

THE INTERNAL COLONIAL MODEL
OF RACE RELATIONS
IN THE UNITED STATES
-- AN EMPIRICAL TEST

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
LEONARD GEORGE BERKEY
1974

THESIS



L



V-057

~~AD 11105~~

JUN 16 1973

107 A145

FEB 26 1974

ABSTRACT

THE INTERNAL COLONIAL MODEL OF RACE RELATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES -- AN EMPIRICAL TEST

By

Leonard George Berkey

The purpose of this research is to attempt to empirically test the accuracy of the internal colonial model as a paradigm of race relations in the United States. The emphasis is primarily upon the structural outlines of the model, rather than its underlying mechanisms.

Because it is difficult to formulate testable hypotheses from the available literature on internal colonialism, Galtung's structural theory of imperialism is introduced as a framework for formalizing the model. The hypotheses that are generated from this conceptualization concern the structural linkages between parties which constitute an imperialistic relationship.

Racial strata are identified which correspond to the classifications used in the hypotheses, and the hypotheses are tested using national income data. The results tend to confirm the hypotheses, with a few significant exceptions. Finally, suggestions are made for further research.

THE INTERNAL COLONIAL MODEL
OF RACE RELATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES
-- AN EMPIRICAL TEST

By
Leonard George Berkey

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology

1974

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would sincerely like to thank Dr. Richard Hill, my committee chairman, for his invaluable assistance and direction throughout this research, and Dr. James McKee and Ms. Kay Snyder for their helpful comments. In addition, I am grateful to Marietta Gamso and William Barclay for initially suggesting the topic. Finally, I wish to thank my wife, Ramona, for her enormous help in editing the text and preparing the final manuscript.

"The fact of racial interest does not belie the importance of divergent and conflicting interests among different segments of the same racial groups, divisions that might widen with changing economic and political circumstances. In American society races and classes interpenetrate one another. Race affects class formation and class influences racial dynamics in ways that have not yet been adequately investigated. The entire relation between racial and class interest (and racial and class privilege) is an exceedingly complicated one that social theorists might well explore in a deeper fashion. It is the most important question that must be faced in constructing a theoretical model of racial capitalist society" (Blauner, 1972:28-29).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem.	3
Review of the Literature on Internal Colonialism.	5
Galtung's Structural Theory of Imperialism.	12
Criticisms of the Internal Colonial Model.	14
II. HYPOTHESES, METHODS, AND DATA.	17
Hypotheses.	17
Methods	19
Data.	31
Analysis of Data.	33
III. RESULTS.	47
IV. SUMMARY.	50
FOOTNOTES.	53
REFERENCES	56

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. Aggregate Income by Quintiles for Families. . .	21
2. Aggregate Income by Quintiles for Persons . . .	22
3. Percent of Total Aggregate Income by Quintiles for Families	23
4. Percent of Total Aggregate Income by Quintiles for Persons.	24
5. Actual Income Cutoff Figures Separating Quintiles of Families.	27
6. Actual Income Cutoff Figures Separating Quintiles of Persons	28
7. Income of White and Nonwhite Families in 1969 Dollars	30
8. Percentage of Total Family Aggregate Income, Negro to White	34
9. Percentage of Total Aggregate Income for Persons, Negro to White.	36
10. Distribution of Total Family Aggregate Income, Negro to White	39
11. Distribution of Total Aggregate Income for Persons, Negro to White.	40
12. Internal Distribution of Total Family Aggregate Income, for Negroes and Whites	42
13. Internal Distribution of Total Aggregate Income for Persons, Negroes and Whites . . .	43
14. Gini Coefficients of Income Inequality for Families	45
15. Gini Coefficients of Income Inequality for Persons.	45

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The failure of American sociologists in comprehending the dynamics of race relations within the United States has been documented by Metzger (1971), and McKee (1970), and others. Blauner (1972:5) argues that this failure resulted primarily from the fact that the study of race relations "developed in a kind of vacuum" with "no overall theoretical framework" to guide its research and development.

As a consequence, a number of models of race relations were formulated in ad hoc fashion, in an attempt both to approximate the changing reality of American society and to complement the dominant liberal political thinking of the time. None of these models, however, were able to integrate race and racial conflict as central aspects of American social reality. Rather, they viewed race as an "epiphenomenal and ephemeral" characteristic (Blauner, 1972:6).

Among the major developments in racial group models, then (cf. Blauner, 1972:6-11; McKee, 1970), were (1) the assimilationist - integrationist model, developed by Park and others, which asserted that relations between dominant and minority groups pass through a series of linear stages,

with a period of conflict and competition at the time of initial contact, progressing to a stage of accommodation, and ending, finally, in the general assimilation of the minority group; (2) the caste-class model¹, developed by Warner and associates, which denied the epiphenomenal character of race and concentrated on "the castelike nature of the color line separating white and black, the class structure of each racial group, and the relations between these two principles of stratification" (Blauner, 1972:7); (3) the emphasis upon prejudice as the primary impediment to the assimilation of minority groups, which accepted the fact that prejudice was based on color, and asserted that the answer to eliminating prejudice was to change the attitudes of the dominant white majority, rather than the institutional framework of the society; and (4) the immigrant group model, proposed by Moynihan, Glazer, and others, which posited a similarity between "the historical experience of European ethnic groups and the contemporary situation of racial minorities" (Blauner, 1972:10), in that both either have been or will be assimilated into the large society through the process of social mobility--by moving into the middle class.

These models not only failed to do justice to the nature of the black community and to the reality of the black historical experience in America, they also obscured the power relations in American society and the prerequisites of meaningful social change. As a result,

sociologists were unable either to anticipate or to adequately explain the momentous developments of the 1960's, from the civil rights movement and the ghetto riots to the black power and nationalist movements that followed.

Into this theoretical void stepped a number of new and not-so-new perspectives on race relations, emanating largely from outside the ranks of academic sociology. One of the most important of these, and the one with which this paper will deal, is the internal colonial model, proposed by Blauner (1969), Allen (1969), and Tabb (1970) among others. This approach seeks to relate the historical experience of black people in the United States with that of nonwhite people in Africa and the Third World who underwent a period of colonial domination.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this paper, then, is to attempt to empirically test the accuracy of the internal colonial model as a paradigm of American race relations. We make no pretense of completeness in this effort, however. This is only a beginning: an effort to examine whether or not in broad outline the model holds. Further study will be needed to determine the underlying mechanisms that are operating to maintain the ghetto's colonial status, as well as the many and complex ramifications of that status.

Since the available literature on internal colonialism is written in a way that makes it difficult for one to

formulate testable hypotheses, Galtung's structural theory of imperialism is introduced as a framework for formalizing the model. The hypotheses that are generated from this conceptualization have to do with the structural linkages between parties that constitute an imperialistic relationship.

Racial strata are then identified which correspond to the classifications employed in these hypotheses, and the hypotheses are empirically tested using national income data. The results tend to confirm the hypotheses, with a few significant exceptions. Finally, suggestions are made for additional research.

My reasons for doing this research are twofold. In the first place, I have an intellectual interest in making some sense of race relations in the United States because I believe race to be a critical variable in determining the overall political, social, and economic character of this society - both present and future. Dubois' (1961:23) famous remark, it seems to me, still holds: "The problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the color-line."

Second, and equally important, I want to understand the structure of race relations in the United States in order to be able to propose, and to engage in, activities which will alter the exploitative nature of those relations. To put it another way, my interest in this research stems also from a moral commitment to the elimination of racial oppression in the United States.

Review of the Literature on Internal Colonialism

The most important early statements on internal colonialism are those of Clark (1965), Carmichael and Hamilton (1967), and Cruse (1968). Their significance, however, lies less in the models that they present than in the description of ghetto reality that they provide; particularly the sense of structural isolation and permanence that dominates ghetto life.

[The dark ghetto involves] invisible walls . . . erected by white society, by those who have power, both to confine those who have no power and to perpetuate their powerlessness. The dark ghettos [have] social, political, educational, and . . . economic [dimensions]. Their inhabitants are subject people, victims of the greed, cruelty, insensitivity, guilt, and fear of their masters. The objective dimensions of the American urban ghettos are over-crowded and deteriorated housing, high infant mortality, crime and disease. The subjective dimensions are resentment, hostility, despair, apathy, self-depreciation, and its ironic companion, compensatory grandiose behavior. . . . The ghetto is ferment, paradox, conflict, and dilemma. . . . It is the surge toward assimilation, and it is alienation and withdrawal within the protective walls of the ghetto. The pathologies of the ghetto community perpetuate themselves through cumulative ugliness, deterioration, and isolation, and strengthen the Negro's sense of worthlessness, giving testimony to this impotence. Yet the ghetto is not totally isolated. The mass media--radio, television, moving pictures, magazines, and the press--penetrate, indeed, invade the ghetto in continuous and inevitable communication, largely one-way, and project the values and aspirations, the manners and the style of the larger white-dominated society. Those who are required to live

in congested and rat-infested homes are aware that others are not so dehumanized.. . . Whatever accommodations [black ghetto residents] must make to the negative realities which dominate their own lives, they know consciously or unconsciously that their fate is not the common fate of mankind. They tend to regard their predicament as a powerlessness which all Negroes share (Clark, 1965 as quoted in Franklin and Resnik, 1973:83-84).

