January 1974

Social Science and Social Welfare: Toward a Society for the Solution of Social Problems

Andrew Billingsley
Howard University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw

Part of the Social Welfare Commons, Social Work Commons, and the Sociology Commons

SOCIAL SCIENCE AND SOCIAL WELFARE:
TOWARD A SOCIETY FOR THE SOLUTION OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS
Andrew Billingsley
Professor of Sociology
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Howard University

Our concern today with social science and social welfare policy is in keeping with the purposes and conceptions of the founders of the Society for the Study of Social Problems. In those early days these men and women were idealists--they were reformists, but they also found themselves in an acute state of embarassment. As humanitarians, idealists and reformists on the one hand, they were concerned about improving the conditions of society to make life more livable for all the people in the society. On the other hand, they were scientists-even though social scientists-and they felt a mandate from their profession and their disciplines to eschew social reforms.

Social science was in the process of becoming more scientific and less social. That required of its practitioners a certain objectivity--a certain dispassionate disclaimer of social reform. Social science was concerned with describing and analyzing what is; what was; the causes and consequences, and the parameters of social behavior. But social science was urged to leave the application of its knowledge and, indeed, even the implications of its knowledge to others; others who were less well-trained; others who had less insight into the nature of these social dynamics and dysfunctions; others who were less well-motivated to engage in social reform. Social scientists said we are simply scientists and not activists or advocates. We only describe and adjust to what is, we do not try to influence what is or what should be. This attitude, one might even say this religious conviction on the part of the dominant social science opinion makers led to a schism between social scientists and social reformers; between science and behavior; between research and action and between theory and policy.

It was an effort to bridge this gap or to resolve this role-conflict in which they found themselves being both scientists and social reformers, that the founders of the SSSP developed this annual forum and its publication. It was, in their mind, a way of calling attention to social problems without abandoning social science. These were brave, courageous and insightful men and women, but they were not brave enough. For they were not willing to join or to organize a movement for social reform. Instead, they stood back a pace or two and decided to study these social problems. This was admittedly a long and innovative step beyond the dominant stance of ignoring social issues, but it was not yet a willingness for social scientists as scientists to become heavily involved in the execution of social change, social reform and social welfare policy.

Today, therefore, as we focus on the topic before us, we are impelled to move a step further. We cannot confine ourselves to the simple study of social issues and social welfare policy, we must be concerned with the analysis of the functions and dysfunctions of those policies from the point of view of social reform of social well-being and of social equality. We must become advocates of those policies and programs that enhance human well-being in our research, in our theories, in our classrooms, in our neighborhoods, in our politics, in the

economic life of the nation, in religion, in communications, in athletics, and so on. This is a call for a new level of consciousness on the part of the SSSP. I suggest that we become a society for the solution of social problems.

Over and over in social science as in social policy, we can see how racism has operated as a barrier to the effective solution of social welfare problems and indeed as a barrier to the effective understanding of these problems. If by racism we mean the systematic negation, exclusion and oppression of members of one racial group by the people, institutions, power, privilege and ideologies of another group, we can see clearly that racism in our society wears a white face. The only kind of racism we have is white racism and those who would speak of Black racism or racism in reverse, for example, would mislead us. For nowhere in the country are Black people arrayed in systematic fashion on the side of the oppressive forces of society utilizing superior wealth, privilege, power, the institutions of society and their own ideologies to systematically negate, exclude and oppress white people. Nowhere is that phenomenon in existence. Everywhere in our society we see just the opposite. Everywhere--including social science and the Society for the Study of Social Problems. This problem is so pervasive that you can almost at random pick any activity of this Society, its annual meetings, the projects it sponsors or any institution where its members are clustered and you will find racism at work.

