

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Barr, William: Files
Folder Title: Civil Rights – General – 1982 (1)
Box: 3

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>



Department of Justice

*file
Civil Rights*

TESTIMONY OF

WM. BRADFORD REYNOLDS
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEPARATION OF POWERS
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
UNITED STATES SENATE

CONCERNING

DESEGREGATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

OCTOBER 16, 1981



Thank you for inviting me to testify on the critically important subject of school desegregation. Few contemporary domestic issues command as much public attention as the question of how this Administration and this Congress plan to respond to the problem of unconstitutional racial segregation of our public schools. Virtually everyone, I believe, agrees with the ultimate objective -- that is, complete eradication of state-imposed racial segregation. Moreover, we all probably can agree that the achievement of this objective is central to the constitutional promise of equal protection of the laws.

In recent years, however, we have witnessed growing public disenchantment with some of the remedies used to accomplish the constitutional imperative of eliminating racial discrimination in public schooling. The hearings being conducted by this Subcommittee underscore an increased public awareness of the need to develop enlightened and forward-looking school desegregation remedies and to eliminate those techniques which have in too many instances proved ineffective, and even counterproductive, in the past.

To this end, this Subcommittee is currently considering several bills dealing with the subject of school desegregation. While the remedial formulas contained in these bills differ in a number of respects -- both in terms of the procedural approach suggested and in terms of the substantive relief contemplated -- all sound the same theme: compulsory busing

of students in order to achieve racial balance in the public schools is not an acceptable remedy.

As a matter of Administration policy, this theme has been endorsed by the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of Education, the Attorney General, and me. The Administration is thus clearly and unequivocally on record as opposing the use of mandatory transportation of students as an element of relief in future school desegregation cases. Stating our opposition to compelled busing, however, is but a starting point in developing just and sound policies to achieve the central aim of school desegregation -- equal education opportunity. If mandatory busing is not an acceptable tool with which to combat unconstitutional racial segregation of our public schools, it is incumbent upon all branches of government to develop reasonable and meaningful alternatives designed to remove remaining state-enforced racial barriers to open student enrollment and to ensure equal education opportunity for all, without regard to race, color or ethnic origin.

It is in the area of developing just such meaningful alternative approaches, to accomplish to the fullest extent practicable the desegregation of unconstitutionally segregated public schools, that we at the Department of Justice have been concentrating our attention in recent months. Since this Subcommittee is engaged in much the same effort through the legislative process, I am pleased to have this opportunity

to share with you the thoughts and tentative conclusions resulting from our analysis to date.

Let me note at the outset that my remarks today are directed only to the policy considerations raised by the several bills currently before this Subcommittee. Other questions have been raised regarding the constitutionality of legislation that seeks to restrict the jurisdictional authority of federal courts to order certain relief. Those complex constitutional issues are being carefully scrutinized by the Department of Justice. Because that review has not yet been completed, I will, for the present, place to one side all discussion relating to the constitutional implications of the several bills in question, and turn my attention solely to the remedial considerations under development by this Administration to vindicate the constitutional and statutory requirements of equal education opportunity. I hope that this Subcommittee will find the Administration's analysis -- and the policies borne of that analysis -- useful in its consideration of appropriate legislation in this area.

The Department's responsibility in the field of school desegregation derives from Titles IV, VI and IX of the Civil Rights Acts of 1964, as well as the Equal Education Opportunity Act of 1974. It is important to emphasize that these statutes do not authorize the Department of Justice to formulate education policy. Nor could they, for under our federal

system, primary responsibility for formulating and implementing education policies is constitutionally reserved to the states and their local school boards. In carrying out this responsibility, however, the states cannot transgress constitutional bounds, and the Department's basic mission under these federal statutes, a mission to which this Administration is fully committed, is to enforce the constitutional right of all children in public schools to be provided an equal education opportunity, without regard to race, color or ethnic origin.

In discussing with you the particulars of how we intend to enforce this constitutional right, it is important to frame the discussion in proper historical perspective. Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), is, of course, the starting point. In Brown, the Supreme Court held that even though physical facilities and other tangible elements of the educational environment may be equal, state-imposed racial segregation of public school students deprives minority students of equal protection of the laws. Id. at 493. Casting aside the shameful "separate-but-equal" doctrine established some 84 years earlier in Plessy v. Ferguson, 110 U.S. 537 (1896), the Court held that state-imposed racial separation inevitably stigmatizes minority students as inferior. Id. at 494. The Court concluded, therefore, that state-enforced racially separated education facilities are inherently unequal. Id. at 495.

One year after the initial decision in Brown, the Supreme Court, in Brown II, ordered that the Nation's dual school systems be dismantled "with all deliberate speed." Brown v. Board of Education, 349 U.S. 294, 300-301 (1955) (Brown II). The goal of a desegregation remedy, the Court declared, is the admission of students to public schools on a "racially nondiscriminatory basis." Ibid.

During the period following Brown II, state and local officials engaged in widespread resistance to the Court's decision; thus, few jurisdictions made any real progress towards desegregation. In 1968, thirteen years after Brown II, the Supreme Court's patience ran out. In Green v. County School Board, 391 U.S. 430 (1968), the Court was confronted with a "freedom-of-choice" plan that had the effect of preserving a dual system. In disapproving this plan, the Court made clear that a desegregation plan must be judged by its effectiveness in disestablishing state-imposed segregation. Id. at 439. The burden on a school board that has operated a dual system, the Court explained, "is to come forward with a plan that promises realistically to work and promises realistically to work now." Ibid.

In neither Brown nor Green, however, did the Court assert that racial balance in the classroom is a constitutional requirement or an essential element of the relief necessary to redress state-enforced segregation in public schools.

Rather, the Court held simply that the Constitution requires racially nondiscriminatory student assignments and eradication of the segregative effects of past intentional racial discrimination by school officials.

Because of the problems encountered by the lower courts in implementing the Green decision, the Supreme Court returned to the subject of a school board's remedial obligations three years later in Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, 402 U.S. 1 (1971). Swann specifically rejected any "substantive constitutional right [to a] particular degree of racial balance" (id. at 24), and reiterated that the basic remedial obligation of school boards is "to eliminate from the public schools all vestiges of state-imposed segregation." Id. at 15. For the first time, however, the Court authorized use of mandatory race-conscious student assignments to achieve this objective, explaining that racially neutral measures, such as neighborhood zoning, may fail to counteract the continuing effects of past unconstitutional segregation. Id. at 27-28. Moreover, in light of the prevalence of bus transportation in public school systems, the Swann Court upheld the use of mandatory bus transportation as a permissible tool of school desegregation. Id. at 29-30.

Thus, in what has proved to be the last unanimous opinion by the High Court in the school desegregation area, the first tentative step was taken down the remedial road of court-ordered, race-conscious pupil assignments and transportation.

Since then, that road has been traversed involuntarily more and more often by the yellow school bus because of a preoccupation with racial ratios in the classroom as a desegregation remedy.

What is interesting to note, however, is that the Swann Court spoke in measured terms, expressing reserved acceptance of busing as but one of a number of remedial devices available for use when, and these are the Supreme Court's words, it is "practicable," "reasonable," "feasible," "workable," and "realistic." The Court clearly did not contemplate indiscriminate use of busing without regard to other important, and often conflicting, considerations. Indeed, the Swann Court, emphasizing the multiple public and private interests that should inform a desegregation decree, expressed disapproval of compulsory busing that risks the health of students or significantly impinges on the educational process, made clear that busing can be ordered only to eliminate the effects of state-imposed segregation and not to attain racial balance in the schools, and tacitly admonished courts to rely on experience in exercising their equitable remedial powers.

Today, a decade after Swann, there is ample reason to heed that admonition. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes counseled wisely, in his book The Common Law, that "the life of the law has not been logic, it has been experience." Unlike 1971, when no court had any empirical evidence on which to assess the advisability or effectiveness of mandatory busing, now we have 10 years of experience and the results of hundreds of busing decrees on which to draw in formulating current

desegregation policies. It is against this backdrop that courts, legislators, and the public must -- as Swann itself signaled -- now reconsider the wisdom of mandatory busing as a remedy for de jure segregation.

