads to a blockage in the communications and interaction between the two groups. Such blockages tend to increase mutual suspicion, distrust and hostility.<sup>8</sup>

Segregation not only perpetuates rigid stereotypes and reinforces negative attitudes toward members of the other group, but also leads to the development of a social climate within which violent outbreaks of racial tensions are likely to occur.<sup>9</sup>

We return now to the question, deferred earlier, of what it is about the total society complex of which segregation is one feature that produces the effects described above—or, more precisely, to the question of whether we can justifiably conclude that, as only one feature of a complex social setting, segregation is in fact a significantly contributing factor to these effects.

To answer this question, it is necessary to bring to bear the general fund of psychological and sociological knowledge concerning the role of various environmental influences in producing feelings of inferiority, confusions in personal roles, various types of basic personality structures and the various forms of personal and social disorganization.

On the basis of this general fund of knowledge, it seems likely that feelings of inferiority and doubts about personal worth are attributable to living in an underprivileged environment only insofar as the latter is itself perceived as an indicator of low social status and as a symbol of inferiority. In other words, one of the important determinants in producing such feelings is the awareness of social status difference. While there are many other factors that serve as reminders of the differences in social status, there can be little doubt that the fact of enforced segregation is a major factor.<sup>10</sup>

This seems to be true for the following reasons among others: (1) because enforced segregation results from the decision of the majority group without the consent of the segregated and is commonly so perceived; and (2) because historically segregation pat-

7. Reid, Ira, *What Segregated Areas Mean*; Brameld, T., *Educational Cost, Discrimination and National Welfare*, Ed. by MacIver, R. M., 1949.

8. Frazier, E., *The Negro in the United States*, 1949; Krech, D. & Crutchfield, R. S., *Theory and Problems of Social Psychology*, 1948; Newcomb, T., *Social Psychology*, 1950.

9. Lee, A. McClung and Humphrey, N. D., *Race Riot*, 1943.

10. Frazier, E., *The Negro in the United States*, 1949; Myrdal, G., *An American Dilemma*, 1944.

terns in the United States were developed on the assumption of the inferiority of the segregated.

In addition, enforced segregation gives official recognition and sanction to these other factors of the social complex, and thereby enhances the effects of the latter in creating the awareness of social status differences and feelings of inferiority.<sup>11</sup> The child who, for example, is compelled to attend a segregated school may be able to cope with ordinary expressions of prejudice by regarding the prejudiced person as evil or misguided; but he cannot readily cope with symbols of authority, the full force of the authority of the State—the school or the school board, in this instance—in the same manner. Given both the ordinary expression of prejudice and the school's policy of segregation, the former takes on greater force and seemingly becomes an official expression of the latter.

Not all of the psychological traits which are commonly observed in the social complex under discussion can be related so directly to the awareness of status differences—which in turn is, as we have already noted, materially contributed to by the practices of segregation. Thus, the low level of aspiration and defeatism so commonly observed in segregated groups is undoubtedly related to the level of self-evaluation; but it is also, in some measure, related among other things to one's expectations with regard to opportunities for achievement and, having achieved, to the opportunities for making use of these achievements. Similarly, the hypersensitivity and anxiety displayed by many minority group children about their relations with the larger society probably reflects their awareness of status differences; but it may also be influenced by the relative absence of opportunities for equal status contact which would provide correctives for prevailing unrealistic stereotypes.

The preceding view is consistent with the opinion stated by a large majority (90%) of social scientists who replied to a questionnaire concerning the probable effects of enforced segregation under conditions of equal facilities. This opinion was that, regardless of the facilities which are provided, enforced segregation is psychologically detrimental to the members of the segregated group.<sup>12</sup>

Similar considerations apply to the question of what features of the social complex of which segregation is a part contribute to

---

11. Reid, Ira, What Segregated Areas Mean, *Discrimination and National Welfare*, Ed. by MacIver, R. M., 1949.

12. Deutscher, M. and Chein, I., The Psychological Effects of Enforced Segregation: A Survey of Social Science Opinion, *J. Psychol.*, 1948, 26, 259-287.

the development of the traits which have been observed in majority group members. Some of these are probably quite closely related to the awareness of status differences, to which, as has already been pointed out, segregation makes a material contribution. Others have a more complicated relationship to the total social setting. Thus, the acquisition of an unrealistic basis for self-evaluation as a consequence of majority group membership probably reflects fairly closely the awareness of status differences. On the other hand, unrealistic fears and hatreds of minority groups, as in the case of the converse phenomenon among minority group members, are probably significantly influenced as well by the lack of opportunities for equal status contact.