Intellectual racism, then, is the manner in which men and women of learning conceive of and perceive Black people and Black institutions in negative terms. It is the way foundation executives treat Black scholars and Black institutions as though they are inferior, not as worthy, as qualified or as competent as white ones. It is the way white-dominated sociology departments refuse to change their character of their curriculum in order to embrace the Black presence in America. It is the manner in which social science studies continue to grow more out of the subjective experience of the investigators than out of the objective realities which surround us. So, ideological and intellectual racism abounds in the sacred halls of academe, and in the Society for the Study of Social Problems, and in the minds, attitudes, experience and consequently the behavior of its members.

Perhaps the following incident will illustrate the pervasive nature of the problem. I was idly browsing through the library of a friend just the other day and came upon a book called Applied Sociology: Opportunities and Problems. Many of you will recognize this as a book published in 1965 by this Society for the Study of Social Problems. It was edited by Alvin Gouldner and S. M. Miller, surely two of the more able and representative social scientists writing today. And no doubt many of you have used this book of readings in your studies or teaching or research. And yet, reflect with me, if you will, that this book was published in 1965 which might reasonably be said to be in the midst of the most active decade of social reform since the end of Reconstruction a hundred years ago. The 1960's was the decade that witnessed a massive attack by Black people and a few white people on segregation in the South. It witnessed the birth of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the rebirth of the Congress of Racial Equality, the pinnacle of the influence of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the preeminence of the public school desegregation battles waged so relentlessly by the

NAACP and other efforts at radical social reform. Moreover, the decade of the sixties represented the first nationally declared war on poverty which, surely next to racism itself, is the most profound and crippling social problem the nation faces. Further, the nation witnessed during the sixties the most explosive ghetto uprisings in its history in reaction to a whole cluster of social problems which social scientists should have seen more clearly perhaps than any other group. And, that is not all. The 1960's gave us the omnibus Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and a great deal of agitation, but less action on housing reform. Model Cities legislation supplemented the array of antipoverty legislation and Head Start was born.

In short, it does not take a great deal of recollection to be reminded that the decade of the sixties witnessed a nation in ferment with a major focus on some of the more crippling social problems which effect this nation, many of which were informed to some degree by the presence of Black folk in this country, more typically toward the bottom levels of the opportunity and reward structures of the society. So, it might be reasonable to suggest that the Society for the Study of Social Problems volume, published in 1965 in the middle of this decade, would reflect the major lines of this development. You will perhaps be as disappointed as I was to learn, or to be reminded, that of the more than two dozen articles covering the study of a variety of social problems only one was written by a Black person, and that was Charles V. Willie's very excellent article on the influence of community leaders on social welfare policies and practices in Syracuse. One looks in vain for an article by James Farmer on the social problems faced by poor Black people in Plaquemine Parish, Louisiana, or the efforts of CORE to help with the solution of those problems. One looks in vain for an article by Bayard Rustin on the social implications of the freedom rides which some say set off the tremendous Southern movement. Or, what about a piece on the social problems represented by the massive national reisitance to the effective education of Black children? Or, perhaps a paper or two on some one of the more prominent social movements of the time. Or, maybe a little piece by Alvin Poussaint on the socio-psychological problems of young Black and white people locked in a struggle with racism, intellectual and otherwise, in their own midst as they attempted to understand and change the massive and more overt racism of the Mississippi Delta. Or a piece on the National Welfare Rights movement which was in its incipient stages, or one on alternatives to the present welfare programs. No, none of these were represented in a volume on applied sociology sponsored by the Society for the Study of Social Problems in the midst of the most active struggle against these social problems the nation has witnessed in modern times.

It might well be that these problems were missing from this volume for the same reason they were largely missing from the annual meetings: because the people most actively involved in them and most knowledgeable about them were not qualified for membership in the Society for the Study of Social Problems, and the social problems they represented were not qualified for study by this Society. To put it more simply, we in the Society were blinded in part by the intellectual racism which has kept the social sciences from being an instrument

for social reform and agents for the solution of social problems. For if we are simply committed to the study of social problems, surely it is much better to study them historically, some years after their emergence as a focal point of interest. Only if we are a society for the solution of social problems is it required that we be actively engaged in their analysis and control and elimination at the same time others are devoting their efforts to these causes.