We shall be concerned in this paper with the later, more developed writings on internal colonialism: in particular those of Blauner (1969), Allen (1969), and Tabb (1970). These works are to a large extent complementary rather than directly overlapping, primarily as a result of the differences in perspective among the authors. Blauner, for example, writes from the standpoint of a sociologist, Allen that of a journalist, and Tabb, an economist.

Blauner (1969:394) contends that "problematic and imprecise as it is, [the model of internal colonialism] gives hope of becoming a framework that can integrate the insights of caste and racism, ethnicity, culture, and economic exploitation into an overall conceptual scheme." Nevertheless, he recognizes the artificiality of making a facile transition from the "classic" colonial model--two geographically distinct political units, colonizer and colonized, usually different in race and culture, where the one (the colonizer) dominates the other (the colonized), exploits its land, raw materials, labor, and other resources, and subjects it to formal political control--to the domestic

American context. Indeed, such vulgar analogies obscure what is unique about the American situation and prevent the development of effective measures for change.

Rather, he suggests, in analyzing the relationship between blacks in the United States and non-white peoples in the Third World, what one should emphasize is the common PROCESS of colonization, and not colonialism as a political, economic, and social system.

The common features ultimately relate to the fact that the classical colonialism of the imperialist era and American racism developed out of the same historical situation and reflected a common world economic and power stratification. . . . Thus because classical colonialism and America's internal version developed out of a similar balance of technological, cultural, and power relations, a common PROCESS of social oppression characterized the racial patterns in the two contexts--despite the variation in political and social structure (Blauner, 1969:395-396).

This colonization process consists of four basic components: (1) "forced, involuntary entry"; (2) an unnatural impact upon the "culture and social organization" of the colonized people; (3) the administration of members of the colonized group by representatives of the dominant group; and (4) "racism" (Blauner, 1969:396).

This model, then, enables Blauner to do what mainstream American sociology has failed to do, namely, to integrate into an overall societal perspective--and thus to make sense of--such black protest phenomena as riots,

separatist movements, cultural nationalism, etc. as strategies for overcoming colonial domination.

Allen (1969) argues that blacks in the United States represent a "neocolonial" rather than a colonial population to the extent that direct control of the ghetto is exercised by an indigenous black bourgeoisie rather than by white outsiders. Moreover, he contends that the transition of the black population from colonial to neocolonial status is a recent and direct result of the policies and programs of America's corporate elite--"the major owners, managers, and directors of the giant corporations, banks, and foundations which increasingly dominate the economy and society as a whole" (Allen, 1969:17)--in their attempt to counteract rebellious forces within the black community which threaten the social and economic stability necessary for productive growth.

The character of neocolonial relations, then, for Allen is the "inevitable product of the STRUCTURE of corporate capitalism" (Allen, 1969:222) rather than the direct outgrowth of a racist ideology. The reason for this has to do with the central importance of "planning" in the American corporate economy. This planning is necessitated by the needs of large-scale corporate capital to operate efficiently and with minimum risk. It involves the regulation of the supply of raw materials and labor, as well as the manipulation of consumers to insure proper

demand for finished products. To be effective, it must, of course, encompass both the black and the white community.

The strategy of corporate management in dealing with the black community, Allen suggests, has been essentially threefold: it has sought to create a "buffer class" of black capitalists and corporate managers within the black community which can serve "as a means of social control by disseminating the ideology and values of the dominant white society throughout the alienated ghetto masses" (Allen, 1969:212); it has attempted to reclaim the so-called "hard-core unemployed" and to integrate them into the work force by retraining them with marketable skills; and finally, it has supported some system of transfer payments for those too old, too sick, or simply unable to be absorbed into the labor force.

It is crucial to understand, however, that neocolonialism involves the continued domination of the black community by white corporate capital. This black "buffer class" of corporate managers represent the white corporate elite and are subservient to them. Thus, whenever it becomes difficult for corporate capital to continue to finance black capitalists--as in periods of recession--or when it becomes unnecessary to push their development--in periods of relative calm--the gains of black capitalists may suddenly dissolve.²

The only real hope for blacks to overcome their neocolonial status, as Allen sees it, is for them to develop

cooperative and collectively managed industries and institutional structures, and to dismantle capitalist property relations within the black community.

Tabb (1970) maintains that the colonial status of the black ghetto is convincingly demonstrated when one examines the characteristics of the ghetto from the perspective of developmental economics.

The economic relations of the ghetto to white America closely parallel those between third-world nations and the industrially advanced countries. The ghetto also has a relatively low per-capita income and a high birth rate. Its residents are for the most part unskilled. Businesses lack capital and managerial knowhow. Local markets are limited. The incidence of credit default is high. Little saving takes place and what is saved is usually not invested locally. The ghetto is dependent on one basic export--its unskilled labor power. Aggregate demand for this export does not increase to match the growth of the ghetto labor force, and unemployment is prevalent. As consumer goods are advertised twenty-four hours a day on radio and television, ghetto residents are constantly reminded of the availability of goods and services which they cannot afford to buy. Welfare payments and other governmental transfers are needed to help pay for the ghetto's requirements. Local businesses are owned, in large numbers, by non-residents, many of whom are white. Important jobs in the local public economy (teachers, policemen, and postmen) are held by white outsiders (Tabb, 1970:22-23).

Historically, Tabb argues, black slave labor was crucial to the development of capitalism in the United States, due to the strategic importance of cotton in the process of capital accumulation. After the Civil War, blacks became "an equilibrating factor" in the economy:

easing labor shortages during periods of rapid expansion; retarding the growth of wage rates and sapping the collective strength of white labor during periods of labor surpluses.

Their relative position has not decisively improved.


The needs of the society have changed. Still, blacks remain in their historic position somewhere between Marx's reserve army and Cairnes's non-competing group. That is, they are an available source of labor when needed by the economy and at the same time a group set apart which can be confined to certain types of work (low-paying, hard, and unpleasant jobs). They . . . act as a buffer pool, keeping labor costs from rising. In this way the entire white society benefits by receiving goods and services more cheaply and white unemployment is cushioned (Tabb, 1970: 26-27).

The **economic dependence** of blacks, likewise, is paralleled by their **political dependence**. All authoritative and power structures, from police and schools to businesses and community agencies, reflect the same pattern of outside white dominance. Indeed, although a number of indigenous blacks rise to positions of authority in ghetto institutional structures, their ultimate dependence upon white society remains.

For Tabb, these two phenomena, "economic control and exploitation" and "political dependence and subjugation", are proof positive that a colonial relationship exists between the black ghetto and white America. However, these criteria are insufficient to prove that a colonial relationship exists, since they also apply to a number of other

possible ghetto models--the class model, the caste model, etc. Therefore, in our effort to empirically test the internal colonial model we must, first of all, identify criteria that clearly distinguish it from other models of race relations in the United States.

Galtung's Structural Theory of Imperialism

Galtung's (1971) work on imperialism provides a framework for formalizing the internal colonial model in a manner that permits us to formulate testable hypotheses concerning the model. This is possible because his work applies in the broadest sense to "collectivities" bound together in a dependency relationship. Thus, **what are Center and Periphery nations in his analysis become white and black populations in ours.** 

He begins by defining imperialism generally as

a sophisticated type of dominance relation which cuts across nations, basing itself on a bridgehead which the center in the Center nation establishes in the center in the Periphery nation, for the joint benefit of both (Galtung, 1971:81).

More specifically, it is

a system that splits up collectivities and relates some of the parts to each other in relations of HARMONY OF INTEREST, and other parts in relations of DISHARMONY OF INTEREST, or CONFLICT OF INTEREST (Galtung, 1971:81).

By INTEREST, in this formulation, he means the "true interest" of the parties involved, as defined by an objective outside observer rather than the parties

themselves--thus avoiding the issue of false consciousness.

