One of the features of Ethnicity, at least for the first several issues, will be a series of articles that attempt to define what ethnicity is. In the present issue we begin that symposium with articles by Professors Schermerhorn and Isaacs. We then turn to a global review of the directions of ethnic development. Duran describes in precise detail the emergence of an ethnic structure in a Kenyan town. Das Gupta and Pipes briefly review the ethnic situation in India and Russia, two of the largest and most diverse nations in the world. Strelz, on the other hand, recounts the successes and failures in the attempt of one nation, Ireland, to find a national identity through the revival of its ancient language. Finally, the editor and managing editor of Ethnicity attempt to demonstrate that a knowledge of ethnic heritage is indeed a considerable help in predicting the behavior of the children and grandchildren of European immigrants to the United States.

A number of the papers in our first issue were originally presented at a conference on ethnicity sponsored by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences with the assistance of the Ford Foundation in the fall of 1972. We are grateful to the Academy, to the co-chairmen of the session (Daniel P. Moynihan and Nathan Glazer), and to Corinne Schelling of the Academy staff for their gracious permission to use these papers. In the next issue we shall continue our symposium on the definitions of ethnicity with papers by Professors Kohn and Wszolek Isin. We shall also present a symposium on the American ethnic group that scholars seem to have ignored since Thomas and Znaniecki—the American Poles. Professors Theodore Radziszewski, William Gabel, H. Donald Phinney, and David Greenstone will contribute papers.

It will be perceived from the tone of this editorial and the contents of the first two issues that Ethnicity is aiming for itself a very broad scope indeed. We believe, however, that breadth and fluidity reflect the nature of the emerging area of study to which this journal is devoted.

Andrew M. Greeley
Editor

Ethnicity in the Perspective of the Sociology of Knowledge:

R. A. Schermerhorn

After the passage of the McCarran Immigration Act, Mary Matthews burst forth in joyous song:

The blood that made this nation great
Will now be tested at the gate
To see if it deserves to be
Admired or despised.
Of nature or that small elite
Whose xenoglyphic counts can meet:
Requirements of purity
Consistent with security
And with that small and rapid mind
That thinks itself above mankind. (1969, 87)

This doggerel verse is a deft satire on the kind of people who somehow regard all newcomers to our country as ethnic but, simultaneously, in some vague way, regard themselves as non-ethnic. A false premise if there ever was one. Everett C. Hughes is entirely correct when he declares that "we are all ethnic" (1952, 7n). In fact, every human being, regardless of where he lives, or whatever society he belongs to, participates in four social structures: a kinship system, a territorial community, a system of social ranking or stratification, and an ethnic grouping (Williams, 1964, p. 355).

I mean by an ethnic group:

a collectivity within a larger society having real or putative common ancestry; memories of a shared historical past; and a cultural focus on one or more symbolic elements defined as the essence of their peoplehood. Examples of such symbolic elements are kinship patterns, physical contiguity (as in localism or sectionalism), religious affiliation, language or dialect forms, tribal affiliation, national identity, phenotypical features, or any combination of these. (R. A. Schermerhorn, 1970, p. 12)

On this basis, all the following are ethnic groups: Japanese Americans, the French in Canada, the Flemish in Belgium, the Serbs in Yugoslavia, the Kurds of Syria, the Uzbeki of the Soviet Union, the Mongols of the

Papers from the Academy's symposium will appear in revised form in a more extensive volume at a later date. They are the ones by Isaacs, Das Gupta, and Greeley and McCreary.
Peoples Republic of China, the Koreans of Japan, the Parsis of India, the Kikuyu of Kenya, the Yoruba of Nigeria, the Aymara of Bolivia, and the Indians of Fiji. There are times when such a grouping constitutes a nation's majority as in the case of the Mestizos in Mexico whose pride of ancestry induces them to speak grandly of their ethnic group as "la raza." In nearly all cases, however, ethnic groups are a minority of the population.

