

THE REVOLUTION FOR EQUALITY—THE URBAN CHALLENGE TO THE JEWISH COMMUNITY *

by SIMON SLAVIN, D.S.W.

Professor, School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York

It is generally recognized that the urban ambience is increasingly deteriorating, physically and socially, confronting the nation with a crisis. Dire prophecies about the future of cities abound. Only recently, Dr. C. A. Doxiadis, the internationally distinguished architect and city planner, wrote that "Our cities are turning into inhuman ones and the situation is getting worse . . . the average city is facing graver problems with every day that passes, and has fewer means of avoiding them."¹ Policy-makers, planners, politicians and social scientists are studying these problems with an intensity that seems born of desperation. My purpose is to review the meaning of contemporary urbanism for the Jewish community, in its collective and individual being, in the light of the current bid by the least favored segments of the society for the more equal share of its bounty. This "revolution for equality" appears to be a world-wide phenomenon, and may well be one of the dominant aspects of contemporary history. The revolution is both peaceful and violent, insistent and pervasive, and touches in one way or another, the entire fabric of

the social structure, and not least of all, the Jewish population.

Growing Inequalities—Social, Economic and in Physical Health

While problems engendered by poverty and its elimination have occupied considerable public attention in recent years, less energy has been expended nationally on the problem of inequality and its reduction. It is quite clear that inequality can increase even as poverty is diminished, a circumstance that might well give rise to portentous social consequences. For, as Eric Hoffer has observed, "it is not actual suffering but the taste of better things which excites people to revolt."² An affluent society may find it increasingly difficult to contain a growing inequality precisely because it makes visible its withheld largesse.

Equality is measured by the range in the distribution of resources and benefits made possible by a social system, by the difference between the most and least favored, and by the extent of variation from the norm. A segment of conventional mythology has suggested that our society has become more egalitarian in recent years.³ It may be in-

* Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, Atlantic City, May 28, 1967.

¹ C. A. Doxiadis, "Of Subhuman and Human Cities," *New York Times*, Mar. 11, 1967.

² Eric Hoffer, *The True Believer*, New York: The New American Library, 1951, p. 33.

³ See Simon Kuznets, *Shares of Upper In-*

structive to look at some of the indices of equality and probe their bearing on Jewish relationships, particularly, with ethnic minorities, and above all with the Negro community.

The distribution of income and wealth is perhaps the most obvious indicator of inequality. After looking at statistics of income, Herman P. Miller, Special Assistant, Bureau of the Census, concluded in 1964, that "our 'social revolution' ended nearly twenty years ago."⁴ While the income gap narrowed somewhat during the prior two decades, "the share of income received by the lower income groups has not changed for twenty years."⁵ Much the same is true of wealth. Lampman concluded that "the concentration of wealth is increasing in the years since 1949,"⁶ reversing an earlier trend.⁷ Parenthetically, Richard Titmuss found parallel discrepancies in England. In his painstaking study entitled *Income Distribution and Social Change*, he concluded: "There is more than a hint from a number of studies that income inequality has been increasing since 1949 whilst the ownership of wealth . . . has probably become

still more unequal, and in terms of family ownership, possibly strikingly unequal in recent years."⁸

Of greater significance for us is the fact that the "income gap between the races generally widened during the fifties."⁹ The New School for Social Research study of poverty drew the following conclusions: "(1) in the years since World War II, the economic gains of the non-white population have been less than proportional to those of the whites; (2) the gainers in the non-white group itself are in a minority; and (3) the relative position of a significant majority of non-whites has worsened."¹⁰

The comparative state of health represents another index of inequality. While it has been common knowledge that Negroes were at a marked disadvantage with respect to health conditions, it is less well known that the health gap is widening, despite, and perhaps even because, of advances in medical science. Drs. James G. Haughton and Paul M. Densen reported recently¹¹ that:

- the mortality rate for pregnant Negro mothers was twice that of white mothers in 1930, and four times in 1964.
- between 1960 and 1964, the number of newly reported cases of tuberculosis increased by 1 percent among Negroes, but decreased by 28 percent among whites in New York City.
- the infant mortality rate for non-whites was 66 percent higher than the rate for whites in 1950, but 90 percent higher in 1964.
- in 1963, the death rate of Negroes was almost twice that of whites.