He equates this with LIVING CONDITION (LC), which is measured by such indicators as income and standard of living, as well as by such abstract notions as QUALITY OF LIFE and AUTONOMY (Galtung, 1971:82). CONFLICT OF INTEREST, then, is defined as follows:

There is CONFLICT, or DISHARMONY OF INTEREST, if the two parties are coupled together in such a way that the LC GAP between them is INCREASING. There is NO CONFLICT, or HARMONY OF INTEREST, if the two parties are coupled together in such a way that the LC GAP between them is DECREASING DOWN TO ZERO (Galtung, 1971: 82).

In order to prove that an imperialistic relationship exists, we need to find "a gap in living condition", of at least one important kind" between the interacting parties; not only should this gap exist but it should be increasing over time.

In summary, according to Galtung, imperialism implies that

- (1) there is HARMONY OF INTEREST between the CENTER IN THE CENTER nation and the CENTER IN THE PERIPHERY nation,
- (2) there is more DISHARMONY OF INTEREST within the Periphery nation than within the Center nations,
- (3) there is DISHARMONY OF INTEREST between the PERIPHERY IN THE CENTER nation and the PERIPHERY IN THE PERIPHERY nation (Galtung, 1971:83).

While this, in fact, represents only the first part of the structural outline of Galtung's theory--the relational framework of imperialism--it is sufficient for

our purposes of formalizing the internal colonial model and generating testable hypotheses. A complete investigation of internal colonialism, however, would necessarily involve an examination of the "mechanisms," "types," "phases," etc. of imperialism (in many ways the most important questions). Unfortunately, that is beyond the scope of this paper.

What we are attempting is merely to explicate and test the general criteria of an imperialistic relationship in terms of the internal colonial model. If these criteria prove to be contradictory to the facts we should have serious questions concerning the accuracy of the model for the American context.

Before proceeding with the investigation, it would be useful to examine some of the more salient criticisms that have been leveled against the internal colonial model.

Criticisms of the Internal Colonial Model

Franklin and Resnik (1973:88-89) summarize the main criticisms of the internal colonial model as follows:

1. Blacks, as a dominated group, are geographically dispersed among their exploiters and, therefore, there is less potential for the development of a concerted, cohesive political movement capable of achieving the consciousness and autonomy needed to control their own resources and destiny.
2. Because the black population is not sufficiently isolated physically, spontaneous economic drains from the black to the white community (for example, income, savings, physical and human capital) are much greater than in the colonial situation. In the standard colonial situation, the potential development of a protective tariff system or the

development of strict controls on the importation of superfluous goods is allowed for. In general, the underdeveloped country, in contrast to the less segregated ghetto, has a significantly greater potential capacity for insulating itself from the competitive and distorting influence of the developed countries. The balance-of-payment problem between developed and underdeveloped sectors is difficult to correct under the most favorable circumstances. With circumstances infinitely less favorable, correcting the deficit seems fairly close to impossible.

3. The black population is not culturally isolated. This means that the "demonstration effect" cannot be avoided; that is, the black population cannot avoid internalizing white consumption styles, which are derived from a society with significantly higher income levels. Aping white consumption habits makes it extremely difficult for the black population to develop an internal ethic conducive to saving and austerity, a prerequisite and accompaniment to the developmental thrust.
4. There is little possibility that the black population can acquire the degree of fiscal and monetary autonomy, for example, taxation powers, control of their own money supply, credit-creation capacities, that are needed to fulfill the political, social, and economic goals derived from a revolutionary development program implicitly suggested in the neocolonial model.
5. Blacks are a minority dominated by the majority, a fact that affects the potential power they can mobilize against their white oppressors, even under the most favorable circumstances.

The thrust of these criticisms, obviously, is directed less at denying the structural peculiarities of the black ghetto--those that we have suggested reflect its colonial status--than in emphasizing the factors that tie the black ghetto to white America in an unalterable way. However, as David (1973:92) has pointed out, arguments against the internal colonial model that are based solely on the physical and spatial proximity of the ghetto "do not . . .

alter the major fact that the ghetto economy like the less developed economy has a structural uniqueness, the main features of which stand out, and are a proper subject of analysis and study." They merely emphasize that the black ghetto is "a particular type of underdeveloped economy, calling for particularistic solutions to its problems."

In addition, criticisms of the internal colonial model which deny the structural uniqueness of the ghetto and attempt to incorporate it into a unitary economic model of the society as a whole, reflect more the ideological bias of bourgeois economics than a coming to grips with reality. The work on the "dual" structure of the labor market (Piore, 1971; Baron and Hymer, 1971; and Bluestone, 1971), has done much to clarify the structurally unique features of urban ghettos in the United States.

Of course there are important differences between the ghetto and the various underdeveloped countries; nevertheless, what we are concerned with are the similarities. Particularly those similarities which are crucial for understanding the underlying structural dynamics of the ghetto and how these might be changed.

CHAPTER II

HYPOTHESES, METHODS, AND DATA

In this chapter we formulate the hypotheses to be tested, delineate the methodological procedures to be followed in the research, and describe the data to be used in testing the hypotheses. We conclude with an analysis of the results of the research.

Hypotheses

We are attempting to empirically test the internal colonial model by formalizing it in terms of Galtung's theoretical framework. This necessitates that we first identify racial strata which correspond to Galtung's categories. For our purposes, these strata need not be narrowly defined. We will simply designate the "white elite"--broadly conceived--as the CENTER IN THE CENTER; the "black bourgeoisie" as the CENTER IN THE PERIPHERY; the "white masses" as the PERIPHERY IN THE CENTER; and the "black masses" as the PERIPHERY IN THE PERIPHERY. A

Our hypotheses, then, follow directly from the theory outlined above.

Hypothesis #1: There is HARMONY OF INTEREST between the white elite and the black bourgeoisie. f

This suggests on the one hand, that the white elite finds it to be to its advantage to solicit the cooperation and support of the black bourgeoisie in order to insure the continued smooth functioning of the system (Allen, 1969:211-222); Baran and Sweezy, 1966:271-277). It makes sense to them to solidify the loyalty of the black bourgeoisie by granting them authority over ghetto institutional structures since they (the white elite) retain ultimate control.

From their perspective, the black bourgeoisie not only obtain token authority within the ghetto itself, but they acquire the status and often the wealth that enables them to function successfully in the white community as well. They see themselves benefiting directly from the maintenance of the status quo.

Hypothesis #2: There is DISHARMONY OF INTEREST between the black masses and the white masses. AB

White labor benefits psychologically from having a "pariah group" of blacks at the bottom of the social heap that both reinforces their feelings of superiority and allows them to vent their frustrations and hostilities (Baran and Sweezy, 1966:265), and economically by being protected from competition by blacks for the better paying and more desirable jobs (Baran and Sweezy, 1966:264). (The history of dual labor markets and exclusive unions attest to this.) In sum, the white masses do much better overall within the system than do the black masses.

Hypothesis #3: There is more DISHARMONY OF INTEREST between the black masses and the black bourgeoisie than between the white masses and the white elite.

In order to support the internal colonial model, rather than some other racial group model, we need to demonstrate that the black bourgeoisie benefits from the exploitation of the black masses. We must determine that a bifurcation of the black community as a whole has developed which may act to impede movement toward unification within that community. This is the underlying mechanism of white control.

In summary the theory suggests that: (1) the interests of the white elite and the black bourgeoisie are in harmony; (2) the interests of the black masses and the white masses are in disharmony; and (3) there is greater disharmony of interest between the black masses and the black bourgeoisie than between the white masses and the white elite.

Methods

INCOME has been chosen as the measure of LIVING CONDITION, and thus the indicator of harmony or disharmony of interest between parties, primarily for two reasons. In the first place, Galtung himself suggests that income or standard of living is an appropriate indicator for measuring what he means by LIVING CONDITION, at least in its objective, materialistic sense. Certainly income has profound and immediate ramifications for the overall quality

and character of people's lives--where they live, what they eat, how they are educated, etc. Secondly, for our purposes, income data are relatively easy to acquire and to work with.

In order to present the data in a way that would enable us to test the hypotheses we turned to Miller's (1971:265-282) "tools of income distribution analysis." First of all, we computed aggregate income totals for each income distribution. Then we divided each aggregate income total into the proportions that accrue to each quintile of the populations involved. Tables 1 and 2 list the results of these computations for families and for persons. Tables 3 and 4 give the corresponding percentages.

For the purposes of this research, then, we can proceed to designate the bottom quintile of each distribution, according to our hypotheses, as the "white masses" or the "black masses"--for both families and persons--and the top quintile as the "white elite" or the "black bourgeoisie." This designation of the "masses" as the bottom 20 percent of the population, however, should be considered the first step in an extended analysis rather than a finalized methodological formulation, since in some cases it might be more accurate to designate the bottom three or four quintiles as the "masses."

