KNOW YOUR HUMAN RELATIONS

A Digest of Information

JANUARY 1956

Revised, November 1956

State of New Jersey
Department of Education
Division Against Discrimination

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

New Jersey recognized its responsibility to all its citizens when the State Legislature adopted the Law Against Discrimination in Employment in 1945. The State Constitution was revised in 1947 to include a provision banning segregation in the public schools and in the militia. The Law Against Discrimination in employment was amended in 1949 to provide equal access to educational institutions and places of public accommodation. More recent amendments cover military status and public housing.

The enactment of these laws, as stated in the act (18:25-2) is ". . . in fulfillment of the provisions of the Constitution of this State guaranteeing civil rights."

The State Division Against Discrimination in the New Jersey Department of Education is charged with administering this body of laws. Together with resolving formal complaints, the Division carries on a broad program of public education to promote understanding and good will among the people of New Jersey. In the past ten years, our State has experienced marked progress in education for good human relations, which has been called, "the art of getting along well with people regardless of race, creed, color, nationality or ancestry." Dr. Dan Dodson defines human relations as ". . . the art and science of human beings relating to each other."

New Jersey citizens have developed greater social maturity as a result of this educational program together with the law enforcement procedures. Regulations and laws raise standards of public conduct by correcting violations; but real progress is evident when individuals accept as right that which the law requires.

In the course of a year the Division receives several hundred pamphlets, brochures and reports from national organizations working to foster good human relations. A great deal of this material has limited distribution. As a first step toward making some of this material available to more people the Division requested permission from these organizations to synthesize and compile materials from their publications. An immediate and encouraging response was forthcoming from the following organizations: The National Conference of Christians and Jews, The American Jewish Congress, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and The National Urban League.

The following articles were first distributed by the State Division Against Discrimination for use by New Jersey's weekly newspapers. They appear now in this pamphlet with modifications and additions for general reading and discussion by interested persons and groups.

1. NO MAN IS AN ISLAND

"No man is an Iland entire of it selfe," wrote John Donne in the seventeenth century. He went on to express the idea that men in society are inter-related, and that what one man does affects all others. He concluded his oft-quoted statement by saying that when men are killed we are responsible, and that the death of one is the death of all; ". . . and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls," he wrote, "It tolls for thee."

Another writer, the great historian Shotwell, once wrote, "Peace is not an ideal in itself. It is a time when ideals may be realized." Both Donne and Shotwell were expressing the same basic thought; namely, that wherever mankind is suffering, we—each one of us—are responsible. If we sit idly by, while others suffer, no matter who they are or where they are we may soon suffer with them. While we have peace, we must use that time to alleviate human ills; else these ills will come to plague each of us.

How often those of us who are middle-aged or older have experienced the truth that human suffering anywhere should call us to action lest we, too, suffer! When Japan marched into Manchuria in the 1930's, we, in America, thought it was no concern of ours. When Mussolini marched into Ethiopia, we sat idly by. When Hitler began to persecute the Jews, we said, "Too bad, but what can we do?" Even before Hitler's rise, we burned corn and slaughtered pigs (and paid good money for these wasteful activities) while people in Germany went hungry. At that time, we had idle ships in our harbors, idle seamen to man these ships; we had granaries bursting with grain. We could have used the idle seamen to man the idle ships, and carried the grain to the hungry Germans. We could have said to them, "We have too much; you are hungry. Let us help you." To have done so might have stayed Hitler's rise and changed the course of history. We failed to take advantage of the opportunity to alleviate human suffering; and we have endured two world wars. Hardly a person but who has suffered the loss of life or limb in himself or among his relatives.

Let us awake to the truth: Are people hungry in India? Are people ill-housed in New York City? Are Negroes refused employment in Newark? If they are, it is our problem—the problem of each one of us. To turn our back upon such problems is to court disaster. "No man is an Iland, entire of itselfe."

2. WHAT WE SEE AND KNOW

When a lighting system breaks down the electrician has a number of things to look for. When human relations break down, it is not so easy to find the

blown fuse or the broken wire. There is, however, a point from which study can begin: Can we learn by what people say how they will act toward others, and can we change their attitudes?

A professor tells about the rose in his garden which bloomed in the middle of June. Because it was the first of all he had planted, he wanted a picture of it. The six year old daughter of a neighbor came by while he was setting up the camera. She asked what he was doing. He told her and pointed to the rose. In the next five minutes she asked many questions and said many things. "Why is this the first one? Will there be more like it? It doesn't smell much. Will it be here tomorrow when I come home from school? Did you make it grow? I bet my daddy has a flower like that." He finally took the picture. The camera caught the flower in a very rich moment. The outer ring of petals curved symmetrically. The inner ones had just begun their outward arching. Something of the deep coloring came through. There was much in the picture—and in a sense, very little. The camera registered only what it "saw". The camera could only take a picture; it could not tell anything about the meaning of the picture. Compare that with the little girl's response. She was able to ask questions about matters of purpose, quality and duration. Her human nervous system is no simple, camera-like recording device but one that is magnificently creative as well. The difference between the achievements of the camera and those of the little girl can be formulated in terms of two kinds of statements: Observation statements, those based on what we see; and inference statements, those based on what we think or say about what we see.