An interesting irony is seen in the increase in death rates of Negroes due to

come Groups in Income and Savings, New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1953; and Selma F. Goldsmith, "Income Distribution in Depression, War, and Peace," in *Poverty in Affluence*, Robert E. Will and Harold G. Vatter, Eds., New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc. 1965.

⁴ Herman P. Miller, *Rich Man, Poor Man*, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1964, p. 52.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

⁶ Robert J. Lampman, "The Future of the Low-Income Problem," in *The Economics of Poverty*, Burton A. Weisbrod, Ed., Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1965, p. 61.

⁷ See Robert J. Lampman, *The Share of Top Wealth-Holders in National Wealth, 1922-1956*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1962. See also, S. M. Miller and Martin Rein, "Poverty, Inequality and Policy," in *Social Problems*, Howard S. Becker, Ed., New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966, p. 470.

⁸ Richard M. Titmuss, *Income Distribution and Social Change*, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1962, p. 198.

⁹ Herman P. Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

¹⁰ Oscar Ormati, *Poverty Amid Affluence*, New York: The Twentieth Century Fund, 1966, p. 59.

¹¹ *New York Times*, March 14, 1967.

homicide, from 6 times that of whites in the 1920's, to ten times by the late 1950's and 1960's,¹² while the white suicide rate is approximately two to three times that for Negroes.

The facts on unemployment are well known. Negroes have quite consistently lacked jobs somewhat more than 2 times as much as whites in recent years. During the thirties, unemployment, though favoring whites, was more nearly randomly dispersed. The intervening years, and especially the very recent years, have witnessed a growing inequality. In 1940, the unemployment rate of Negroes was 20 percent; in 1953, 71 percent; and between 1956 and 1963, 112 percent higher than that for whites. The averages hide the fact that the discrepancies are actually much greater. During 1960-1961, white males in Chicago between the prime working ages of 25 and 44 had an unemployment rate of only 2.2 percent, but in thirty-one all Negro census tracts, the unemployment rate was over 15 percent.¹³ In the early months of 1966, 25 to 30 percent of non-white girls, and 20 to 25 percent of non-white boys were unable to find work.¹⁴ In 1948, Negro teenage unemployment was actually lower than that for white youth (7.6 percent compared with 8.3 percent). In the following years the white rate doubled, but the Negro rate quadrupled.¹⁵

¹² Helen C. Chase, "Non-White Mortality Differentials in the United States," *H.E.W. Indicators*, June 1965, p. 36. Dr. Chase's figures on maternal and child mortality generally conform to those of Drs. Houghton and Densen, cited above.

¹³ Herbert Hill, "Racial Inequality in Employment: The Patterns of Disermination," in Raymond J. Murphy and Howard Elinson, Eds., *Problems and Prospects of the Negro Movement*, Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1966, p. 87.

¹⁴ *The Negroes in the United States*, Bulletin No. 1511, U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, June, 1966, p. 21.

¹⁵ Peter Marris and Martin Rein, *Dilemmas*

In its recent report to the President, the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service made the following observations on the effect of the draft on the Negro: "the number of men rejected for service reflects a much higher percentage (almost 50 percent) of Negro men found disqualified than of whites (25 percent) Negro soldiers comprise 14.5 percent of all Army units (and in Army combat units appreciably higher). . . . During the first 11 months of 1966, Negro soldiers totaled 22.4 percent of all Army troops killed in action."¹⁶

These dreary statistics take on sharp dimensions when we realize that on each of these counts, the Jewish experience moves in an opposite direction. With the white community generally, Jews share an enhanced position in respect to the proportion of goods and services that they command. Studies of income distribution among religious groups by the National Opinion Research Center, and substantially confirmed by similar studies of the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan indicate that while the proportion of Jews with incomes in 1959 under \$5,000 was lower than those for the nation as a whole, for the income categories above that amount it was substantially higher.¹⁷ After reviewing a variety of studies, Reich concluded that 40 percent of the Jews are in the commercial sector, 20 percent in manufacturing, 15 to 17 percent in

of Social Reform, New York: Atherton Press, 1967, p. 11. See also, Raymond W. Mack, "Race Relations," in *Social Problems, A Modern Approach*, Howard S. Becker, Ed., New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966. "In the entire United States the gap separating Negro and White citizens is widening in critical areas of social life," p. 352.