Examining the data, in terms of these categories, we would expect Negroes in the bottom quintile of the distributions to obtain a smaller proportion of the total black

TABLE 1

AGGREGATE INCOME BY QUINTILES FOR FAMILIES

QUINTILES	1949	1959	1969	1972
<u>Whites</u>				
Bottom quintile	\$ 6,853,686,268	\$ 14,626,796,367	\$ 28,795,988,582	\$ 37,147,940,855
Second quintile	16,050,289,243	34,190,547,799	64,528,051,961	78,217,646,772
Third quintile	22,865,456,477	48,491,856,945	98,792,592,040	120,063,023,470
Fourth quintile	30,072,837,735	64,223,416,966	121,156,415,928	165,597,421,819
Top quintile	55,229,401,000	125,138,867,208	225,011,964,635	269,663,927,024
Total	131,071,670,723	286,671,485,285	538,285,013,146	670,689,959,940
<u>Negroes</u>				
Bottom quintile	\$ 343,204,843	\$ 622,580,462	\$ 1,397,941,196	\$ 2,055,456,185
Second quintile	655,521,620	1,602,998,956	3,583,389,723	4,485,779,700
Third quintile	1,046,773,355	2,645,850,252	5,936,736,495	7,217,262,473
Fourth quintile	1,677,192,768	4,082,560,259	9,083,243,846	11,745,161,642
Top quintile	3,057,822,769	7,549,315,506	15,668,265,628	20,391,629,310
Total	6,780,515,355	16,503,305,435	35,669,576,888	45,895,289,310

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 7, Table 2; Census of Population: 1950, P-C1, Table 137; Census of Population: 1960, PC(1)-1C, Table 95; Census of Population: 1970, PC(1)-C1, Table 83; Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 87, Table 2.

TABLE 2
AGGREGATE INCOME BY QUINTILES FOR PERSONS

QUINTILES	1949	1959	1969	1972
<u>White males</u>				
Bottom quintile	\$ 4,362,505,847	\$ 8,211,488,013	\$ 12,555,025,091	\$ 16,140,571,895
Second quintile	13,368,913,588	25,175,761,959	42,823,304,766	53,606,089,979
Third quintile	20,405,380,012	42,820,276,101	77,407,291,331	95,922,871,832
Fourth quintile	28,299,834,103	59,029,560,942	116,934,900,618	144,483,861,577
Top quintile	58,837,262,230	110,321,013,737	218,959,617,475	262,484,864,122
Total	125,273,895,780	245,558,100,752	468,680,139,281	572,638,259,405
<u>White females</u>				
Bottom quintile	\$ 2,025,860,639	\$ 3,114,521,139	\$ 4,392,320,470	\$ 4,756,654,847
Second quintile	2,025,860,639	3,114,521,139	10,099,136,208	12,711,335,541
Third quintile	4,785,858,961	9,460,544,394	20,688,603,003	26,064,178,651
Fourth quintile	7,600,664,021	17,518,129,760	37,129,185,814	44,815,168,116
Top quintile	15,203,325,100	32,064,021,297	75,526,346,521	85,006,441,631
Total	31,641,569,360	65,271,737,728	147,835,592,016	173,353,778,786
<u>Negro males</u>				
Bottom quintile	\$ 384,117,169	\$ 480,457,002	\$ 823,346,429	\$ 966,880,653
Second quintile	420,350,099	1,097,901,524	2,449,044,024	3,009,413,982
Third quintile	1,152,351,618	2,136,394,166	4,697,788,200	5,692,505,565
Fourth quintile	1,545,931,925	3,340,355,711	7,164,977,483	9,058,461,151
Top quintile	2,438,858,419	5,374,517,285	12,030,382,043	15,583,804,909
Total	5,941,609,230	12,429,625,688	27,165,538,179	34,311,066,260
<u>Negro females</u>				
Bottom quintile	\$ 261,068,149	\$ 388,481,448	\$ 552,657,171	\$ 626,145,941
Second quintile	261,068,149	388,481,447	1,146,173,969	1,869,653,066
Third quintile	261,068,149	573,366,969	2,212,962,295	3,099,356,894
Fourth quintile	491,521,805	1,288,620,049	3,902,108,047	5,216,203,108
Top quintile	1,097,890,750	2,763,687,659	7,698,143,758	10,292,024,241
Total	2,372,617,000	5,402,637,572	15,512,045,240	21,103,383,250

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1950, P-C1, Table 138; Census of Population: 1960, PC(1)-1C, Table 97; Census of Population: 1970, PC(1)-C1, Table 84; Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 87, Table 5.

TABLE 3
PERCENT OF TOTAL AGGREGATE INCOME BY
QUINTILES FOR FAMILIES

QUINTILE	1949	1959	1969	1972
<u>White</u>				
Bottom quintile	5.23	5.11	5.35	5.54
Second quintile	12.25	11.93	11.99	11.67
Third quintile	17.45	16.92	18.36	17.91
Fourth quintile	22.95	22.41	22.51	24.69
Top quintile	42.14	43.66	41.81	40.21
<u>Negro</u>				
Bottom quintile	5.07	3.78	3.92	4.48
Second quintile	9.67	9.72	10.05	9.78
Third quintile	15.44	16.04	16.65	15.73
Fourth quintile	24.74	24.74	25.47	25.60
Top quintile	45.10	45.75	43.93	44.43

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 7, Table 2; Census of Population: 1950, P-C1, Table 137; Census of Population: 1960, PC(1)-1C, Table 95; Census of Population: 1970, PC(1)-C1, Table 83; Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 87, Table 2.

Note: Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 4
PERCENT OF TOTAL AGGREGATE INCOME BY
QUINTILES FOR PERSONS

QUINTILES	1949	1959	1969	1972
<u>White males</u>				
Bottom quintile	3.49	3.35	2.68	2.82
Second quintile	10.68	10.26	9.14	9.37
Third quintile	16.29	17.44	16.52	16.76
Fourth quintile	22.59	24.04	24.95	25.24
Top quintile	46.97	44.93	46.72	45.84
<u>Negro males</u>				
Bottom quintile	6.47	3.87	3.03	2.82
Second quintile	7.08	8.84	9.02	8.77
Third quintile	19.40	17.19	17.30	16.59
Fourth quintile	26.02	26.88	26.38	26.40
Top quintile	41.05	43.24	44.29	45.42
<u>White females</u>				
Bottom quintile	6.41	4.78	2.98	2.75
Second quintile	6.41	4.78	6.84	7.34
Third quintile	15.13	14.50	14.00	15.04
Fourth quintile	24.03	26.84	25.12	25.86
Top quintile	48.05	49.13	51.09	49.04
<u>Negro females</u>				
Bottom quintile	11.01	7.19	3.57	2.97
Second quintile	11.01	7.19	7.39	8.86
Third quintile	11.01	10.62	14.27	14.69
Fourth quintile	20.72	23.86	25.16	24.72
Top quintile	46.28	51.16	49.63	48.77

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1950, P-C1, Table 138; Census of Population: 1960, PC(1)-1C, Table 97; Census of Population: 1970, PC(1)-C1, Table 84; Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 87, Table 5.

Note: Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

aggregate income over time--a negative trend--whereas whites in the bottom quintile should receive a larger proportion of white aggregate income--a positive trend. This would suggest that their interests are in conflict.

Negroes in the top quintile of the distributions should receive a larger proportion of the total black aggregate income over time, while whites in the top quintile should get a smaller proportion of total white income. Their interests are in harmony, however, because Negroes in the top quintile actually represent no threat to the dominant position of whites in the top quintile. Indeed, a decline in the relative percentage of total aggregate income going to whites in the top quintile corresponds, in actual dollars, to an enormous increase in wealth as displayed in the actual aggregate income figures. In addition, it is in this category--the top quintile of whites--where the poorest reporting of income and the general obfuscation of income occurs.³

Finally, adding the above together, Negroes in the bottom quintile of the distributions should receive a declining proportion of total black income in relation to Negroes in the top quintile, and whites in the bottom quintile should receive an increasing proportion of the total white income relative to whites in the top quintile. In other words, there should be greater inequality in the distribution of income among Negroes than among whites over time.

Tables 5 and 6 record the approximate dollar amounts which signify cutoff points for each quintile of the distributions⁴, allowing us to get a sense of the actual size of the income differences between whites and blacks at particular quintiles. For example, the cutoff figure of \$8946 for the top quintile of Negro males in 1972 is less than the cutoff figure of \$9453 for white males at the fourth quintile in 1972. This data allows us to specify who it is that we are talking about when we refer to the "black bourgeoisie" in 1972--in the case of Negro males, those with income above \$8946.

