To Members of the University Faculty:

The Committee on Student Life and Interests submits for your information the following materials dealing with certain rights of students and with university policies related to those rights. On May 9, 1949, the Committee received a report and recommendations on this subject from Student Board. These furnished the reasons for the report and recommendations of the Committee on Student Life and Interests.

Attached as faculty document are

I. Report and recommendations of the Committee on Student Life and Interests Concerning University Policies on Human Rights of Students.

II. Minority Report. This report has the support of three members of the Committee.

III. Report of the Student Board Committee Against Discrimination.

The Committee on Student Life and Interests gave careful consideration to the proposals of Student Board. Certain interested individuals and representatives of university departments, student organizations, and city and state groups appeared before the Committee, (nine students, three university staff, five non-university).

The Committee praised the purposes of the Student Board Committee study and expressed substantial agreement with the objectives of its recommendations. It commended Student Board for their interest in and concern about a widespread and difficult social problem.

Because of the controversial character of the issues and the wide scope of its recommendations, the Committee on Student Life and Interests transmitted its report to President Fred with the recommendation that its report, together with the Minority Report and the report of Student Board, and the recommendations of each, should be transmitted to the faculty for its consideration.

In order that the members of the faculty may have more opportunity to study the reports prior to consideration of them at the October meeting of the University Faculty, the President has directed this distribution in advance of the agenda for that meeting.

Very sincerely yours,

Paul L. Trump, Chairman
Committee on Student Life and Interests
I. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON STUDENT LIFE AND INTERESTS

Recommendations Concerning

University Policies on Human Rights of Students

The Committee on Student Life and Interests has received the Student Board's report of its Committee Against Discrimination, and has given careful study to its recommendations.

The recommendations of the Student Board report fall into two categories:

1. Policies and practices of agencies, units, or officers of the University.

2. Policies and practices of private individuals who furnish employment, housing or other services to students.

Policies and Practices within the University

The University of Wisconsin stands squarely upon a policy which treats all students upon their qualifications and merits as individuals. The University strives to promote the fullest possible measure of democratic living in all aspects of University life. Students are admitted without respect to race, religion, or national origin. The University keeps no census of its students by color or creed. University courses of instruction, residence halls, student activities, and student services are open upon an equal basis to all students. Students of all races, creeds and nationalities share the social, recreational and cultural activities provided by the University and enjoy positions of honor and leadership in student life. We believe that the University now enjoys a high degree of democratic living.

There is no reason, however, to be complacent. There is need to safeguard human rights, and to extend them. It was toward the extension of these rights that the report of the Student Board was addressed.

Our Committee believes that the entire University strongly disapproves any policy, practice, or act, either by students or staff, individually or by groups, which violates the basic right of each human being to consideration upon his individual qualifications or merit.

It is a matter of deep concern whenever a student is denied a University benefit or service, whatever its nature, because of his race, creed, or national origin. We believe that University staff members should exercise every care that all students receive equal consideration and treatment in the administration of University services. If and when situations arise in which basic human rights are violated by University staff members, we believe that the University administration should take immediate steps to correct them.

Policies and Practices of Private Individuals

Our Committee believes that it is a matter of equal concern whenever a student is denied basic human rights by persons other than University personnel. We recognize the right of private individuals to select the students who are to live in their houses, or who are to perform services for them; we do not believe that this right justifies practices which discriminate against students.
because of race or religion. We strongly urge a policy of non-discrimination to employers of students, and to those who provide housing for groups of students. Successful experiences in industry, business, and community housing, including the experiences of the University, clearly demonstrate that people of different races, creeds, and nationalities can work effectively and live congenially together.

As a service to students, the University operates a Student Employment Bureau and a University Housing Bureau. The primary purposes and functions of these bureaus are to provide information to students. These bureaus exist to help students find work or rooms, not to serve employers or house operators.

We believe that it is the proper concern of the University that its students find housing which meets specified objective standards of health, safety, and resident supervision. The University's practice of listing as "approved" those houses which meet such standards should not imply that the University approves or condones every action or attitude of the operators.

We believe that it is not a practicable function of University service bureaus or special University Committees to determine in each case the reasons for which private employers or house operators select or reject applicants, or attempt to apply forms of disciplinary action to them upon the basis of such investigations. Leadership should be exercised by the University primarily through educational processes -- by precept in classroom, by example in the conduct of its own affairs, and by informal relationships with employers and house owners.

Meanwhile, students should not be refused the chance to live in houses of their own choice, where those houses meet standards of safety, health, and resident supervision. Students who themselves are not the victims of discrimination, are free to refuse housing in houses whose operators practice discrimination. The same chance and choice should be open to students who seek employment. In our opinion, nevertheless, it is the right of students of a given race or religious faith, if they so wish, to be employed, or to be housed together. We believe, however, that a higher purpose will be served if students do not exercise this right of self segregation.

Community Relationships

The problems of student employment and student housing merge with the general employment and housing situation in Madison. There has been and is a pressing need for more adequate housing for students who attend the University.

Our Committee believes that whenever students are subjected to unfair discrimination by local employers or house operators, the University as an integral part of the Madison community should cooperate with the civic agencies which have been established for the protection and extension of human rights in the City and State. In our opinion, such agencies are the ones to which grievances should be reported, and through which consultations should proceed. To the efforts of these agencies, the University should give its fullest help, and support.
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Recommendations

Our Committee makes the following recommendations with respect to specific proposals in the Student Board report:

1. **Residence Halls:** In our opinion, the policies, practices, and the total social program of the Residence Halls have been successfully directed toward the promotion of democratic living. We believe that it is a right of students to select their own close associates. To honor the stated preferences of students for their room-mates recognizes this right. Students of different races are assigned to the same rooms when such assignment is mutually agreeable. Since some students have strong preferences to room with persons of their own race, we believe it is desirable that such students have the option of giving information necessary for such assignment.

We recommend that efforts be continued to encourage students of different races, religions and nationalities to associate and live together. We believe that it is desirable that race and religion not be used in making room assignments except at the request of students.

2. **University Approved Houses:**

The Committee recommends:

   a. That, because of the misunderstanding that has been attached to the term "approved" houses, the houses which meet present standards henceforth be designated instead as "privately supervised houses, certified as to physical facilities";

   b. That the Student Housing Bureau continue its practice of not listing housing accommodations described as excluding students because of their race or religion;

   c. That, the Housing Bureau take especial care that the same information and equal service are made available to all students. We believe, however, that it is proper to furnish information about the preferences of house operators, or the preferences of students, when given at the specific request of the students;

   d. That, the Housing Bureau use every opportunity through consultation and conference to encourage the housing of students on a non-discriminatory basis.

3. **Employment Bureaus and Placement Offices:**

The Committee recommends:

   a. That the Student Employment Bureau continue its practice of not listing jobs described as excluding applicants because of their race or religion;
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b. That placement offices collect only such personal data as specifically relate to qualifications for employment as based upon achievement, knowledge, skill, training, and individual personal qualities. We believe, however, that photographs upon application blanks may serve a purpose in service to students; their use, when needed, should not be discarded because of a presumption of misuse.

4. Nursing School: We are satisfied that the Nursing School has not discriminated and does not discriminate against applicants because of their race or religion.

5. Student-Faculty Committee:

The Committee recommends:

a. That a continuing committee composed of student and faculty members be established to consider together the ways and means of extending the democratic spirit and way of life upon our campus.

b. That a special function of this committee be to study and recommend ways in which the University might best recognize and give encouragement to the employers and house operators whose policies and practices recognize the human needs and rights covered in this report.

COMMITTEE ON STUDENT LIFE AND INTERESTS

Faculty Members

Voting for adoption:
Butts, Fcrter
Church, Richard
Gregg, Russell T.
Troxell, Louise
Trump, Paul L. (Chairman)
Weaver, Andrew T.