¹⁶ New York Times, March 5, 1967.

¹⁷ Nathan Reich, "Economic Status," in *The American Jew, A Reappraisal*, Oscar I. Janowsky, Ed., New York: Jewish Publications Society, 1964, p. 57.

the professions, and the remainder in personal service, transportation, construction trades and other occupations.¹⁸ They are three times as numerous as proprietors, managers and sales workers than the national average, but one-fifth as numerous as laborers. According to the economist William Haber, "Jews are overwhelmingly middle-class, concentrated in merchandising and the free professions."¹⁹ They were once a decidedly disadvantaged minority staffing sweat shops and struggling against a wide array of discriminatory barriers. Today they are a favored minority by-and-large, and, in relation to other ethnic minorities, the Negro, the Puerto Rican, the Mexican American, represents a growing disparity of privilege. Because of what is happening in American cities, this observation takes on a strategic importance.

Among the dominant trends in America is the increasing change in the ethnic profiles of its cities. The vast migration of Negroes spurred by the two world wars, from South to North, and from rural to urban areas has changed their complexion and character. The number of non-white migrants leaving the South has accelerated in recent years. Net Negro outmigration from the South totaled three million from 1940 to 1960, with another 235,000 from 1960-1963. About half of the Negro residents in the 10 cities of the north and west that had the largest Negro population in 1960 were not born there. Well over half of the increase in Negro population between 1950 and 1960 was in the central cities of standard metropolitan areas, the only areas which lost white populations during the decade.²⁰ Between 1940 and 1960, the percentage of

Negroes in the population of Philadelphia and New York doubled, and in Chicago, Los Angeles and Detroit nearly tripled.²¹ The relative and absolute increase in Negro populations in these dominant cities had led the Griers²² to predict that by 1980, several major United States cities will have Negro majorities. Today Washington and Newark have already passed the fifty percent mark, and others are on their way, including Baltimore, Cleveland, Detroit, Philadelphia and St. Louis.

This increasing ghettoization of urban communities, with its "emergence of a large underclass of Negro unemployed [and] the growth of a permanent Black lumpenproletariat, might well alter the character of the Negro civil rights movement,"²³ to quote an official of the N.A.A.C.P. The pool from which continued migration to northern cities might draw remains large—over half (54 percent) of Negroes still live in the South, three out of five in urban areas. Continued migration, together with a larger than average Negro birth rate help define a situation that is largely irreversible. This post-World War II urban world is one we never knew, qualitatively different from the past in its dominant aspects. Its impact on diverse strata of the population is stark. Their capacities to deal with its accumulated pathologies differ. And these differences provide primary data for community relations agencies.

Social Tensions Inherent in Reverse Trends of Negro and Jew

In contrast to these demographic move-

²¹ St. Clair Drake, *Race Relations in a Time of Rapid Social Change*, New York: National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, 1966, p. 9.

²² George and Eunice Grier, *Equality and Beyond*, Chicago, Ill.: Quadrangle Books, 1966, p. 7.

²³ Herbert Hill, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

¹⁹ William Haber, *The Economy, Where is it Going?* New York: Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 1966, pp. 6-7.

²⁰ *The Negroes in the United States, op. cit.*

ments, Jews have in the past two decades largely left the inner city, their places taken by other ethnic minorities. They have tended to congregate in suburban enclaves, becoming, themselves, increasingly ghettoized in new and more favored environments. Two major questions confront them in their new habitat—time honored relationships with the non-Jewish community in the urban fringe, where they live, and their continued relationship with the urban core, to which they return by day in the course of their normal economic and professional pursuits.

The Jewish move to the suburbs, however, is accompanied by a stepped up parallel move by Negroes. A special 1965 Federal census in Westchester County reported that the Negro population increased by one-fifth in its six cities between 1960 and 1965, while the white population declined by 0.6 percent.²⁴ In Mount Vernon the Negro population increased by one-third, and the white decreased by 13 percent during the same period. In some mid-western cities, Jewish agencies have had to deal with problems that have grown out of this new Jewish-Negro confrontation where Negroes have become suburban neighbors, or where Negro children were bused into suburban schools. In one community, the public school was located near the Jewish community center, and the bid for use of its facilities by these children has occasioned considerable community debate. Latent anti-Negro hostility has become manifest in areas where escape from inter-racial contact in neighborhood and institution was sought. It is natural to expect continued interchange in the years ahead, and an intensification of the troublesome problems it is likely to bring.