We examine income data for PERSONS as well as families, due to certain biases inherent in using family income data alone.

Family units at any given time vary greatly in the number of persons that compose them, in number of earners, and in the amount of doubling up (the combination of young married couples or of the elderly with family heads in the prime of life). Moreover, family structures vary as between nonwhites and whites. Family structures also vary over time for both nonwhites and whites (Wohlstetter and Coleman, 1972:9-10).

We include data on males AND females both to explore the impact of sex discrimination on income levels and to better understand disparities in family income trends.

. . . nonwhite to white income ratios are higher for women than for men. Thus, among nonwhites, men have higher incomes than women, but the difference is smaller than that between white men and women (Wohlstetter and Coleman, 1972:17-18).

TABLE 5
 ACTUAL INCOME CUTOFF FIGURES
 SEPARATING QUINTILES OF FAMILIES

QUINTILES	1949	1959	1969	1972
<u>White</u>				
Bottom from				
second quintiles	\$1700	\$3151	\$ 5368	\$ 6164
Second from				
third quintiles	2774	5107	8536	9852
Third from				
fourth quintiles	3731	6771	11,752	13,549
Fourth from				
top quintiles	5196	9260	16,158	20,033
<u>Negro</u>				
Bottom from				
second quintiles	648	1273	2598	3132
Second from				
third quintiles	1319	2495	4859	5419
Third from				
fourth quintiles	2023	3902	7385	8451
Fourth from				
top quintiles	2905	5843	11,232	13,360

Source: cf. Table 1 for source of data.

TABLE 6
ACTUAL INCOME CUTOFF FIGURES SEPARATING
QUINTILES OF PERSONS

QUINTILES	1949	1959	1969	1972
<u>White males</u>				
Bottom from				
second quintiles	\$1046	\$1572	\$ 2179	\$ 2761
Second from				
third quintiles	2139	3484	5333	6157
Third from				
fourth quintiles	3029	5118	8068	9453
Fourth from				
top quintiles	4016	6899	11,951	13,791
<u>White females</u>				
Bottom from				
second quintiles	432	493	741	860
Second from				
third quintiles	863	986	1700	1936
Third from				
fourth quintiles	1522	2064	3247	3602
Fourth from				
top quintiles	2407	3520	5377	6086
<u>Negro males</u>				
Bottom from				
second quintiles	512	737	1332	1518
Second from				
third quintiles	1031	1699	3124	3621
Third from				
fourth quintiles	1683	2824	5111	5926
Fourth from				
top quintiles	2479	4232	7412	8946
<u>Negro females</u>				
Bottom from				
second quintiles	281	362	684	993
Second from				
third quintiles	562	725	1519	1877
Third from				
fourth quintiles	843	1221	2729	3202
Fourth from				
top quintiles	1433	2276	4529	5366

Source: cf. Table 2 for source of data.

Male income data alone, therefore, does not permit us to generalize adequately to the population at large.

By analyzing the entire distributions, moreover, particularly the polar ends rather than simply averages of the distributions such as means or medians, we are able to avoid overly optimistic conclusions about relative nonwhite income trends. For instance, by looking at the data on median income trends for white and nonwhite families in Table 7 we would conclude that nonwhites are making steady and substantial gains in income relative to whites.⁵

This obscures what is happening at either end of the distributions, however. At the lower end, income maintenance programs have tended "to put at least a low floor under nonwhite as well as white income and so to raise low-level nonwhite relative to low-level white income" (Wohlstetter and Coleman, 1972:13). Whereas, at the top of the distributions, nonwhites have encountered an income ceiling, due to particularly harsh discrimination against them for higher paying jobs, "that is hard to penetrate" (Wohlstetter and Coleman, 1972:15).

Since our data is for the conterminous United States, our results are not biased as a result of internal migration patterns of whites and nonwhites - especially blacks moving from the south to the north. It would be useful, nonetheless, to attempt to corroborate this research with a similar analysis, using data from metropolitan areas where blacks in recent years have tended to congregate.

TABLE 7
INCOME OF WHITE AND NONWHITE FAMILIES
IN 1969 DOLLARS

Year	Median income		Ratio of nonwhite to white
	White families	Nonwhite families	
1947	\$5194	\$2660	.51
1959	7106	3661	.52
1961	7361	3913	.53
1963	7841	4165	.53
1965	8424	4666	.55
1967	9086	5641	.62
1969	9794	6191	.63

Source: Reynolds Farley and Albert Hermalin, "The 1960's:
A Decade of Progress for Blacks?" Demography,
Volume 9, Number 3 (8-72), Table 1.

Finally, one further qualification bearing on this analysis involves the choice of years from which the data has been drawn. It seems that Negro income undergoes rather extreme fluctuations at different points in the business cycle; much more so than does white income.

The greater cyclical instability of nonwhite income is related to the fact that during the business cycle, in general, wages fluctuate most, the general run of salaries less, and professional and executive salaries least . . . , and nonwhite income has a disproportionately large share of some of the sorts of earnings that fluctuate most widely (Wohlstetter and Coleman, 1972:21).

As a result, our use of Census data from 1949, 1959, and 1969 suffers from the impact of recessions during those years.

This is not true for the data from 1972 which was not a recession year. We will assume, then, that since our primary concern is with general relative trends over the entire 22 year span from 1950 to 1972, short term fluctuations in income received by blacks are less important. Our description of the RATE of black income gains, however, may be somewhat overly optimistic. It would again be useful to check our results against data from periods of economic expansion.

Data

The data used in this research has been drawn from the following sources: U.S. CENSUS OF POPULATION:1950, DETAILED CHARACTERISTICS, U.S. SUMMARY (p. 297); U.S.

CENSUS OF POPULATION:1960, GENERAL SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS, U.S. SUMMARY (p. 226); U.S. CENSUS OF POPULATION:1970, GENERAL SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS, U.S. SUMMARY (pp. 377-379); U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, CURRENT POPULATION REPORTS, Series P-60, No. 7 (p. 20); and U.S. Bureau of the Census, CURRENT POPULATION REPORTS, Series P-60, No. 87 (pp. 3-5).

In essence, what we are concerned with are the income distributions, by "total money income",⁶ of families and persons--male and female--divided according to race, for the conterminous United States. In most cases we will be comparing "whites" with "Negroes". Although since the Census did not publish data for "Negro" families in either 1950 or 1960 we will substitute data for "nonwhite" families in these two cases.⁷

While acknowledging the problems of error in Census data,⁸ we will assume that the data is adequate for our purposes. On the whole, the data seems to "understate everyone's dollar income and overstate the Negro's relative position" (Batchelder, 1964:530). Assuming that this is consistent over time, it will not seriously affect our results since we will be looking more for relative trends than actual dollar inequalities.

Finally, in addition to the above, selected data from secondary sources will be included in the analysis.

Analysis of Data

To summarize briefly, our hypotheses predict:

(1) a divergence over time in the proportion of total aggregate income accruing to whites and to Negroes in the bottom quintile--the percentage for whites will increase; the percentage for Negroes will decrease; (2) a convergence over time in the proportion of total aggregate income accruing to whites and to Negroes in the top quintiles--the percentage for Negroes will increase; the percentage for whites will decrease; and (3) greater inequality in the overall distribution of total aggregate income among Negroes than among whites over time.

The information in Table 8 by and large tends to support the predicted trends for hypotheses 1 and 2. The percentage of total aggregate income accruing to white families in the bottom quintile increased from 5.23 percent in 1949 to 5.54 percent in 1972; while for Negro families, the percentage of total aggregate income accruing to the bottom quintile actually declined from 5.07 percent in 1949 to 4.48 percent in 1972. This is the case in spite of the increase in transfer payments to Negro families in those years.

In the top quintile, likewise, the percentage of total aggregate income received by white families declined from 42.14 percent in 1949 to 40.21 percent in 1972. However, the percentage of total aggregate income received

TABLE 8
PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL FAMILY AGGREGATE
INCOME, NEGRO TO WHITE

QUINTILE	1949	1959	1969	1972
Bottom quintile				
Whites	5.23	5.11	5.35	5.54
Negroes	5.07	3.78	3.85	4.48
Negroes to whites	97%	74%	72%	81%
Top quintile				
Whites	42.14	43.66	41.81	40.21
Negroes	45.10	45.75	43.99	44.43
Negroes to whites	107%	105%	106%	111%

Source: cf. Table 1 for source of data.

by Negro families in the top quintile also declined from 45.10 percent in 1949 to 44.43 percent in 1972. The growth quintile appears, instead, to be the fourth quintile, where the percentage of total aggregate income received increased from 24.74 percent in 1949 to 25.60 percent in 1972. If the percentages for the top two quintiles are added together, the predicted trend results: there is an increase from 69.84 percent in 1949 to 70.03 percent in 1972.