Not active and not voting during Summer Session:
Howells, W. W.
Kuby, Harold E.
Smith, Henry L.

Student Members (Summer Session only)

Voting for adoption:
Bedrosian, Armina
Livesey, Richard

Voting against adoption:
Miller, Iyle L.

Ex-officio Staff Members (without vote)

Hilsenhoff, Ray L.
Zillman, Theodore W.
Madden, Elizabeth (Secretary)

July 23, 1949
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II. MINORITY REPORT

Committee on Student Life and Interests

Concerning University Policies on Human Rights of Students

As a member of the Student Life and Interests Committee and representing Student Board on this Committee, I find it necessary to dissent in large part from the majority's recommendations concerning the discrimination report submitted by Student Board.

The Committee separates its recommendations into two categories," (1) policies and practices of agencies, units, or officers of the University" and, "(2) policies and practices of private individuals who furnish employment, housing, or other services to students." This is a false division, as those Student Board recommendations which affect non-University persons or agents do so only through policies and personnel of the University, and in no way attempt to step outside the existing agencies and general policy of the University.

This policy is stated in the majority report as one "which treats all students upon their qualifications and merit as individuals." The University has put this policy into practice in admitting students to the University, in providing classroom facilities, and in most student activities and services. But it falters and compromises in the areas of student housing, employment, and sororities and fraternities.

It is precisely in these areas that the Student Board has recommended several steps which should be taken to eliminate existing discrimination.

The first recommendation is that race and religion questions be removed from applications for rooms in University residence halls. The Student Life and Interests Committee rejects this on the grounds that students have a right to select their roommates.

Now, there exists on the form a "roommate preference" question wherein a particular person may be selected for a roommate. But those students who do not state a particular preference are assigned rooms by the Residence Halls administration. Present policy is to assign people of the same race to room together, on the assumption that all students who do not specifically state otherwise would not room with students of another race, no matter how compatible they might be in other respects.

I do not believe it is fair to students to assume that prejudice exists; I do not think it is just and consistent with University policy to co-operate with discriminatory attitudes and practices; I do not think it logical to admit students to the University and to the Residence Halls without regard to race or religion, and then draw a line of distinction.

The questions on race and religion on the Residence Halls application, as on any questionnaire, are discriminatory by their very presence, and doubly so by the purpose for which the information is gathered, namely, to segregate the races. These questions imply inferiority and undesirability of minority races; the use made of the information by Residence Halls administrators is apparently based on the assumption that the majority of students considers the members of minority groups inferior or undesirable. It is my opinion, backed by University policy, that until questions of race and religion are removed from Residence Halls
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applications a policy of discrimination exists both in fact and intent, although I feel certain that the intent is not malicious.

Our committee has rejected the proposal of the Student Board that "Approved" houses be required, as a qualification for approval, to follow a policy of non-discrimination. In rejecting this recommendation, our committee suggests that the term "Approved" be clarified by being changed to "privately supervised houses, certified as to physical facilities." This hardly solves the problem; present approval goes far beyond physical facilities.

An approved house may house only one of the sexes; the householder is required to enforce WSGA and other rules which are incumbent upon the students. Failure to enforce these non-physical rules may result in denial of approval just as readily as failure to adhere to physical standards. The University is anxious to protect the morals of its students, but is willing to look the other way when the rights of its minority students are being violated.

The Housing Bureau has stated that it will not approve a house if it is intended to be used for segregated housing. Yet the rejection of the Student Board proposal is partly on the grounds that house operators have a right to state preferences insofar as the race and religion of student roomers are concerned. Is this not playing with words? Either the Housing Bureau has a policy of non-discrimination, or it does not. At present, its policy permits discriminatory practices at the expense of minority students. The adoption of a positive policy of non-discrimination is essential to the elimination of this type of discrimination.

I wish to commend the Nursing School for its promise to drop its method of advice which in effect tended to lead to discrimination. This action was announced in a letter from the Dean of the Nursing School to the Chairman of the Student Board Committee Against Discrimination, and as a result the Board's recommendations regarding the Nursing School have been withdrawn.

I do not understand why our Committee felt it necessary to delete its recommendation concerning discrimination in fraternities and sororities from the final draft of its report to President Fred.

I would like to incorporate these recommendations into this minority report as pertinent to the whole subject of discrimination, and also because I feel that the Student Board Committee made its greatest real progress on this question.

The recommendations of the Student Life and Interests Committee which have been referred back to sub-committee are:

"a. That fraternity and sorority chapters at the University of Wisconsin whose national charters do not permit the selection of members upon the basis of their individual qualifications or merits take action to accomplish removal of such restrictions.

"b. That inactive chapters which seek reactivation, or new chapters which seek recognition be considered in terms of their adherence to the principle of selecting members solely upon their individual qualifications, and their willingness to support the stated aims and purpose of the organization.

"c. That the University cooperate with all chapters in their efforts to bring about these changes."
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My only suggestion is that recommendation a., above be strengthened by making it mandatory that local chapters remove restrictive clauses with or without the action of the national group by a reasonable but definite date, say, September 1, 1952.

This, briefly, is my stand on the specific proposals of the Student Board, and the recommendations of the majority of the Student Life and Interests Committee.

Beyond this, however, there are broad, serious problems which the Committee's majority report brings to the surface.

First, there is the problem of how the University educates its students. I believe the responsibility of the University for its students extends into every aspect of student life. If the University promotes in the classroom the study of ideas which are directed toward rooting out prejudice and preventing discrimination, and if the University practices or permits to be practiced discrimination in the housing, social, or working areas of a student's life, then it is falling down on its job and is doing a disservice to the student. Co-operation with prejudices and discriminatory acts is inconsistent with the aims and methods of a liberal educational institution. Anything short of one-hundred per cent eradication of discrimination against students of minority groups is a shame and a disgrace to this University's reputation.

Second, there is a problem of the status and function of the University in the community. The one-hundred-year tradition of the University of Wisconsin has been to take the lead in social progress in the state—and in the nation, too. Its reputation as a fearless and progressive source of democratic ideas is world-wide.

How did the University of Wisconsin get this reputation? By leading the community, by showing the way—not by tagging along behind! In its relations with the community the University must stand strongly on its principles and educate not only its students but every one with whom it comes in contact by the powerful influence of its example.

It is argued that the University cannot "legislate" prejudice out of existence. With this I agree. Every proposal considered by the Committee is concerned not with prejudice but with discrimination—the denial of full and equal rights to everyone.

Private, personal opinion cannot be legislated out of existence. But discrimination can be ruled out, and by so doing, prejudice will tend to disintegrate.

It is all well and good to protect the rights of the majority to think freely, but even the majority doesn't have the right to act according to its opinions if such action denies any other person any human right.

Such denial exists here and now. It is the responsibility of the University to take the lead in setting matters right. The University already has the necessary policy; all that needs doing is to implement this policy.

Signed:

Lyle Miller, President of
Summer Student Board, 1949

Henry Ladd Smith
Professor of Journalism
III. REPORT OF THE STUDENT BOARD COMMITTEE AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

INTRODUCTION

The Committee was established by Student Board.

The Committee against Discrimination was established in November 1948 by the Student Board as a sub-committee of the Student Welfare Commission.

Purpose and Aims of the Committee.
The Committee was established to ameliorate ethnic relations and to eliminate discrimination practices which demoralize the community, especially in the campus area.

Committee represents campus organizations.
The Committee believed it could best achieve the purposes and aims by recruiting its personnel from all campus groups that concern themselves with problems of discrimination. In this way its program would best represent the wishes of the campus.

Its personnel consists of one member from each of the campus political and church groups at the University of Wisconsin. With few exceptions, all campus groups have participated in this program. When a personnel shortage existed for implementing investigations, help was recruited from individuals who were not affiliated with any particular group.

The Chairman is not affiliated with any political or church organization. The Committee is definitely free from domination by any one of these groups.