Observation statements refer to details, aspects, or charactristics of anything which human beings can be aware of directly. Such statements represent what can be known by the senses. An observation statement implies a set of relationships between things, happenings or people with which one is acquainted. It can be made only AFTER acquaintance. It usually suggests that such and such happened, or that particular features were found, or that such and such can be recognized. The maker of this kind of statement usually implies that if someone else had been where he was, responding as he did, that other person would have made much the same statement. The observation statement is a way of pointing to something to which another person could also point were he similarly stationed and equipped. It, in effect, stands for the picture the camera takes.

Inference statements refer to factors and considerations which are outside the immediate acquaintance of the speaker. They go beyond what can be directly observed. They add details to the observation statements. Inference statements fill in what is not apparent in a situation and fill out what is not provided in the description. They imply that something may happen before it happens. These are the statements made about what is as yet unknown and what can only be guessed. These are the statements a man makes most frequently when he talks about motives, makes predictions, or attempts explanations in the absence of observation. Inference statements imply that such and such may have happened, or that some indicated features may possibly be found, or that such and such might yet be recognized.

It is one of the curiosities of everyday speech that a person can be making inference statements when he sounds as though he were talking about something observable. For example, look at an apple with its skin intact. You now can say, "There are seeds in this apple." Your sentence has the form and sound of the factual. It is exactly what you might say AFTER you had cut it open and found seeds there. Before the investigation the statement is only a supposition. Of course, if you have had experience with many apples you might say, "They all had seeds. The evidence is overwhelming. This one will have seeds, too." The first sentence can be considered factual. The third should not be so considered. It is rather a statement of very great probability—so great that it would be "safe" to bet on. Nevertheless, it is not yet a statement of fact. Maybe a seedless apple has been grown without your knowledge.

This distinction between observation statements and inference statements would not be important if many people did not make questionable declarative statements as though they were facts. This belief in the factual character of their statements in turn leads them to proceed all too readily not caring whether they are going beyond the truth.

The next time you hear someone sounding off about who owns what or about what one people can do which another cannot, or about the dangerous intentions of this or that group, listen for the note of factual finality. It is conceivable that the statements could satisfy the requirements of the observational, but on the other hand he may be reciting his own inferences. The mere sound of certainty does not establish the validity of a statement.

3. THE NATURE OF PREJUDICE

A wise man once said, "Prejudice consists in being down on something we're not up on." Modern studies have shown that children are not born with prejudice. They learn prejudice from their home, school, and religious environments. The teaching of prejudice takes place in the same informal manner in which many good attitudes are taught.

Parents exercise the earliest influence. Some parents do not want their children to be prejudiced. Others teach prejudice to their children because they themselves grew up believing false ideas. Some parents teach prejudice unwittingly by their own behavior, by their indications of what they consider humorous or degrading, and so on. Sometimes children feel bad when older people make fun of them. They respond appropriately to regain a feeling of "belongingness." But much of the time older people do not realize that they are teaching prejudice to children. At the dinner table, while the children are listening, a wife may tell her husband about her trouble with the Negro or Polish maid. Not only do the children absorb the story, but they also tend to absorb mother's attitude towards the maid.

At Sunday school a child may derive negative ideas about Jews from the manner in which certain Biblical events presented. Scholars point out that the Roman government punished only those they considered dangerous to the Empire; but Sunday school teachers may fail to present completely the historical facts of early Christian times. It may seem to some children that the Jews were punished because they were Jews.

Some school textbooks, especially history books, often contain derogatory descriptions of people of other nations, and disparage minority groups within the nation itself. An immigrant group, for instance, may not be judged in terms of what its members hold dear and consider proper, but rather by the standards of the majority group. People may be hard-working, kindly, and ambitious, but if they are poor and ignorant and have not yet learned the customs of their adopted nation, they are frowned on in some textbooks.

Older children teach prejudice to younger ones. Children quickly develop rules about all sorts of things, and each member of the neighborhood group is expected to follow the rules. If prejudice is one of the "rules" in the community, older children are sometimes even more forceful than adults in teaching prejudice to the younger ones. Sometimes they make up stories about how stupid or dangerous members of minority groups are. These stories are imaginative child's play, but their effect can be very powerful in determining future attitudes. One study of prejudice among adults showed that quite a number of people claimed that their prejudice stemmed from bad childhood experiences. But when the stories were examined more closely, it was found that the incidents reported were largely "scare" stories circulated among local children.

Thus we see how children learn prejudice. Like most other things, they learn it from one another,

and especially is it true that the old teach the young. As it passes from generation to generation, prejudice comes to be applied to new minority groups. But it is always taught in the same manner as games, rules of conduct, idiom, or anything else of a similar nature.

The teaching of prejudice is, of course, not inevitable. Some parents, even those who live in predominantly prejudiced cultures, bring up their children to be fair-minded and free from prejudice. Also, children and adults who have been taught prejudice can unlearn it. Wise parents, teachers, friends and books can explain the errors and dangers of prejudice.