Few issues have generated as much public anguish and resistance, and have deflected as much time and resources away from needed endeavors to enrich the educational environment of public schools, as court-ordered busing. The results of numerous studies aimed at determining the impact of busing on educational achievement are at best mixed. There has yet to be produced sufficient evidence showing that mandatory transportation of students has been adequately attentive to the seemingly forgotten "other" remedial objective of both Brown and Swann; namely, establishment of an educational environment that offers an equal education opportunity to every school child, irrespective of race, color, or ethnic origin. In his May address to the American Law Institute, Attorney General William French Smith accurately commented on the accumulated evidence in this area in the following terms:

Some studies have found negative effects on achievement. Other studies indicate that busing does not have positive effects on achievement and that other considerations are more likely to produce significant positive influences.

In addition, in many communities where courts have implemented busing plans, resegregation has occurred. In some instances upwardly mobile whites and blacks have merely chosen to leave the urban environment. In other instances, a concern for the quality of the schools their children attend has caused parents to move beyond the reach of busing orders. Other parents have chosen to enroll their children in private schools that they consider better able to provide a quality education. The desertion of our cities' school system has sometimes eliminated any chance of achieving racial balance even if intra-city busing were ordered.

These lessons of experience have not been lost on some judges, including members of the Supreme Court, where opinion in this area is now sharply divided. For example, Justice Lewis Powell recently remarked in dissent in the Estes case:

This pursuit of racial balance at any cost . . . is without constitutional or social justification. Out of zeal to remedy one evil, courts may encourage or set the stage for other evils. By acting against one race schools, courts may produce one race systems. */

The flight from urban public schools has contributed to the erosion of the tax base of a number of cities, which has in turn had a direct bearing on the growing inability of many school systems to provide a quality education to their students -- whether black or white. Similarly, the loss

*/ Estes v. Metropolitan Branches of the Dallas NAACP, 444 U.S. 437, 450 (1980) (Powell, J., joined by Stewart and Rehnquist, J. J., dissenting from dismissal of certiorari as improvidently granted).

of parental support and involvement -- which often comes with the abandonment of a neighborhood school policy -- has robbed many public school systems of a critical component of successful educational programs. There is, in addition, growing empirical evidence that educational achievement does not depend upon racial balance in public schools.

To be sure, some communities have accepted mandatory busing, thus avoiding some of its negative effects. Unfortunately, however, calm acceptance of mandatory busing is too often not forthcoming; and, plainly, the stronger the parental and community resistance, the less effective becomes a compulsory student transportation plan.

One of the principal objections to busing is that courts -- frequently relying on the advice of experts -- have largely ignored the measured terms of the Swann decision and have employed busing indiscriminately, on the apparent assumption that the cure-all for past intentional segregative acts is to reconstitute all classrooms along strict racial percentages. Not even in a perfect educational world would one expect to find every school room populated by precise racial percentages that mirror the general population.

Mandatory busing has also been legitimately criticized on the grounds that it has been employed in some cases to alter racial

imbalance that is in no way attributable to the intentionally segregative acts of state officials. In Keyes v. Denver School District, 413 U.S. 189 (1973), the Supreme Court held that a finding of state-imposed racial segregation in one portion of a school system creates a presumption that racial imbalance in other portions of the system is also the product of state action. To avoid imposition of a system-wide desegregation plan, which often includes system-wide busing, a school board subject to the Keyes presumption must shoulder the unrealistic burden of proving that racial balance in other areas of the system is not attributable to the state. Consequently, the application of Keyes has in my view resulted in system-wide transportation remedies that in some instances encompass not only de jure, or state-imposed, segregation, but de facto segregation as well.

Sobered by this experience, the Administration has reexamined the remedies employed in school desegregation cases. Stated succinctly, we have concluded that involuntary busing has largely failed in two major respects: (1) it has failed to elicit public support and (2) it has failed to advance the overriding goal of equal education opportunity. Adherence to an experiment that has not withstood the test of experience obviously makes little sense.

Accordingly, the Department will henceforth, on a finding by a court of de jure racial segregation, seek

a desegregation remedy that emphasizes the following three components, rather than court-ordered busing:

- (i) removal of all state-enforced racial barriers to open access to public schools;
- (ii) insurance that all students -- white, black, hispanic or of any other ethnic origin -- are provided equal opportunities to obtain an education of comparable quality;
- (iii) eradication to the fullest extent practicable of the remaining vestiges of the prior dual systems.

To accomplish this three-part objective, we have developed, I think, a coherent, sound, and just litigation policy that will ensure fair enforcement of the civil rights laws, eliminate the adverse results attending percentage busing, and make educational issues the foremost consideration.

As part of that litigation policy, the Department will thoroughly investigate the background of every racially identifiable school in a district to determine whether the racial segregation is de jure or de facto. In deciding to initiate litigation we will not make use of the Keyes presumption, but will define the violation precisely and seek to limit the remedy only to those schools in which racial imbalance is the product of intentionally segregative acts of state officials. And all aspects of practicability, such as disruption to the education process, community acceptance, and student safety, will be weighed in designing a desegregation remedy.

In developing the specific remedial techniques to accomplish this three-part objective, we recognize that no single desegregation technique provides an answer. Nor does any particular combination of techniques offer the perfect remedial formula for all cases. But some desegregation approaches that seem to hold promise for success include: voluntary student transfer programs; magnet schools; enhanced curriculum requirements; faculty incentives; in-service training programs for teachers and administrators; school closings in systems with excess capacity and new construction in systems that are over-crowded; and modest adjustments to attendance zones. The overarching principle guiding the selection of any or all of these remedial techniques -- or indeed resorting to others that may be developed -- is equal education opportunity.

Let me add that our present thinking is to give this approach prospective application only. We thus do not contemplate routinely reopening decrees that have proved effective in practice. The law generally recognizes a special interest in the finality of judgments, and that interest is particularly strong in the area of school desegregation. Nothing we have learned in the 10 years since Swann leads to the conclusion that the public would be well served by reopening wounds that have long since healed.

On the other hand, some school districts may have been successful in their efforts to dismantle the dual systems of an earlier era. Others might be able to demonstrate that circumstances within the system have changed to such a degree that continued adherence to a forced busing remedy would serve no desegregative purpose. Certainly, if, in the wake of white flight or demographic shifts, black children are being bused from one predominantly black school to another, the school system should not be required to continue such assignments. A request by the local school board to reopen the decree in such circumstances would in my view be appropriate, and the Justice Department might well not oppose such a request so long as we are satisfied that the three remedial objectives discussed above will not be compromised.

There is another dimension to the Administration's current school desegregation policy that deserves mention. Apart from the issue of unconstitutional pupil assignments, experience has taught that identifiably black schools sometimes receive inferior educational attention. Whatever the ultimate racial composition in the classroom, the constitutional guaranty of equal education opportunity prohibits school officials from intentionally depriving any student, on the basis of race, color, or ethnic origin, of an equal opportunity to receive an education comparable in quality to that being received by other students in the school district.

Deliberately providing a lower level of educational services to identifiable black schools is as invidious as deliberate racial segregation. Evidence of such conduct by state officials might include disparities in the tangible components of education, such as the level and breadth of academic and extracurricular programs, the educational achievement and experience of teachers and administrators, and the size, age, and general conditions of physical facilities.

Indeed, Swann itself held that, independent of student assignment, where it is possible to identify a black school "simply by reference to the racial composition of teachers and staff, the quality of school buildings and equipment, or the organization of sports activities, a prima facie case of violation of substantive constitutional rights under the Equal Protection Clause is shown." 402 U.S. at 18. The Court explained that the proper remedy in such cases is to "produce schools of like quality, facilities, and staffs." Id. at 19. Despite the recognition of this constitutional right by a unanimous Court in Swann, suits have rarely been brought to redress such wrongs.

In pursuing constitutional violations of this kind, the Justice Department in no way intends to second-guess or otherwise intrude into the educational decisions and policymaking of state education officials. That function, as I have previously made clear, is reserved to the states. And in many cases substantial disparities in the tangible components of

education may well be attributable to legitimate, racially nondiscriminatory factors. But when such disparities are the product of intentional racial discrimination by state officials, can it seriously be maintained that the educationally disadvantaged students are being afforded equal protection of the laws? Our future enforcement policies will be aimed at detecting and correcting any such constitutional violations wherever they occur.

In sum, the Administration remains firm in its resolve to ferret out any and all instances of unlawful racial segregation and to bring such practices to a halt. We do not believe that successful pursuit of that policy requires resort to a desegregation remedy known from experience to be largely ineffective and, in many cases, counterproductive. The school desegregation bills currently being considered by this Subcommittee suggest a similar attitude on the part of members of the Senate. To the extent that those bills seek to restrict the use of mandatory student transportation as a tool of school desegregation, they reflect the thinking of the Administration in this area.