Approach and Method Employed by the Committee.
The Committee spent the first two months organizing and talking to many people connected with bettering race relations. This initial groundwork included discussions on legal matters with the Attorney General and the District Attorney. In getting our information we believe and hope we have antagonized no one.

The policy of the Committee was to work with people attempting to persuade them to pursue what we consider fair practices. In some cases there was honest disagreement between the Committee and the authorities as to what was the best method of achieving better race relations. In many cases the "go slow" approach has been offered as an excuse when the authorities really meant "stand still". When the "go slow" approach is followed by signs of progress, we feel this argument is quite reasonable and we are happy to cooperate fully in such a program.

While discrimination against the Negro receives the main emphasis in this report, we do not intend to exclude other minority groups. Since the Negro bears the main burden of discrimination, we believe that solving his problem will go a long way toward solving the entire problem of discrimination.

Publicity and the force of public opinion are of tremendous value, but we feel they should be used only when the discriminatory practice cannot be eliminated by means of persuasion. The above has been and is the policy of the Committee. Much can be done through a mediatory procedure. We request that students report cases of discrimination to us as soon as they appear.
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Philosophy of the Committee.

The Committee recognizes the sociological fact that everyone is a product of his environment, influenced by the customs and mores of the community, and subject to personal prejudices. As a result, we all practice discrimination to a greater or lesser degree. But these prejudices which are the root of discrimination are by definition unreasoned and without factual basis. If allowed to operate without restraint they would demoralize our society and would constitute a serious threat to the fundamentals of democracy and good government. Without restraint discriminatory practices would become more pernicious and more flagrant. The Committee was primarily concerned with those demonstrations of discriminatory practices which pertain to ethnic relations and concentrated its efforts to promulgate the doctrine that all human beings should be treated alike regardless of creed or color.

Scope of the Committee.

This report relates to the areas of University approved housing, University dormitories, the Medical School, and the Nursing School. Sources of information referred to in this report can be reached through the Committee.

HOUSING

The problem of discrimination is tacitly recognized by the Student body and University Housing Officials. A complete survey of the housing situation was made in 1943. Our object is to determine what progress has been made in the last six years so that we may better understand what action should be taken at this time.

Our policy is not merely to fight cases of discrimination as they arise, but to aid wherever possible in laying a basis for bettering racial relations. All house owners and housemothers of independent approved undergraduate housing have been spoken with regarding their present policy; attempts also were made to persuade them to liberalize their policy in the future.

We also learned that some house owners who had never had Negro applicants stand ready to welcome Negroes. This type of informal persuasion suggests the importance of the evolutionary approach and cannot be overemphasized from the educational point of view.

While the individual case of discrimination arouses the public and makes it aware of the specific problem, it almost hides the overall problem of discrimination which covers a greater area. It points up some individual discriminators, who take the brunt of the attack, while other consistent discriminators pass unnoticed because they are more subtle. There are those whose discriminatory policies are so well known that they do not have to practice discrimination, for minority groups don't bother to apply. Few people like to have doors slammed in their faces.

We are interested in the problem as a whole. We are not interested in past cases of discrimination except as incidents of fact and of human behavior that shed light on present procedure; but we are interested in preventing all future cases of discrimination. We will refer to past incidents and the present University policy only to show the great need for a change in the future.
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University Policy

The Director of the University Housing Bureau told us last November that the University policy was not to approve any house that discriminates against minority groups. However he admitted that he would not go out of his way to notice cases of discrimination. We recently learned that the Director told the Minority Housing Exchange about the same time that the University has not had a policy of withholding approval from houses that discriminate.

We wanted to work through University channels, so we interviewed the owners and/or housemothers of all the approved houses for undergraduates. When we returned with admission from a few houseowners that they "would not take Negroes or Jews" (one owner imposed a quota system for Catholics), we were told that an actual case of discrimination must be involved before the Bureau could withdraw approval of the house. After further questioning the Director stated that if this policy were to be enforced, after specific cases of discrimination were brought to his attention, it must be established by the faculty committee (Student Life and Interest Committee). He sincerely desires that a definite policy be established.

Other officials have been very evasive. Seemingly they have condoned discrimination where it existed. Recently a Negro woman had been promised a room in a letter from Mrs. Moore, House Mother of the College Club. When she appeared she was refused a room because of her color. An official learned of the case a few minutes afterwards, while the Negro was enroute to the Housing Bureau. The official thought it too late to influence Mrs. Moore. At first she told the Committee the room was rented by then. Later she admitted it probably was not rented. As explained to us, the official simply accepted the fact that a vacancy existed at the house after the student was refused, and no action was taken by the official.

This official refused to tell us what the University policy was on matters of this sort. She refused to tell us her policy, talked about the circumstances, whether or not the Negro had plenty of time, was a freshman, etc. Negro students have informed us that the policy is to tell them at which houses they will be welcome.

Committee Investigation

The official was asked if she wouldn't encourage better relations. We were told that she did encourage better relations and that she was instrumental in obtaining interracial housing. Investigation by the Committee showed that house owners/mothers and students interviewed had varying experiences. Of the five householders whom the official claimed to have influenced towards accepting Negro applicants, three were interviewed by the Committee and stated that the housing bureau had never made any effort to encourage acceptance of Negro students.

In another instance where the official felt that a specific effort had been made to encourage mixed living, investigation showed that the official had called the house and asked if they would take Negroes, making no further attempt at encouragement.

Students who were interviewed at these and the other two houses also stated that this official had questioned the desirability of mixed living and suggested that the quality of persons living in mixed houses was lower than that of non-mixed houses.
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Marie Cochrane, colored student, said she was told by the official that she might suffer embarrassment if she applied at any house other than Groves Co-op.

Laverne Schmitt, President of Doxy House has stated that to her knowledge no white person has been directed by the housing bureau to apply at Doxy House or Groves House. She further stated that Negroes were directed by the bureau to apply at Doxy House and Groves House.

Dore Ashton, a white student, made inquiries at the housing bureau and was given the impression that Doxy House was an all-colored house.

Patricia Green and Yvonne Tarborough, colored girls, were directed only to Groves Co-op and Doxy House, although white girls with them at the same time were given complete listings of all housing available. When the colored students complained of the discrepancy in offering listings they were told by the housing official that they should be happy to have any place to live during the housing shortage.

A colored student who desired to move from Doxy was discouraged from moving to another house and was told she would be unhappy if she made a change.

Other students have stated that during interviews at the housing bureau they were questioned as to the desirability of living in mixed houses, told that embarrassment and discontent would arise from such living and that while colored students were almost uniformly directed only to Doxy House or Groves Co-op, white students were not referred to such houses.

While we appreciate the efforts made by the Housing Bureau to place Negroes who are unable to find rooms, we feel that no progress has been made towards the solution of the real problem of encouraging mixed living and treating all applicants as individuals.

On Friday, April 1, Mrs. Moore promised this committee that no discrimination would occur at the College Club in the future. On Monday, April 4, Mrs. Moore was no longer so amicable. Between these two talks she had seen a high official of the University. Mrs. Moore told us that "the University" said that "there was nothing wrong in what she did; everything is perfectly O.K." The official missed a real opportunity to accomplish something to better racial relations, and in addition the Committee's work was undone. The official does not "remember exactly what she told Mrs. Moore."

There seems to be no encouragement whatsoever on the part of the University towards a non-discriminatory housing policy. The University has kept a hands-off policy; it will help minority groups to get rooms but it will not discourage discrimination. The University, by condoning discrimination in the Approved Houses, co-operates fully with discrimination and creates the public impression that discrimination is its policy.

Legal Aspects

As we all know, it is unconstitutional for the state to practice racial discrimination. The University at this time rides on thin legal wire; it does not directly discriminate but it co-operates with discriminatory policies and thereby indirectly encourages them.
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A University official expressed his feeling that there might be legal obstacles to the University's making a non-discriminatory policy prerequisite for approval of houses. The Committee considers that there would be no question of legality, for the following reasons:

(1) The entire policy of approval of houses is subject to rules and regulations laid down by the University. An additional policy prohibiting discrimination would therefore be consistent with the current practice of the University to establish certain standards.