With reference to the probable effects of segregation under conditions of equal facilities on majority group members, many of the social scientists who responded to the poll in the survey cited above felt that the evidence is less convincing than with regard to the probable effects of such segregation on minority group members, and the effects are possibly less widespread. Nonetheless, more than 80% stated it as their opinion that the effects of such segregation are psychologically detrimental to the majority group members.<sup>13</sup>

It may be noted that many of these social scientists supported their opinions on the effects of segregation on both majority and minority groups by reference to one or another or to several of the following four lines of published and unpublished evidence.<sup>14</sup> First, studies of children throw light on the relative priority of the awareness of status differentials and related factors as compared to the awareness of differences in facilities. On this basis, it is possible to infer some of the consequences of segregation as distinct from the influence of inequalities of facilities. Second, clinical studies and depth interviews throw light on the genetic sources and causal sequences of various patterns of psychological reaction; and, again, certain inferences are possible with respect to the effects of segregation *per se*. Third, there actually are some relevant but relatively rare instances of segregation with equal or even superior facilities, as in the cases of certain Indian reservations. Fourth, since there are inequalities of facilities in racially and ethnically homogeneous groups, it is possible to infer the kinds of effects attributable to such

---

13. Deutcher, M. and Chein, I., *The Psychological Effects of Enforced Segregation: A Survey of Social Science Opinion*, *J. Psychol.*, 1948, 26, 259-287.

14. Chein, I., *What Are the Psychological Effects of Segregation Under Conditions of Equal Facilities?*, *International J. Opinion and Attitude Res.*, 1949, 2, 229-234.

inequalities in the absence of effects of segregation and, by a kind of subtraction to estimate the effects of segregation *per se* in situations where one finds both segregation and unequal facilities.

### III

Segregation is at present a social reality. Questions may be raised, therefore, as to what are the likely consequences of desegregation.

One such question asks whether the inclusion of an intellectually inferior group may jeopardize the education of the more intelligent group by lowering educational standards or damage the less intelligent group by placing it in a situation where it is at a marked competitive disadvantage. Behind this question is the assumption, which is examined below, that the presently segregated groups actually are inferior intellectually.

The available scientific evidence indicates that much, perhaps all, of the observable differences among various racial and national groups may be adequately explained in terms of environmental differences.<sup>15</sup> It has been found, for instance, that the differences between the average intelligence test scores of Negro and white children decrease, and the overlap of the distribution increases, proportionately to the number of years that the Negro children have lived in the North.<sup>16</sup> Related studies have shown that this change cannot be explained by the hypothesis of selective migration.<sup>17</sup> It seems clear, therefore, that fears based on the assumption of innate racial differences in intelligence are not well founded.

It may also be noted in passing that the argument regarding the intellectual inferiority of one group as compared to another is, as applied to schools, essentially an argument for homogeneous groupings of children by intelligence rather than by race. Since even those who believe that there are innate differences between Negroes and whites in America in average intelligence grant that considerable overlap between the two groups exists, it would follow that it may be expedient to group together the superior whites and Negroes, the average whites and Negroes, and so on. Actually, many educators have come to doubt the wisdom of class groupings made homogeneous solely on the basis of intelligence.<sup>18</sup> Those who

15. Klineberg, O., *Characteristics of American Negro*, 1945; Klineberg, O., *Race Differences*, 1936.

16. Klineberg, O., *Negro Intelligence and Selective Migration*, 1935.

17. Klineberg, O., *Negro Intelligence and Selective Migration*, 1935.

18. Brooks, J. J., *Interage Grouping on Trial-Continuous Learning*, *Bulletin No. 87, Association for Childhood Education*, 1951; Lane, R. H.,

are opposed to such homogeneous grouping believe that this type of segregation, too, appears to create generalized feelings of inferiority in the child who attends a below average class, leads to undesirable emotional consequences in the education of the gifted child, and reduces learning opportunities which result from the interaction of individuals with varied gifts.

A second problem that comes up in an evaluation of the possible consequences of desegregation involves the question of whether segregation prevents or stimulates interracial tension and conflict and the corollary question of whether desegregation has one or the other effect.

