In community relations and civil rights circles, advancing the idea and practice of equality of opportunity in housing has generally been viewed as a discouraging and disheartening process—a sentiment openly expressed at regional and national conferences on housing problems during the last decade. This pessimism was undoubtedly intensified by the realization that housing is the crucial civil rights issue in the North.

BACKGROUND FACTORS

This pervasive manifestation of pessimism on the housing "front" was composed of a number of stubborn and irreducible factors, and it may be both informative and useful to review the most significant of them. First, we note the crucial and strategic importance of residential segregation, whether statutory or de facto, in creating and maintaining nearly all other forms of segregation—segregated schools, PTA's, community services, employment, and segregated social, political, and religious activities; indeed, a most ubiquitous and formidable phenomenon. Second, the community relations field was intimidated by the magnitude and depth of social and economic variables over which there seemed to be little possibility of exerting control, direction, or leverage: massive internal migrations, the highest rate of horizontal mobility known among modern nations (nearly 40 million persons change their place of residence annually in the United States), the decreasing but continuing population shifts have brought many changes in the economic, social, and political life of American cities, e.g., the tremendous surge Northward of many Negro citizens, thus increasing the voter population of Negroes in Northern cities—a fact reflected in the presence of four Negro Congressmen in the national legislature and in increasing numbers of Negroes serving in the upper echelons of state and local governments. But the size of the Negro Northward movement has somewhat obscured the substantial movement of the white Southern population to the North and West and, as fragmentary evidence indicates, this population is encountering many of the classic problems that accompany social and economic re-location.

Fourth, research and experience quickly taught us that housing, of all the major civil rights fields, is the area of greatest resistance to the idea of equality of opportunity. For as we scan civil rights efforts in transportation, employment, education, and housing, we observe increasing resistance to the demands of equality of treatment and service. In addition, we discovered that there is no necessary carry-over of positive attitudes of group acceptance and co-operation from one area to another; that is, persons and groups may accept minority members on the job, but oppose their entry into the local community or neighborhood. Furthermore, the policy and practice of open-occupancy housing re-generated old fears often associated with the conventional view of "social equality"—what, in soci-
logical circles, we refer to as the "status threat"—housing being considered as a prime symbol of social status, recognition, and of related ego-involvements. This type of resistance calls our attention to the consequences that unresolved conflict between drives for social recognition and the demands of the egalitarian ethos may have for the attainment of equality of opportunity in the American social system.

In particular, suburbanization has intensified the status dimension that is often reflected in opposition to open-occupancy housing. The suburbs have become, in many instances, prime "social filters," screening out the heterogeneity of group backgrounds that is characteristic of the urban setting. To the extent that suburban movements are essentially "status movements" (5; 8), place and type of residence may come to symbolize total social status in ways not generally possible in the city; heightened status-sensitivity tends to explain the hospitality that suburbia often extends to residential segregation and other devices calculated to insure residence-validated social status. Thus, in dealing with these problems, sometimes in mistaken fashion, we grew increasingly sophisticated in theory and practice. We discovered, for example, that, although violence and intimidation may, on occasion, accompany the introduction of non-discriminatory housing policies, that many such "incidents" were not, in fact, due to "race differences" or to that old bromide "racial tensions," but to differences in social experience, status, and expectation between the "old settlers" and the migrating "newcomers," and to the stresses and strains that are commonly associated with population growth, migration, and community expansion.

Fifth, it was also necessary to contend with the problems and obstacles generated by the extremely conservative character of the housing industry—banking and lending institutions, developers, real estate associations, contractors and builders, insurance and mortgage companies, and the building trades—all seemingly engaged in a gigantic conspiracy to thwart the idea of open housing. The conservatism of the housing industry is unique in the American economy. In other fields, employment, for example, there have always been some internal forces for liberality and change, whether emanating from the unions or industry, but in housing one could only choose between conservatism and blind reaction.

Finally, there was the inhibiting fact that the magnitude and complexities of the housing problem in the United States were simply beyond the skills and experience of community relations practitioners and social scientists. Most of them lacked knowledge about and mastery of the mass of technical data, statistics, housing practices, and market conditions, necessary to the informed advancement of open-occupancy housing. Few agencies, even large ones, employ a full-time staff member to explore and manage problems in minority housing.