What, then, is ethnicity? It is a synthetic term which refers to the fusion of many traits or components that belong to the nature of any ethnic group: thus ethnicity is a composite of shared values, beliefs, norms, tastes, consciousness of kind within the group, shared in-group memories and loyalties, certain structured relationships within the group, and a trend toward continuity by preferential endogamy. (Singer, 1962, 473 n. 11) Each of these traits has its own continuum of greater or less coherence so that the values may be more or less shared, more or less important, awareness of the group's distinctiveness may be high or low, memories of the group's historical past may be bright or dim, group loyalties may be strong or weak, and so forth. These components may be conceived as variables that can alter independently which is an important half-truth. The other half, however, is that all of the traits of ethnicity can also vary together, and that there is a high probability they will do so. When, for example, there is a threat, real or perceived, to the unity or survival of the group, the silence of all variables will go up concurrently. Conversely, under conditions of assured safety and/or acceptance there could very well be little need to feel the need of in-group solidarity for the sake of protection. This would lower the necessity to stress the singular, intimate or exclusive properties of the group. If these suppositions are correct, then both ethnicity and its components are relative to time and place. There is certainly nothing novel in this assertion—it is the sort of thing the symbolic interactionists have been saying for years. In fact, Shihinuti and Kwan state this truth in an extreme form by saying, "... ethnic groups are not the natural biological divisions of mankind, but temporary alignments of people created by communication channels... Ethnic groups disappear when consciousness of kind is altered, when people change their self-conceptions." (Shihinuti and Kwan, 1965, pp. 215, 383). In the short run, this probably overstates the case, but in the total perspective of human history there is much to be said for it.

However, today our interests are more limited to the circumstances of our own society: if these are treated broadly enough they will absorb us from the charge of parochialism. Assuming that ethnicity varies and changes its nature with alterations in social structures and the climate of opinion, this would mean that to understand it properly requires, inter-

互利, an enquiry belonging to the sociology of knowledge. W. J. H. Sprott defines this mode of investigation as follows: "The sociology of knowledge... is concerned with the way systems of thought... are conditioned by other social facts" (1954, p. 141).

My analysis today rests on an assumption about conditions in the United States between the turn of the century and our own year of 1972. I am assuming that the 1960's, particularly the last part of that decade, constitutes a watershed of the twentieth century, so that (to use Sprott's terms) the social facts before the late 1960's constitute one cluster that permits a special set of inferences, while the cluster of social facts after the late 1960's requires a different set of inferences whose meaning is now only dimly perceived, though the outlines of its significance become clearer as time goes on. The events of the 1960's to which I refer are sometimes called the Negro revolution, though I suggest that the terms "rebellion" or "insurrection" would be closer to common usage. While the Civil War or the War Between the States was the turning point of the nineteenth century in our nation, the black revolt is the critical juncture of the twentieth; it is an interesting but probably not significant coincidence that both these decisive events came in the sixties approximately a hundred years apart.

Although we are still too close to the startling occurrences of the 1960's to make any final judgments about them, I believe that, taken as a whole, they correspond admirably to what Kenneth Boulding calls "thresholds" of social systems. Thus he mentions examples where societies cross certain thresholds of social conditions that precipitate qualitative differences affecting the entire field of human activity. As he puts it:

In the case of societies, soil erosion, increase in population density in limited agricultural areas, and erosion of ideologies or systems of legitimation are examples of continuous processes which may lead to discontinuous thresholds. On the other hand, discontinuous processes—certain_chunk events—profoundly change the subsequent parameters of a social system.

K. Boulding, 1967, pp. 107-81

Such a threshold or turning point in the ongoing life of a society is like a sluice gate for social alternatives and simultaneously does three things: it shuts off some alternatives altogether, narrows other alternatives to a smaller compass, and opens up new ones. To put it in the language of athletics, it opens up a whole new ball game. But unlike the athletic metaphor the social contiguity often changes the rules at the same time.

For the purpose of identification, I shall speak of the black revolt as the "crisis" or the "disruption," synonymously. This will allow us to designate the period of 1900 to the 1960's as the B.C. epoch—before the
crisis; in like manner it is possible to call the era after the late 1960's to the present and prospectively to the future as the A.D. era, i.e., after the disruption. A comparison of events and major social trends in the two periods will reveal. I believe, good reasons why "ethnicity" as a term in common usage, was hardly ever heard of in the B.C. era, while people are writing articles and books about it in the A.D. epoch.

I cannot do justice to the contrast between B.C. and A.D. in a brief discussion like this one, but a few highlights will show that America has turned a corner and the future is pregnant with different possibilities, for good or ill. The B.C. era was one of massive European immigration, two World Wars in Europe, and the spotlight on immigrants and refugees from southern and eastern continental areas. In the A.D. period the immigrant tide has receded with an increased proportion from the Western Hemisphere. During the B.C. epoch there was a pronounced rise of nationalism throughout Europe, partly abetted by American immigrants newly awakened to patriotism for their national homelands. Small wonder, then, that they became known as nationality groups in distinction from other minorities like the Afro-Americans, Mexican Americans, Indians or even the Jews whose nationalistic identification with Israel was a delayed reaction. However, in the A.D. years, the term "nationality group" is largely dropped in favor of the term "ethnics." This cognomen now distinguishes them from the blacks who used to be Negroes. Pluralistic competitive politics helped create the first label while Elijah Mohammed and Malcolm X gave currency to the second.