When the percentage of total aggregate income received by Negro families in the top and bottom quintiles is compared to the percentages of total aggregate income received by whites in those quintiles, the predicted relative trends appear. The ratio of the percentage of Negro to white family income in the bottom quintile declines from 97 percent in 1949 to 81 percent in 1972, and in the top quintile it increases from 107 percent to 111 percent.⁹ Thus even though the percentage of total aggregate income decreased somewhat for the top quintile of Negro families, it decreased more rapidly for the top fifth of white families.

Table 9 gives the corresponding income trends for persons. The trends for Negro males in both the bottom and top quintiles, and for white males in the top quintile, run as expected. The percentage of total aggregate income accruing to Negro males in the bottom quintile declined from 6.47 percent in 1949 to 2.82 percent in 1972, and

TABLE 9
PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL AGGREGATE INCOME
FOR PERSONS, NEGRO TO WHITE

QUINTILE	1949	1959	1969	1972
<u>MALES</u>				
Bottom quintile				
Whites	3.49	3.35	2.68	2.82
Negroes	6.47	3.87	3.03	2.82
Negroes to whites	186%	116%	113%	100%
Top quintile				
Whites	46.97	44.93	46.72	45.84
Negroes	41.05	43.24	44.29	45.42
Negroes to whites	88%	97%	95%	99%
<u>FEMALES</u>				
Bottom quintile				
Whites	6.41	4.78	2.98	2.75
Negroes	11.01	7.19	3.57	2.97
Negroes to whites	172%	151%	120%	108%
Top quintiles				
Whites	48.05	49.13	51.09	49.04
Negroes	46.28	51.16	49.63	48.77
Negroes to whites	97%	105%	98%	100%

Source: cf. Table 2 for source of data.

increased from 41.05 percent in 1949 to 45.42 percent in 1972 in the top quintile. For white males in the top quintile the percentage declined from 46.97 percent in 1949 to 45.84 percent in 1972.

The trend for white males in the bottom quintile, however, is reversed. This group's share of total white income declined from 3.49 percent in 1949 to 2.82 percent in 1972. Indeed, there is no growth in the percentage of total aggregate income accruing to white males until the third and fourth quintiles--16.29 percent in 1949 to 16.76 percent in 1972 in the third quintile, and 22.59 percent to 25.24 percent in the fourth quintile--or between the actual dollar cutoff points (see Table 6) of \$6157 and \$13,791. This suggests that white male aggregate income is being redistributed largely within the middle income groups rather than among poor whites. It would be most interesting to determine the characteristics of white males who are in the bottom two quintiles--age, occupation, industry, and residence--and what potential they might imply for forming coalitions with poor blacks.

The data for females in Table 9 is also problematic. The trends for Negro females in both the bottom and top quintiles run as predicted--a sharp decrease at the bottom, and an increase at the top. However, neither trend for white females support our hypotheses. The percentage of total aggregate income received by white women in the bottom quintile declined from 6.41 percent in

1949 and 2.75 percent in 1972, and increased from 48.05 percent to 49.04 percent in the top quintile.

Overall, there seems to be a convergence between white and Negro females in terms of the percentage of total aggregate income received by each quintile of the distributions. There also seems to be a closing of the gap in the absolute dollar cutoff figures for quintiles (see Table 6). Thus their relative income performances seem to be correlated much more closely than those of white and Negro men, where the gap remains relatively constant.

Again, however, when we compare the percentage of total aggregate income received by Negro males and females in both the top and bottom quintiles with the corresponding percentage of total aggregate income received by white males and females in both the top and bottom quintiles, the expected trends result.

Tables 10 and 11 duplicate the procedures that were used in Tables 8 and 9. However, instead of using PERCENTAGES of total aggregate income that are relative to each racial group in order to compare the groups, they use ACTUAL aggregate income figures. In other words, they compare the groups DIRECTLY with one another on the basis of actual dollar incomes rather than merely relative percentages.

It is interesting to note that all of the predicted trends--declining Negro to white percentages at the bottom quintile, increasing Negro to white percentages at the top

TABLE 10

DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL FAMILY AGGREGATE INCOME, NEGRO TO WHITE

QUINTILE	1949	1959	1969	1972
Bottom quintile				
Whites	\$ 6,853,686,268	\$ 14,626,796,367	\$ 28,795,988,582	\$ 37,147,940,855
Negroes	343,204,843	622,580,462	1,595,566,793	2,055,456,185
Negroes to whites	5.0%	4.3%	5.6%	5.6%
Top quintile				
Whites	55,229,401,000	125,138,867,208	225,011,964,635	269,663,927,024
Negroes	3,057,822,769	7,549,315,506	18,234,317,411	20,391,629,310
Negroes to whites	5.6%	6.1%	8.1%	7.6%

Source: cf. Table 1 for source of data.

TABLE 11

DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL AGGREGATE INCOME FOR PERSONS, NEGRO TO WHITE

QUINTILE	1949	1959	1969	1972
MALES				
Bottom quintile				
Whites	\$ 4,362,505,847	\$ 8,211,488,013	\$ 12,555,025,091	\$ 16,140,571,895
Negroes	384,117,169	480,457,002	823,346,429	966,880,653
Negroes to whites	8.8%	5.9%	6.6%	6.0%
Top quintile				
Whites	58,837,262,230	110,321,013,737	218,959,617,475	262,484,864,122
Negroes	2,438,858,419	5,374,517,285	12,030,382,043	15,583,804,909
Negroes to whites	4.2%	4.9%	5.5%	6.0%
FEMALES				
Bottom quintile				
Whites	2,025,860,639	3,114,521,139	4,392,320,470	4,756,654,847
Negroes	261,068,149	388,481,448	552,657,171	626,145,941
Negroes to whites	12.9%	12.5%	12.6%	13.2%
Top quintile				
Whites	15,203,325,100	32,064,021,297	75,526,346,521	85,006,441,631
Negroes	1,097,890,750	2,763,687,659	7,698,143,758	10,292,024,241
Negroes to whites	7.3%	8.7%	10.2%	12.1%

Source: cf. Table 2 for source of data.

quintile--occur, except those for families and females in the bottom quintile. In the bottom quintile Negro family aggregate income as a percentage of white family aggregate income increases from 5 percent in 1949 to 5.6 percent in 1972. Negro female aggregate income as a percentage of white female aggregate income in the bottom quintile also increases from 12.9 percent in 1949 to 13.2 percent in 1972. The latter trend accounts for the former since the decline in Negro male aggregate income relative to white male aggregate income is canceled out by the relative increase in Negro female income. Negro females, then, appear to be moving toward equality with white females in terms of their distribution of income.¹⁰

This implies that the internal colonial model, at least as we have outlined it, fails to adequately explain either the position of white or Negro women in the society. It may be that a class model, or something similar to it (see footnote number 1), offers a better explanation of their inferior position relative to men. At any rate, sex rather than race appears to be the more important variable in explaining the status of women.

Finally, Tables 12 through 15 deal with hypothesis number 3--that there is greater inequality in the distribution of total aggregate income among blacks than among whites. Tables 12 and 13, in particular, compare the bottom quintile of whites with the top quintile of whites, and the bottom quintile of Negroes with the top quintile of

TABLE 12
INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL FAMILY
AGGREGATE INCOME, FOR NEGROES AND WHITES

QUINTILE	1949	1959	1969	1972
Bottom quintile of whites	5.23	5.11	5.35	5.54
Top quintile of whites	42.14	43.66	41.81	40.21
Bottom to top	12.5%	11.7%	12.8%	13.8%
Bottom quintile of Negroes	5.07	3.78	3.85	4.48
Top quintile of Negroes	45.10	45.75	43.99	44.43
Bottom to top	11.3%	8.3%	8.8%	10.1%

Source: cf. Table 1 for source of data.