I would sound only one cautionary note. In framing legislation aimed at eliminating, or severely limiting, the use of forced busing as an available remedial tool, care should be taken not to draft the statutory prohibition so broadly that it bans as well other desegregation techniques which have not been shown to be ineffective or counterproductive in combating state-imposed racial segregation

of our public schools. In this regard, a legislative prohibition against inferior federal courts ordering transportation of students to obtain racial balance in the schools need not, in our view, also preclude use of other remedial techniques such as school closings in systems with excess capacity or involuntary transfers of teachers to break up state-created racially identifiable faculties.

The evidence currently available to the Department of Justice indicates that school closings and teacher transfers may in some instances assist effectively in eliminating the vestiges of racially discriminatory dual school systems. Nor does the Department have information suggesting that these desegregation techniques are attended by any of the adverse consequences often associated with mandatory student transportation. Accordingly, we would hope that the Subcommittee, in its consideration of appropriate anti-busing legislation, would hesitate before eliminating desegregation methods which, unlike mandatory busing, have been usefully employed in the past to assist in vindicating the constitutional guaranty of equal education opportunity for all public school students, regardless of race, color or ethnic origin.

In closing, let me state that this Administration will tirelessly attack state-imposed segregation of our Nation's public schools on account of race, color or ethnic origin. The Department's mission continues to be the prompt and

complete eradication of de jure segregation. While the relief we seek may differ in certain respects from the remedies relied upon by our predecessors, the Department of Justice will not retreat from its statutory and constitutional obligation to vindicate the cherished constitutional guaranty of equal education opportunity.

Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to respond to questions that you or other members of the Subcommittee may have.



U.S. Department of Justice
Civil Rights Division

Assistant Attorney General

Washington, D.C. 20530

APR 27 1982

*file Civil Rights
gen.*

Mike --

This is an unsolicited,
"outside" view of our (?)
"affirmative action" program.
The question of a group to study
the Exec. Order looms larger.
Notwithstanding Fortune, I
am of the view we should not
abandon all efforts to rid
ourselves of a major source
of the problems.

Brad

Bill F.Y.

APR 17 11 49 AM '82

1116 St. Stephens Road
Alexandria, VA 22304
April 13, 1982

CIVIL RIGHTS
DIVISION

Mr. William Bradford Reynolds
Assistant Attorney General for
The Civil Rights Division
Room 5643, Main Justice Building
10th and Constitution Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D.C. 20530

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

On December 22, 1981, I wrote you a letter enclosing material (copies attached hereto as Tabs A, B and C for your convenience of reference) which showed pretty conclusively, I think, that minorities (including women) are grossly overrepresented in the executive branch of the federal government and that they are also at least equally represented in the higher grades.

I was gratified to receive your reply dated January 27, 1982, stating the firm position of the Justice Department that equal employment opportunity can be achieved without affording preferential treatment to minorities solely on the grounds of race, sex and national origin and affirming a race and sex neutral hiring and promotion policy.

That is just great, but the policy you enunciate must be confined to the Justice Department alone. It does not seem to be the policy of the federal government as a whole. Affirmative action programs continue in the executive branch in this administration just the same as they did in past administrations. (Please see the exhibits under Tab D.)

I don't have to tell you that Congress never legislated affirmative action; in fact, Section 703(j) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 explicitly does not require it. As far as I can see, no President ever ordered affirmative action (Tab C), although President Carter certainly endorsed it (Tab A). To my knowledge, all affirmative action programs in the federal government are voluntary; that is, no court ever ordered the federal government to have one. I think plainly it is illegal discrimination against white men not of Hispanic origin for an employer to conduct an affirmative action program in the absence of either a court order or demonstrated underrepresentation of minorities. The executive branch of the federal government is the only employer I know of that falls into this category. Affirmative action programs and the large EEO staffs that implement them in the executive branch have just grown and grown

4/23/82
2/2/82

over the years and become fixtures that cost the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars annually (Tab E). It is as Kathy Sawyer said in the first of a series of articles that started last Sunday in the Washington Post: "Out in the real world, affirmative action has taken on a life of its own."

If you agree that affirmative action programs in the executive branch are being conducted in violation of Section 703 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964-- and it is hard for me to see how you could disagree-- is it not your duty as the Chief of the Civil Rights Division to see that these violations are brought to a halt? I'm sure it won't be easy, but we who are being discriminated against on the basis of race and sex are depending upon you.

Sincerely,

Walter J. Lander
Walter J. Lander



United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF MINES
2401 E STREET, NW.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20241

IN REPLY REFER TO:

December 7, 1978

Memorandum

To: Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, Department of the Interior

From: Assistant Director--Administration, Bureau of Mines

Subject: Affirmative Action Program

Let me begin this memorandum by stating that I fully support the principle of equal employment opportunity, and have acted vigorously and consistently in accordance with that principle throughout my career in government. In fact, it is because I believe that the principle is being undermined that I have written this memorandum. If the goals established for the affirmative action program are unrealistic and are not supported by the facts, then this important program and the principle underlying it will be jeopardized.

Designated minority groups make up 18.6% of the Nation's population (Encl. 1), 16.7% of the national non-institutional work force (Encl. 2), and 21.6% of the federal government work force (Encl. 3). The proportion of minorities in the federal work force exceeds the proportion in the national work force by 29.3%. This situation has persisted for some time. In 1969, the former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission reported that almost 20% of the jobs in the federal work force were held by designated minority groups and that the proportion of non-white persons employed in the federal government exceeded the percentage of non-whites in the national work force by almost 50%--16% as contrasted with 10.8%. In addition, 70,000 hispanics were employed by the federal government at that time (Encl. 4).

Representatives of your office have disputed the figure of 16.7% for designated minorities in the national work force stating that the figure should be much higher and that the Bureau of the Census admits to having overlooked 6 million hispanics alone in the 1970 census. Officials that I have talked to in the Bureau of Census make no such admission, and both the Bureau of Census and the Bureau of Labor Statistics stand by their published figures.

The Department's goal for designated minority employment is 12% (Encl. 5). The goal assigned to the Bureau of Mines by your office is 9.6% (Encl. 6). Designated minority groups make up 27.8% of the Department's work force (Encl. 3) and 9.5% of the Bureau's work force (Encl. 6). The proportion

A

for the Department exceeds the proportion of designated minorities in the federal government work force by 28.7% and the national work force by 66.5%. It exceeds the Department's goal by 131.7%.

Representatives of your office state that a contract was awarded recently to develop methodologies for calculating parity levels of employment for designated minorities and women by occupation, grade level, individual minority group, etc. Representatives of your office also state that there is little or no factual basis for either the Department's goal of 12% employment of designated minorities or the goal of 9.6% assigned to the Bureau of Mines. The wide divergence among government agencies in the employment of designated minorities (39.4% for GSA to 8.0% for TVA) and for women (62.3% for HEW to 8.9% for TVA) causes one to wonder how affirmative action goals are calculated in other agencies as well (Encl. 3). Section 310 of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 requires that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission establish guidelines and make determinations of underrepresentations of designated minorities to be used in minority recruitment programs to be conducted by each agency of the federal government. The EEOC work force is made up of 62.6% minorities (including 49.9% blacks) and 56.3% women (Encl. 7):

Females constitute 51.3% of the national population (Encl. 8), ^{40.5%}~~36.6%~~ of the national non-institutional work force (Encl. 9), 30.7% of the federal work force and 28.6% of the Interior work force (Encl. 3). No doubt the percentage of women in the national work force (in the absence of a further reduction in the birth rate) will never much exceed 40% because there will always be a substantial percentage of women of the work force age who will be out of the work force by preference engaged in the bearing and rearing of children. The difference between the percentage of women in the national work force and the federal work force is undoubtedly due largely or, perhaps, entirely to veteran's preference which applies to the federal government but not to the national work force generally. However, the precise effect of either of these two factors on the employment of women is to me, at least, uncertain. Another factor affecting the employment of women in Interior is the underrepresentation of women in scientific and engineering disciplines. Quite conceivably the conclusion that women are under employed in the federal work force and the Department of the Interior is mere speculation. Women could be over employed in the Department and the federal government rather than under employed.