(2) It is not a right but a privilege to operate a University Approved House. University regulations apply only to those who choose to qualify for the Approved list; and no owner is compelled to comply with these standards unless he wishes to obtain University approval.

The University of Wisconsin has been given affirmative direction by the State Legislature in the field of housing. In 1945 the legislature of the State of Wisconsin enacted the Fair Employment Act which declared the policy that an act would constitute discrimination under the Statute when housing was restricted on the basis of creed or color.*

Beginning with World War II, the U. S. Federal policy has been neither to co-operate nor to do business with any company that discriminates against minority groups in its hiring policies. If the United States could risk the success of the War by this policy, certainly the Liberal University of Wisconsin, a State Institution, cannot afford to refuse to adopt a liberal policy when its success is almost assured.

OTHER OBJECTIONS TO INTERRACIAL POLICIES

Some house owners have asked that the University not approve any house that discriminates. They want to take persons from minority groups as renters but fear economic loss if they are the only ones renting to such groups. We do not agree that economic loss will result from non-discrimination. (Note the attached employment report indicating that hiring Negroes as clerks does not affect success of business). No one who has rented to Negroes complained about the economic results. However we do have a statement from Robert Levine, owner of the "Villa Maria" in which he says: "We have every indication that it will work out well" (introduction of a Negro to the house). The expressions from the students have been favorable. Many of the girls went out of their way to express pleasure with the admittance of the negro girl. But for the most part, the girls ignored it; she was just another girl who moved in...."We feel the Villa can set its own standards, though we would like to see the University take a stronger stand on discrimination within its approved houses."

Consideration of Protest

If the University adopts a policy of approving only non-discriminatory houses, it must be prepared to receive praise from some people and condemnation from others, especially from some houseowners. However, there never has been an advance in racial relations without violent protests from some quarters. When a Negro obtains a job that has been formerly denied his race, protest is encountered.

*1947 Wisconsin Statutes 111.31
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When a Negro moves out of the ghetto into a section of town where he has a legitimate right to be, protest is encountered. Generally this protest soon subsides, and the Negro begins to establish himself as just another person. If the American people were afraid to protest they would have made little progress in the past. The protest must be considered, and the temporary harm that may result in the small minority of cases must also be considered, but the effects of the protest and the harm done are far outweighed by the democratic advances which will result.

Consideration of Houseowners

Many houseowners will threaten to close up their houses if a policy of approving only houses that do not discriminate is enforced. Every effort should be made on the part of the University to convince the owners of the wisdom of the non-discriminatory policy. Even if these efforts failed and the non-discriminatory policy were enforced, it is extremely doubtful that any owner will close his house. We have found many people who discriminate for what they think will be economic profit. We have not found any owner to discriminate when it would cost him money. Since it is more profitable to rent to students than to townpeople, we do not believe that houses would go off the University market to avoid the policy change recommended. A few houses may be sold to non-discriminating people; but that will not hurt the cause that this Committee espouses. We are more interested in the welfare of the students who are the victims of discrimination than that of a few discriminators.

Student Opinion

The 1943 Report of the Student Board Committee on Student Housing and Discrimination, whose recommendations are still advocating, informs us that a majority of the girls on the lodging houses were in favor of the Report, as indicated by votes taken in the houses at the time. One could hardly say that the same situation does not prevail today; we are sure that enlightened attitudes are helping people to combat discrimination.

Specific results of mixed living

Individual cases* have shown that actual instances of mixed living have perhaps as great a positive effect on the overall improvement of race relations as any other single factor. Our investigations show conclusively that mixed living resulted in greater understanding and a strong tendency towards treating people simply as people. Groves Co-op, Doxey House, Truax and the Stadium Dormitories provide copious evidence in this direction.

Recommendations

(1) We recommend that houses to be retained on the University Approved List be required to follow a policy of non-discrimination at all times.

(2) We recommend that the holders of houses who discriminate against students on the basis of race, color or creed be removed from the University Approved List after due notice and a fair hearing.

(3) We recommend that the University administration abstain from the policy of directing students to segregated houses.

*Case histories are on file with this Committee.
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(4) We recommend that the practice which requires students to indicate race or religion on their room application blanks be abolished.

(5) We recommend that a permanent committee consisting of an equal number of students and faculty be established to investigate and to report on all cases of discrimination brought to its attention. A committee of this sort would have authority and would be respected by the public and the house owners.

Our recommendations nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 are identical with recommendations made by the Student Board Committee on Housing in 1943. The situation in Approved Houses remains about the same. The University has had 6 years to show progress; yet very little change has taken place in this time. In view of this fact, we urge that those who advocate the "go slow" approach consider the necessity for more positive action.

DORMITIES

"With reference to the Dormitory and Residence Halls over which we have control, our policy is clearly stated", said President Fred on November 11, 1947.* He continued: "The policy of room assignments in the Residence Halls and all housing units controlled by the University gives preference to Wisconsin residents and further preference to veterans. All new room assignments are made strictly in accordance with the date of the original application and the above preferences. No consideration is given to race and color or creed. This policy reflects the Wisconsin policy in all such matters. This shall be our policy in the future."

We agree wholeheartedly with President Fred's position. However, in view of the policy laid down by the President, we fail to understand why the Residence Halls continue to give consideration to race in making assignments.

The Residence Halls attempt to assign suitable roommates wherever possible. However, two students who might (judged on the basis of information on the application blanks) make perfect roommates are not allowed to room together if their skin is of a different color. (We are discussing the policy of assignment in the Halls: where an individual requests a particular roommate, Residence Halls fulfill the request). One can hardly say that "no consideration is given to race, color or creed." Why has the Division of Residence Halls refused to comply with President Fred's policy?

We propose that all questions pertaining to race and religion on the Residence Halls application blanks be removed. We recommend further that a new question be inserted which would give each student an opportunity to state what qualities he would like to find in his new roommate.**


**All Dormitory application blanks already have a space headed "Roommate preference" which might be elaborated to include this: "state any particular qualities you desire in your roommate."
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Segregation in Dormitories

The presence of questions on race and religion on application blanks always makes members of minority groups think in terms of discrimination. This psychological effect is a necessary consequence of the frequent use of these questions in implementing discriminatory policies. While we know of no negro who was denied admission to any Residence Hall of the University of Wisconsin on account of his color, we do know of many Negroes who have not bothered to apply because they were under the impression that discriminatory admissions policies were in effect. Also, there is always the chance that discrimination against minority groups may take place as long as the questions remain on the application forms, especially when there is a change of personnel.

While the Residence Halls do not exclude members of minority groups, the Director of Residence Halls admits that Negroes are placed in single rooms or - in cases where another Negro is available - in double rooms with Negro roommates.

Regarding Jews, the policy of non-segregation claimed by the Residence Halls has not been consistently adhered to. It is to be hoped that the discrepancy between policy and practice will be discontinued in the future.

We have found no encouragement of mixed living on the part of the officials of Residence Halls.

Action of Housefellow

The Housefellow's organization of the Residence Halls recently recommended to the Division of Residence Halls that mixed living be encouraged by approaching students to determine where it would be agreeable. If this recommendation is adopted, the situation may be improved. However, while interracial living will be increased, harm can be done by the method of asking Caucasians whether they are willing to live with Negroes. This method appears to be a very patronizing one toward the Negro, though we do not doubt the sincerity behind the Housefellows' proposal. The method would create the impression that the Negro is being done a favor when he is allowed to room with a White. We do not want to give the Negroes any privileges or do him any favors; we merely want to give him the rights that belong to him and that are daily being stolen from him.