There is a second major landmark of intellectual racism represented in the annals of social science. It is a contemporary version of the works of Daniel Patrick Moynihan, most especially his study of The Negro Family: A Case for National Action, and his infamous memorandum on "benign neglect." I refer now to a fairly recent book by a very highly regarded social scientist. Edward Banfield's The Unheavenly City, is in the forefront of the more recent social scientific treatises which grow out of and feed into a most vicious kind of racism and anti-humanitarianism.

Edward C. Banfield is among the more outstanding social scientists and urbanologists in the nation today. Professor Banfield is author of at least ten major books and monographs on social science, government planning and the cities. Many of us know him for his very authoritative and pioneering work of some years back titled, Politics, Planning and the Public Interest done with Martin Meyerson, or his Government and Housing in Metropolitan Areas done with Morton Grodzins or his City Politics done with James Q. Wilson. His most recent book he authored by himself and that may be the major problem with it.

It is titled, The Unheavenly City: The Nature and Future of our Urban Crisis. It draws heavily on all the major social science disciplines and is focused on the social problems most characteristic of life in large scale urban America. It is, therefore, very appropriate to our consideration today of social welfare problems and policy. At the very beginning of his book, Professor Banfield gives us a very important clue to its style as well as its contents. In the very first sentence of the preface, he states, "This book will probably strike many readers as the work of an ill-tempered and mean-spirited fellow." In his second sentence he confirms that it might, indeed, be an accurate impression: "I wouldn't mind that," he tells us, "especially if I did not think that it might prevent them from taking its argument as seriously as they should." Then, describing himself as "well-meaning" and as "soft-hearted" as the next man, he proceeds to lay out an analysis of the social problems of the cities and his proposed solutions to them.

One of the major findings Professor Banfield sets forth in this book is that social class overshadows all other realities in urban life and accounts more than any other complex of factors for the difficulties both individuals and the society face. Throughout the book, he consistently minimizes what many sensitive observers consider to be major, severe and unacceptable social problems. In his introductory chapter, he argues that "Most of the 'problems' that are generally supposed to constitute 'the urban crisis' could not conceivably lead to disaster. They are - some of them - important in the sense that a bad cold is important, but they are not serious in the sense that a cancer is serious." (p. 6) And, again, he finds that "there is still much poverty and much racial discrimination. But there is less of

both than ever before." (p. 4) Thus, on his way to making what he considers more important observations, he slides right over two of the nation's most outstanding and crippling social problems, namely racism and poverty.

He continues:

It is clear at the outset that serious problems directly affect only a rather small minority of the whole urban population. . . . the overwhelming majority of people are safely above the poverty line, have at least high school education, and do not suffer from racial discrimination. For something like two-thirds of all city dwellers, the urban problems that touch them directly have to do with comfort, convenience, amenity, and business advantage. (p. 11)

This is a very curious type of analysis for a social scientist concerned about social problems. For even if two-thirds of the nation is "alright Jack" the fact that a third of the nation may be ill-housed, ill-clothed, ill-fed, and ill-treated by the other two-thirds, does not add up to a set of serious problems for Professor Banfield. If that is so, you can imagine what he would think about the problems faced by only a tenth of the population.

Indeed, insofar as this book is concerned at all about Black people, it advances the view that the problems of racism or racial discrimination and even racial prejudice are not major problems. Thus, according to this hypothesis, it is not being Black that causes problems for Black people in this society, but being lower class. His major criterion for social class distinctions is psychological, or the individual's "orientation toward the future." "The more distant the future the individual can imagine and can discipline himself to make sacrifices for, the 'higher' is his class." (p. 47)

Now, if it were possible for a social scientist to be truly objective, he could not possibly come to such a conclusion. Or, if Professor Banfield, whom I assume is an intelligent and honest man could read the social science literature more carefully, critically and sensitively, and if he could become actively involved in the solution of the problems he writes about, and more especially still, if he could live and work sensitively among all socio-economic sectors of the Black community as well as the white community, he might well come to see that the true nature of the reality he is attempting to describe is just the opposite of his description. It is not that the more futuristic a person's orientation is the higher is his social class. In the complex reality of real life, it is more accurate to say that the higher a person's social class, the more futuristic he is able to be. This book, then, is another of the more recent and celebrated social science treatments which inverts the true nature of social cause and effect relationships and places on the shoulders of the victims of social problems the responsibility for causing their own difficulties.