There are assertions that designated minorities and women are underrepresented in the upper grades of the federal work force. On the surface, this appears to be obvious, but a picture that is less clear begins to emerge when such factors as educational level, age, and length of service are considered. In any case, it is difficult to see how plans to increase the employment and grades of designated minorities and women can be soundly based when methodologies for calculating parity employment are only now being developed.

Although all discrimination based on race, sex, and ethnicity is prohibited by Title 7 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, courts have upheld affirmative action plans--which, in effect, discriminate against white men--when those plans were designed to remedy the effects of past discrimination against designated minorities and women and to achieve parity of employment. I know of no case where such plans have been upheld when the employer was already exceeding parity of employment for designated minorities and women, or when the employer could not factually demonstrate that the plan was necessary to achieve parity.

Nevertheless, the Department and the federal government continue to emphasize the employment and promotion of designated minorities and women as affirmative action goals (Encl. 10). I believe that persistence along these lines, in the face of increasingly visible evidence like that cited above, will ultimately result in legal action by white men who, understandably, will feel themselves to be the victims of discrimination.


Walter J. Lander

Enclosures

Table 1.—Population of the United States by Race and Spanish Origin: 1977 and 1970

(Numbers in thousands)

Race and Spanish origin	March 1977		April 1970	
	Total population	Percent of total	Total population	Percent of total
Total.....	212,566	100.0	203,212	100.0
White.....	184,335	86.7	177,749	87.5
Black and other races.....	28,231	13.3	25,463	12.5
Black	24,474	11.5	22,580	11.1
All other races	3,757	1.8	2,883	1.4
American Indian	(NA)	(NA)	793	0.4
Asian American	(NA)	(NA)	1,369	0.7
Japanese	(NA)	(NA)	591	0.3
Chinese.....	(NA)	(NA)	435	0.2
Filipino	(NA)	(NA)	343	0.2
Other races.....	(NA)	(NA)	721	0.4
Spanish origin	11,269	5.3	9,073	4.5
Mexican	6,545	3.1	4,532	2.2
Puerto Rican	1,742	0.8	1,429	0.7
Cuban.....	681	0.3	545	0.3
Central or South American.....	872	0.4	1,509	0.7
Other Spanish	1,428	0.7	1,057	0.5

NA Not available.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Black and other races + population of Spanish origin = Designated minority percent
Population of U.S. of U. S. population

$$\frac{28,231 + 11,269}{212,566} = 18.6\%$$

Enclosure 1

Table 6. Employment status of the noninstitutional population by race and Hispanic origin, quarterly averages, not seasonally adjusted

[Numbers in thousands]

Employment status	Total		White		Black ¹		Hispanic origin ²	
	III 1977	III 1978	III 1977	III 1978	III 1977	III 1978	III 1977	III 1978
TOTAL								
Civilian noninstitutional population	156,764	159,235	137,870	139,822	16,374	16,678	7,320	7,829
Civilian labor force	98,690	101,841	87,135	89,585	9,962	10,431	4,599	4,978
Percent of population	63.0	64.0	63.2	64.1	60.8	62.5	62.8	63.6
Employment	91,978	95,786	82,001	84,997	8,513	9,125	4,163	4,523
Agriculture	3,600	3,801	3,324	3,447	228	270	257	255
Nonagricultural industries	88,379	91,986	78,677	81,550	8,286	8,855	3,906	4,267
Unemployment	6,712	6,055	5,134	4,588	1,449	1,306	437	456
Unemployment rate	6.8	5.9	5.9	5.1	14.5	12.5	9.5	9.2
Not in labor force	58,074	57,394	50,735	50,237	6,411	6,247	2,721	2,851

¹ Data relate to black workers only. According to the 1970 Census, they comprised about 9 percent of the "black and other" population group.

² Data on persons of Hispanic origin are tabulated separately, without regard to race, which means that they are also included in the data for white and black workers. At the time of the 1970 Census, approximately 96 percent of their population was white.

NOTE: Data for 1977 for total Hispanic origin are not strictly comparable with those published earlier. These estimates incorporate the expanded sample and revised estimation procedures introduced in the national sample in January 1978.

Table 7. Employment status of persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban origin, quarterly averages, not seasonally adjusted

[Numbers in thousands]

Employment status	Total Hispanic origin ¹		Mexican origin		Puerto Rican origin		Cuban origin	
	III 1977	III 1978	III 1977	III 1978	III 1977	III 1978	III 1977	III 1978
TOTAL								
Civilian noninstitutional population	7,320	7,829	4,260	4,602	1,043	1,090	566	618
Civilian labor force	4,599	4,978	2,797	3,022	527	575	363	424
Percent of population	62.8	63.6	65.7	65.7	50.5	52.8	64.1	68.6
Employment	4,163	4,523	2,543	2,755	446	489	338	397
Agriculture	257	255	231	227	12	13	2	5
Nonagricultural industries	3,906	4,267	2,312	2,528	434	476	336	392
Unemployment	437	456	255	267	81	86	25	27
Unemployment rate	9.5	9.2	9.1	8.8	15.4	15.0	6.8	6.4
Not in labor force	2,721	2,851	1,462	1,579	517	515	203	194

¹ Includes persons of Central or South American origin and other Hispanic origin, not shown separately.

NOTE: See note, table 6.

Source: USDL 78-849, Labor Force Developments: Third Quarter 1978
Bureau of Labor Statistics, U. S. Department of Labor

$$\frac{\text{Total Civilian Labor Force Minus White Labor Force} + (.96 \times \text{Labor Force of Hispanic Origin})}{\text{Total Civilian Labor Force}} = \text{Designated Minorities as Percent of Total Civilian Labor Force}$$

$$\frac{101,841 - 89,585 + 4,779}{101,841} = 16.7\%$$

Enclosure 2

TABLE 3 - TOTAL AND WOMEN FULL-TIME FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES, BY MINORITY GROUP AND SELECTED AGENCY (12,000 OR MORE EMPLOYEES) AS OF NOVEMBER 30, 1977