We immunize our children against diseases of the body; we have a duty to protect their minds and hearts against the corrosive effects of prejudice.

4. FACT and FICTION ABOUT RACE

Men are not alike in appearance; yet all people are more alike than different. We tend to think of race in terms of skin color, bone structure, hair texture. A race may be defined simply as a group of people who have in common certain physical traits that are inherited. These traits set them apart from other groups who have different combinations of physical traits. Within the three primary races, Caucasoid, Negroid, and Mongoloid, there are many variations in physical characteristics. The anthropologist reminds us there are differences in head shape, in hair form, and even in limb proportions within a single family.

What are some of the primary differences among races? The eyesockets of the Mongoloid are a slightly different shape from the sockets of any other race. Among the three major races, there is a small difference in the angle of the jaw. Head shapes vary. The shin bone, which may be flat in one race or slightly rounded in another, is just as important in determining race as is the color of skin.

In cataloguing data about race, the scientist does not say that one stock is superior to another. He offers no support for the "master race" theory. It makes as little sense to say that a woman with a rounded shin bone can write a better book than a woman with a flat shin bone, as it does to say that a man with skin of a certain color is less capable of being educated than a man with skin of another color. Such physical differences are insignificant compared to other physical traits in which man is everywhere alike. The similarities include, for example, skeletal structure, heart, lungs, the nervous system, and blood types—in all of these, man everywhere is exactly alike.

In the early books of the Old Testament, we find the belief that the physical and mental differences

between individuals and groups alike are congenital, hereditary and unchangeable. In the later books of the Bible, on the other hand, the theme of the universal brotherhood of man is advanced. Most of the religious disregard individual differences and look upon all men as brothers and equal in the sight of God.

The Greeks of two thousand years ago looked upon all men not of their own race as "barbarians", and Herodotus tells us that the Persians in their turn thought themselvess greatly superior to the rest of mankind. Cicero, a Roman, thought otherwise: "Men differ in knowledge but all are equal in ability to learn. There is no race which, guided by reason, cannot obtain virtue."

Despite the facts, race prejudice developed into a regular doctrinal system during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. There was a brief period when it appeared that the spread of the principles of the French and American revolutions and the success of the anti-slavery campaign in England might lessen or even abolish race prejudice. But after the Restoration and the industrial revolution in Europe, prejudice regained and held the field. The development of power spinning and weaving opened up wider markets to cotton manufacturers, resulting in an increasing demand for labor. Slavery, which was breaking down in America and might have vanished of itself, automatically became an institution on which the prosperity of the cotton states depended. In defense of this special institution, there evolved in some regions a pseudo-scientific interpretation of race to justify slavery.

After the Civil War, with the abolition of slavery and the adoption of the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth amendments, the ruined southern economy found need to cling to the mythology which supported slavery, while attempting to recover its lost prosperity. State and local segregation laws served to crystallize the sad plight of the American Negro in the South. During World War II our nation was required to use its full manpower. A presidential directive was issued forbidding discrimination in plants producing government materials. Many states adopted anti-discrimination laws. Thus a long step was made toward ending racial discrimination in employment.

About the same time, Hitler was using the social sciences to foster the myth of a "Jewish" race. He made the German Jews scapegoats for his insane economic theories and his ideas of conquest. Today behind the iron curtain, men of science are forced to echo the dogma of their rulers in a manner like that of Hitler's minions.

Democracy recognizes the existence of differences between man, but considers that all men possess the

same inalienable rights. Democracy seeks to afford all men equal political, social and economic opportunities.

Totalitarianism also accepts the differences between man and peoples as inevitable, but holds that these facts require obedience to the will of a "master" race expressed through "superior" men. Its aim is to enslave all who are capable of falling in with the will of the "Masters", and to exterminate all those who will not become units in a totalitarian world.

When we look at some of the implications of racism, we see that we cannot afford to reject any race. This nation symbolizes respect for the worth of the human person. The position of world leadership to which we are called deserves our dedication to unity and concord among ourselves.

5. STEREOTYPES

A stereotype is an over-blown picture in the mind. "Women are dangerous drivers," is an example of a stereotype held by some persons. Americans stem from many cultural patterns. Our heterogeneous population includes all races, creeds, and nationalities. An European meeting an American for the first time might form an impression of all Americans based on this one individual. Here is a stereotype in the making. The Oxford student who regarded all Americans as objectionable, but who never met one he didn't like, was the victim of a stereotype probably created by his reading or by his attending American motion pictures.

Stereotypes are a source of prejudice. Opinions are transmitted to children largely by means of the "stereotype". The stereotype reduces people to a few traits. All Greeks own restaurants; all Italians sing; the Scotch are stingy—are a few more examples of the stereotype.

Civics courses, without intent, sometimes lead students to accept the status quo, by assuming the superiority of the dominant group. Most civics texts do not deal with the problem of the mixture of ethnic groups in the average American community. When reference is made to the subject, often it is in terms of superiority and patronage. Negroes are a "race of former slaves"; immigrants are "foreigners".