Let us consider Professor Banfield's own analysis of how the lower-class people cause their own difficulties:

At the present-oriented end of the scale, the lower-class individual lives from moment to moment. If he has any awareness of a future, it is of something fixed, fated, beyond his control; things happen to

him, he does not make them happen. Impulse governs his behavior, either because he cannot discipline himself to sacrifice a present for a future satisfaction or because he has no sense of the future. . . . He works only as he must to stay alive, and drifts from one unskilled job to another, taking no interest in the work.

Professor Banfield continues:

In his relations with others, he is suspicious and hostile, aggressive yet dependent. He is unable to maintain a stable relationship with a mate; commonly he does not marry. He feels no attachment to community, neighbors, or friends . . . . resents all authority . . . . and is apt to think that he has been "railroaded" and to want to "get even." . . . . The lower-class household is usually female-based. . . . The incidence of mental illness is greater in the lower class than in any of the others. Moreover, the nature of lower-class culture is such that much behavior that in another class would be considered bizarre seems routine. (pp. 53-54)

In his chapter on the problem of unemployment, Banfield concludes that the lower-class unemployed people are largely, though not completely, responsible for their own unemployment. "One important reason, then, why the number of jobs for very low-value labor is declining . . . [is] that those who might do these jobs have been told by parents, welfare departments, and the ever more affluent middle class generally that the small amounts they could earn by doing them are 'peanuts' --too little for a self-respecting person to bother with." (p. 101) He thinks that this is clearly a mistake, and part of the problem, not part of the solution of the problem.

Professor Banfield does recommend making more jobs available, but then adds:

Even if there were a lively demand at high wages for all the labor in the city, however unproductive, some people would remain unemployed. Members of the lower class work only intermittently even if job opportunities are good. Providing for a future, even a week or two away, is not part of their culture; nor will they accept the discipline that a job usually imposes. . . . Resistance to steady work on the part of able-bodied persons is especially strong in the slums. (p. 112)

On careful reflection, The Unheavenly City seems to be a rather more sophisticated, modern, up-to-date, warmed-over version of the Moynihan report. The major exception is that Professor Banfield insists that he is speaking not about Black people, but about lower-class people, and the fact that they are largely coterminus for him is coincidental.

A final observation on the author's conception of the causes, consequences and solutions to the problems of ghetto uprisings:

It is naive to think that efforts to end racial injustice and to eliminate poverty, slums, and unemployment will have an appreciable effect upon the amount of rioting that will be done in the next decade or two. These efforts are not likely to be very serious or, if they are, very successful. . . . they will significantly affect

the factors that produce riots. Boys and young men of the lower
classes will not cease to "raise hell" once they have adequate
job opportunities, housing, schools, and so on. (p. 205)
Banfield continues, "The faster and farther the Negro rises the more impatient he
is likely to be with whatever he thinks prevents his rising still faster and still far-
ther." (pp. 205-206) What then, does he recommend? He advises: less television
coverage of these uprisings and improved police methods and equipment. Finally,
he offers his own type of final solution. "It would seem that the problems posed by
the lower class can be solved fundamentally only if the children of that class are
removed from their parents' culture." (p. 229)

So there we have a fairly representative view of what one of the most suc-
cessful and respected social scientists has found from his life's work and study to
be the problems and the solutions for urban America. The problem in a nutshell,
is the lower-class people who live in the cities. The solution is to restrict their
freedom, police them more carefully, remove their children and place them with
"normal" people, and incarcerate large numbers of lower-class adults in semi-
concentration camps. For the rest, pay them lower wages so that employers will
have incentives to keep them employed. Then wait for another hundred years or
so and the problem will take care of itself. Banfield is not alone. Experts like
him have enormous influence with other social scientists, with policy makers,
government officials, industry and universities and even religious bodies. Little
wonder that Black people, and poor people, and the society at large are in such
trouble.