SELECTED AGENCIES	ALL FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES		ALL MINORITY EMPLOYEES		NEGRO/BLACK		SPANISH-SURNAMED		AMERICAN INDIAN		ORIENTAL AMERICAN		ALL OTHER EMPLOYEES	
	TOTAL	WOMEN	TOTAL	WOMEN	TOTAL	WOMEN	TOTAL	WOMEN	TOTAL	WOMEN	TOTAL	WOMEN	TOTAL	WOMEN
TOTAL ALL AGENCIES	2,414,034	740,314	529,850	209,537	387,630	170,674	83,394	19,265	25,216	11,877	24,610	7,721	1,893,184	530,777
AVERAGE GRADE ^{a/}	8.22	5.93	5.54	5.62	6.32	5.66	7.02	5.36	6.01	4.88	6.67	6.69	8.59	6.04
DEFENSE TOTAL	(901,113)	(261,170)	(164,185)	(51,062)	(109,034)	(39,256)	(41,378)	(8,156)	(2,685)	(657)	(11,088)	(2,993)	(736,928)	(210,108)
AVERAGE GRADE	7.84	5.36	6.39	5.14	6.08	5.22	6.53	4.86	7.63	5.56	8.14	5.53	8.08	5.40
ARMY	320,433	101,670	54,052	19,930	36,986	15,753	12,758	2,737	912	218	3,396	1,222	266,381	81,740
AVERAGE GRADE	7.60	5.32	6.27	5.23	5.96	5.24	6.48	4.93	7.09	5.32	8.16	5.78	7.81	5.34
NAVY	272,162	64,163	55,108	13,720	40,889	11,348	8,350	1,316	584	114	5,285	942	217,054	50,443
AVERAGE GRADE	8.12	5.35	6.35	5.10	5.92	5.10	6.76	4.84	8.13	5.45	8.19	5.32	8.41	5.41
AIR FORCE	238,241	68,789	40,334	11,210	18,820	6,596	18,743	3,741	1,028	266	1,743	607	197,907	57,579
AVERAGE GRADE	7.63	5.24	6.31	4.92	6.03	4.96	6.34	4.77	7.61	5.60	7.68	5.18	7.83	5.30
OFFICE OF SEC. OF DEFENSE AND OTHER DEP. ACTIVITIES	24,656	9,744	2,939	1,203	2,285	1,001	354	98	18	9	282	95	21,717	8,541
AVERAGE GRADE	9.74	6.67	8.34	6.55	7.97	6.48	9.04	6.23	9.60	7.20	10.26	7.70	9.93	6.69
DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY	45,621	16,804	11,752	4,999	10,054	4,558	1,173	264	143	50	382	127	33,869	11,805
AVERAGE GRADE	8.00	5.58	6.54	5.49	6.39	5.52	7.24	4.91	8.56	6.30	7.63	5.38	8.37	5.62
STATE (INCLUDES AID)	15,905	5,794	2,953	1,640	2,421	1,497	380	76	19	13	133	54	12,952	4,154
AVERAGE GRADE	10.50	8.09	8.13	7.09	7.83	7.02	9.42	7.51	8.89	7.31	10.38	8.28	11.00	8.48
TREASURY	115,431	54,705	22,640	14,393	17,617	12,071	3,631	1,731	182	85	1,210	506	92,791	40,312
AVERAGE GRADE	8.03	5.64	6.27	5.34	6.07	5.38	6.45	4.76	7.51	5.15	8.16	6.31	8.42	5.75
JUSTICE	51,505	17,050	9,035	4,764	6,514	4,006	2,127	600	95	25	299	133	42,470	12,286
AVERAGE GRADE	8.66	5.88	6.48	5.23	6.04	5.18	7.56	5.34	8.87	5.96	7.68	6.05	9.13	6.13
INTERIOR	69,299	19,861	19,250	8,175	3,372	1,242	1,622	411	13,785	6,367	471	155	50,049	11,686
AVERAGE GRADE	8.28	5.70	6.12	5.07	7.05	6.20	7.32	5.48	5.66	4.77	9.13	6.52	8.99	6.12
AGRICULTURE	86,428	20,718	8,783	3,128	5,763	2,523	2,110	348	377	97	533	160	77,645	17,590
AVERAGE GRADE	8.47	5.75	7.28	5.90	7.15	5.94	6.98	5.32	6.94	4.64	9.70	7.19	8.59	5.72
COMMERCE	31,072	10,612	6,456	3,553	5,479	3,289	462	149	119	20	396	95	24,616	7,059
AVERAGE GRADE	9.50	6.50	7.41	6.20	7.02	6.13	9.11	6.60	8.27	5.50	10.48	7.93	10.01	6.65
LABOR	14,940	6,714	4,394	2,952	3,797	2,689	388	169	53	19	156	75	10,586	3,762
AVERAGE GRADE	9.35	6.88	7.44	6.17	7.19	6.12	8.88	6.04	10.79	7.89	8.87	7.59	10.14	7.44
ENERGY	17,657	5,399	2,121	990	1,151	710	634	177	129	31	207	72	15,536	4,409
AVERAGE GRADE	10.17	7.10	8.06	6.67	7.91	6.73	7.67	6.18	8.30	6.30	9.84	7.46	10.47	7.20
HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE	138,172	86,045	43,372	31,139	32,593	23,982	3,875	2,436	5,504	3,886	1,400	835	94,800	54,906
AVERAGE GRADE	7.83	6.59	6.51	5.98	6.49	6.08	7.32	6.23	5.35	4.78	8.51	7.52	8.39	6.93
HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT	16,822	7,575	4,522	2,909	3,802	2,537	458	229	71	39	191	104	12,300	4,666
AVERAGE GRADE	9.21	6.58	7.77	6.48	7.68	6.52	8.09	5.82	8.48	5.97	8.50	7.01	9.74	6.64
TRANSPORTATION	68,092	11,243	8,566	2,916	6,078	2,499	1,409	215	606	108	473	94	59,526	8,327
AVERAGE GRADE	10.87	6.53	8.88	6.15	8.38	6.16	9.90	5.83	10.02	5.91	10.48	6.97	11.13	6.66
GENERAL SERVICE ADMINISTRATION	34,825	11,520	13,704	5,350	12,114	4,947	1,070	234	125	39	395	130	21,121	6,170
AVERAGE GRADE	7.81	6.11	6.29	5.73	6.15	5.72	6.85	5.56	7.63	5.29	7.82	6.19	8.46	6.30
NAT'L AERONAUTICS & SPACE AD'M	23,996	4,543	2,035	755	1,338	603	400	85	47	18	250	49	21,961	3,788
AVERAGE GRADE	10.98	6.42	8.22	5.51	7.76	5.45	9.24	5.08	9.47	6.33	10.34	11.23	6.60	
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY	39,445	3,526	3,150	406	3,019	393	37	4	33	1	36,295	3,120	4.98	
AVERAGE GRADE	7.87	4.92	5.95	4.43	5.62	4.34	8.92	6.75	7.71	7.00	10.30	7.13	8.03	
UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE	514,162	81,475	129,449	34,807	107,793	32,191	16,476	1,709	861	226	4,319	681	384,713	46,668
AVERAGE GRADE	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
VETERANS ADMINISTRATION	192,531	100,045	53,860	28,225	46,344	25,102	4,996	1,714	372	174	2,148	1,235	138,671	71,820
AVERAGE GRADE	6.96	6.33	5.73	5.63	5.45	5.44	6.40	5.98	6.51	5.77	9.08	8.42	7.36	6.56
ALL OTHER AGENCIES	82,599	32,319	22,375	12,373	19,401	11,137	1,941	822	153	72	880	342	60,224	19,946

^{a/} Average grade for employees under General Schedule and equivalent pay systems.

Source: Civil Service News, Advance August 23, 1978, U.S. Civil Service Commission

See attached page.

Attachment to Enclosure 3

$$\frac{\text{Full Time Designated Minority Employees in Federal Work Force}}{\text{Total Full Time Employees in Federal Work Force}} = \text{Designated Minorities as Percent of Federal Work Force}$$

$$\frac{520,850}{2,414,034} = 21.6\%$$

$$\frac{\text{Full Time Designated Minority Employees in the Department of the Interior Work Force}}{\text{Total Full Time Employees in the Interior Work Force}} = \text{Designated Minorities as Percent of Interior Work Force}$$

$$\frac{19,250}{69,299} = 27.8\%$$

$$\frac{\text{Full Time Designated Minority Employees in the GSA Work Force}}{\text{Total Full Time Employees in the GSA Work Force}} = \text{Designated Minorities as Percent of GSA Work Force}$$

$$\frac{13,704}{34,825} = 39.4\%$$

$$\frac{\text{Full Time Designated Minority Employees in the TVA Work Force}}{\text{Total Full Time Employees in the TVA Work Force}} = \text{Designated Minority as Percent of TVA Work Force}$$

$$\frac{3,150}{39,445} = 8.0\%$$

$$\frac{\text{Full Time Women Employees in the HEW Work Force}}{\text{Total Full Time Employees in the HEW Work Force}} = \text{Women as Percent of HEW Work Force}$$

$$\frac{86,045}{138,172} = 62.3\%$$

$$\frac{\text{Full Time Women Employees in the TVA Work Force}}{\text{Total Full Time Employees in the TVA Work Force}} = \text{Women as Percent of TVA Work Force}$$

$$\frac{3,526}{39,445} = 8.9\%$$

Continuation of Attachment to Enclosure 3

Full Time Women Employees in the
Federal Work Force = Women as Percent of Federal Work Force
Total Full Time Employees
in the Federal Work Force

$$\frac{740,314}{414,034} = 30.7\%$$

Full Time Women Employees in the
Interior Work Force = Women as Percent of Interior Work Force
Total Full Time Employees
in the Interior Work Force

$$\frac{19,861}{69,299} = 28.6\%$$

Equal Employment Opportunity in the Federal Government

*Memorandum Report for the President From
Robert E. Hampton, Chairman, United States
Civil Service Commission. August 8, 1969*

You asked that I review the Government's equal employment opportunity program and report to you recommendations for policy and program changes. This is my report.

There is no program in the Civil Service Commission of greater importance than the effort to achieve full equality of employment opportunity in the Federal service. Assuring equal opportunity and eliminating any vestige of discrimination in employment practices is essential to the well-being of the Government and crucial to the nation. Race, color, religion, national origin, or sex must never affect the opportunity of an American to work for and advance within the Federal service.

Review

In making the review, we took the following actions:

- Studied the ways in which the Federal Government had organized in the past for equal employment opportunity and program effectiveness under each of these organizational approaches.
- Reviewed particularly the organization and results under the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, which exercised program leadership immediately prior to the Civil Service Commission's assumption of responsibility in 1965.
- Conducted a thorough analysis of efforts and results under Commission stewardship during the past three and one-half years.