Rooming Policies of Other Universities

Miss Nancy Curti of the Student Board Committee on Discrimination sent a questionnaire concerning the policies of other universities. The replies cannot be considered conclusive as to the extent the particular school attempts to promote better ethnic relations, especially in regard to their residence halls system because such a policy takes many forms and general statements are often highly deceiving.

However, an attempt was made to evaluate and categorize the schools strictly on the basis of the substance of their replies. Group one consists of those schools which have eliminated race and religion as criteria for placement of residence, and actively promote a philosophy that differences in race and religion do not establish separate rights in a democratic society, and that all human beings should be treated alike.
Group two consists of those schools which state that they do not practice segregation, i.e., they will place black with white indiscriminately when no preference is indicated, and neither race nor religion appear on the application, but no philosophy of community living was offered. Too, there was no positive statement of a program implementing better ethnic relations.

Group three consists of those schools which state that they do not practice segregation, but later qualify the statement in some manner to indicate that "backgrounds" are taken into consideration, or that students are "consulted" before a minority group individual is placed with a majority group individual, or where personal interviews with dormitory officials is required before placement is made.

Group four is made up of those schools which state that they do segregate, or indicate that segregation is implicit in their system. The usual apology is stated, that if a student "requests" a negro roommate, the university will not disallow it. Also in this category are schools which require applicants to answer race questions on race and religion. Many schools in this category declare that they have a very enlightened program and are proud of the democratic manner in which it is succeeding. In fact, it is the schools in this category which more often make this kind of statement.

Group five consists of those schools which have so evaded the questionnaire that it is impossible to tell what their policy is in this regard.

None of the schools admit to any discrimination in their policy. None of the schools which ignore the question of race and religion report any ill effects from this policy.

Dormitories at Wisconsin without Segregation

A policy of non-segregation has been practiced at Truax Field and at the Stadium Dormitories. The Director and the Assistant Director of Residence Halls both stated that the policy has worked out very well. However, the Director explained that there it was different because there were three or four men to a room, with the result that living need not be so close. Since the Assignment Office assured us that the policy at Truax existed in double rooms as well as rooms with 3 and 4 occupants, we consider it unnecessary to do more than repeat the Director's comment that the policy has worked out very well.

We are unable to understand, of course, why the policy should be successful at Truax and not at the Residence Halls. We feel certain that the Director could not have meant that mixed living will work only in less desirable housing.

Action of Wisconsin Legislature in related field

The Wisconsin State Legislature recently passed the bill calling for a non-segregated National Guard by an overwhelming majority. No one appeared at the legislative hearing to oppose the Bill. If the State can room citizens of different races in the same barracks, the University of Wisconsin can surely room different races and religions together in its dormitories.
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Policy of Director of Residence Halls

Originally the Director of the Halls suggested that Race and Religion appear on the cards, with a statement that this information be used only if the individual states a preference. The Director was then asked: "Then you mean that if the individual states no preference, black and white will be mixed?" He stated that he did not mean that to be the effect.

Asked about groups of non-Negro races who would appear negroid to any roommate (e.g. Indians), the Director asserted that he would have no qualms about accepting the Indian as a member of the White race. This seems odd. Is one who appears to be a Negro suddenly considered acceptable when it is learned that he is from Puerto Rico, Haiti or India?

The Director has agreed to make questions on Dormitory application forms pertaining to race and religion optional. However, by his own admission he feels that everyone will answer these questions. We agree with him; the majority group will fill them out unthinkingly; members of minority groups will feel that failure to supply the information will indicate shame or denial of one's race or religion.

Poll of Students on Their Reaction to mixed living

Five Housefellows at the Dormitories polled their men and asked what their reaction would be if they walked into their room and found a Negro roommate. Less than 10% stated that they would request a change in roommate. However, 70% of those polled would prefer not to have a Negro roommate, if asked ahead of time. Appendix I gives complete data on one of the 5 polls.

We are interested in the 30% who have no objection to living with a Negro. We are greatly interested in the 50% who have mild prejudices and who do not wish to admit, even to themselves, that they are prejudiced. These people will live with Negroes, and it will help tremendously in breaking down the barrier of thinking that superior or inferior qualities are inherent in any race.

The problem of discrimination includes segregation as well as exclusion. We believe in equal right for all; that is, the right to be treated as an individual member of the human race, with no sub-divisions to this race. This does not mean equal but separate rights, as the Residence Halls would have us believe.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN PARTY CHAPERONES

The Committee wishes to commend Dean Trump for having questions on Race and Religion removed from application blanks for party chaperones.

It is our hope that such forthright action can be maintained throughout the University setup and that the University of Wisconsin will live up to the democratic heritage for which it is famous and act as a positive force towards racial equality.
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NURSING SCHOOL

Requirements

Two years in the College of Letters and Science, a physical and psychological examination and a 1.5 average are the requirements for admission to the Nursing School. There are no questions as to race, creed or color on the application blanks. However, a personal interview is required.

Policy

Miss Emanuel, Director of the Nursing School, has stated that it has been her policy, in at least one instance, to attempt to influence a colored girl not to enter the school and the nurses' dormitories. Miss Emanuel explained to the girl that, while she has a right to enter, she would be the only colored girl there and that the other students might resent her presence, which would result in discomfort and embarrassment to the colored girl. Miss Emanuel explained that her staff did not have time to spend straightening out the emotional disturbances which might result. This girl did not apply. No other Negroes have applied. The above incident occurred when Miss Emanuel was a supervisor. She does not know of the experiences of other supervisors.

Conclusions

The Committee feels that race relations will not be improved by sheltering minority groups.

Members of minority groups have felt discrimination too often to be shocked on meeting it face to face. While we realize that the policy of "protection" is often used for well-meaning purposes and that problems will arise as racial problems are met, we feel that refusing to recognize the problem and to deal with it directly will not help, but that improvement will come when people work with and live with minority groups. We wish to further emphasize that we are not asking that special rights or privileges be granted minority groups. We only ask that equal treatment be accorded all persons and that stress be laid on individual, not group, qualifications.

We therefore recommend that the Nursing School abandon any "protectionist" policy it may have and that applicants be allowed to stand on their own feet as individuals in the future. We further recommend that the Nursing School declare a positive policy of non-discrimination so that in the future no applicant need fear she may be unwelcome because of race, creed or color.

THE MEDICAL SCHOOL

Application Blanks

No information is or ever has been required as to race, creed or color.

Wisconsin Students

The two requirements which must be met in order to gain admittance to the medical school are state residence and top scholastic standing as determined by the number of applicants and the number of students which can be admitted. No Wisconsin Negro student who has applied has met the required grade point standard.
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Out of State Students

Exceptions are sometimes made to allow out of state students of particular qualifications to attend the medical school, although they are not permitted to graduate due to the state residence requirement. The Dean of the Medical School has made a special effort to obtain a Negro of desirable qualifications, even though he be from out of state. The efforts of the Dean to encourage Negro attendance is documented by correspondence on file in the medical school office.

Employment

At the present time a Negro holds an assistantship in the medical school. He has stated that to his knowledge there has been no discrimination of any kind connected with the medical school.

Quota System

No quota system of any kind exists, according to the Dean.

Conclusion

The committee feels that fact, not opinion should govern any conclusions drawn, and that in the absence of any facts to the contrary, and in view of the positive statements and acts of the Dean and of the faculty, the medical school should be commended and held out as a school where no student need fear discrimination because of race, creed or color.

ATHLETICS

While the athletic situation is being investigated, a factual report is not yet ready. We understand from correspondence with similar committees from other schools that a gentlemen's agreement exists in the Big Nine whereby Negroes are excluded from basketball. Two schools have already taken action to break down such barriers. This Committee joins with other schools of the Big Nine in urging that in all fields of athletics, as elsewhere, persons be allowed to participate equally in all phases of athletics without reference to race, creed, or color.

PUBLIC PLACES

Investigation of some bars and restaurants has shown no cases of discrimination as to service in the campus area. However, the Committee stands ready to serve wherever a case of discrimination exists.