History courses provide a wide field for creating stereotypes of a prejudicial nature. The child is likely to learn that his country has always been above criticism in its dealings with other nations; while these other nations have invariably been stupid, base, and cruel.

In geography lessons children may pick up questionable ideas, to the effect that inferior intelligence is to be expected of people living in a hot climate, and that the brightest races live in temperate zones.

Customs differing from our own are often perceived as moronic, queer, or ridiculous.

The study of literature may contribute to the formation of stereotypes. Racial origins of authors may be stressed unduly, the teacher pointing out that most of them come from England, or are born of Anglo-American stock.

At Sunday school, too, where presumably the child is taught attitudes of brotherly love, much that is productive of prejudice may be learned. For example, Biblical history improperly presented may, by strong emphasis on the perfidy of Judas, strengthen or engender antipathy towards Jews.

Games, such as tag, baseball, cops and robbers give children the opportunity to judge one another in terms of sportsmanship, athletic ability and cooperativeness, but incidentally to form prejudices. If a child who is particularly awkward and argumentative happens to be Polish, his companions, having already heard disparaging remarks about Polish people, will say to themselves, "Yes, he's just like they all are," thereby setting a stereotype still more strongly. The stereotype is a funnel into which bits of supporting information will be poured. Information that does not support the stereotype, once it is accepted, is apt to be forgotten, or regarded as "the exception that proves the rule."

Toys can also be significant in attitude formation. Dolls with black faces are sometimes made to look ridiculous. Some of the games prepared for older children also have invidious implications. One such game is throwing balls at the open mouth of a face, a Negro face.

The effect of any single motion picture, play or pageant is likely to be quite small. However, when the same type of emphasis is found repeatedly, the screen becomes a powerful tool in the formation of stereotypes. There have been recent motion pictures and television programs presenting members of groups in natural and dignified roles.

Children's stories are another important source of tabloid belief. A tale about an Italian lad who is too lazy to do anything but sing all day long, may leave in the child's mind a false picture of Italians.

We can build antidotes to stereotyped thinking by developing a greater appreciation of the worth of individuals, regardless of their race, creed, color, or national origin.

6. SCAPEGOATING

From the earliest times, among all peoples, there is to be found the notion that guilt and suffering can be transferred to some other person or being. To the primitive mind this transferral of blame seems reasonable. For example, if a load of wood can be lifted from one man's back to another's, why not a load

of guilt or sorrow? The primitive thinker concludes that the shift is not only possible but entirely natural.

In ancient times a living animal was often chosen to receive the burden. The Book of Leviticus describes a ritual practiced by the Hebrews. On the Day of Atonement a live goat was chosen by lot. The high priest laid both hands on the goat's head and confessed over it the iniquities of the children of Israel. The sins of the people having thus been symbolically transferred to the beast, it was taken out into the wilderness and let go. The people felt purged, and for the time being, guiltless.

We still use the term "scapegoat" to refer to an innocent substitute who gets punished for someone's trouble or anger. When we are prevented from doing something we want to do or become angry for some reason, we may kick a chair or throw something on the floor. Small children do this frequently. Little harm is done if the scapegoat is not a living creature; but sometimes a man will beat a child or dog, not so much because of what the child or the dog did, as because the man is angry about something else One who is reprimanded by his employer will sometimes come home and pick a fight with his wife. He cannot talk back to his employer so he vents his anger upon his wife. The wife, the child, and the dog are scapegoats, and they suffer because they are scapegoats.

Occasionally a whole group of people, perhaps a whole country, feels frustrated. Such people may not know what the trouble is, or they may know, but there is nothing that can be done about it. They may feel frustrated by bad economic conditions, or they may feel frustrated by failure to become the leading nation of the world. Nothing they do seems to bring prosperity or glory to their land, so they take it out on a scapegoat. Hitler persuaded the German people that the Jews were the cause of all their troubles. In South Africa, politicians are sometimes elected to office after a campaign devoted merely to raising white people's fears about Negroes.

Frustration explains the force behind prejudice; but it does not explain why certain minority groups are chosen as scapegoats. To explain this, psychologists help us out with another theory—the symbolic theory. This theory is based on the important fact that one thing can stand for something else in the unconscious mind. People often find themselves liking certain foods or scenery, for example, without knowing why. If such feelings could be traced back to their origin, it would be found that these new foods or new scenery "remind" people of some pleasant experience in the past. There need not be any real connection at all. The unconscious mind is always making connections, so that one thing will substitute for another. There can also be substitutes, or symbols,

as the psychologists call them, for things disliked. Probably everyone has had the experience of disliking something at first sight, without any reason for doing so. The unconscious mind has made a symbolic connection there, too.

Now, the question is: Why are certain minority groups disliked by so many people? Obviously, they must be symbolically connected with something very important to many people. Such things would include an interesting life with new opportunities, money, family life, good health, and so on. Toward all these things most people have mixed attitudes: we like them, but we also dislike them. But we cannot say so: it is not proper to dislike these important things. So the dislike becomes unconscious, and can be expressed only through a substitute. Minority groups become substitutes for important things in the culture with which they have deep psychological and historical connections. We cannot publicly admit dislike, or fear, or the wish to revolt against these things. So we apply these attitudes to their substitutes, which are frequently minority groups.