As for the inner city, major questions obtrude. Jews return each day to the

city in a variety of roles, many of which involve them in an intimacy of formal relationships with the urban minorities. They serve largely as gatekeepers in the dominant institutions that bind the lives of the ghetto residents—as principals and teachers in the schools, as judges and lawyers in the courts, as welfare investigators and supervisors. Each of these institutions conjures up images of failure, arenas of strife. In these organizations and agencies Negroes are frequently disciplined and judged in subordinate status positions. Hostility is engendered by the frequent disregard of needs and values. Schools fail to teach (reading retardation in ghetto schools is a national scandal, attested to by the monumental Coleman report), justice is frequently denied, welfare degrades its clients. In addition, Jews are frequently landlords, merchants and employers in business. Here too, super-ordinate, subordinate relations that touch life deeply are apparent.

One consequence of the peculiar spatial relationship Jews have to the central city, and especially its ghetto areas, is that they take wealth from the city and return relatively little. It is, of course, true that they share this process with others, but their numbers and pervasiveness makes them highly visible. This economic relationship does not evade ghetto residents, and one can expect increasing discussion about what often appears to them as unfair economic exploitation.

In addition, the relationship to role occupants in gate-keeping and property positions is frequently seen as invidious and exploitative. Daily and relatively intimate contact impresses the role partner with sharp degrees of differential social advantage, because these move in divergent directions, enhancing perceptions of growing inequality. What is happening in urban areas favors the white middle-class, and Jews as a disproportionate part of that class, but

²⁴ *New York Times*, February 26, 1967.

is negative to the lower-class urban resident and the dominant Negro population. Benefits accrue to the educated, the literate, the trained, those favored by advantages largely denied the ghetto tenant.

Ecologically, American cities appear to assume a reverse apartheid. In South Africa, the blacks leave their segregated enclaves and shanty towns to work in the central city areas. Here, Jews leave the favored districts for work in the rotting city core. This super-ordinate, often exploitative relationship has built-in consequences that can, in time, appear to be patterned after similar relationships common in dependent, suppressed and disadvantaged colonial or semi-colonial national states. There is a danger to the Jewish community implicit in this circumstance, as there is to the nation as a whole. The vulnerability of businessmen in the ghetto, and Jewish businessmen among them, to threat and actions has led community relations councils to mount programs in cities like Philadelphia and Cleveland where riots have had direct and costly impact on merchants. The action of the Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia in the Lancaster Avenue Project and in the Council of Property Owners dealing with community-responsible ethical practices in merchandizing and landlord-tenant relationships is an outstanding illustration of the recognition of the urban imperative in responding to some of the major problems faced by inner city residents, and especially in addressing anti-Semitism among urban Negroes.

While much of the strategic direction for community relations activity must inevitably be directed to external group contact, much requires doing internally within the Jewish community itself. I have the feeling that members of that community need increasingly to be viewed as a target of action and interpretation. Evidence points to the fact

that general community attitudes find their reflection in Jewish opinion. The bigotry of parents and taxpayers groups is widely shared by local Jewish community leaders. In their study of an episode in school desegregation, the Langs came to the following "simple conclusion: class was more important than ethnicity in determining the likelihood that a person was on one side or the other of this school desegregation controversy. They lend no support to the proposition that Jews, just because they are Jews, will necessarily behave differently from other whites. On the contrary, Jews frequently divide along class lines, very much as other groups do."²⁵ In one respect, the Jews were found to be different—they were more vocal *pro* and *con*. Attitude change *within* the Jewish community may be as important to engineer by intergroup agencies as attitudes in other population groups. The behavior of Jews and Jewish institutions in relation to other minorities, and especially in minority ghettos, must take on central importance in the contemporary concern for programmatic action. A furthering of the sectarianization of welfare agencies in both central city and suburb further removes the Jewish community from meaningful contact with other groups, increasing its isolation and withdrawal from the reality of urban living and helping to polarize Jewish and non-Jewish goals. By contrast, the institutional interests of the various Protestant groups and of the Catholic Church have led them to concentrate on the pathology of the city and to allocate significant resources to those tasks.