In reviewing program activities and progress since the Commission was assigned responsibility by Executive Order 11246, we did the following:

- Requested and received recommendations from department and agency heads on future program direction.
- Met with agency equal employment opportunity officers and directors of personnel to discuss progress and problems and to receive program suggestions.
- Met with representatives of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, the Department of Justice, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, to obtain input from these Federal agencies having civil rights responsibilities.
- Met with the Commission's ten regional directors to gain their insights and program recommendations.
- Consulted, through our regional directors, with Federal Executive Boards and Associations to get program ideas from managers of Federal installations across the nation.

- Consulted at the staff level with minority group organizations to assure consideration of their points of view and suggestions.
- Met with representatives of women's organizations and Federal agencies to obtain recommendations relating to equal employment of women in the Federal Government.

We thus compiled a comprehensive base for overall assessment of the Federal equal employment opportunity program. We looked at its beginnings; we evaluated what has been done and what is underway; we attempted to assess our overall progress. Finally, we defined the challenges which still must be met and mapped out a proposed course of action.

Progress

We can report that the Government has made significant progress in equal employment opportunity. Much has been done to open the doors of opportunity to many for whom they had been closed.

- Since 1965, when the Civil Service Commission was given leadership responsibility for the Government's equal opportunity program, significant gains have been made in overall minority employment in the Federal service.
- One-half million jobs, almost 20% of the Federal workforce in the Executive Branch, are held by minority group Americans.
- The proportion of non-white persons employed in the Federal Government is almost 50% higher than the percentage of non-whites in the overall workforce in the United States—16% as contrasted with 10.8%, based on most recent data available. In addition, the Government employs over 70,000 Spanish sur-named Americans.

Total employment figures, impressive as they are, cannot tell the whole story, either of progress or of failures.

- Federal departments and agencies have engaged in action programs in their organizations and in their communities designed to improve equal employment opportunity.
- The climate in the Federal service for equal employment opportunity has improved greatly over the past few years.
- Equal opportunity is becoming recognized as an integral part of the responsibilities of each manager and supervisor in the Federal service.

The employment system is continually being reviewed and modified by the Civil Service Commission to assure that it is in fact open on an equal basis to all our citizens and at the same time meets the needs of Federal agencies for qualified manpower. The ultimate strength of the equal opportunity effort depends not so much on systems, however, as it does on the extent to which it becomes an inseparable part of management so that the commitment to equal opportunity is fully reflected in the day-to-day operations of the Government.

3	Area of Concern: Recruitment		
3.1	Problem Statement: Minority group members are underrepresented in the Department's workforce.		
3.1.1	Objective: Increase the total number of minority employees within the Department. Continue to work toward the Department goal of 12 percent minority employment. Responsible Official: Target Date:		
	Affirmative Actions:	Responsible Official	Target Date
31.1.1	Each bureau has established a long-range goal for full-time permanent minority employment consistent with the Department goal. Considering the Bureau's long-range goal and the the accomplishment of FY'76, establish goal to increase full-time permanent minority employment during Fy'77. Establish a goal at each major administrative area consistent with the bureau's goal and the installation's current EEO posture.	Managers EEO Officers	9/30/77
31.1.2	Provide in EEO commitments of installations located near major concentrations of Negro, American Indians and Spanish Speaking Americans action items, including numerical goals, where appropriate, designed to attain full promotion and career development.	Managers EEO Officers SSPC's	
31.1.3	Continue the community contact-recruitment program concentrating initially on the South-western part of the United States where there is a large Spanish Speaking population and Indian population. The contact-recruitment program involves the selection of a nucleus of bureau installations in a particular region, on-site visitation of the education and training resources, contacts with local universities	OEO SSPC's	November March June September
Report of Accomplishment of Objective:			
		6/30/77	6/30/76
	Total paid employment	87,384	81,667
	Black	4,320	4,233
	Spanish-Surnamed	2,353	2,164
	American Indian	13,119	11,860
	Oriental	748	665
	Male	62,431	58,385
	Female	24,953	23,282
	Total Minority employment	20,540	18,922
	Minority Employment excluding AI's	7,421	7,062
			% of change
			+ 7%
			+ 2%
			+ 8.7%
			+ 10.6%
			+ 12.5%
			+ 6.9%
			+ 7.1%
			+ 8.5%
			+ 5%

3. Recruitment

Except for a concentration of Bureau field units in the Denver Area, our organizations are small and geographically scattered. Some are in small towns with miniscule populations of minority groups. Turnover is low since the Bureau has been declining in total population. Mass transfers to the Department of Energy resulted in a disproportionate loss of minorities, thus making it more difficult to improve our minority employee percentage. Our six most populous occupations are technical and professional occupations in the physical sciences and there are few minorities and women in these fields. The consistent decline in total Bureau population, and the restructuring of vacated positions to lower grade levels, has curtailed the opportunities for hiring women and minorities into mid-level positions. The employment of Hispanics in the Denver Area is less than population statistics indicate that it should be. The system for monitoring selections from CSC registers and promotion certificates has been inaugurated, but selecting officials in some cases are not following the procedures. It is not always possible to identify minority applicants from the certificates and, therefore, we do not have complete information on the minority candidates who were available but not hired. Despite these difficulties, the percent of minority fulltime employees is 9.5% this fiscal year. This is .1% short of our goal of 9.6%.

Occupations designated by the Bureau for special emphasis do not show significant increases in minority and female representation. Gains in these areas have been offset by losses.

Recruitment for permanent employees is done primarily through CSC registers. In addition to the CSC the following sources have been used: Veterans Readjustment Act, Presidents's Youth Stay-in-School Campaign Program, Worker Trainee Program, Minority Organizations, Newspaper College Placement Offices, and personal contacts.

These sources do yield qualified minority and/or female candidates for some job series but not for others. For example for summer programs an even distribution among minority/majority, and male/female candidates has been achieved in most locations.

Most supervisors have not consciously reviewed their interview and screening process to assure equal treatment regardless of race, color, religion, sex, national origin or age.

An analysis of relevant statistical data on the Bureau's workforce is needed. Additional computerized information is also needed.

Problem Statement

3.1 Acquisition of workforce statistics from computerized personnel records.

Source: Page 30 of Bureau of Mines Equal Employment Opportunity Plan, Fiscal Year 1979.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

PAY SYSTEM	TOTAL ALL EMPLOYEES			TOTAL MINORITY EMPLOYEES				NEGRO			
	No.	No. WOMEN	% WOMEN	No.	%	No. WOMEN	% WOMEN	No.	%	No. WOMEN	% WOMEN
TOTAL ALL PAY SYSTEMS	2,359	1,329	56.3	1,477	62.6	855	36.2	1,178	49.9	720	30.5
TOTAL GEN SCHED & EQUIV	2,347	1,328	56.8	1,485	62.4	854	36.4	1,164	49.6	719	30.8
GS-2	15	14	93.3	11	73.3	10	66.7	8	53.3	7	46.7
GS-3	108	96	88.9	82	57.4	55	50.9	48	44.4	42	38.9
GS-4	184	167	90.8	119	64.7	107	58.2	86	53.3	90	48.9
GS-5	348	285	81.9	216	62.1	188	53.4	174	50.0	154	44.3
GS-6	136	129	94.9	107	78.7	101	74.3	83	68.4	89	65.4
GS-7	250	142	56.8	163	65.2	100	40.0	118	46.8	90	36.0
GS-8	11	10	90.9	9	81.8	8	72.7	8	72.7	7	63.8
GS-9	183	105	64.4	109	66.9	72	44.2	86	52.8	59	36.2
GS-10	2	1	50.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	1	50.0
GS-11	326	144	44.2	216	66.3	95	29.1	156	47.9	80	24.5
GS-12	278	95	34.2	178	63.3	58	20.1	130	46.8	45	16.2
GS-13	293	88	30.0	153	52.2	39	13.3	118	40.3	33	11.3
GS-14	117	30	25.8	61	52.1	11	9.4	44	37.6	9	7.7
GS-15	91	17	18.7	47	51.6	9	9.9	42	46.2	9	9.9
GS-16	19	4	21.1	10	52.8	3	15.8	8	42.1	3	15.8
GS-17	6	1	16.7	5	83.3	1	16.7	4	66.7	1	16.7
AVERAGE GRADE	8.99	7.41		8.80		7.20		8.68		7.24	
TOTAL WAGE SYSTEMS	10			10	100.0			10	100.0		
REGULAR NONSUPERVISORY	6			6	100.0			6	100.0		
WG-5	5			5	100.0			5	100.0		
WG-9	1			1	100.0			1	100.0		
AVERAGE GRADE (WG)	5.67			5.67				5.67			
OTHER WAGE SYSTEMS	4			4	100.0			4	100.0		
\$14,000-\$15,999	3			3	100.0			3	100.0		
\$16,000-\$17,999	1			1	100.0			1	100.0		
AVERAGE SALARY	15,200			15,200				15,200			
TOTAL OTHER PAY SYSTEMS	2	1	50.0	2	100.0	1	50.0	2	100.0	1	50.0
THRU \$ 7,999	2	1	50.0	2	100.0	1	50.0	2	100.0	1	50.0
AVERAGE SALARY	4,800	4,800		4,800		4,800		4,800		4,800	

Source: Federal Civilian Work Force Statistics, Equal Employment Opportunity Statistics, SM70-76B, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Personnel Management, Information Systems.