It is not only a matter of disliking the objects of prejudice; it is also a matter of fear. When people hate something strongly, they are usually also afraid of it. It is of course sensible to hate and fear certain things, but when the danger is imaginary, there is something wrong with the person who has hates and fears. That is the situation when there is prejudice against minority groups. Most of the fears connected with prejudice are imaginary, even though they may seem real enough to those who have them.

Here are some of the motivations behind scapegoating: (a) *Thwarting and Deprivation.* People are often deprived of what they want or what they have. Such deprivation frequently results in anxiety and then in aggression. In scapegoating, such aggression is directed not against the source of the thwarting or deprivation, but against any object that happens to be convenient. (b) *Guilt Evasion.* Guilt feelings arise from the omission or commission of certain deeds. Such feelings may be relieved by blaming others for one's own sins. This projection of guilt onto others is the classic form of scapegoating. (c) *Fear and Anxiety.* Fear is an acute feeling of danger and dread. It may be reduced or dispelled by a preventive attack on what is considered to be a threat. Often, in times of fear, we do not distinguish between real and pseudo-threats. Anxiety is anticipation of danger. Like fear, it represents feelings of insecurity. It can be alleviated by rationalizations which take the form of verbal scapegoating. (d) *Self-Enhancement.* Feelings of inferiority may lead to scapegoating, in order that the individual may convince himself of his own value and strength. (e) *Conformity.* Conformity makes for security. If everyone around us is given to scapegoating, and particularly those we esteem highly, then only by imitating their actions can we be fully accepted in the group whose approval we desire. An individual may conform to the current pattern of prejudice simply because he habitually imitates prevailing folkways. He is scarcely aware that he is an imitator. (f) *Tabloid Thinking.* Periods of social strain bring out vividly the helplessness every individual feels in the face of world-wide forces. He must seek to simplify the issues in order to make possible some understanding of this social chaos. Simplification of issues provides economy of energy; if a person feels hostile and aggressive it is more economical for him to attack one single obstacle in his path than to diffuse his attack upon the many true, but not fully understood, causes of his difficulties.

7. LAW AS A PREVENTIVE MEASURE

Concerning laws against discrimination, it is often said, "You can't legislate against feelings." Another common observation is, "Only education will solve the problems of prejudice." Let's examine these two statements.

Do we legislate against feelings in other areas? When feelings are translated into such overt acts as murder, arson and assault, we have laws, not only to penalize, but to restrain and to protect all citizens against these crimes.

Acts of discrimination which interfere with or abridge the rights of an individual to enjoy equal educational opportunities, employment and up-grading based on merit, and access to places of public accommodation, violate the principles of freedom set forth in our Constitution.

Many state constitutions as well as our federal Constitution contain sections on civil rights. These provisions are not self-executing, and must be supported by enabling legislation.

New Jersey passed laws against discrimination in employment in 1945. Revision of the State Constitution in 1947 included a section banning segregation in public schools and in the militia. The employment laws were amended in 1949 to provide equal access to places of public accommodation and educational institutions. Additional amendments include sections concerning military status and public or publicly-assisted housing. Administration of these laws is carried out by the Division Against Discrimination, in the State Department of Education. The Division receives, investigates and resolves verified complaints brought by aggrieved individuals who report discrimination because of race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry. The Attorney General and the Commissioner of Labor may file complaints on behalf

of aggrieved persons or groups who may be unable to act for themselves.

The presence of these laws on the statute books is an affirmative expression by the people of New Jersey that, "Discrimination threatens not only the rights and privileges of the inhabitants of the State but menaces the institutions and foundation of a free democratic State." These laws deter, minimize and correct violations by giving sanction to fair practices and thus hit directly at the root of prejudice. They make possible the educational experience of learning, working, and sharing among people of various racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds. The unknown and the feared, become the known and the understood.

Living in a democratic society will not be achieved by osmosis. It will not come about by allowing time to elapse and miscalling the process evolution. The word prejudice has a root meaning, "judge", which suggests reason; but to pre-judge is to desert rationality. Prejudice seldom yields to facts alone, because it is often compounded of ignorance, ill-feeling and inflexibility.

Consider an end-product of prejudice. If, because of his color or religion, a man is not permitted to develop his highest potential through education and work opportunity, his earning power is limited, his family suffers, he cannot make his fullest contribution to society, and the whole human community is poorer. He is relegated to the status of second-class citizenship. His frustration turns to aggression against himself or others. He is a victim of prejudice.

It would be foolish to expect time to correct these inequities. But law, as an educational and preventive measure reduces prejudice by providing equal opportunity to participate in learning and work situations. These experiences help to dislodge fears and preconceived ideas. They enlarge all horizons, so that the Brotherhood of Man is no longer a lofty slogan, but a dynamic approach to realization of the idea.