TABLE 13
INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL AGGREGATE
INCOME FOR PERSONS, NEGROES AND WHITES

QUINTILES	1949	1959	1969	1972
<u>MALES</u>				
Bottom quintile of whites	3.49	3.35	2.68	2.82
Top quintile of whites	46.97	44.93	46.72	45.84
Bottom to top	7.5%	7.5%	5.8%	6.2%
Bottom quintile of Negroes	6.47	3.87	3.03	2.82
Top quintile of Negroes	41.05	43.24	44.29	45.42
Bottom to top	15.8%	9.0%	6.9%	6.2%
<u>FEMALES</u>				
Bottom quintile of whites	6.41	4.78	2.98	2.75
Top quintile of whites	48.05	49.13	51.09	49.04
Bottom to top	13.4%	9.8%	5.9%	5.6%
Bottom quintile of Negroes	11.01	7.19	3.57	2.97
Top quintile of Negroes	46.28	51.16	49.63	48.77
Bottom to top	23.8%	14.1%	7.2%	6.1%

Source: cf. Table 2 for source of data.

Negroes, for families and persons, in an attempt to measure internal inequality within the distributions. In all cases, we would expect the relative percentages for whites to increase over time. That is, the percentage of total aggregate income accruing to the bottom quintile of whites should increase relative to the percentage of total aggregate income accruing to the top quintile. We would likewise expect the relative percentages for Negroes to decrease. Negroes in the bottom quintile should receive a smaller percentage of total aggregate income relative to those in the top quintile.

The predicted trends occur in all cases except those for white males and white females; there the expected trends are reversed. This suggests again that there is a substantial group of poor whites who are not adequately incorporated into our model. We cannot tell, of course, from income data alone, who these people actually are--whether they are aged, disabled, or whatever. We can say, however, according to Table 6, that they are white men with incomes less than \$2761 and white women with incomes less than \$860 in 1972.

Tables 14 and 15 provide Gini coefficients of income inequality for the various distributions.¹¹ According to our hypothesis, we would expect the coefficients to be smaller for whites and to decrease over time; whereas for Negroes, the reverse should be true--they should be larger

TABLE 14
GINI COEFFICIENTS OF INCOME INEQUALITY
FOR FAMILIES

RACE	1949	1959	1969	1972
White	.363	.377	.355	.353
Negro	.400	.423	.407	.407

Source: cf. Table 1 for source of data.

TABLE 15
GINI COEFFICIENTS OF INCOME INEQUALITY
FOR PERSONS

RACE	1949	1959	1969	1972
<u>MALES</u>				
Whites	.426	.410	.449	.445
Negroes	.373	.409	.424	.436
<u>FEMALES</u>				
Whites	.441	.467	.492	.468
Negroes	.349	.445	.472	.454

Source: cf. Table 2 for source of data.

and increase over time. These trends do, in fact, hold in the case of both white and Negro families.

However, in the case of persons the results are ambiguous. The coefficients for both white males and females are substantially higher than those for Negro males and females in 1949--.426 for white males and .441 for white females compared to .373 for Negro males and .349 for Negro females--and they increase over time. Yet when the rates of increase are considered, the actual amount of increase in the coefficient for Negro males from 1949 to 1972 is more than three times the amount of increase for white males, and the amount of increase in the coefficient for Negro females is nearly four times the amount of increase for white females.

With the result, by 1972 Negro male and female coefficients are nearly equal those of white males and females. Perhaps the movement of significant numbers of male and female Negroes into the middle-class during this period has much to do with the increase in overall inequality among Negro persons as reflected in these coefficient trends.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The results of this research, then, tend to support the hypotheses, with some significant exceptions. The comparative data trends run generally as expected for both white and Negro families and white and Negro males. Negro families in the bottom quintile of the population received proportionally less of Negro total aggregate income over time than white families in the bottom quintile received of white total aggregate income, and proportionally more of Negro total aggregate income in the top quintile over time than white families received of white total aggregate income. In addition, Negro families displayed greater, and increasing, internal inequality in the distribution of total aggregate income than white families.

Negro males, likewise, received a declining proportion of Negro total aggregate income at the bottom quintile and an increasing proportion of Negro total aggregate income at the top quintile, relative to the proportions of white total aggregate income that white males at the bottom and top quintiles received over time. Moreover, the rate of increase in internal inequality was more than three times as great for Negro males as for white males.

The comparative data trends for females, however, reflect somewhat different patterns. Negro women, it seems, moved closer to full equality with white women over the 22 year period from 1949 to 1972 in terms of their overall proportional distribution of total aggregate income, and, more importantly, in terms of their actual amount of total aggregate income--the total aggregate income for Negro females in 1972 was \$21,103,383,250, or 12.2 percent of the total aggregate income for white women (see footnote number 10).

These findings are corroborated by Batchelder (1964), Wohlstetter and Coleman (1972), and Farley and Hermalin (1972). Ashenfelter (1970:429) suggests that these relative income gains by Negro women may be due primarily to their movement into clerical occupations where most of the better-paid white women are located. On the other hand, Batchelder (1964:533) contends that the relative gains in Negro female income may be in part a result of the "decline in the income ratio between white women and white men." They all agree, nevertheless, that the relative income gains of Negro women have not been matched by corresponding gains for Negro men.

Finally, there appear from the data to be a substantial number of whites--the bottom two quintiles for males and at least the bottom quintile for females--who are receiving a declining percentage of total white aggregate income. (As we pointed out above, inequality in the distribution of

total aggregate income is also increasing for whites, only at a slower rate than for Negroes.) This, on the surface at least, is inconsistent with our hypotheses, and suggests that political coalitions might be formed between these poor whites and poor blacks in an effort to obtain an increased share of the wealth. However, the psychological advantages of being white in the colonial context may well outweigh the disadvantages of increasing relative inequality.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY

What this paper has attempted to do is empirically test the internal colonial model of American race relations by formalizing it in terms of Galtung's framework. In the process of doing this we formulated the following hypotheses: (1) there is HARMONY OF INTEREST between the white elite and the black bourgeoisie; (2) there is DISHARMONY OF INTEREST between the black masses and the white masses; and (3) there is more DISHARMONY OF INTEREST between the black masses and the black bourgeoisie than between the white masses and the white elite.

In order to test these hypotheses, we, first of all, designated "level of INCOME" as an indicator of INTEREST. Second, we computed aggregate income totals for the distributions of white and Negro families and persons for 1950, 1960, 1970, and 1972. And finally, we divided these aggregate income totals into the proportions that accrued to each of the quintiles of the distributions.

We then identified the bottom quintile in each distribution as either the white masses or the black masses, and the top quintile as either the white elite or the black bourgeoisie. Our prediction was that over time the trends

in the relative percentage of total aggregate income accruing to whites and to Negroes in the bottom quintile would diverge--whites getting more, Negroes getting less--and in the top quintile would converge--Negroes getting more, whites getting less. We also predicted that the overall distribution of total aggregate income among quintiles would become more unequal over time for Negroes and less unequal over time for whites.

The results of the research tend to support the hypotheses, particularly those trends dealing with families and males. However, Negro females seem to have made significant progress in raising their income levels relative to white females. Thus, perhaps a class model, or something similar, would make more sense of the relatively inferior position of ALL women in the society in relationship to men than does the internal colonial model.

Nevertheless, these relative gains by Negro women were not matched by relative gains for Negro men. In some cases, their position relative to white males actually declined.

There were, in addition, a sizable portion of whites whose relative position declined also--particularly those in the bottom quintiles. This obviously contradicts our hypotheses; however, it is hard to determine what effect it actually has on the internal colonial model since there are various psychological advantages gained even by poor whites in the colonial situation which may supersede the

disadvantages of being poor--at least to the extent of inhibiting the formation of political coalitions between poor whites and poor blacks. This is worthy of further consideration and research.

It would be useful to undertake additional research on indicators other than income in an effort to corroborate the general findings of this study. This might take the form, for example, of examining data for other factors that contribute significantly to one's sense of the quality of life - health statistics, housing statistics, etc. Or, equally important, it might involve an investigation of the structure of political control that dominates the ghetto - what are the possibilities for community control, for instance, when resources are allocated primarily at the level of the nation-state.

Additional research might profitably be directed toward examining the distribution of whites and blacks by occupation and by industry in an effort to determine the nature of the mechanisms which underlie the above trends in the distribution of income.

All of this research - not to mention the examination of race as a factor in international stratification - will be both useful and necessary if one is to adequately understand the oppression of blacks in the United States and to engage in meaningful activity to eliminate that oppression. It is hoped that in some small way this paper will serve that effort.

FOOTNOTES

1. This is a precursor to the contemporary literature on "marginal underclasses."

Marginal underclasses, then, are those populations that have not been integrated, or have been integrated under highly disadvantageous conditions, into the institutions of society, but are not located in what will be termed "regionally based internal colonies" or of allegedly "inferior" racial or cultural origins. Categorized by the character of participation in the economy, these include the hard-core unemployed, those employed in low-wage sectors of the urban economy operating with labor-intensive technologies, and, the most important category, those whose skills are superfluous to a technologically geared society. A marginal underclass would include some but not all of the aged and those deprived of regular or above-subsistence income because of physical or mental incapacity (Johnson, 1972:276).