Another striking contrast separates B.C. from A.D. In the former, the dominant ideology was assimilation. Popular opinion echoed tolerance for European immigrants only when they were willing to give up their language and foreign customs; self-effacement was the price of acceptance. With few exceptions, the newcomers found it expedient to adopt this viewpoint and thus win their eligibility for the title "American," even the intellectual community, led by Robert Park, viewed assimilation as inevitable in the long run and tacitly gave approval. The same outlook captured the attitude of Negro leaders who opted for integration as their long-term goal—this being just one variant of assimilation. Hardly anyone in the B.C. period questioned this widespread assumption except for a few scattered immigrant leaders, settlement workers and a number of prominent Jewish leaders, the latter denying it more for their own community than for others. However in our A.D. period the current runs in the opposite direction as cultural pluralism and separatism capture the imagination of countless persons to whom a merger with faceless masses looks increasingly unpromising. Minorities of every kind are now resonating to the claims of the right to be different, authenticity, independence, autonomy, self-determination and self-sufficiency.

What was less obvious at the time, though more visible to us today, is that European immigrants were losing much of their culture at the time when blacks were gaining much of theirs during the B.C. era. Those arriving from Europe had, in each national group, a distinctive ethos on arrival—an ethos gradually lost to the extent that assimilation took hold and a substitute culture tended to replace it. Afro-Americans, on the other hand, forcibly separated from family and friends by their captors, arrived as atomized individuals without cultural ties to reinforce their need for survival. At first they were nothing but a social category without group consciousness or social bonds. But subject to the same fate as they were, they could not help but react in concert—in the slave revolt, the underground railroad, the clustering into religious groupings, the migrations to cities, the sharing of sentiments in music—in these and many other ways they were gradually forming an ethos of their own. Singer has called this development "ethnogenesis," i.e., "the process whereby a people, that is an ethnic group, comes into existence" (Singer, 1962, p. 423).

In the B.C. era, the dominant ideology of Americanization regarded the process of change among minority groups as a simple, one-way movement toward a homogeneous set of beings called Americans. Anything short of that uniform goal would obviously be deficient, unfinished, incomplete. Those among the European newcomers who failed to go and complete the full route were simply dubbed un-American as for the blacks. Myrdal articulated what others were thinking when he called American Negro culture in the 1940's "a distorted development, or a pathological condition of general American culture" (Myrdal, 1944, Vol. 1, p. 938).

Today in the A.D. epoch, both those of European as well as those of African descent are vigorously denying such imputations from the dominant group. While ethnics repudiate the notion that they are un-American when they cherish and revive the folk elements from their past or celebrate their culture heroes who distinguished themselves in the past, and black ethnics refuse to be intimidated by terms like "exaggerated American" or "distorted American," as they are awakening to full awareness of their historic culture-building process and, in a delayed appreciation of Garvey's gross attempts at autonomy, are re-thinking their role as an ethnic group. But in our A.D. epoch, the current stress on cultural pluralism and ethnicity implies a renaissance of an older ethos for those of European descent, but a budding nascent of a newly formed ethos for the blacks.