An even more recent example of intellectual racism which has a crippling
effect on efforts to solve the problems faced by millions of young Black people in
trying to get an effective education is represented by the works of Christopher
Jencks in his massive study, Inequality. During the past year, Christopher Jencks
and his associates at Harvard have published this huge volume summarizing and
interpreting a wide range of social science data which bear on the interrelation-
ships among family background, schooling, and success in the economic areas of
later life. The study has been widely interpreted as supporting the current polit-
ical and social trends away from a focus on meeting the educational needs of
Black youth as a means of improving the conditions of life for Black people and
bringing about a greater measure of equality between Blacks and whites. The
book has been generally viewed as an attack on educational reform while advo-
cating in a vague, general, and unexamined way what the authors consider more
basic economic reforms by means of a redistribution of wealth. It has been
generally criticized for its rather unscientific conclusion that "luck" rather than
education or cognitive ability was responsible for the achievement of individuals,
families and groups in the socio-economic areas of life.

It seemed to many of us to be a wide-ranging manipulation of data ori-
ented by a beginning bias against educational reform, reflecting a great deal of
ignorance of educational matters combined with an inordinate amount of arro-
gance on the part of the investigators, which all added up to be a massive anti-
intellectual undertaking. Having posited the ends of education as making people

rich, it then proceeds to suggest that education fails at this task and that there is no feed to reform education in order to make it more effective because it is useless. In his own words, Jencks has described the major findings of the study as follows:

(1) Poverty is not primarily hereditary... While children born into poverty have a higher than average chance of ending up poor, there is still an enormous amount of economic mobility from one generation to the next. This means that inequality is recreated anew in each generation, even among people who start life in essentially identical circumstances.

(2) The primary reason some people end up richer than others is not that they have more adequate cognitive skills... Equalizing everyone's reading scores would not appreciably reduce the number of economic "failures."

(3) There is no evidence that school reform can substantially reduce the extent of cognitive inequality... Neither school resources nor segregation has an appreciable effect on either test scores or educational attainment.

Recently when ten Black social scientists and educators pooled our analysis and reaction to this work, we were at a loss to explain how so well trained a scholar could make so many mistakes in the formulation of the problem, the analysis of it, and the conclusions he drew. In our experience, it would be hard to find an informed group of persons dedicated to the effective education of Black children who would agree with his statement of the ends of education. Likewise, it would be difficult for an unbiased group of methodologists to accept his use of path analysis and the conclusions he draws from it, particularly because of the limitations of path analysis and especially because he left Black children out of the analysis, but included them in his conclusions and inferences. Finally, the conclusions and inferences he draws left us convinced that at best, this was another exercise in mischief on the part of unrestrained and uninformed manipulators of data and ideas. And at worst, it was another social scientific justification for racism and the status quo.

In a very informed working paper presented to our group by Howard Taylor, titled, "Playing the Dozens with Path Analysis" the phenomena of blaming the victim and particularly his parents for his failure in society were carefully pointed out in this work. We concluded, therefore, that "Despite its appearance of scientific sophistication, Jencks' work suffers from a rather long list of methodological pitfalls. Jencks and his co-workers conclude that schooling and related variables make little difference in determining a person's ultimate success in occupational attainment and income. However, the statistical technique used, path analysis, ignores any possible nonlinear relationships that might exist between family background, schooling, and success; it ignores any 'interactive' or 'conditional' relationships; and it ignores all variables or factors in an individual's past life or school environment that would not constitute what statisticians call 'interval scales'." Furthermore, we were critical of Jencks' acceptance of past studies done under a wide variety of conditions with a wide variety of sampling errors, and treating them as though they were equal and equally valid and true. Finally, because of our own knowledge about the importance

of effective education to the later success of Black people, we could not understand why he would apply the findings of his analysis to Black children since they were left out of his major reliance on path analysis.