But the attempt to overcome and master these obstacles and circumstances did, nonetheless, result in change and improvement. Out of the Depression period came the need and demand for low-cost housing; subventions were granted to the housing industry for housing that it otherwise was not inclined to build; public attention was called to blight, slums, and their corroding impact on family and community life. The result of this concern and activity was to establish a new perspective on housing—the idea that housing is a matter of public interest. Heretofore, housing in America was generally regarded as a wholly private matter; that is, families simply housed themselves wherever they could in the absence of any public concern about supply, market conditions, the
quality of available housing, or about
the special problems of minorities,
the aged, and low-income groups.

Within a relatively short period,
however, public interest was rapidly
transformed into governmental aid
and support — legislative and finan­
cial. It was in this fashion that con­
cern about minority housing and dis­
criminatory practices grew apace with
increased governmental activity in
financing, renewal programs, and slum
clearance.

LAW, HOUSING, AND
SOCIAL CONFLICT

In recent years, law and legislation
have extended the principle of public
interest to housing discrimination:
the United States Supreme Court de­
clared that restrictive covenants were
not enforceable in courts of law, pres­
sure mounted to alter the discrimina­
tory policies of FHA, and numerous
states found it necessary to enact legis­
lation barring discrimination in public
and publicly-assisted housing. In fact,
by 1959, eight state anti-discrimina­
tion agencies were given jurisdic­tion
over enforcing non-discriminatory
policies in such housing.* Similarly,
new legal bases were developed for
the statutory prohibition of discrimi­
nation in housing; that is, not only
those established bases for barring dis­
crimination where public funds are
involved but, in addition, where gov­
ernmental authority (e.g., right of
eminent domain) is invoked as an aid
or condition for the development of
housing, in the power retained by the
state in granting tax exemption, in
control over the use of land assembled
and condemned by government au­
thority, and in regulations enforcing
proper concern for tenant re-location
in large-scale redevelopment projects.
In addition, New York City and Pitts­
burgh have enacted municipal statues
barring discrimination in private as
well as public housing; the Pittsburgh
statute bars discrimination in "any
housing." In other instances, certain
states have turned over enforcement
of anti-discrimination law in housing
to existing statutory civil rights com­
misions. In New Jersey, the supreme
court of that state recently declared
that a new Levittown development
comes under the purview of New
Jersey's anti-discrimination statutes.

The legislative and litigative attack
on housing discrimination is, of course,
wholly consistent with the dramatic
advances these approaches have made
in other civil rights fields. This de­
velopment also reflects increased accep­
tance of the role of law in promoting
and maintaining equality of oppor­
tunity and a necessary relinquishing of
an idea that has hampered inter-group
relations for a quarter-century; name­
ly, the curious notion that resort to
law and litigation is "bad." In part,
reluctance to invoke legal remedies in
the effort to attain civil rights and
community relations objectives, springs
from a one-sided and uninformed
image of the law — the law as "police­
man," as naked, arbitrary force. But
the law is also a major instrument of
social change and the chief guarantor
of individual rights and liberties.

The negative image of the law re­
lects the tendency of the "enlightened"
middle class to identify the law solely
with court suit and complaint, court­
room hostilities, and "nororjery;" in
intergroup relations, it most common­
ly takes the form of assuming that re­
sort to legal remedy inevitably "causes
more conflict" and "worsens com­
munity relations." It is also related to the
view that serious social problems are
primarily "caused" by personal or in­
dividual dereliction, willfullness, ca­
price, failure, and ignorance, and not
by the structure of the social system,
the inadequacy of means for the at­
tainment of social goals, or by the
conflicts and cross-pressures generated

*Colorado, Connecticut, Massachusetts,
New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Rhode
Island, and Washington.
by dilemmas in choice, values, and goals. This view not only has obvious quasi-religious and psychologistic overtones, but serves to deflect attention away from and subvert the analysis of the social origin and distribution of such problems as discrimination, crime, delinquency, and economic deprivation. An examination of these views and the assumptions upon which they rest does provide an explanation for those programs that seek to solve social problems solely through "adjustment," education, and gradualism and why, in fact, their advocates tend to reject, if not wholly misunderstand, the role of law and litigation in the attainment of equality of opportunity.