In view of the fact that barber shops in the past have refused to serve Negroes on the same basis as other groups, this Committee wishes to call attention to the Wisconsin statute prohibiting such discrimination, and to state that we stand ready to aid in obtaining proper legal remedies should any case of discrimination arise.
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A Wisconsin statute does prohibit discrimination because of race or religion in public places. However, a conference with the Dane County District Attorney, Robert Arthur, showed he looks upon the statute with disfavor. The D.A. referred to Negroes as "Darkies" and suggested that in the event a case arose, it be tried civilly rather than under the statute, through his office. He said that although his office would take a case if asked to and investigation showed it should be tried, that such a criminal suit might embarrass the family of the person accused of discrimination, and therefore he would rather see private lawyers handle a civil suit for damages.

EMPLOYMENT

Introduction

This Committee feels that it is a matter of common knowledge that Negroes are discriminated against in employment and job placement. In fact the situation is so well known, that in many cases Negroes no longer bother to apply for certain jobs, with the further result that specific evidence of actual cases of discrimination are hard to uncover.

We therefore feel it is tremendously important not only to aid in securing jobs for the Negro but to better race relations by obtaining jobs that are equal in prestige to those held by majority groups. We hope for no special rights but only for treatment as an individual to be afforded all members of the human race. The matter of prestige is important in the overall picture of race relations.

To attempt to trace the social and psychological roots of prejudice would go beyond the scope of this report. However, the vicious circle which exists under present conditions is rather obvious. The Negro is often thought of as incompetent, lazy or lacking in intelligence, because he works in an unskilled position. Many feel he is incapable of holding a better job. If Negroes could obtain better jobs, when qualified, even prejudiced people would think less in terms of stereotypes and perhaps realize that competency is a matter of individual, not racial quality, thus diminishing existing prejudice.

Policy

We feel that all efforts should utilize a positive approach to the problem. That is, in the case of business places, this Committee and the groups we represent should make special efforts to bring more business to the employer who does not discriminate. In all cases the important thing is to establish a trend. We feel that the University itself occupies a particularly important position as it can establish completely and firmly a basis of non-discrimination which can, once established, be easily and naturally followed in all phases of employment. Two Campus stores have already agreed to hire Negroes, but the situation needs more expansive study.

We have distributed to Campus business men a report by Dr. Saenger of New York University which concludes that hiring Negro clerks has had no effect on customer patronage. While prejudiced persons may object when asked beforehand, they do not seem to be bothered by the accomplished fact, i.e. a Negro already working in the store. Dr. Saenger's results are attached to this report as Appendix II.
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University Hiring

Within the University setup itself many Negroes have felt that discrimination exists in University hiring policy for secretarial help. We do not have a count on the number of Negroes employed in departmental offices; but about 1% of the 3135 people employed by the University are Negroes, and the great majority of these are in the physical plants.

This Committee recommends that a copy of this Report be mailed to the Teachers' Union as an effort to encourage teachers to hire more Negroes. We further urge that such policy be adhered to throughout the University.

The Memorial Union

A separate investigation was made of hiring within the Memorial Union, with the following findings:

An interview with the Assistant Director of the Union, Mr. Douglas Osterheld disclosed that the Union has no set policy regarding minority groups. Mr. Osterheld further stated: "...We had a Negro waiter in the Georgian Grill during the War, we've had other Negroes working in the building, in fact I hired the first one back around 1941". There are no records as to the number of Negroes now working in the Union, but Mr. Andrew Wolff, Personnel Director, stated that only about 6 Negroes applied for work out of about 250-300 applicants last September.

A supervisor who was head of the checkrooms in 1945-46 stated that she was told to use what amounted to the quota system in hiring. While the supervisor does not recall the exact words used, and while there was no direct order, she was told that two or three Jews working in a cloakroom were enough.

While the committee has no specific cases of discrimination in Union hiring, we feel that in light of the aforementioned facts the Union should state a public policy of non-discrimination so that in the future all persons may feel assured that placement within the Union shall be solely on the basis of individual qualifications.

University of Wisconsin Employment Bureau

An investigation was also made of the University Employment Bureau. For the past two years the office has refused to accept listings from employer's who specify race or religion on their job listings. However the office will not refuse to list jobs though at the time of personal application the employer may have indicated he would discriminate because of race or religion. Registrar Kenneth Little has told the committee he feels it is beyond the scope of university policy to refuse to list places even though in actual practice they discriminate because he feels that what happens in the employer's office is a personal affair.

Our committee feels to the contrary. We feel that listing the jobs is clearly within University authority and that in line with state policy, as declared by the legislature and the university, that no discrimination should be tolerated, the employment bureau of the university can justly refuse to list jobs where it is shown the employer discriminates as to race, creed or color.
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Commerce School

We wish to commend Vice-President Baldwin for his efforts in having race and religion questions removed from the Commerce School's placement applications. However, to actual placement much the same situation exists in the Commerce School as in the University Employment Office. The application blanks are free of any questions as to race, creed or color but the actual hiring is done by employer-student interviews at the Commerce School. While this committee fully realizes that the university cannot tell an employer who to hire we feel that placement facilities within the university should be denied to any employer who acknowledges use race, creed or color as criteria in hiring.

CONCLUSIONS

We recognize that some of our investigations are incomplete. On these, of course, we have made no recommendations - we hope to complete these reports soon. We shall begin immediately to investigate other areas of the problem where complaints have been registered with us. It is hoped that by the end of this semester all statistical data will be gathered so that next semester's Committee can concentrate its activities along the following lines:

We recommend that the Student Board Committee confine itself to promoting better racial relations through education and through compilation of statistical material.

The educational means used should include exchange dinners, talks with student groups and student houses, talks with housemothers and house owners. The Committee should further devote much of its time to the promotion of better racial relations by actively co-operating with Negro History Week, Brotherhood Week, Christian-Jewish Conclaves, etc., and should co-operate extensively with the Campus groups which have in the past worked on these projects.

The Committee should further concentrate on the high schools throughout the State. Prejudices are developed at a young age, and if members of the Committee, familiar with the problems could work with the high school students, great benefit could be derived. We commend the Inter-Fraternity Racial Committee for having begun the practice of speaking at high school assemblies.

It is recommended that a joint student-faculty committee try all charges of discrimination involving students. The Committee should consist of an equal number of faculty and students, (perhaps three from each group), the students to be elected by majority vote of the Student Board. This committee should make reports on all cases brought before it, including cases in those areas where the Committee would have no power to take official action. It is essential that a hearing be given to all complaints of discrimination. This will assure the reporting of definite factual material, so that the public can make up its mind on the cases concerned.
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Inconsistency of the University

Jerry Erdahl, Club Service Director of the Memorial Union has told us that the Union would not do business with the Union Barber shop if it refused to serve Negroes. However, the University appears willing to do business with discriminators in the case of housing and employment. In order to be consistent, we feel that the University should adhere to the policy of non-discrimination throughout the entire University area.

We recommend that no photograph or information concerning race, religion, national origin or mother's maiden name be required on any application blank of the University. Too often such information is used for discriminatory purposes.
APPENDIX I

POLL OF STUDENTS AT RESIDENCE HALLS


Group: Winslow House, University of Wisconsin. Thirty polled out of thirty-seven. All are university undergraduates, most are veterans.


Technique: (a) Subject is polled in his own room; (b) Subject is alone with interviewer; (c) Sample: "Do you mind if I ask you a couple of questions? I'm gathering some statistics and I want to get objective answers. There is nothing personal about the questions at all. I don't care how you answer the questions as long as it is as honestly as you know how. If you have any objections about answering the questions, don't hesitate to say so."

Questions: (1) What room is this, ____. Well, if you came into room ____ for the first time and there was a colored boy standing there and he said "I'm your new roommate," what would you do? (If answer is vague, follow up with another question. If answer is negative, the very next question is, "If he were a Jew instead of a Negro, then what?")