The urban challenge to the Jewish community grows out of what is hap-

²⁵ Kurt Lang and Gladys Engel Lang, "Resistance to School Segregation: A Case Study of Backlash Among Jews," *Problems and Prospects of the Negro Movement*, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

pening to the city and its people, and the inevitable impact it has on the group relatedness of Jews, individually and collectively. The problems of the city *are* the problems of its minority groups, and any attempt to address the latter must grapple in full with the former. McGeorge Bundy was recently quoted as saying that "the struggle for full opportunity for all Negroes is in a larger sense the struggle for all of us for the viability of the American city and the society at large."²⁶ Put another way, community relations represents a set of problems and operations in social policy that bear on central questions of institutional change, on community values—in a word, on social reconstruction. I do not think it is any longer possible to deal in its fullness with issues of group relatedness as such, though some aspects will continue to require specific educational and other group-centered remedies. Exacerbation of group antagonism in the current scene is a consequence largely of the divergent rewards made available to group members, and the widespread racism that is awakened and rekindled as people attempt to redress the uneven balance of equality and power. Widespread powerlessness is a danger to the powerful once it becomes articulated and organized. This latter process is moving along, together with the desperation that is born of fear and retribution. Paradoxically, our very affluence brings in its train dissatisfaction and discontent because it is so great and so visible. This society has, for perhaps the first time in history, the resources not only to eliminate want born of poverty, but to provide a relative abundance for all to share. When so many are able to claim a full share by moving upward on the mobility scale, those who do not must naturally harbor resentment. Bettelheim and Janowitz found an as-

sociation between downward social mobility and intolerance, and upward social mobility and tolerance. They concluded that "to understand intolerance it is less important to concentrate on the social and economic background of the individual than to investigate the nature of his social mobility. The question which must be answered for each individual is whether or not he is being forced downwards or prevented from fulfilling his expectations of upward social mobility."²⁷ These conclusions were substantially confirmed by a number of recent studies reviewed by them.²⁸

The Social Structure Itself As The Target of Community Relations Work

I draw the conclusion from the above observations and analysis that it is necessary to redefine much of the field of practice in community and intergroup relations. A substantial part of its work must deal with a broadly conceived strategy, one that in a real sense makes the social structure its target of planning and action.

This is not necessarily a novel observation in relation to other fields of practice. In his recent special message to the Congress on crime, President Johnson quotes the following from the report of the Crime Commission: "We will not have dealt effectively with crime until we have alleviated the conditions that stimulate it. To speak of controlling crime only in terms of the work of the police, the courts and the correctional apparatus alone, is to refuse to face the fact that widespread crime implies a widespread failure by society as a whole." The report itself states that "A commu-

²⁷ Bruno Bettelheim and Morris Janowitz, *Social Change and Prejudice*, New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964, p. 165.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 29-34.

²⁶ *New York Times*, January 30, 1967.

nity's most enduring protection against crime is to right the wrongs and cure the illnesses that tempt men to harm their neighbors,"²⁹ and points to the need to deal with inadequate housing, poverty, unemployment, racial discrimination, commercial exploitation, futile education and the like—"every effort to improve life in American 'inner cities'." I suggest that similar conclusions obtain in connection with the work of community relations agencies. Their attention must be directed to the dominant institutions of the culture, and especially in the cities.

A parallel illustration can be drawn from the health field. In her recent Bronfman Lecture, Eveline M. Burns had the following to say:

. . . it is well known that the health of a people, while obviously affected by the nature of its health services and the presence or absence of contaminations in its physical environment, is also greatly influenced by other factors of a social character. Poor housing, inadequate nutrition, unwanted pregnancies, inability to secure employment, limited education, especially as it relates to elementary knowledge of the functioning of the body and mind, exclusion from participation in the ongoing life of the community, all these have a direct impact on physical or mental health and often on both.

If it is health that we are concerned with then the scope of our social policy for health must be expanded to encompass these social areas as well.³⁰

One might paraphrase Professor Burns' question, "Is the primary concern of social policy with health services or with health?," by asking, should our

essential concern be with community relations (services) or with community?