The recent efforts of civil rights organizations, for example, those of the NAACP and other agencies of similar purpose and function, are neither radical nor revolutionary. Civil rights groups are not asking for special privileges or for radical revision of the existing constitutional system but, merely, for the extension and application of constitutionally guaranteed civil rights to all citizens. The ironic aspect of the civil rights effort goes to the fact that it is often necessary to enact "enabling" legislation in order to guarantee proper recognition of rights already statutorily embedded in the Constitution. And yet there can be little quarrel with the observation that the civil rights approach to problems in discrimination has, in the last decade, materially advanced the public welfare and the idea and practice of equality of opportunity, more rapidly and effectively than four decades of "greater intercultural equalitarianism," "brotherhood," and other devices of dubious validity and intellectual integrity.

But it cannot be said that social science is entirely blameless in promoting the view that legal redress and social conflict are to be avoided, if not condemned. Social scientists, particularly sociologists, seem to have forgotten their Simmelian heritage; namely, that social conflict, whether religious, political, economic, legal, and industrial, has socially productive properties, qualities, and functions (1; 9) — particularly when they are measured against the demands and expectations of the democratic state. The important task is not, therefore, the naive and indiscriminate attempt to "eliminate" or deny the social efficacy of conflict, but the creation and preservation of devices whereby conflict can be made socially productive (4). The field of law, however, often exhibits a greater understanding of the role of conflict in advancing the commonweal than is sometimes found in social scientific literature dealing with problems in intergroup relations — a considerable paradox when viewed in the light of the fact that, in the development of sociological theory, social conflict is generally regarded as one of the classic social processes of all human societies.

**LEGISLATIVE PURPOSE AND LIMITATION**

We must now consider, briefly, the purpose of anti-discrimination legislation enacted at local, state, or Federal levels. The purpose of such statutes is not only to bar discrimination, but to (a) place all available housing in the open, competitive market, and (b) to remove official and public sanction from the application of private prejudices and discriminatory determinations. At this stage, we have also come to realize that where government does not legislate in the housing field, housing policy and occupancy patterns will, by default, be set by private groups.

But the success and promise of the legislative approach should not blind us to the fact that many discriminatory practices and policies in housing are not directly subject to legal remedy and judicial review. There is, for example, the misuse of the discretionary
powers of local governments in perpetuating housing discrimination and residential segregation. I refer to the arbitrary administration of local laws and regulations in matters effecting land use, building codes, zoning, and the construction of public facilities. Local officials cannot legally segregate or discriminate, but they can use their authority to restrict housing opportunities for minorities in ways that are not always subject to legal challenge or review. The City Council of Chicago, for instance, manipulated the selection of public housing sites so as to contain Negroes within existing areas (6; 7) —a practice that is probably common to cities other than Chicago. Davis McEntire, director of research for the Commission on Race and Housing, has observed that local officials and city councils have manipulated and restricted the choice of sites for housing developments and that these practices have been accomplished in such fashion that discrimination cannot be detected nor brought under judicial review (6).

Urban renewal and redevelopment programs often suffer from these infirmities and, consequently, they may become projects in "minority clearance," rather than in "slum clearance." The magnitude of urban renewal and redevelopment programs can intensify the problems of minority populations, particularly in the matter of tenant relocation. Generally speaking, where urban renewal projects have removed minorities from renewal areas without opening up compensating areas of residence, renewal serves to reduce still further the supply of housing available to minorities. In addition, there is considerable doubt that urban renewal has, in fact, accomplished any serious reduction of slums and blighted areas because, in nearly every instance, new slums have been created and expanded by crowding re-located minorities into adjacent areas already on the way to becoming slums (6, p. 67).

