

of such crude political behavior has now shrunk to a few states and local pockets.

"Goldwaterism" was out-and-out racism in the South; more subtly so in the North. Its crushing defeat in the '64 presidential campaign may have been the death blow to racism as a primary issue in nationwide elections.

When Lyndon Johnson danced with Mrs. Hobart Taylor, an attractive Negro woman, at one of the inaugural balls last January, he performed what was possibly the most significant symbolic act of a President of the United States in the field of race relations since Teddy Roosevelt had Booker T. Washington for dinner in the White House. Johnson's deed was deliberate (unlike Roosevelt's). Moreover, it was done for the whole world to see and in the presence of friends from the South. This act not only placed the stamp of approval from the White House on "social equality," but was also notice that Lyndon Johnson no longer considered himself a "Southerner;" he meant to be "an American, president of all of the people!"

SCHOOLS ALSO TEACH AMITY

Almost everyone (including Government officials) generally looks upon the improvement of race relations as the job of education. This is more a vague hope and faith than a program. Many scholars and educators shy away from this duty for they fear the charge of "indoctrination" and "involvement in partisan affairs." On many campuses, "race relations" is a controversial question.

Nevertheless, in this field our colleges and schools and their off-campus adjuncts have made many strides forward during the past two decades. At the high-

est level of scholarship, most of the national organizations of the sociologists, anthropologists, psychologists and even the biologists have passed resolutions and issued pronouncements that put them on the side of scientific truth and human understanding.

The Social Science Research Council boldly organized a committee on "techniques for reducing group hostility." It produced a notable booklet of some one hundred and fifty-three pages entitled, *The Reduction of Inter-Group Tensions* by Robin Williams. The sub-title of the modest volume is even more descriptive: "A Survey of Research on Problems of Ethnic, Racial and Religious Group Relations." This was a good critical summary. Any group that wanted a copy of the report could get it but the SSRC seemed to have felt that with publication its job was completely done. There was no follow-up to insure wide distribution, even within intellectual and institutional circles.

Since the 1940s, the colleges have increased the number of their classes on inter-cultural relations. Thus, Dr. Caliver could only count 1478 courses of this type after he had examined the catalogs of some two hundred and sixty-two institutions. The number now is more than double. Incidentally, Caliver did not include Jews, Catholics, Puerto Ricans and Appalachian whites in his list of minorities. He did realize, however, that a reference to race or a minority in the title of a course was only one index to the studies that might be devoted to such subject areas.

Scholars have produced many more books on our subject and some of these are intended to give some guidance to