2. This dependency underlies much of the literature on Black Capitalism. For example, see Theodore L. Cross, Black Capitalism: Strategy for Businesses in the Ghetto (New York: Atheneum, 1969); William F. Haddad and G. Douglas Pugh, Black Economic Development (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969); Earl Ofari, The Myth of Black Capitalism (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1970).
3. The most important effect of this underreporting of income by whites in the top quintile, for our purposes, is that it tends to overrate the income gains of Negroes in the top quintile. Nevertheless, even with our data (see Table 5) the gap between the actual income cutoff figures for white and Negro families in the top quintile in 1972, \$20,033 for whites as compared to \$13,360 for Negroes, is striking. It should also be noted that Census data tends to underrepresent the poorest ghetto males, and thus the situation of poor blacks in the United States may be more serious than our analysis suggests.

4. The figures were computed using the procedures outlined by Herman P. Miller, Rich Man, Poor Man (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1971), pp. 272-273. Once the ratio of percentages were obtained for dividing the distributions into quintiles, the top percentage of each ratio was multiplied by the actual size of the corresponding income category--\$1000, \$5000, etc.--to determine an actual income cutoff figure.
5. Similar data for white and nonwhite males can be found in Richard C. Edwards, Michael Reich, and Thomas E. Weisskopf, The Capitalist System (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972), p. 289.
6. This includes "earnings plus rental income, interest, dividends, and transfer payments of all sorts such as welfare, social security, alimony, and others" (Wohlstetter and Coleman, 1972:8-9).
7. In 1960, 94 percent of those classified as "nonwhite" by the Census identified themselves as Negroes.
8. A good discussion of this problem is U.S. Bureau of the Census, Income Distribution in the United States, by Herman P. Miller (A 1960 Census Monograph). U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1966, pp. 169-212. When Census data from 1950 and 1960 was compared with Office of Business Economics estimates--considered quite accurate because they are based on data from "business and governmental sources including industrial and population censuses, employees' wage reports under the Social Security program, and records of disbursements to individuals by governmental agencies" (p. 172)--Miller found that there was

very close agreement for wages and salaries but evidence of substantial underreporting of income other than earnings in the census. In the 1950 Census, the wage and salary aggregate amounted to 97 percent. The 1950 Census estimate of income other than earnings, on the other hand, amounted to only 54 percent of the OBE estimate; for 1960 it was 62 percent.
9. This does not mean that Negro families in the top quintile in 1972 received 111 percent of the ACTUAL income of white families in that quintile. Rather, Negro families in that quintile received 44.43 percent of the total aggregate income accruing to "Negroes". White families in that quintile received 40.21 percent of total aggregate income accruing to "whites". When these PERCENTAGES are compared to one another, the

Negro percentage of total aggregate income is 111 percent of the white percentage of total aggregate income.

10. The growth in Negro female total aggregate income relative to white female total aggregate income offers additional evidence.

	<u>White females</u>	<u>Negro females</u>	<u>Negro/White</u>
1949	31,641,569,360	2,372,617,000	7.5%
1959	65,271,737,728	5,402,637,572	8.3%
1969	147,835,592,016	15,512,045,240	10.5%
1972	173,353,778,786	21,103,383,250	12.2%

This is in contrast to the corresponding data for families and males.

	<u>White families</u>	<u>Negro families</u>	<u>Negro/White</u>
1949	131,071,670,723	6,780,515,355	5.2%
1959	286,671,485,285	16,503,305,435	5.8%
1969	538,285,013,146	35,669,576,888	6.7%
1972	670,689,959,940	45,895,289,310	6.9%

	<u>White males</u>	<u>Negro males</u>	<u>Negro/White</u>
1949	125,273,895,780	5,941,609,230	4.8%
1959	245,558,100,752	12,429,625,688	5.1%
1969	468,680,139,281	27,165,538,179	5.8%
1972	572,638,259,405	34,311,066,260	6.0%

These figures do not control for differences in PROPORTIONS of whites and Negroes who receive income. When those proportions are standardized, the percentages of Negro female to white female total aggregate income are 6.2% in 1949, 7.3% in 1959, 9.8% in 1969, and 11.2% in 1972.

11. The Gini coefficient is a tool for measuring inequality within a distribution--in our case, an income distribution. The coefficient ranges from 0 to 1, with 0 representing perfect equality and 1 representing absolute inequality. It is calculated with the use of a Lorenz Curve. See Herman P. Miller, Rich Man, Poor Man (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1971), pp. 274-276.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Allen, Robert L.
1969 Black Awakening in Capitalist America. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
- Ashenfelter, Orley
1970 "Changes in labor market discrimination over time." The Journal of Human Resources (Fall): 403-430.
- Baran, Paul A. and Paul M. Sweezy
1966 Monopoly Capital. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Baron, Harold M. and Bennett Hymer
1971 "The dynamics of the dual labor market." Pp. 94-101 in David M. Gordon (ed.), Problems in Political Economy: An Urban Perspective. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Batchelder, Alan
1964 "Decline in the relative income of negro men." Quarterly Journal of Economics 78 (November): 525:548.
- Blauner, Robert
1969 "Internal colonialism and ghetto revolt." Social Problems (Spring):393-408.
- 1972 Racial Oppression in America. New York: Harper and Row.
- Bluestone, Barry
1971 "The characteristics of marginal industries." Pp. 102-107 in David M. Gordon (ed.), Problems in Political Economy: An Urban Perspective. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Carmichael, Stokely and Charles V. Hamilton
1967 Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America. New York: Random House.

- Clark, Kenneth
1965 Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power. New York: Harper and Row.
- Cross, Theodore L.
1969 Black Capitalism: Strategy for Businesses in the Ghetto. New York: Atheneum.
- Cruse, Harold
1968 Rebellion or Revolution?. New York: William Morrow.
- David, Wilfred L.
1973 "Black America in Development Perspective, Part I." Review of Black Political Economy (Winter):89-104.
- DuBois, W. E. Burghardt
1961 The Souls of Black Folk. Greenwich, Connecticut: Fawcett Publications.
- Edwards, Richard C., Michael Reich, and Thomas E. Weisskopf
1972 The Capitalist System. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Farley, Reynolds and Albert Hermalin
1972 "The 1960's: a decade of progress for blacks?" Demography (August):353-369.
- Franklin, Raymond S. and Solomin Resnik
1973 The Political Economy of Racism. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Galtung, Johan
1971 "A structural theory of imperialism." Journal of Peace Research. No. 2:81-117.
- Haddad, William F. and G. Douglas Pugh
1969 Black Economic Development. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Johnson, Dale L.
1972 "On oppressed classes." Pp. 269-301 in James D. Cockcroft, André Gunder Frank, and Dale L. Johnson, Dependence and Underdevelopment: Latin America's Political Economy. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company.
- McKee, James B.
1970 "Sociology and race relations: the failure of a perspective." Paper read at a meeting of the Ohio Valley Sociological Society. May, 1970.

- Metzger, L. Paul
1971 "American sociology and black assimilation: conflicting perspectives." American Journal of Sociology (January):627-646.
- Miller, Herman P.
1971 Rich Man, Poor Man. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.
- Ofari, Earl
1970 The Myth of Black Capitalism. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Piore, Michael
1971 "The dual labor market: theory and implications." Pp. 90-94 in David M. Gordon (ed.), Problems in Political Economy: An Urban Perspective. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Tabb, William K.
1970 The Political Economy of the Black Ghetto. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census
1951 Current Population Reports. Series P-60, No. 7. "Income of families and persons in the United States: 1949."
1953 U.S. Census of Population: 1950. Vol. II, Characteristics of the Population. Part 1, United States Summary. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
1964 U.S. Census of Population: 1960. Vol. 1, Characteristics of the Population. Part 1, United States Summary. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
1966 Income Distribution in the United States, by Herman P. Miller (A 1960 Census Monograph). U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
1970 U.S. Census of Population: 1970. General Social and Economic Characteristics. Final Report PC(1)-C1. United States Summary.
1973 Current Population Reports. Series P-60, No. 87. "Money income in 1972 of families and persons in the United States."

Wohlstetter, Albert and Sinclair Coleman
1972 "Race differences in income," Pp. 3-81 in
Anthony Pascal (ed.), Racial Discrimination in
Economic Life. Lexington, Massachusetts:
D.C. Heath and Company.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293102204918