Does this, then, open a Pandora's box, with no boundaries, no limits? How can the Jewish communal interest be circumscribed and differentiated from that of other agencies and organizations concerned with similar questions? Is this approach too global, and in the long run self-defeating?

To put the matter in more specific terms, should these agencies move from an interest in fair housing and non-discrimination in employment to include action for a vastly expanded, subsidized housing program and full or guaranteed employment? Should the chronic problems of educational failure be made subjects of interest along with integration, subsidy for parochial schools and church-state separation, or should the general issues continue to be referred to organizations like the Public Education Association and the Teacher's Union?

I mean to suggest that the broad questions of social policy and institutional change should indeed be part of the community relations workers' professional focus, influenced, of course, by such workers' own philosophical orientation and concern with the potential impact of these broad questions on the Jewish community in its relationship to other segments of the population.

Outer-Directed Focus of Jewish Intergroup Relations

Strategy in Jewish intergroup relations practice has historically two vectors—one inner-, the other, outer-directed. The more vulnerable the Jewish community has been to direct threat by political and social forces in the environment, the more its attention has been given to problems of protection and defense. Inner-directed strategy is based on conceptions of group self-interest. The fate of the individual is here seen as largely a function of the viability of the group.

²⁹ *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*, A Report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, February 1967, p. 6.

³⁰ Eveline M. Burns, "Social Policy and the Health Services: the Choices Ahead," *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 57, No. 2 (February 1967), p. 208.

Thus collective and individual reality propel group cohesion, and community relations work becomes targeted at barriers to group development. Many of these questions have now been resolved, and the conventional forms of anti-Semitism are no longer a matter of great significance. Challenge and threat now come from new forms of encounter that are shaped by the social forces that surround the dynamic of urban development. Some patterns of suburban hostility are now quite visible, much of it centering on aspects of educational policy, frequently involving questions of school and neighborhood desegregation, and emboldened by a resurgent racism lodged in the radical right. The inner-urban encounter represents, I believe, a major source of internal threat, growing out of relationships that are pre-conditioned by unequal status positions, where poverty and color, on the one side, meet economic well-being and religio-ethnic identity on the other.

Outer-directed strategy grows out of the continuity of the Jewish historic tradition of humanism. The ancient virtues of justice, equality and fair play, rooted in the Jewish experience, suggest action on a broad front and grows out of the concern for all who share the historic suffering of the Jewish people. As the self-interest preoccupation declines with the general enhancement of economic and social status, and the lowering of barriers to growth and advancement, concern naturally turns to questions of general inter-group import. A quick perusal of recent editions of the Joint Program Plan for Jewish Community Relations published by the N.C.R.A.C. indicates the areas in which attention has been directed—civil liberties, the radical right, the poverty programs, legislative reapportionment, federal aid to education, and so on.

I would like to suggest that both dimensions of strategy move increasingly not in parallel but in converging lines,

and that this is largely a consequence of the social and economic trends that are affecting inter-group relations in the urban areas of the nation. The humanistic impulse is now a matter, more than ever, of Jewish group and individual self-interest. Making the city more human, to refer again to the language of Doxiadis, addresses quite directly the major issues that will increasingly confront Jewish community relations agencies. The vulnerability of the city, its social and physical pathologies, and its areas of obsolescence and decay present a threat to Jewish security in ways that have little precedent. It raises the question as to whether urban livability should not become a major objective of the professional community relations practitioner. The Jews are, after all, the most urbanized ethnic group in the country. Ten years ago, an informal survey of the United States Bureau of the Census found that urbanized areas of 250,000 or more inhabitants accounted for 87.4 percent of the Jews of the country, about 54 percent of the Roman Catholics and about 25 percent of the white Protestants. Nine cities contained 70 percent of the American Jewish population.³¹ The relative concentration is probably more pronounced now.