NO. 24. POPULATION, BY SEX, RACE, RESIDENCE, AND MEDIAN AGE: 1790 TO 1976

[In thousands, except as indicated. Total resident population excluding Armed Forces abroad. For definition of median, see p. xli. See also *Historical Statistics, Colonial Times to 1870*, series A 73-81 and A 143-149]

CENSUS DATE	SEX		RACE				RESIDENCE ¹		MEDIAN AGE (years)		
	Male	Female	White	Black		Other	Urban	Rural	All races	White	Black
				Number	Percent						
CONTIGUOUS U.S.²											
1790 (Aug. 2)	(NA)	(NA)	3,172	757	19.3	(NA)	202	3,728	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
1800 (Aug. 4)	(NA)	(NA)	4,306	1,002	18.9	(NA)	322	4,986	(NA)	16.0	(NA)
1810 (Aug. 6)	(NA)	(NA)	6,852	1,378	19.0	(NA)	525	6,714	(NA)	16.0	(NA)
1820 (Aug. 7)	4,897	4,742	7,867	1,772	18.4	(NA)	693	8,945	16.7	16.5	17.3
1830 (June 1)	6,632	6,334	10,537	2,329	18.1	(NA)	1,127	11,739	17.2	17.2	16.9
1840 (June 1)	8,689	8,381	14,196	2,874	16.8	(NA)	1,848	16,224	17.8	17.9	17.3
1850 (June 1)	11,838	11,354	19,353	3,639	15.7	(NA)	3,544	19,648	18.9	19.2	17.3
1860 (June 1)	16,085	15,358	26,922	4,442	14.1	79	6,217	25,227	19.4	19.7	17.7
1870 (June 1)	19,494	19,065	33,589	4,880	12.7	89	9,902	28,656	20.2	20.4	18.5
1880 (June 1)	25,819	24,637	43,403	6,581	13.1	172	14,130	36,026	20.9	21.4	18.0
1890 (June 1)	32,237	30,711	55,101	7,489	11.9	258	22,106	40,841	22.0	22.5	17.8
1900 (June 1)	38,816	37,178	66,809	8,834	11.6	351	30,160	45,835	22.9	23.4	19.4
1910 (Apr. 15)	47,332	44,640	81,732	9,828	10.7	413	41,999	49,973	24.1	24.5	20.8
1920 (Jan. 1)	53,900	51,510	94,821	10,463	9.9	427	54,158	51,653	25.3	25.6	22.3
1930 (Apr. 1)	62,137	60,638	110,287	11,891	9.7	567	68,955	53,820	26.4	26.9	23.5
1940 (Apr. 1)	66,062	65,608	118,215	12,866	9.8	589	74,424	57,246	29.0	29.5	25.3
1950 (Apr. 1)	74,833	75,864	134,942	15,042	10.0	713	96,468	64,230	30.2	30.8	26.2
1960 (Apr. 1)	87,865	90,600	158,455	18,800	10.6	1,149	124,699	63,765	29.6	30.3	23.5
UNITED STATES											
1950 (Apr. 1)	75,187	76,139	135,160	15,045	9.9	1,131	96,847	64,479	30.2	30.7	26.2
1960 (Apr. 1)	88,331	90,992	158,832	18,872	10.5	1,620	125,269	64,054	29.5	30.3	23.5
1970 (Apr. 1)	96,926	104,309	178,096	22,581	11.1	2,557	149,325	53,887	28.0	28.9	22.4
1971 (July 1, est.)	100,445	105,775	180,411	23,084	11.2	2,725	(NA)	(NA)	28.0	28.8	22.5
1972 (July 1, est.)	101,477	106,767	181,894	23,465	11.3	2,875	(NA)	(NA)	28.2	29.0	22.7
1973 (July 1, est.)	102,240	107,619	183,032	23,796	11.3	3,031	(NA)	(NA)	28.4	29.3	22.9
1974 (July 1, est.)	102,954	108,435	184,083	24,113	11.4	3,193	(NA)	(NA)	28.7	29.5	23.2
1975 (July 1, est.)	103,712	109,320	185,141	24,435	11.5	3,456	(NA)	(NA)	28.8	29.6	23.5
1976 (July 1, est.)	104,472	110,177	186,225	24,763	11.5	3,661	(NA)	(NA)	29.0	29.8	23.8

NA Not available. ¹ Beginning 1950, current definition. For explanation of change, see text, p. 2.
² Excludes Alaska and Hawaii.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *U.S. Census of Population: 1930*, vol. II; *1940*, vol. II, part 1, and vol. IV, part 1; *1950*, vol. II, part 1; *1960*, vol. I; *1970*, vol. I, part B; and *Current Population Reports*, series P-25, Nos. 614 and 643.

NO. 25. RATIO OF MALES TO FEMALES BY AGE GROUPS, 1910 TO 1976, AND BY RACE, 1976

[Represents number of males per 100 females. Total resident population]

AGE (years)	1910 (Apr. 15)	1920 (Jan. 1)	1930 (Apr. 1)	1940 (Apr. 1)	1950 (Apr. 1)	1960 (Apr. 1)	1970 (Apr. 1)	1975 (July 1)	1976 (July 1)			
									Total	White	Black	Spanish origin ¹
All ages	106.6	104.1	102.5	100.7	98.6	97.1	94.8	94.9	94.8	95.4	90.8	95.8
Under 14	102.1	102.1	102.6	103.0	103.7	103.4	103.9	104.1	104.2	104.8	101.4	106.5
14-24	101.2	97.8	98.4	98.9	98.2	98.7	98.7	101.3	101.5	102.4	96.1	99.3
25-44	110.2	105.1	101.8	98.6	96.4	95.7	95.5	96.5	96.6	98.6	84.0	84.4
45-64	114.4	115.2	109.1	105.2	100.1	95.7	91.6	91.7	91.8	92.5	85.9	93.6
65 and over	101.1	101.3	100.5	95.5	89.6	82.8	72.1	69.3	69.0	68.4	72.3	75.4

¹ March data. Persons of Spanish origin may be of any race. Computed from *Current Population Reports*, series P-20, No. 310.

² Includes "age not reported."

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, based on *U.S. Census of Population: 1950; 1960; and 1970*, part B; and *Current Population Reports*, series P-25, No. 643, and earlier issues.