(2) Now forget the last situation. If the housefellow said to you, "X, there is a new fellow moving into the house next semester. He's a Negro. Will you room with him." What would you do? (If there is an affirmative answer, follow up with Why?)

Check: Each subject was asked: Did you understand the questions? Were you given a fair chance to answer the way you feel? Will you keep the questions to yourself until I have a chance to poll the rest of the men?

1. I would stay. Only if I could talk with him.
2. I don't know. Look for someone else.
3. It would be all right. Sure.
4. I'd accept him. But if it were a Jew I wouldn't. No, I'd take a Jew too. Makes no difference.
5. If it were a general practice, I'd accept him. I'd take him if I didn't have a roommate.
7. I'd see my H. F. Races get along better separated. A Jew, it depends on the fellow. I'd complain to Division.

_____
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8. I'd stay but ask for a transfer next semester. Wouldn't mind a Jew.

Be rather difficult. I think it's ambiguous. Division wouldn't do it. It's a good policy. I don't think I'd get along, that's all.

9. Not certain, probably take him. I think I should but I'd feel funny.

I don't know. (vague)

10. It's a good question. I would be prejudiced, but I'd try to change. Wouldn't matter if a Jew.

No.

11. I'd accept him if his personal habits weren't disagreeable.

I'd feel strange and do it out of principle.

12. Would be okay.

I'd prefer a white. I'd take him if there were no choice.

13. I wouldn't want to room with a Negro. I'd see H. F. It wouldn't matter so much.

No.


I don't think I'd have much in common with a Negro. It would be more suitable.

15. I wouldn't do anything. Not too much difference.

In that case, I'd rather not.

16. Get acquainted. See what he's like and find out his likes and dislikes.

Yes. I don't have any race discrimination.

17. No objections. I'd get acquainted. I wouldn't take a Negro if I had a choice.

Sure.

18. I wouldn't kick too much.

I don't know why not. I don't have anything against him.

19. Everything I've learned tells me to stick. I wouldn't ask for change.

No objection. If I had a choice, no. Indifferent.

20. I'm prejudiced. I'd ask for a transfer. I wouldn't mind a Jew.

I would refuse.

21. It's all right. (Doubts about cleanliness and afraid about other people's talk.) It's o.k.

I wouldn't go out of my way. Sure.

22. I wouldn't do anything. It would be interesting.

Sure.


Ya, uh huh.
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24. Be hard to make yourself at home. I don't know. It would take some thinking. I wouldn't ask for a new assignment. I don't know why. Probably no objection.

25. It all depends. If he is honest, clean, orderly, I wouldn't mind. If I had any choice I wouldn't like it. I know it contradicts what I said originally.

26. I'd shake hands with him and tell him my name. I wouldn't ask for a transfer, but it would be a shock. Why don't you see the rest of the fellows in the house? I wouldn't volunteer. Double dates, etc.

27. I wouldn't treat him any different than anybody else. They've been my best friends. That would be fine. Be broadening and be able to practice brotherhood, so to speak. Challenge to impartiality.

28. I'd shake hands with him. I'd prefer my own friend for a roommate, but I'd take him. No. I'd say it was a guilt complex. The discrimination film impressed me, but I can't say why I'd object.

29. Must I answer? I had a hell of a time with them in the Navy. I know it isn't fair to judge from that. It'd be okay. I suppose I'd live with him. I wouldn't ask for a change because he was a Negro.

30. Shake hands and say my name's Xm what's yours? Sure. If I couldn't get along, it would be because of the person, and not the color.

Remarks: While an effort was made to keep the questions free, it was noticeable in some cases that the subject was inhibited. A majority of the subjects expressed considerable conflict. Accuracy of the answers is susceptible to error: 1. relationship of interviewer to subject 2. the very significant difference between an "Academic Question" and a real situation.

The technique of interviewing was modified slightly in order to obtain more than a superficial answer. Nevertheless, the gross inconsistencies that appear are not explained, nor do the answers themselves reveal the sincerity or authenticity exercised by the subject.

Other tests are being made based on the pattern established in Test 1 which might aid in checking the accuracy of Test 1 and point up significant flaws or unnoticed patterns.

Results: While the conclusions are not at all conclusive, and the limited test is subject to unknown errors, it is worthy to note that only three men said they would refuse to room with a Negro if placed in the same room. In other words, they would not take the initiative at that time (during the current semester) to make any transfer.

The second question is more revealing as far as determining whether or not the subject has pronounced latent prejudices, that he would not otherwise reveal. His emotional and ethnic conditioning are more persuasive in his actions as opposed to his intellect or conscience than in the first situation. Twenty-one would refuse to live with a Negro if asked by the house fellow or do so only with reservations. An affirmative answer must be critically examined here, due to the relationship of interviewer and subject. The fact that it was not a real situation seemed to bear a slight effect in a few instances here, subjects asking if that would commit them in any way.
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RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDENT BOARD COMMITTEE AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

(Approved in 18 to 0 vote by the University of Wisconsin Student Board)

A. University Approved Housing

(1) We recommend that houses to be retained on the University approved list be required to follow a policy of non-discrimination at all times.

(2) We recommend that the holders of houses who discriminate against students on the basis of race, color, or creed be removed from the University approved list after due notice and a fair hearing.

(3) We recommend that the University administration refrain from the policy of directing students to segregated houses.

(4) We recommend that the practice of requiring students to indicate race or religion on their room application blanks be abolished.

B. University Residence Halls

(1) We recommend that all questions pertaining to race and religion on the Residence Halls application blanks be removed.

(2) We recommend that the Residence Halls application blanks carry a new question to give each student an opportunity to state what qualities he would like to find in his new roommate.*

C. Nursing School

We recommend that the Nursing School declare a positive policy of non-discrimination so that in the future no applicant need fear she or he may be unwelcome because of race, creed or color.

D. Employment

(1) We recommend that this Committee and the groups we represent make special efforts to bring more business to employers who do not discriminate against minority groups.

(2) We recommend that teachers be encouraged to hire more Negroes for secretarial positions.

(3) We recommend that the Memorial Union state a public policy of non-discrimination.

(4) We recommend that the Student Employment Bureau and the University Placement Services refuse to list jobs where it is shown that the employer discriminates as to race, creed or color.

*All Dormitory application blanks now have a space headed "Roommate Preference," which might be elaborated to include: "state any particular qualities you desire in your roommate."
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E. General Recommendations

(1) We recommend that no photograph or information concerning race, religion, national origin, mother's maiden name or wife's maiden name be required on any application blank of the University.

(2) We recommend that agencies and departments of the University abandon any protectionist policy towards minority groups as exemplified especially by the Housing Bureau and that applicants be allowed to stand on their own feet as individuals in the future.

F. Permanent Student-Faculty Committee

We recommend that a joint student-faculty committee be established to try all charges of discrimination involving students. It should make reports on all cases brought before it, giving a hearing to all complaints of discrimination. Its chief function would be to enforce Recommendation 2 of Section A and 4 of Section D. This Committee should consist of an equal number of students and faculty (i.e. three from each group), the students to be elected by majority vote of Student Board.

G. Future Function of the Student Board Committee

(1) We recommend that the Student Board Committee against Discrimination in the future confine itself to promoting better racial relations through educational means (in cooperation with other groups with the same aim) and through compilation of statistics.

(2) We recommend that this Committee, besides devoting much of its time to better racial relations at the University, should further concentrate on the high schools throughout the State of Wisconsin.

(3) We recommend that this Committee be empowered to contact similar committees of other Universities and that a conference of such groups be called as soon as practicable.

All the above recommendations are elaborated and explained in the Report of the Student Board Committee Against Discrimination.
APPENDIX II

CUSTOMER REACTION TO THE INTEGRATION OF NEGRO SALES PERSONNEL

by

DR. GERHART SAENGER
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

This paper was read at the 56th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association in Boston on September 8, 1948.