One consequence of viewing the city as target is the necessity of examining the new Negro-Jewish encounter and its meaning for Negro-Jewish relationships. Foremost in this assessment is the perception and significance of new forms of Negro group consciousness and especially of black power and its overtones. Black power is too pervasive a concept for simple analysis. It carries implications of positive and negative effects. If it is seen as an effort to overcome victimization and powerlessness through an en-

³¹ C. Bezalel Sherman, "Demographic and Social Aspects," in *The American Jew, A Reappraisal*, Oscar I. Janowsky, Ed., New York: Jewish Publications Society, 1964, pp. 30-31.

hanced sense of identity and group unity, it only repeats the history of Jewish group consciousness, in which thoughts of creative group survival lead to the establishment of Negro institutions and organizations that open channels for individual growth and intergroup power and self-respect. If it is seen as a reverse racism, threatening person and property, then Jewish backlash joins that of the white population and withdraws from the liberal-ethnic coalition and cooperative civil rights activity. Both currents are found in the Jewish community. A clarification of this phenomenon is urgent for Jewish community relations. The historic opposition of Jews to racism in all its forms becomes ambivalent and needs, the more, direction and form. A sympathetic view of the positive potentials in black power, of its response to white exploitation (in which the Jews share), of its expression of a new sense of dignity, of its bid for a redistribution of the society's bounty, of its political, social and economic significance should, in my view be counter-balanced to the often reactionary response to its most extreme forms. But the open discussion and debate within the Jewish community is essential for community relations progress.

Recent experiences in New York City illustrate the nature of the new encounters between Negro and Jew. The nationally publicized situation of a new school in Harlem, P.S. 201, brought to the fore the call for integration, or parent-community (Negro) control, including a black principal. Since the assigned principal was Jewish, the call for his dismissal took on overtones of inter-group conflict. A few days ago, sharp conflicts in P.S. 248, with a predominantly Negro and Puerto Rican student body, and located in the Brownsville section of Brooklyn, pitted the teachers (largely Jewish) and the Teachers Union, against local Negro organiza-

tions. The Schoolmen's Lodge of the B'nai B'rith, composed of Jewish teachers and supervisors complained of increasing anti-white and anti-semitic incidents.³² These are parts of the elements that made up the liberal-labor political coalition of recent decades. One can expect similar patterns of confrontation in other urban areas.

Violence and conflict are implicit in much that is likely to happen in the inner city. The subject is much too broad to be treated here. It should be stated, however, that intergroup agencies need to study these twin phenomena, to isolate their functional and dysfunctional aspects, to learn how best to manage conflicts so as to maximize their positive potentials, and above all, to understand the nature and causes of violence. Long-range approaches to the threats of riots and disturbances are needed. Short range efforts that stimulate riot insurance, are, in the long run, self-defeating. Repression will only lead to the garrison state. Recent events in Cleveland forecast the natural consequences of an apartheid-like separation of races in the central city. They project the analogue of an occupying army in the form of police, national guard, army reserves and state militia. Insight into causes can lead to remedial action. No more urgent or more difficult task confronts all intergroup relations efforts.

The major implications of an urban livability goal for community relations practice concern problems of public and social policy and institutional change as they inevitably affect what happens to the city and to the people who reside therein. While much of the current general work of community relations agencies has relevance to urban problems, I suggest that a specific focus on urbanism as an organizing principle for study and action will bring to the fore

³² Reported in *The New York Times*, May 24, 1967.

a variety of planning and policy questions that are now either not apparent or of only peripheral significance to workers in the field. I have earlier alluded to the question of appropriate boundaries of concern for Jewish community relations activity. It seems to me clear that agencies need to continue to deal with matters of immediate and direct interest in the development of positive intergroup relationships. In the current day, however, there is also need for a variety of *indirect* approaches that have as their intended consequences the achievement of similar goals. While this opens up an almost unlimited potential for action, both an appropriate sense of priority and the use of an intergroup relations cognitive screen applied to social policy questions can narrow down and delimit professional activity and group action. The general principle that whatever has the effect of taking disadvantaged populations out of poverty and narrows the social and economic discrepancies between minority racial and ethnic groups and the majority population removes the basis for the growth of intergroup hostility and destructive conflict.