When we turn to politics we find a parallel contrast. During the B.C. period, the European ethnics participated primarily in the local arena through competition for recognition by the party machine. Early arrivals like the Irish took precedence and later comers had to fight their way in. At any rate ethnicity for the voter simplified his choice where issues
were complicated or took second place. Recognition politics became the norm, with the development of the balanced state. And as one political scientist well commented, “For the Irish, Jewish, Italian bright boys who pursue it, politics is a status-conferring occupation... As successful politicians, they can command deference from the greatest capitalists, the toughest union leaders, the oldest of the old families” (Reichley, 1959, p. 404). With the coming of the New Deal, however, the fulcrum of power shifted to the Federal center and the last 30-40 years of the B.C. era have been spent in a herculean effort by urban ethnic politicians to come to terms with the new realities. In the meanwhile the black ethnic, finding the city as fate-comers found their political gains retarded as both their votes and their leaders were coopted by party machines that gave major rewards to others. Paradoxically, however, the blacks through a civil rights organization, had brought pressure to bear in Washington even while weak at the municipal level, and through numerous Supreme Court decisions, established legal norms that would result in major gains at all local centers, provided they were enforced. And when such implementation was lacking the blacks took to the streets in new, and to the outsider, frightening forms of unconventional political participation. For those who had regarded voting and the accompanying accommodative politics as the only true forms of politics, such mass demonstrations were a serious threat to national order. However, these blacks, in the marches and parades, inexperienced in conventional forms of politics and even distrustful of voting, could take special delight in what Bayley calls “concrete public protest” (Bayley, 1962) or Waskow speaks of as “creative disorder” (Waskow, 1966, p. 225) since it could be learned by anyone and often brought gains when nothing else did. Often this kind of pressure was put directly upon federal agencies, agencies that did not exist in the early B.C. years (Litt, 1970) pp. 147-148). Unfortunately the momentum and contagion of this popular activism could not be stopped before it exploded in the riots of Watts, Detroit, Cleveland and Newark. Those acts of violence are the watershed between B.C. and A.D. They cannot be understood in a purely political context, however. Until we see the convergent economic realities, we overlook a really crucial variable. Historically the European ethnic entered the system when the economy was rapidly expanding and there was demand for unskilled labor. Before the turn of the century, most foreign-born from Europe were operatives, manual laborers or domestic servants but by 1950 the occupational level of second generation Americans matched that of the nation as a whole almost exactly (Lipset and Bendix, 1960, pp. 104n-105m; Hutchinson, 1956, pp. 114, 115, 195, 216). Thus the European ethnic accepted equality of opportunity because the system worked for them, even in the depression when the New Deal boosted life chances for organized labor and the homeowner. Since the great majority of the European ethnic were Catholic, John Kane’s designation of the religious group as a lower-middle or lower socio-economic income group rising definitely in the system but at a relatively slow rate (Kane, 1955, p. 30, quoted in Litt, op. cit., p. 133) is one that seems appropriate. The B.C. period was therefore, a time of modest but solid economic gains, part of which included a substantial flight to working-class suburbs in the wake of black migration to adjacent areas. In the same historic phase, only a tiny elite among the Negroes advanced with the economy; the great masses have remained at the lowest occupational levels with many losing the little foothold they actually had. Blacks did not enter the urban labor market until it was fairly well preempted by workers from abroad. Though showing some advances in war time they have not been able to sustain that advance, partly because of widespread discrimination on the part of employers and organized labor and partly for structural reasons as technological changes eliminate unskilled and semi-skilled occupations (the very ones that gave European ethnic their start) at the rate of 35,000 a week or nearly two million a year. The economy forge ahead by reason of increased productivity which is a euphemism for job elimination at the bottom levels. This is where the bulk of Negro workers are found. During the 1950’s and 1960’s when the courts and the national congress were enunciating new civil rights gains, federal promises raised the level of black expectations to new heights at a time when income levels were sinking and unemployment growing in the black community. Thus, “the gap between the income of white and Negro workers has been growing steadily greater. In Michigan, for example, the ratio of average Negro income to white income dropped from 87 to 66% in 1949 to 56% in 1958, and has continued to deteriorate since that time” (Hill, 1965 quoted in Yetman and Hey Steele, 1971, p. 45). Unemployment is regularly twice as high among blacks as among whites and among black youth of approximately high school age it typically reaches 25% or more (ibid., p. 456).

From still another angle, the families below the poverty line in America, a goodly percent of them black, have less income in proportion to their numbers than they had in the 1930’s (Roby, 1969) which means that the very poor have been downwardly mobile since that time. And as De Fleur and D’Antonio tell it, “The very fact that the society has preached upward mobility so loudly and so long increases the bitterness and frustration of those who find themselves cut off from the good things upward mobility can bring (though not from the mass media that advertise these good things) and thus contributes to the tendency toward alienation and conflict” (DeFleur, D’Antonio and DeFleur, 1971, p
street crime growing out of control as poverty deepened in the ghettos and the availability of drugs raised the level of thievery to an unprecedented height. Relief roles, violence and crime became the symbols of the blacks to an increasing number of European ethnicics who started buying firearms in preparation for the coming Armageddon.