8. LAW AS A REMEDY FOR DISCRIMINATION

In the early days of administering the Law Against Discrimination, statements and attitudes of employers and employees indicated a rather general feeling that government cannot legislate against prejudice. With ten years of successful administrative experience behind it, the Division Against Discrimination can refute such attitudes and statements with solid statistics which illustrate the practicality of legal means being used to eliminate discrimination and prejudice.

There are hundreds of cases in the files of the D.A.D. which could be used as illustrations of this fact. All of these cases follow a rather common pattern, a description of which will clearly show the sociological and emotional changes which take place in any plant or factory carrying out a decision to put fair employment hiring policy into effect.

Many employers desiring to hire help without regard to race, color, or creed, hesitated to do so because they feared employee resistance. Employers visualized this resistance as culminating in lowered employee morale, and, possibly, violence. Upon analysis, it was disclosed there was no real basis for such apprehension. Employees had never been put to the test. In a few instances, employers had heard rumors to the effect that there would be labor trouble if they hired people of certain minorities. It should be emphasized that these were rumors; no reliable data could be obtained to verify the rumors.

In these many situations, formal complaints filed against employers charging violation of the Law Against Discrimination necessitated positive action on the part of the employers. As a basis of settling the complaints filed against them, employers began to hire persons on the basis of ability to do the job, regardless of race, color or creed. Employers were not asked to lower their qualification standards. They were encouraged to maintain these standards and apply them equally to all applicants. Such policies resulted in broadening the labor market for employers and also in opening a very tight labor market for minority group members in specific job classifications. Employers were also advised to be firm in the application of an open policy, making no exceptions despite any employee resistance.

In the relatively few cases where there was evidence of employee resentment or resistance, it was always only one or two individual employees who attempted to stir up broad resistance to the new policy of their employer. These efforts met with defeat in every case. It should be reported that some employers doubted the wisdom of such a policy but were willing to give it a chance to operate for a while before judging its merits.

Members of various minority groups entering into these types of situations experienced certain common patterns of relationships with their new fellow workers. At the outset, there was very little, if any, acceptance as a brother member of the work force. However, the passage of time blotted out this initial reticence on the part of other employees. Gradually the minority group workers became acquainted with the other employees and they began to know and accept each other as individuals. As this relationship developed—the fears, reservations, and prejudices disappeared; and all employees subsequently hired were no longer confronted with the problem of overcoming the mass prejudice which their predecessors encountered.

These hundreds of cases have resulted in positive proof of the fact that when people are brought together in any type of work situation their close relationship results in a social experience which eliminates prejudice through knowledge and understanding. The early prejudices which stemmed from the unknown yielded to understanding when they came to know people they had never associated with before in any day by day situation. With an opportunity to work with and come to know people of other groups, these employees had a valuable learning experience through the adjustment of an employment complaint which had been legally filed.

Checkbacks by the staff of the Division Against Discrimination have shown acceptance of these fair employment practices by most employees. In many instances a number of the minority group workers, whose initial employment was resented, have taken and held their places equally and acceptably with their fellow employees.

Numerous cases are compelling evidence that law as a remedy for discrimination is one of the most effective means available to us today to carry out the principles set forth in our Declaration of Independence and underlined by our Bill of Rights.

9. INDIVIDUAL ADJUSTMENT IN HUMAN RELATIONS

A person must live with himself as well as with others. In the world today where many disturbing forces are at work, ignorance and cruelty which result in manifold injustices are apparent in every society and community. This unhappy condition multiplied, fosters an atmosphere of hostility, which is reflected not only in local and state scenes, but touches national and international levels as well.

The individual who is committed to the concept of good human relations acknowledges the interrelation of all persons. He accepts his responsibility to face and to overcome problems which arise because others do not share his belief in the universality of human worth.

He takes the trouble to understand that many persons are victims of faulty training in their home, school, religious and work environments; that they manifest aggression against themselves and others because they are unhappy and insecure. Even those raised in more favorable environments may sometimes show meanness of spirit and may reject knowledge which brings understanding.

The individual committed to good human relations recognizes all of these things. He does not avoid unpleasantness, or fail to "stand up and be counted" when human rights are at stake. He allies himself with individuals and with groups which, like him, are

committeed to good human relations. He seeks to work with such groups to improve the community in which he lives by fostering better human relations practices among all the individuals and groups in the community. He renders such service as he can to his fellowman; at the same time maintaining his personal adjustment. He resists at all times the temptation to hate those people who, unfortunately, are lacking in human relations qualities. He seeks to understand them better; he tries to preserve toward them a calm, reasonable attitude—one in which he gives evidence of understanding their problems and of desiring to be helpful. He seeks at every point to act in accordance with the great principle of the philosopher, Kant, who said that every man should be considered an end in himself, and no man should be used as a means only.

Individual adjustment in human relations in a world which presents so many problems is not easy; it is extremely difficult; but the firm acceptance of one's personal obligation for service and for conducting himself in terms of Kant's practical imperative is a way toward satisfying personal adjustment, even in a world of conflict.