This is being distributed by the University Student Board Committee Against Discrimination. We hope you will take the time to read the report (underlinings are those of the Committee) giving time and thought to the results and the areas to which they are applicable.

Winn Newman, Chairman
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CUSTOMER REACTIONS TO THE INTEGRATION OF NEGRO SALES PERSONNEL

Partially as a result of recent legislation, New York department stores - for the first time in their history - have begun to hire Negro sales clerks. This innovation raised the question whether anti-Negro prejudice among customers would lead to a loss of business. Would customers resist the hiring of Negro white collar workers?

Apart from the practical significance of this issue, a study of customer resistance was expected to yield further information on the relationship between verbal expressions of attitudes and behavior. We were particularly interested in knowing under what conditions prejudicial attitudes would fail to lead to discriminatory behavior. The Research Committee on Intergroup Relations, in co-operation with the Commission on Community Relations, of the American Jewish Congress, therefore decided to sponsor a study on customer resistance to the integration of Negro sales personnel in New York department stores.

Our main hypothesis was that the prejudiced customer confronted with a Negro sales person would find himself in a dilemma between his desire to act out his prejudice and his desire to buy in the store because the store was inexpensive, convenient, well-stocked, or otherwise attractive. Therefore, we expected that though prejudiced customers may express their prejudices - if given an opportunity - they may not express them in discriminatory action.

As Myrdal has shown, prejudiced persons at the same time believe in the American philosophy of life with equal opportunities for all. Theoretically, in a given situation either component, the democratic or the prejudicial attitude, may be activated. The chance, however, that the democratic attitude will be activated appears to be greater if the prejudiced customer is confronted with a fait accompli, which makes it difficult to express his prejudicial attitude in action.

To test our hypothesis we decided to compare customers' attitudes toward the hiring of Negro sales persons with their actual behavior if confronted with Negro sales clerks. If prejudice influenced buying behavior at all, one could expect that people buying from Negroes would be less prejudiced than those buying from white clerks. To compare customers buying from Negroes with those buying from white clerks 128 people were interviewed. To accomplish this, observer pairs were stationed near those sales counters where Negro and white clerks worked side by side. The observers waited until each clerk had been contacted by a customer. After the contact between customer and clerk was terminated, the customers were followed into the street and interviewed. All respondents were completely unaware that they had previously been observed talking either to a Negro clerk or to a white clerk standing in close proximity to the Negro. This procedure enabled us to compare respondents' actual behavior with their opinions and prejudices.

In addition, to those customers observed in the stores a second, equally large, representative sample of a department store customer was interviewed in streets and parks near the stores. This sample enabled us to study the relative frequency of exposure to Negro sales persons of the average customer. It also made it possible to study the attitudes of people not in recent contact with Negro sales clerks.
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To examine the relationship between prejudicial attitudes and behavior it was necessary to determine the relative incidence of prejudice for the total customer group. Prejudice can be of different intensity. To be sure the relative degree of prejudice a scale was constructed on the basis of questions concerned with attitudes toward Negro sales personnel. It was found that two-fifths of our sample failed to express any prejudice. Another fifth approved of Negro sales personnel but shoved stereotyped notions concerning Negro inferiority. Two-fifths of the sample were more or less prejudiced. Half of these people - 31 per cent of the total group - approved of Negro sales clerks except for certain more "intimate" departments such as clothing, lingerie, and food. The remaining 19 per cent were opposed to the hiring of Negro sales personnel generally.

We now proceeded to compare the relative incidence of prejudice among those customers dealing with Negro clerks and those observed dealing with white clerks. In line with our hypothesis, we found exactly the same distribution of prejudice in both groups of customers. There were as many prejudiced people dealing with Negroes as with whites. In the department store setting at least, prejudicial attitudes are not significantly correlated with discriminatory behavior.

The same result was obtained if we included the respondents from our second sample, those who had not been observed in recent contact with or close proximity to Negro clerks. If we compare prejudice ratings for all respondents having bought from Negroes with those having bought from white clerks, again the same proportion of prejudiced persons is found in both groups.

To some extent this inconsistency between expressed attitudes and action may be attributed to the fact that while many people are opposed to social innovations, few will actively fight them. Among those who were strongly prejudiced many said that they would continue to frequent the store and simply turn to the next white clerk if confronted with a Negro. Of the nine people in our sample who said that they would never buy from a Negro, three had actually been observed buying from a Negro less than an hour before they were interviewed. And we cannot be sure even of the remaining six because we do not know how they would have behaved if they had encountered a Negro clerk.

It has been argued that the very small number of Negro clerks accounts for the absence of resistance. Although eight per cent of the New York City population is colored, only four-tenths of one per cent of the department store sales force are Negroes. It is our opinion that this argument is invalid, for a number of reasons. All the people observed in our study had been in close proximity to at least one colored clerk. To duplicate this situation for the average New York department store customer would require adding a tremendous number of Negro sales people to those now employed. Actually, it would be possible to hire several times as many Negro clerks without having more than one of them in any one department. Moreover, there were several times as many Negro cashiers and packers in the stores as clerks, all handling merchandise. These cashiers and packers have been employed for a long period of time, apparently without any customer objections.

The statement is sometimes made that while the average store would encounter no objections, high class stores would meet with resistance. Actually, we found that prejudice against Negro sales persons was least frequent among upper socio-economic strata.
How are we to understand this discrepancy between what people say and how they act? A qualitative analysis of our case material clearly indicates the existence of a conflict between two opposing desires or motives for action within the prejudiced person. On the one hand he may prefer to give in to his prejudice and either leave the store or turn to the next white clerk; on the other hand he wants to buy in the store because of the advantages offered by it. Now, while it is possible to express mutually contradictory attitudes or desires, it is not possible to act on both simultaneously. In the interview situation the respondents can freely express their prejudice, and yet in the reality situation in the store buy from a Negro.

The decision to buy from Negroes - "tolerate" them as it were - is made easier by a second conflict which Myrdal calls the American dilemma. In the average American prejudicial attitudes co-exist with his belief in the fundamental right of equal opportunity for all. Either attitude can be activated, depending upon the prejudiced person's conception of this situation. Allport and Frenkel-Brunswik have shown that prejudiced persons are insecure, hence conformists. The prejudiced person, if confronted with a fait accompli - i.e. the presence of Negro sales persons - believes that others must have accepted the fact of these Negro clerks. The existence of a law against discrimination will further reinforce his reluctance to object and run counter to what he believes to be public opinion.

We thus find that behavior in the department store situation conforms more to the democratic than to the prejudicial attitudes. Yet the prejudiced individual still has to resolve his inner conflict. In order to preserve his self-esteem, he must appear consistent to himself. One way of achieving this goal is to remain unaware of the inconsistency in his behavior. Fully, one-third of all customers talking to a Negro clerk stated within an hour after this contact that they had never seen any Negro clerks in department stores. Failure to perceive or recall the color of the sales people who served them prevents many prejudiced customers from becoming aware of their own inconsistency.

Others rationalized their behavior by stating that Negroes were alright as servants, and subsequently interpreted sales jobs as "service" occupations.

There is finally some evidence that the hiring of selected Negro clerks actually tends to reduce prejudice. We may recall that one group of customers did not object to their employment in general. They only wanted them excluded from departments handling "intimate" merchandise. But curiously enough those who saw Negroes in the food department never objected to their handling food. They only objected to their presence in the clothing departments. Those seeing Negroes in lingerie and clothing departments, on the other hand, objected only to Negroes handling food. Thus the mere presence of Negroes in a specific department appeared to counteract prejudicial expectations, and lead to their acceptance.

A particularly neat illustration of both the inconsistency of attitudes and the fait accompli effect is provided by those prejudiced customers who objected to Negro sales clerks handling food or clothing, but thought they were all right as cooks or maids!