It was in this overheated atmosphere that the new ethnicity was born. Mass media have been focused so long on the blacks that those of European extraction had been forgotten men. Ponder what Michael Novak said about the Pole in America:

Those Poles of Buffalo and Milwaukee — so notoriously taciturn, sullen, nearly speechless. Who has ever understood them? ... But where in America is there anywhere a language for voicing what a Christian Pole in this nation feels? He has no Polish culture left him, no Polish tongue. Yet Polish feelings do not go easily into the idiom of happy America, the America of the Anglo-Saxons, and yes, in the arts, the Jews. The Jews have long been a culture of the word, accustomed to write, skilled in scholarship and in reflection. The Christian Poles are largely of peasant origin, free men for hardly more than a hundred years. Of what shall the man of Buffalo think as his life's work, as his art's strength depart from his relatively clear-cut roots and streets? What tools does he have? What language of the heart is available to him? (M. Novak, 1971, p. 46)

It is to answer questions like these, to rescue men like these from hopeless obscurity, and to put them anew in touch with their own histories before they are engulfed by other concepts, that a veritable crusade for recognition of ethnicity has come to life in the A.D. era. Taking a lead from the new federal politics, white ethnic leaders have made this into a campaign with national repercussions. The goals are both cultural and economic. On the cultural side are conferences like the one we attend today, or the Schweiker and Piotrowski bills before Congress to establish “ethnic heritage studies” in the public schools with the aid of federal funds (Isaacs, 1972, p. 78). On the economic side, the drive is being directed by the National Confederation of American Ethnic Groups, a Washington-based association that claims a membership of 67 groups and 18.5 million individuals. ... It wants to become the conduit for federal aid, and it wants white ethnic representation on such national boards as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission” (Wall Street Journal).

As an ideology ethnicity is therefore a response to the rather abrupt changes of the A.D. period. As a reaction it may itself become a causal element in a new national pattern. Interacting with political and economic activities, it contributes a unique element to a converging series of events that make up the tumultuous stage of our A.D. era. At the moment the atmosphere is pregnant with possibilities, much like the physicists’ critical mass which can explode, fizz out, or burn steadily in new direc-
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In the current scene, ethnicity appears on the knife edge of three possible tendencies, any one of which may become dominant in the next year or two. I see these trends as polarization, proliferation, or pluralist alliance. These are major alternatives.

Polarization is always a strong probability when the economy falters. And in our paradoxical post-industrial society when the GNP keeps rising while the number of jobs keeps shrinking, rivalry for jobs becomes fierce as it takes on ethnic and racial overtones. Lionel Lokos, a leading writer of European ethnic heritage pictures the way such conflicts can polarize purely on the basis of color when he speaks of a plan to enlarge the number of jobs. He writes:

"If the Afro program is not successful enough, it will arouse the fierce resentment of white residents who will readily denounce whites for "living" him again. If the Afro program is too successful, it will arouse the fierce resentment of white workers who will see a black skin as a passport to privilege in the plants and factories. . . . And I am convinced that the more favorable it shows the Negro, the more inevitable this tragic conflict will become. Call them the White Lower Middle Class, call them the White Working Class. Give them any name you like, but show them that some of them are ready to fight - with a toughness, a fury, a recklessness, and a courage that are a match for the most militant black men in the ghetto."

(Lokos, 1971, pp. 385-387)

Those who are too complacent and who misjudge the depth of hostility already engendered over this issue should read Lokos' cry of alarm. This polarization could expand even more widely. The notion of black power has now spread by contagion to catch fire in the red power of the American Indian and the Chicano power or Chicanismo of the Mexican American. In many cities a confrontation between white ethnicities and non-white ethnicities over employment opportunities is not entirely a fanciful picture. Until the economy improves at all levels, it is definitely an explosive prospect.

The second possibility is proliferation. This could easily occur in case one of the federal bills to establish "ethnic heritage studies" finally passes. Experience with black studies programs irrevocably raises a great many relevant questions on how such educational experiments actually work. The most critical issue, of course, is making decisions on what leaders or experts will represent each ethnic community and what version of history will be taught in each. Since there are "heretical contending subgroups" in each minority, this could very well awaken old factionalisms and stir up new ones. Considering that there are scores of ethnic groups and a goodly number of factions in each, this could result in a bewildering proliferation of hundreds of groups gathered around the federal trough. There is danger that the current search for a new plural-

ism or a new ethnicity which depolarizes on social issues while repolarizing ethnically will be faced by just such a baffling multiplication of separate views points in spite of the valiant effort of Father Greeley, Monsignor Baroni and the National Project on Ethnic America sponsored by the American Jewish Committee to find an acceptable formula. The failure to find such a formula means that the momentum of a well meaning endeavor could be frustrated away in innocuous irrelevancies or a general cultural Balkanization (Issacs, 1972). I do not say that this will happen but that it is another of the alternatives that could work itself out. In its attempt to bypass the first alternative it could even make the explosion more likely.