The cumulative impact of specified advances in housing, the increase in certain types of open-occupancy housing, and the advent of law and legislation barring discrimination in housing have altered the housing situation — but we are not always sure that it is for the best or in the right direction. It has been observed, for example, that while there has been an increase in open-occupancy housing and in the number and scope of laws prohibiting discrimination, there appears to be an absolute increase in the amount of residential segregation in the nation.

Generally, this seeming paradox results from (a) the high rate of white migration from the central city to the suburbs that, in many cases, simply transplants and establishes residential segregation in communities where it has never existed, (b) the consequent reduction in the mixed occupancy patterns of the central city, thus increasing the size and persistence of minority ghettos, and (c) the barring of minorities from the housing market, thus forcing them to remain where they are because they cannot get out even when able to do so. The deleterious social, political, and economic consequences of these trends have been dramatically spelled out by Morton Grodzins (2; 3).

The "Quota" Problem

The use of quota systems to achieve civil rights and community relations objectives has always been abhorred — on the grounds that they institutionalize segregation and discrimination, that they are merely devices for "stalling," and that they are wrong in principle, morality, and theory. Nevertheless, many able and dedicated advocates of open-occupancy housing have come to adopt, under specified circumstances, the idea of "benign quotas." Morris Milgrim and associates, a major developer of open-housing projects, used a quota of 55 per cent white and 45 per cent Negro in the Concord
Park and Greenbelt Knoll projects. Milgrim points out, however, that quotas are not, as some fear, self-perpetuating, because they are costly to administer and maintain. The idea seems to be that quotas are workable under certain circumstances, particularly as a device for getting open-housing established while efforts continue to effect basic reform in local housing practices.

A recent (April, 1960) decision of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois has, however, cast doubt upon the validity of a "benign quota" in housing where it is intended to avoid the possibility that projects to which minority groups are admitted without limitation may become occupied almost exclusively by members of such groups. In its decision, the Court noted that the housing project in Deerfield, Illinois, was planned in such a way as to assure that an 80 to 20 white-Negro ratio of ownership would always be maintained and that, therefore, the Village of Deerfield could not legally be charged (as it was) with attempting to block an integrated housing development. Nonetheless, there is considerable force in the Court's observation that, once a quota system is upheld as constitutional, there may no longer be any basis for distinguishing between a ratio of 80 to 20 and 99 to 1, or perhaps even for one of 100 to zero.

**STRATEGY AND FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY**

The matter of Federal responsibility and law in the field of housing is of paramount importance; on the other hand, the fulfillment of this responsibility is contingent upon the satisfactory resolution of certain conflicts in strategy and goal — conflicts that have occurred in other civil rights fields. In education, for instance, we recall the debate over the wisdom of attaching civil rights "riders" to proposals for Federal aid to education; that is, riders denying Federal aid to those states not complying with the United States Supreme court decision of May, 1954. Many groups felt that such riders would kill all possibility of Federal aid to the public schools; others felt that such riders were both inevitable and necessary. A similar situation has arisen in housing. There are those who feel that civil rights riders or similar safeguards against the use of Federal funds to support or perpetuate segregated housing must be applied to FHA, VA, FNMA, and other Federal involvements in housing. On the other hand, there are those who insist that proposals of this kind will destroy the Federal housing program and seriously curtail the supply of housing for those most in need of it.

All serious dilemmas involve complexities, but there are feasible and acceptable alternatives at hand. To ignore the civil rights aspects of Federal involvement in housing is to adopt the position that obtaining equality of opportunity in housing must await the solution of the nation's overall housing problem. This view is not generally acceptable to those groups concerned with both civil rights and the expansion of the nation's housing supply. They take the view that ignoring the civil rights issue serves the cause of segregation in the name of increasing that supply. They also point out that urban renewal and redevelopment programs are still immune from anti-discrimination controls and, so long as this situation obtains, it remains a serious threat to the establishment of open housing.

Moreover, they aver, such a policy places the Federal government in the support of segregated housing contrary to its stated opposition to discrimination in other major areas of American life.