Areas of Social Policy to Which Community Relations Can Attend

While community relations attention would be directed to policy arenas occupied by related professions and organizations, the distinctive task would be to raise different questions and enhance sensitivity to aspects of policy that are often overlooked. I point to several areas of social policy to carry the argument along. Among the most important national issues is the public debate on questions of income supports. America is becoming singular in the developed world with respect to its failure to provide equitable minima of income to its people. Recent interest in guaranteed income or work is now occupying enor-

mous energy in our national governmental agencies concerned with human well-being. Negative income tax, universal "demogrant," family or children's allowances and the like, all vie for public attention and support. Where is the analysis pinpointed to the effect of these divergent policies on the intergroup structure of the nation? I suggest that an interdisciplinary conjoint effort on behalf of community relations professionals with those in economics and in social work could lead to action for saner policies. When less than one-fourth of the families in poverty receive public assistance, when almost one-half the Negro population lives below the poverty line, and when minority children are a disproportionate segment of the poor, concern for justice and minority group well-being propel interest in these national policy questions. When public welfare degrades and encapsulates the very poor, reform, as suggested by Senator Robert Kennedy and Commissioner Mitchell Ginsberg, is clearly indicated and should be advanced with utmost resolve by agencies with intergroup goals.

When questions of criminal justice are raised concerning equal consideration in the courts and of treatment by the police, and these questions invariably affect the ethnic poor, then the intergroup field needs to enter the arena of debate and action concerning police brutality and the denial of civil rights and liberties. When urban living is threatened by the social pathologies of drug addiction, prostitution, alcoholism, congestion, and air and water pollution, then, similarly, intergroup thought and action needs to be directed at these indices of decay, and especially from the point of view of how they affect urban ethnic populations.

While professional interest in intergroup relations has drawn heavily on the law, social work and education, a focus on the city would imply a similar

borrowing from urban and city planning. Intergroup interest in housing and urban renewal and their affect on urban population groups leads quite naturally to a concern for programs of social and physical reconstruction, such as that embodied in the recent model cities legislation. Sharp questions were recently raised by the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing as to the potential of this legislation for perpetuating ghettos, much as the various urban renewal efforts in the past have often resulted in reinforcing segregation patterns in the inner city. This is surely an area in which community relations agencies should not be silent. The tragic events in Watts called attention to the importance of the location of service facilities in blighted areas, but also to the crucial role of transportation in perpetuating unemployment and inadequate health care. The economics of community development and its impact on group relations similarly call for intergroup analysis. The imperative need for expanding jobs, and especially for young people in ethnic enclaves, perhaps goes more to the heart of intergroup tension than any other aspects of national policy. The application of national resources to this task seems to me to warrant prime consideration on the intergroup agency's agenda.

So much that is needed in national policy to address these and other issues has taken second place to the current war effort, that concern with peace and with the swiftest possible termination of the Vietnam war seems to me to require bold, direct and incisive action. Urban pathology and intergroup conflicts are casualties of the national war policy. What could we not achieve in social goals with 26 billion dollars a year? A redirection of expenditures to the War on Poverty from the War in Vietnam could make a skirmish of the latter and an unconditional effort of the former, the opposite of the current cir-

cumstance. In a remarkable essay published in 1966, Gunnar Myrdal sets the parameters for national planning for healthy cities as (1) "the unconditional war against poverty," including major alterations in income distribution, and (b) "the challenge to plan for sustained and rapid economic growth," which has the effect of making labor scarce, "the alpha and omega of any scheme to eradicate poverty."³³ A peace economy that applies our vast resources to these twin policies would go far toward making much of current concern for group relations irrelevant.

Summary Implications for Community Relations Practice

What, then, are some implications for community relations practice from all the foregoing? To a substantial degree there should be a reassessment of fundamental strategy. Traditional concerns that grow out of specific questions generated by group relatedness need to be supplemented by questions of broad social policy which, in an increasingly complex and interrelated world, have the effect of attacking the social and structural basis for the growth of intergroup problems and conflicts. Above all, social policies that encompass urban remedial action are required. The city as a target of action puts into focus problems of urban livability. These parameters need to be identified with the added insight of community relations expertise. Urban demographic movements pose problems of new confrontations and new sources of tension. In looking at these, both Jewish and non-Jewish population segments become targets for attitude and behavioral change. Mediating between Jew and non-Jew has

³³ Gunnar Myrdal, "National Planning for Healthy Cities: Two Challenges to Affluence," in *Planning for a Nation of Cities*, Sam Bass Warner, Jr., Ed., Cambridge, Mass., M.I.T. Press, 1966.