A third possibility is that of a pluralist alliance. The demand for roots and for group identities that mounts like a crescendo in the A.D. era is not confined to black, red or brown ethnics but characterizes them all. Our time of troubles will not yield to Gleichschaltung to a homogenization of our nation in the name of unity. That was possible in a European setting where the uniformity of language and culture permitted such a dream to exist. But if that was a false dream, even in Europe, it is far more illusory in a nation of nations. A people of people such as America has always been. In the face of these real forces that do appear to flatten us into leveled-out masses, the old individualism can no longer save us. We do need group reinforcement and we do need group identity to prevent our being submerged. This pluralism, whose most creative form is ethnicity, is the first step to sanity. But only the first. If the meaning of ethnicity remains purely intense, if it has no goal beyond itself, if it is exhausted in self-congratulation and bemused nostalgia, it will become like a stagnant pool whose lack of outlet condemns it to final pollution. If, however, it flows free or to change the figure, if ethnicity becomes a tool an agent for larger goals, it can lose its egoistic pretensions and contribute its rich resources to the major needs of a society growing daily more desperate. The confidence, poise and courage that come from a sure sense of one's roots and identity need an outlet worthy of their merit. But it must be an outlet big enough to challenge the most hardy spirits. I submit that the goal most likely to enlist the full energies of men in our time is a full-employment economy. This is no longer an exclusive aim of the left as is quite evident when an orthodox Republican president, in a single year, devalued the dollar, imposed wage and price controls and approved new outlays for government jobs. But these are only first steps toward the transformation of the economy that can no longer afford a tri-modal shape in which the upper fifth of our families has 45% of the income, the middle three-fifths 50% and the lowest fifth 5% (cf., Hodges, 1971, p. 236). Some ethnics, particularly the non-white forces are making revolutionary noises about this. If the
European ethnicities regard this as a threat and ally themselves with the establishment when, in reality, they have no more than a toe-hold there. They will be letting themselves be used as pawns in a battle where they find themselves no better off after a presumed victory than they were before. Richard Rubenstein has put his finger on the central issue when he declares:

If American workingmen... and here his reference is largely to the European ethnicities are beginning to act in a dangerously racist fashion, this is not because they are rambunctious but because the present economic and political system has failed them as it has failed the blacks—because they feel compelled to defend the little they have against threatening forces, real or fancied.

Rubenstein, 1970, 186

Thus until the poor and the recently poor, the deprived and the partly deprived, those at the bottom of the ladder and those on the first rung can align forces to demand a genuinely redistributive society, the nation will be engulfed by extremism of the right and left in a holocaust of mass destruction. Those who want to avoid Armageddon and have been awakened to a genuine self-respect in their own ethnic heritages can utilize their newfound freedom to make America a land where the sharing of affluence spreads more widely. This sort of pluralistic alliance can replace the old ruling coalitions that now rigidify our entire distributive system. It is a task which all ethnicities will find rewarding and it will demand a new political coalition. As Michael Harrington has expressed it:

Labor cannot, of course, prevail alone, but it has natural allies in the middle class:

and the middle class is one upon which the interests of black and white workers most obviously converge. To the formation of such a coalition... would have ramifications for the entire society.

(Harrington, 1972, 62)

So the pluralist alliance is a third possibility in the A.D. era. I share with you all the conviction that it is a long shot. But the slogan of this conference, i.e., "Together," must face the query: "Together for what?" Without an answer, the quest for ethnicity is a cul-de-sac.

As events unfolded, this is more a value projection than a realistic analysis. It is written in several mirrors, raised in the 1972 election when prejudice the opposite occurred and the "white man's" all-white poll with the most efficient reference group as a mode of crystallizing a newly developing status while simultaneously seeking the security of a "law and order" administration. The McGovern Democrats neglected the blacks as no previous Democrats had ever done, while the Nixon Republicans explicitly favored them and sought out their strongholds with attractive offers. The campaign by word, "Work ethic vs. welfare ethic," became the theme.

As Ralph Ellison once said, "America is woven of many strands; I would recognize them and let it so remain. Our fate is to become one, and yet many—this is not prophecy but description" (quoted in Dinnerstein and Jakes, 1970, p. 347).
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