10. HOUSING PROBLEMS

We have in New Jersey the wealth, the skills, the planning facilities to provide all with adequate housing. Let us be about the task.

Much of our trouble lies in our discriminatory treatment of non-white citizens. Let us look at some facts from the 1950 census. Of the dilapidated structures, particularly those lacking hot water and bath rooms, we find 1.7% occupied by white families while 19.6% were occupied by non-white families. Again, 9.4% of all New Jersey dwellings have no bath or shower, but 32.6% of all dwellings occupied by Negro families have no bath or shower.

Special investigations by field representatives of the New Jersey Division Against Discrimination reveal some deplorable conditions. Some Negroes pay high rents for exceedingly poor facilities. Negroes all too frequently live in quarters which are overcrowded. It is true, of course, that some white families, too many in fact, live in inadequate houses; but these families can and will do better with increased income. The Negro, in many instances, is denied adequate housing, even when he can afford it.

What can be done? First, we must face the fact that we need more housing. An effort is called for involving the construction of three types of housing:

(1) We need many more low-rent public housing family units than we now have.
(2) We need to build many more small but good homes at a lower price level.

(3) We should move at once to rehabilitate blighted areas.

Each of these three types of activity is necessary to the solution of our housing problem and to end housing discrimination.

Can we afford such a program? The answer is that we cannot afford not to have such a program. It is an obvious fact that a clear relationship exists among poor housing, crime, corruption, and other ills of society. A general statement hard to disprove is that: GOOD HOUSING MAKES GOOD PEOPLE BETTER AND BAD PEOPLE BETTER. If we will see to it that every family has the opportunity to occupy a decent home, we shall be taking a long step toward curing many of the ills of society.

11. SPORTS—THE SUCCESS STORY IN HUMAN RELATIONS

Sports demonstrate dramatically, and in the simplest terms, that a man's value is measured by what he does and not by the color of his skin or where he worships or where his grandparents were born. In no other area of activity has there been such striking advancement in breaking down racial and religious barriers.

What manager would refuse to have a Di Maggio, a Mays, a Greenberg on his team? American baseball fans judge a player solely on his ability. Negro players were not seen in organized baseball until 1946, and were something of a curiosity for a few years after that, but today's fans are color blind.

Championships in sports are won by teamwork. There are many outstanding examples of interracial teamwork in American sports today. The truth is that almost without exception every championship team represents a cross-section of America. In very few phases of American enterprise are results so measurable as they are in sports. A man's ability, how much he puts out, how valuable he is to teamwork are immediately apparent. This is one reason for the absence of discrimination in sports.

Even denominational institutions do not adhere to racial and religious lines. Notre Dame, a Catholic University, has many Protestant and Jewish students in its classrooms and on its athletic teams. ND monograms have been awarded recently to a Lewis, a Shannon, a Schaeffer, an Epstein, a Rosenthal.

The Cleveland Browns have long been one of the world's great football teams. Who can forget Ralph Metcalfe or Jesse Owens of Olympic fame? How about the World Champion Dodgers—Campanella, Furillo, Snider, Robinson, Podres, Gilliam, and their Brooklyn teammates?

It is not possible to write a story about how a championship team took membsrs of different racial,

religious and national origin backgrounds and welded them together into a smoothly-working unit, because race, religion and nationality had nothing to do with getting the team together. The manager of Brooklyn did *not* say. "We can have just one Jew on the squad, and three Negroes, and only one Italian because we already have one in the outfield." Had the Brooklyn team been assembled on a quota basis, it would have been just another ball club.

The lesson of the high cost of discrimination is harder to learn in business and other areas, because there is no win-loss column, nor championship playoffs to measure success.

Lou Boudreau, Manager of the Kansas City Athletics, says, "You quickly find out in big league baseball that when you don't have teamwork, you have nothing. I have played alongside men of every race and creed. They have helped me to win games, and I hope I have helped them. Always it has been the team that meant success, not the nine individuals. Discrimination has no place in baseball, and I hope that baseball may be an instrument to show that it (discrimination) has no place in America."

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. NO MAN IS AN ISLAND—See Page 5
   a. Can you recall situations where failure to act in defense of others has resulted in more trouble?
   b. What problems exist, now, which require positive action in your locality?
   c. What can be done by you and others interested to seek solutions to local and state problems?
   d. What can be done by citizens to seek solutions to problems at the national and international levels?
2. WHAT WE SEE AND KNOW—See Page 5
   a. Can you give some examples of fact?
   b. What makes a statement true or untrue?
   c. Can your group list a number of statements and decide whether they are "observational" or "inferential"?
   d. Can you have several members of your group read the same newspaper story and report separately to the group on its contents?
   e. What standards can your group develop for using "observational" and "inferential" statements more appropriately?
3. THE NATURE OF PREJUDICE—See Page 7
   a. Can you define and give examples of prejudice?
   b. Can you recite any instances in which you or a friend have suffered at the hands of a prejudiced person?

c. What can schools do to change prejudiced attitudes of children?
d. What are some prejudices which exist in your community?
e. What can your group do to eliminate prejudice in your community?