Admittedly, there are several persistent and disturbing aspects of the present Federal stance, particularly that of FHA, on the matter of dis-
criminatory housing practices. In 1958, the Administrator of FHA expressed a point of view on this issue completely at odds with the national policy of non-discrimination in other areas of government control and interest, e.g., employment and government contracts, military service, and education. Moreover, FHA tends to adopt the dictates of local custom on the matter of occupancy patterns: if state law bars discrimination in housing, it will abide by that requirement; if state law or the absence of law permits discrimination, it will accept that condition and pattern of occupancy. This is to say that FHA favors equal rights in principle, but denies them in practice. It still does not control discrimination by lenders or developers. Furthermore, where FHA follows local custom or law in perpetuating segregated housing; that is, where it may accept local law or custom requiring segregation to be binding on FHA, it does so even though the Federal courts have declared such practices invalid—a curious position for a Federal agency.

On occasion, laws and programs designed to promote the public welfare can be used to thwart that end. Let us note, for example, that there is far less housing segregation, proportionately, in Southern than in Northern cities. There have always been large areas in Southern cities where whites and Negroes live together as neighbors. It is a most curious development, therefore, that Title I of the Federal Housing Act of 1949, enacted to assist local communities in managing the problems of slums and blight, is being used as an instrumentality for creating segregated housing where none existed. This case is important because (a) the actual development is in the hands of private developers, (b) the land turned over to the private developers was assembled and condemned by the state housing authority, and (c) the cost of the land acquisition is borne by government funds—two-thirds of the cost by the Federal government and one-third by the city of Gadsden. A majority of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals has held that no restraining action can be brought against the state because the development is in private hands and, therefore, the "equal protection" clause of the Fourteenth Amendment does not apply. A minority opinion submitted in this case states, however, that the Gadsden development is a "governmentally coerced, governmentally-aided and governmentally regulated project in urban redevelopment.*

Concerning Federal action in the housing field, there are at least two possibilities: (a) insistence on anti-discrimination on all housing legislation involving the Federal government (publicly-owned, publicly-assisted, and publicly-aided housing); or (b) follow the recommendation made by the Commission on Race and Housing

*The United States Supreme Court has since denied certiorari in the Gadsden case, possibly on the view that the alleged intention to exclude Negroes from the new housing to be built under the redevelopment plan should be presented in a complaint after the housing is actually available for occupancy.
that the President take effective execu-
tive action to remove all sanction of
the Federal government from dis-
criminatory practices (10). Recently,
the Annual Civil Rights Leadership
Conference, one of the principal poli-
cy-making bodies in the civil rights
field, recommended that the President
assign responsibility for eliminating
discrimination in all Federal involve-
ment in housing to the Federal Civil
Rights Commission. Meanwhile, it
would be prudent for state and local
governments to consider the enact-
ment of legislation designed to pre-
vent discrimination in at least five
classes of housing: publicly-owned,
publicly-assisted, publicly-aided, hous-
ing involving the privilege of state
authorized tax exemption, and hous-
ing projects wherein government au-
thority has been used to assemble and
condemn land for renewal or redevel-
opment purposes.

Pessimism is often a state of mind
for providing the motivation for con-
tinuing achievement because it gen-
erally springs from acknowledging the
reality of existing problems and com-
plexities. The effort to surmount past
and existing obstacles in advancing
the idea of open housing has slowly
changed an uneasy pessimism into an
informed and productive optimism;
without which, of course, very little
would have been accomplished.
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PARENTAL INTERACTION AS RELATED TO
THE EMOTIONAL HEALTH OF CHILDREN

NATHAN B. EPSTEIN AND WILLIAM A. WESTLEY
McGill University

This paper presents some tentative
findings about the psychodynamics of
parental interaction and the emotional
health of children. Specifically, it is
concerned with the relationship be-
tween the quality of the parents' sex-
ual relationship, unresolved oral de-
dendency needs, and the strength of
the executive ego function of the
father, on the one hand, and the aver-
age level of emotional health among
the children on the other.

The data are drawn from an inten-
sive, interdisciplinary exploratory
study of the families of nine adoles-
cean University School of Medicine, to analyze the psychological dynamics of family interaction and their impact on children's emotional health.