Finally, I would call your attention to a new study recently published in Commentary Magazine by Wattenberg and Scammon. When we turn to an analysis of Wattenberg and Scammon's contention that 52 percent of Black families are now securely in the American middle class, we are indebted to a very perceptive analysis written by Herrington J. Bryce, Professor of Economics at Howard University, and Director of Research at the Joint Center for Political Studies sponsored by the University and by the Metropolitan Applied Research Center. Dr Bryce has articles in the August issue of Ebony Magazine as well as in the August issue of Commentary which call into severe question the validity of Wattenberg's and Scammon's research and conclusions. Dr. Bryce raises the following simple, yet penetrating, question of this analysis: "What good is it that black incomes are rising faster than those of whites when the incomes of blacks remain only about 60 percent of that of whites?" And he continues: "It is true, and gratifying, that black family income grew significantly during the past decade [the 1960's]. For example, the median income of blacks in 1960 was $4,236, but today it is just under $7,000. Yet, the U.S. Department of Labor estimates that a family of four needs at least $7,386 to maintain itself at a minimum standard of decency. Half of black families are barely making it, if at all." What Professor Bryce did not add is that the median white family income during this same period rose to just under $12,000. And that since 1970, the income differential between Black and white has been on the increase; while poverty has been on the decline among white families, it has been on the increase among Black families.

Many of these matters which were critical social problems in the sixties are still critical social problems today. They cry out for solutions based on sound, sensitive analysis and strong advocacy. Consider, for example, the housing situation which has been in a state of crisis for Black people and some other poor people since the end of World War II. Where are the social scientists who have mastered the intricacies of this problem and have developed a consistent, persistent, lifetime dedication to its solution? There are, of course, a few social scientists who have dabbled in the housing field, but they have abandoned it as soon as government grants combined with the dilettantish nature of most social scientists make for movement from one area to another with limited understanding of each and with almost no impact on the problem to be studies or solved.

And when Wattenberg and Scammon decide that more than half of all Black families have now moved into the middle class because median income in the Black community approaches six thousand dollars a year, compared to nearly twelve thousand dollars for white families, it is a curious analysis for sophisticated social scientists, statistical experts and long-time students of population. It is curious on a number of counts, not the least of which is that they eliminate any reference to housing whatsoever. Now all of us know that you can't have or measure middle-class status without reference to housing and neighborhood patterns. It would seem to me that an intelligent concern for housing as a social

problem would produce among social scientists some ongoing analysis of the ebb and flow of housing adequacy for the various sectors of the population. It is true that some sociologists were among the advocate of the movement that led to the Housing Act of 1968 with its goal of constructing 26 million housing units within ten years with six million of those devoted to low and moderate income families. But how many members of the Society for the Study of Social Problems know how the nation is progressing with this very modest and grossly inadequate and disproportionate goal? This legislation provided subsidies for builders, but not for families. And predictably it has fallen far short of its goal, especially for low- and moderate-income families. It is apparently now about to be scrapped by the administration. Will the successor program reflect a systematic analysis of the functions and dysfunctions of the 1968 legislation done by a group of social scientists? And will those social scientists be among the advocates of a sounder and more effective approach to the housing of people? Even so, this new approach promises to give even greater attention and assistance to the construction of homes for the upper-middle-income families. It is hard to escape the conclusion that if such an overwhelming proportion of the ill-housed were not Black and poor, the nation and the nation's social scientists would have paid much more systematic and sustained attention to their needs.