4. FACT AND FICTION ABOUT RACE — See Page 9
   a. What statements are used to prove that members of one race are inferior to those of another?
   b. What is meant by the "master race" theory?
   c. What are some evidences that people of non-white origins can progress to high status?
   d. What are some causes of race prejudice in this country?
   e. What can you and your friends do to eliminate race prejudice in your community?
5. STEREOTYPES—See Page 11
   a. Can you give examples of stereotyped thinking?
   b. Can you cite an example of how you or a friend have become the butt of stereotyped thinking?
   c. Could your group make a list of all stereotypes common in your community?
   d. What can your group do to eliminate these stereotypes?
6. SCAPEGOATING—See Page 12
   a. Can you restate the idea and illustrate the meaning of "scapegoating"?
   b. Can you cite examples of scapegoating if you or your friend were the "goat"?
   c. Can your group list examples of scapegoating in recent times?
   d. Does your group know of examples of scapegoating in your community?
   e. What can your group do to help the "goats" of the scapegoating process?
7. LAW AS A PREVENTIVE MEASURE—See Page 15
   a. What difference exists between legislating against prejudice and legislating against discrimination?
   b. Can you cite examples of discrimination in employment? In places of public accommodation? In housing?
   c. Can a law be devised to correct discrimination in private housing?
   d. What can your group do to promote observance of the Law Against Discrimination?
8. LAW AS A REMEDY FOR DISCRIMINATION —See Page 16
   a. What is the true basis of understanding people?

   b. Why do some people become violent because of prejudiced attitudes, while others, perhaps equally prejudiced, do not?
   c. Can you recite any instances where persons have experienced changed attitudes because of a closer acquaintance with other persons?
   d. How does a law against discrimination help promote better inter-group relations?
9. INDIVIDUAL ADJUSTMENT IN HUMAN RELATIONS—See Page 18
   a. Can you give examples of actions of people which demonstrate poor human relations practices?
   b. What can be done by individuals to deal with such practices in constructive ways?
   c. Why is it necessary to avoid hate in order to maintain personal adjustment?
   d. What are the implications of Kant's practical imperative?
10. HOUSING PROBLEMS—See Page 19
   a. Can your group recite facts about housing in your community?
   b. Can your group describe the extent to which discrimination in housing sales and rentals is practiced against Negro? Jew? Puerto Rican? Others?
   c. What conditions exist in your community with respect to public housing? Low cost private housing? Blighted areas?
   d. What can your group do to stimulate interest in better housing for all citizens, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin?
11. SPORTS—THE SUCCESS STORY IN HUMAN RELATIONS—See Page 20
   a. To what extent do students in your community participate in football, basketball, baseball and track, on the basis of merit, regardless of race, creed, color, or nationality?
   b. In what ways have such students been honored for athletic achievement?
   c. What is your local school's attitude regarding student participation in sports on the basis of ability?
   d. Make a survey of students' attitudes on this matter.
   e. If student attitudes be wrong, what can be done to change them?

SUGGESTED READINGS

Hirsh, Selma—*The Fears Men Live By.* Harper & Bros. 1955

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E. and others—*The Authoritarian Personality.* Harper & Bros. 1950.

Ackerman, Nathan W., and Jahoda, Marie—*An Semitism and Emotional Disorders.* Harper Bros. 1950
Marrow, Alfred J.—*Living Without Hate.* Harper Bros. 1952
Rowan, Carl T.—*South of Freedom.* Fred A. Knop 1952
Allport, Gordon W.—*The Nature of Prejudice.* A dison-Wesley Pub. Co., Inc. Cambridge 42, Ma 1954
Forster, Arnold—*A Measure of Freedom.* Doubled & Co. 1950
Smith, Lillian—*Now is the Time.* Dell Publishing C Inc. 1955
Ellison, Ralph—*Invisible Man.* Random House. 19

PAMPHLETS

National Conference of Christians and Jews, 43 We 57th St., New York 19
Building Brotherhood
Feelings are Facts
Freedom Pamphlets, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.
How Do You Talk About People?
A B C's of Scapegoating
Strangers and Neighbors
Danger in Discord
Civil Rights—Barometer of Democracy
Modern Education and Better Human Relatio
Friendship Press, 257 4th Avenue, New York 10
Sense and Nonsense About Race
Public Affairs Pamphlets, 22 East 38th St., New York 16
Who's on First? #233

HOW TO USE THIS MATERIAL

The material in this pamphlet can be used to pr mote better human relations in many ways:

1. Read it, think about it, and pass it on to othe
2. Use it for discussion purposes in school a college classes, with church groups, local neig borhood groups, etc. (Questions for stimul ing discussion appear on pages 21-23.)
3. Ask your local library to provide a shelf of r erence material.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THIS PAMPHLET WI BE FURNISHED UPON REQUEST.

Write or phone:
State Division Against Discrimination
1100 Raymond Boulevard, Newark, New Jersey
MArket 4-1414
162 West State Street, Trenton, New Jersey
EXport 2-2131