The most direct evidence available on this problem comes from observations and systematic study of instances in which desegregation has occurred. Comprehensive reviews of such instances<sup>19</sup> clearly establish the fact that desegregation has been carried out successfully in a variety of situations although outbreaks of violence had been commonly predicted. Extensive desegregation has taken place without major incidents in the armed services in both Northern and Southern installations and involving officers and enlisted men from all parts of the country, including the South.<sup>20</sup> Similar changes have been noted in housing<sup>21</sup> and industry.<sup>22</sup> During the last war, many factories both in the North and South hired Negroes on a non-

---

Teacher in Modern Elementary School, 1941; Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administration Report in *Education For All Americans*, published by N. E. A. 1948.

19. Delano, W., *Grade School Segregation: The Latest Attack on Racial Discrimination*, *Yale Law Journal*, 1952, 61, 5, 730-744; Rose, A., *The Influence of Legislation on Prejudice*; Chapter 53 in *Race Prejudice and Discrimination*, Ed. by Rose, A., 1951; Rose, A., *Studies in Reduction of Prejudice*, Amer. Council on Race Relations, 1948.

20. Kenworthy, E. W., *The Case Against Army Segregation*, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 1951, 275, 27-33; Nelson, Lt. D. D., *The Integration of the Negro in the U. S. Navy*; 1951; *Opinions About Negro Infantry Platoons in White Companies in Several Divisions*, *Information and Education Division, U. S. War Department Report No. B-157*, 1945.

21. Conover, R. D., *Race Relations at Codornices Village, Berkeley-Albany, California: A Report of the Attempt to Break Down the Segregated Pattern on A Directly Managed Housing Project*, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Public Housing Administration, Region I, December 1947 (mimeographed); Deutsch, M. and Collins, M. E., *Interracial Housing, A Psychological Study of A Social Experiment*, 1951; Rutledge, E., *Integration of Racial Minorities in Public Housing Projects: A Guide for Local Housing Authorities on How to Do It*, Public Housing Administration, New York Field Office (mimeographed).

22. Minard, R. D., *The Pattern of Race Relationships in the Pocahontas Coal Field*, *J. Social Issues*, 1952, 8 29-44; Southall, S. E., *Industry's Unfinished Business*, 1951; Weaver, G. L-P, *Negro Labor, A National Problem*, 1941.

segregated, nondiscriminatory basis. While a few strikes occurred, refusal by management and unions to yield quelled all strikes within a few days.<sup>23</sup>

Relevant to this general problem is a comprehensive study of urban race riots which found that race riots occurred in segregated neighborhoods, whereas there was no violence in sections of the city where the two races lived, worked and attended school together.<sup>24</sup>

Under certain circumstances desegregation not only proceeds without major difficulties, but has been observed to lead the emergence of more favorable attitudes and friendlier relations between races. Relevant studies may be cited with respect to housing,<sup>25</sup> employment,<sup>26</sup> the armed services<sup>27</sup> and merchant marine,<sup>28</sup> recreation agency,<sup>29</sup> and general community life.<sup>30</sup>

Much depends, however, on the circumstances under which members of previously segregated groups first come in contact with others in unsegregated situations. Available evidence suggests, first,

23. Southall, S. E., *Industry's Unfinished Business*, 1951; Weaver, G. L-P., *Negro Labor, A National Problem*, 1941.

24. Lee, A. McClung and Humphrey, N. D., *Race Riot*, 1943; Lee, A. McClung, *Race Riots Aren't Necessary*, *Public Affairs Pamphlets*, 1945.

25. Deutsch, M. and Collins, M. E., *Interracial Housing, A Psychological Study of A Social Experiment*, 1951; Merton, R. K.; West, P. S.; Jahoda, M., *Social Fictions and Social Facts: The Dynamics of Race Relations in Hilltown*, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia Univ., 1949 (mimeographed); Rutledge, E., *Integration of Racial Minorities in Public Housing Projects; A Guide for Local Housing Authorities on How to Do It*, Public Housing Administration, New York Field Office (mimeographed); Wilner, D. M.; Walkley, R. P.; and Cook, S. W., *Intergroup Contact and Ethnic Attitudes in Public Housing Projects*, *J. Social Issues*, 1952, 8, 45-69.

26. Harding, J., and Hogrefe, R., *Attitudes of White Department Store Employees Toward Negro Co-workers*, *J. Social Issues*, 1952, 8, 19-28; Southall, S. E., *Industry's Unfinished Business*, 1951; Weaver, G. L-P., *Negro Labor, A National Problem*, 1941.