What we say about housing can be said, of course, about a number of other areas in which the social welfare of the Black and poor portions of the population are not being vigorously pursued by social scientists concerned about the study of social problems. The same can be said for health, education and economic security. These are the critical areas of the social welfare of a people. They are the areas where our most critical social problems lie. They need a certain amount of study, to be sure, but not isolated, idiosyncratic studies done primarily so that the author can get another publication to put on his vita or so that he can get promoted and become a leading professor in one of the sociology departments of one of the nation's leading universities so that he will be in a better position to keep women and Black people and brown people from being admitted into the profession. What we need from social scientists is sustained, systematic study done in collaboration with the people most actively engaged in and affected by the problems, together with sustained and systematic action in collaboration with those same forces designed to solve the problem. Then, when we come together annually, we can share our experiences in the struggle. We can share our mistakes and failures, as well as our successes. We can learn from each other and from the people themselves how to fashion both a professional and a national society devoted to the solution rather than study of social problems.

The sociologists in the audience will perhaps forgive me if I close with a reference to a psychologist who seems to have pointed up, with a great deal of precision, the nature of the greatest social problem we face in this country. James Comer, in his new book, Beyond Black and White, has reminded us that "Our social system produces too much uncertainty, fear and anxiety." "This is due largely," he suggests, "to the fact that America has a defect in its executive or leadership structure, and in its ethical or moral structure, similar to

ego and superego defects in an individual." Sociologists are particularly aware of the hazards of making analogies from the individual to the collective and from the structure of personality to the structure of society. And yet, one needs only read today's headlines to appreciate the aptness of Professor Comer's analysis written more than two years before the onset of Watergate. He continues his analogy as follows: "In fact, the behavior of too much of the leadership group resembles neurotic patterns in individuals." These include, "fleeing from responsibility, failing to face up to reality, [and] self-destructiveness."

Now, before we conclude by pointing our collective fingers toward Washington or City Hall, let us remind ourselves that the members and participants in the Society for the Study of Social Problems are all members of the leadership structure in society. And, if you are an established social scientist or social practitioner in one of the established institutions or agencies, you bear a heavy responsibility, indeed, for the level of uncertainty, fear, and anxiety in the land. For much of it is based on inaccurate and misleading information. An awfully large segment of the population and a fairly large segment of our student bodies actually believe that the most severe crime problem facing the nation is crime in the streets. They have not been effectively taught by us about the insidious and pervasive nature of official, upper-class and white collar crime, or what a Black preacher has referred to as "crime in the suites." Middle-class white women actually think that they are in constant danger of being molested by some strange and unknown Black man out of the ghetto because they have not been taught by social scientists that their greatest threat lies in their own communities, their own race, among their own friends, and in their homes. Many people now truly think that Black people have reached equality with white people in most sectors of society and that continued agitation for affirmative action is designed to discriminate against white people and take their jobs and homes and academic positions away from them. They think this, in part, because social scientists concerned about social problems have not done an adequate job and many have abandoned the struggle for equality and have joined with middle America and the political conservatives in attacking Black people and other poor people and all of those who would advocate our cause.

There is a very simple truth which Vernon Jordan of the National Urban League is trying very hard to teach the nation. It might very well become the basis for a rejuvenation of this Society. It is this: What the average Black man wants for himself and his family is very similar, indeed, to what all men want. It consists of a combination of the following: good health, a good job, adequate housing, and a good education for his children. These are the basic requisites for social welfare on the part of individuals and families, and for social reform on the part of the nation. These are among the most critical problems before us. It would be very exciting, indeed, if, at the next annual meeting, our awareness and activities were such as to enable us to bear proudly, informally, if not formally, the appellation and indeed the accusation of being a very vigorous Society for the Solution of Social Problems.

REFERENCES

Edward C. Banfield, The Unheavenly City: The Nature and Future of Our Urban Crisis, Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1970.

Herrington J. Bryce, "Putting Black Economic Progress in Perspective," in Ebony Magazine, August 1973.

James Comer, Beyond Black and White, New York: Quadrangle Books, 1972.

Alvin Gouldner and S. M. Miller (eds.), Applied Sociology: Opportunities and Problems, New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Christopher Jencks, Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America, New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Daniel P. Moynihan, The Negro Family: The Case for National Action, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Planning and Research, 1965.

Ben J. Wattenberg and Richard Scammon, "Black Progress and Liberal Rhetoric," Commentary Magazine, April 1973.