27. Kenworth, E. W., *The Case Against Army Segregation*, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 1951, 275, 27-33; Nelson, Lt. D. D., *The Integration of the Negro in the U. S. Navy*, 1951; Stouffer, S., et al., *The American Soldier*, Vol. I, Chap. 19, *A Note on Negro Troops in Combat*, 1949; Watson, G., *Action for Unity*, 1947; *Opinions About Negro Infantry Platoons in White Companies in Several Divisions*, *Information and Education Division, U. S. War Department, Report No. B-157*, 1945.

28. Brophy, I. N., *The Luxury of Anti-Negro Prejudice*, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 1946, 9, 456-466 (Integration in Merchant Marine); Watson, G., *Action for Unity*, 1947.

29. Williams, D. H., *The Effects of an Interracial Project Upon the Attitudes of Negro and White Girls Within the Young Women's Christian Association*, Unpublished M. A. thesis, Columbia University, 1934.

30. Dean, J. P., *Situational Factors in Intergroup Relations: A Research Progress Report*. Paper Presented to American Sociological Society, 12/28/49 (mimeographed); Irish, D. P., *Reactions of Residents of Boulder, Colorado, to the Introduction of Japanese Into the Community*, *J. Social Issues*, 1951, 8, 10-17.

that there is less likelihood of unfriendly relations when the change is simultaneously introduced into all units of a social institution to which it is applicable—*e.g.*, all of the schools in a school system or all of the shops in a given factory.<sup>31</sup> When factories introduced Negroes in only some shops but not in others the prejudiced workers tended to classify the desegregated shops as inferior, "Negro work." Such objections were not raised when complete integration was introduced.

The available evidence also suggests the importance of consistent and firm enforcement of the new policy by those in authority.<sup>32</sup> It indicates also the importance of such factors as: the absence of competition for a limited number of facilities or benefits;<sup>33</sup> the possibility of contacts which permit individuals to learn about one another as individuals;<sup>34</sup> and the possibility of equivalence of positions and functions among all of the participants within the unsegregated situation.<sup>35</sup> These conditions can generally be satisfied in a number of situations, as in the armed services, public housing developments, and public schools.

#### IV

The problem with which we have here attempted to deal is admittedly on the frontiers of scientific knowledge. Inevitably, there must be some differences of opinion among us concerning the conclusiveness of certain items of evidence, and concerning the par-

---

31. Minard, R. D., *The Pattern of Race Relationships in the Pocahontas Coal Field*, *J. Social Issues*, 1952, 8, 29-44; Rutledge, E., *Integration of Racial Minorities in Public Housing Projects; A Guide for Local Housing Authorities on How to Do It*, Public Housing Administration, New York Field Office (mimeographed).

32. Deutsch, M. and Collins, M. E., *Interracial Housing, A Psychological Study of A Social Experiment*, 1951; Feldman, H., *The Technique of Introducing Negroes Into the Plant, Personnel*, 1942, 19, 461-466; Rutledge, E., *Integration of Racial Minorities in Public Housing Projects; A Guide for Local Housing Authorities on How to Do It*, Public Housing Administration, New York Field Office (mimeographed); Southall, S. E., *Industry's Unfinished Business*, 1951; Watson, G., *Action for Unity*, 1947.

33. Lee, A. McClung and Humphrey, N. D., *Race Riot*, 1943; Williams, R., Jr., *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions*, Social Science Research Council, New York, 1947; Windner, A. E., *White Attitudes Towards Negro-White Interaction In An Area of Changing Racial Composition*. Paper Delivered at the Sixtieth Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, September 1952.

34. Wilner, D. M.; Walkley, R. P.; and Cook, S. W., *Intergroup Contact and Ethnic Attitudes in Public Housing Projects*, *J. Social Issues*, 1952, 8, 45-69.

35. Allport, G. W., and Kramer, B., *Some Roots of Prejudice*, *J. Psychol.*, 1946, 22, 9-39; Watson, J., *Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude*, *Human Relations*, 1950, 3, 1.

ticular choice of words and placement of emphasis in the preceding statement. We are nonetheless in agreement that this statement is substantially correct and justified by the evidence, and the differences among us, if any, are of a relatively minor order and would not materially influence the preceding conclusions.