228-000 O - 77 - 4

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States 1977

$$\frac{\text{Female Population 1976}}{\text{Total Population 1976}} = \text{Female Percent of Population}$$

$$\frac{110,177}{214,649} = 51.3\%$$

HOUSEHOLD DATA
ANNUAL AVERAGES

44. Employment status of the civilian noninstitutional population and the white, black, and Hispanic origin components by sex and age

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status	Total		White		Black ¹		Hispanic origin ²	
	1976	1977	1976	1977	1976	1977	1976	1977
TOTAL								
Civilian noninstitutional population	153,904	156,426	135,569	137,595	15,945	16,314	6,843	7,156
Civilian labor force	94,773	97,401	83,276	86,207	9,293	9,738	4,146	4,391
Percent of population	61.6	62.3	61.9	62.6	58.9	59.7	50.6	61.4
Employment	87,485	90,546	78,021	80,734	8,093	8,364	3,668	3,953
Unemployment	7,288	6,855	5,255	5,373	1,301	1,355	478	438
Unemployment rate	7.7	7.0	6.2	6.2	13.8	13.9	11.5	10.0
Not in labor force	59,130	59,025	51,692	51,488	6,552	6,576	2,697	2,765
Males, 20 years and over								
Civilian noninstitutional population	64,561	65,796	57,482	58,516	6,101	6,253	2,720	2,891
Civilian labor force	51,577	52,464	46,178	46,960	4,582	4,710	2,288	2,445
Percent of population	79.8	79.7	80.3	80.3	75.1	75.3	84.1	84.6
Employment	48,486	49,737	43,704	44,784	4,068	4,214	2,076	2,262
Unemployment	2,359	2,727	2,474	2,176	514	496	212	184
Unemployment rate	5.2	8.7	5.4	4.6	11.2	10.5	9.3	7.5
Not in labor force	13,034	13,332	11,304	11,556	1,519	1,543	432	446
Females, 20 years and over								
Civilian noninstitutional population	72,917	74,160	64,234	65,104	7,618	7,832	3,171	3,276
Civilian labor force	34,276	35,685	29,659	30,853	3,992	4,168	1,403	1,162
Percent of population	47.0	48.1	46.2	47.4	52.4	53.5	44.4	44.9
Employment	31,730	33,199	27,634	28,930	3,578	3,675	1,246	1,321
Unemployment	2,546	2,486	2,025	1,922	464	513	162	148
Unemployment rate	7.4	7.0	6.8	6.2	11.6	12.2	11.5	10.1
Not in labor force	38,641	38,474	34,475	34,251	3,626	3,664	1,768	1,861
Both sexes, 16-19 years								
Civilian noninstitutional population	16,426	16,470	13,952	13,975	2,227	2,240	952	994
Civilian labor force	8,970	9,252	8,039	8,295	820	841	450	476
Percent of population	54.6	56.2	57.6	59.4	36.8	37.7	47.3	47.9
Employment	7,269	7,610	6,683	7,020	497	495	325	370
Unemployment	1,701	1,642	1,356	1,275	323	346	104	106
Unemployment rate	19.0	17.7	16.9	15.4	39.3	41.1	23.1	22.3
Not in labor force	7,455	7,218	5,914	5,680	1,407	1,399	502	518

¹ According to the 1970 Census, black workers comprised about 89 percent of the "black and other" population group. means that they are also included in the data for white and black workers. At the time of the 1970 Census, approximately 95 percent of the population was white.

² Data on persons of Hispanic origin are tabulated separately, without regard to race, which

Source: Employment and Earnings, January 1978, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Vol. 25, No. 1

Female Civilian Labor Force 1977 = Female percent of labor force
Total Civilian Labor Force 1977

$$\frac{35,685}{97,401} = 36.6\% \quad 40.5\%$$



United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

AUG 2 1978

Memorandum

To: Solicitor
Assistant Secretary - Energy and Minerals
Assistant Secretary - Fish and Wildlife
Assistant Secretary - Indian Affairs
Assistant Secretary - Land and Water Resources
Assistant Secretary - Policy, Budget and Administration

From: Secretary

Subject: Departmental Affirmative Action and the Bakke Decision

On June 28, 1978, the United States Supreme Court rendered its decision in the case of Regents of the University of California v. Allan Bakke. Although this decision is subject to many interpretations, one statement that is central to all these interpretations is: affirmative action is permissible. Consistent with this statement, and consistent with my memorandum to the Assistant Secretaries of August 15, 1977, the Department of Interior reaffirms its commitment to affirmative action to achieve equal participation in all its activities by minorities and women. The Department currently has underrepresentation of minorities and women in its procurement, grant, employment and other activities, and it remains our strongest intention to remedy this situation.

All bureaus and offices should continue and increase their affirmative action efforts to achieve equal participation for minorities and women. For example, all bureaus and offices should (1) actively seek out minority and women's business enterprises for procurement opportunities and (2) increase Departmental employment at all levels for minorities and women.

This message should be communicated by you to the heads of your respective bureaus and offices for complete dissemination within the Department, both in Washington, D.C. and in Regional and Field offices. The Solicitor's Office and the Office for Equal Opportunity will be able to assist you with questions concerning the relationship of Departmental affirmative action policy and the Bakke decision.

Through efforts such as outlined above, the Department will obtain equal participation by minorities and women through affirmative action.

Louis D. Anderson
Secretary

cc: Under Secretary
Director, Office for Equal Opportunity
Heads of Bureaus and Offices

Enclosure 10A

Spotlight



Published bimonthly
by the United States Civil Service Commission
in the interest of equal employment opportunity

Volume 10 Number 6

September-October 1978

President Carter on Affirmative Action

Reaffirming a strong commitment to a policy of affirmative action and charging departments and agencies to continue developing, implementing and vigorously enforcing affirmative action plans, President Carter recently sent a memorandum to heads of executive departments and agencies.

The July 20, 1978 memorandum reads, "Since my Administration began, I have been strongly committed to a policy of affirmative action. It is through such programs that we can expect to remove the effects of discrimination and ensure equal opportunities for all Americans.

"With your help, this Administration has been able to develop and implement meaningful affirmative action programs throughout the Federal government, and as a result minority employment has in-

creased to its highest level in history.

"The recent decision by the Supreme Court in Bakke enables us to continue those efforts without interruption. That historic decision indicates that properly tailored affirmative action plans, which provide minorities with increased access to Federal programs and jobs and which are fair to all Americans, are consistent with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and with the Constitution.

"I want to make certain that, in the aftermath of Bakke, you continue to develop, implement and enforce vigorously affirmative action programs. I also want to make certain that the Administration's strong commitment to equal opportunity and affirmative action is recognized and understood by all Americans."

No Upper Age Limit in Federal Employment

Civil Service Commission Bulletin 713-53, entitled "Newly Protected Age Group Coverage in Part 713 Discrimination Complaints System — ADEA Amendments of 1978 (Public Law 95-256)" provides guidance needed for extending the part 713 administrative discrimination complaints system for use by those individuals newly included in the Age Discrimination in Employment Act — protected age group.

Insofar as Federal employment is concerned, the protected age group no longer has any upper age limit. Effective September 30, 1978, the protected age group was redefined from employees age 40 to less than 70 and applicants age 40 to less than 65 to employees and applicants who are at least 40 years of age.

Subject to coverage in the provisions of part 713, applicants age 65 or more and employees age 70 or more are to be covered

to New Post

Carlos F. Esparza, Director the Federal Hispanic Employment Program Office of 1 CSC, has been named Dep Director of the Civil Serv Commission's Philadelphi Region. Esparza assumed 1 new duties on October 2, 1978.

Esparza began his Federal career as a personnel investigator with the CSC in 1961. He was selected as an Administrative Intern in 1967 and served in the CSC central personnel office through 1970. From 1970 until his selection as Director of the Hispanic Employment Program (then the Office of the Spanish Speaking Program) in 1973, he held various assignments as an inspector with the Commission's Bureau of Personnel Management Evaluation.

Evaluation of FWF

The Office of the Federal Women's Program of the Civil Service Commission is conducting an evaluation of the eleven year old program. The evaluation stems from a recommendation of the President's Personnel Management Task Force which calls for better evaluation criteria for Equal Employment Opportunity Programs.

Bentley Roberts of the CSC
cont'd p. 4

under part 713 discriminatory complaints provisions: a) If a complaint of age discrimination is based on alleged discriminatory action(s) occurring on or after September 30, 1978; b) If a complaint of age discrimination is based on alleged discriminatory action(s) occurring within 30 days immediately preceding September 30, 1978; or, c) If a complaint of age discrimination was the subject of administrative proceedings in process on September 30, 1978.

Federal employees should check with their personnel offices to review CSC Bulletin 713-53.

1116 St. Stephens Road
Alexandria, Virginia 22304
March 12, 1979

Director, Office of Affirmative
Employment Programs
Office of Personnel Management
1900 E Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20415

Dear Sir:

These are my comments regarding the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) proposed regulations and attached Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) guidelines published in the February 9, 1979, Federal Register and entitled: Antidiscrimination Policy: Special Federal Recruitment Program.

The proposed regulations and guidelines are based on Section 310 of the recently enacted Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 (CSRA 1978) now codified as 5 USC 7201. This section makes crystal clear the authority for doing what the federal government has been doing for years.

Before commenting on these new proposals, it is important to examine the effects on the federal work force that EEO plans and affirmative action programs have had over the years. Let me begin by stating outright that designated minorities are now overrepresented in the federal work force by 91.2%, blacks by 132.3% and women by 12.2%. Because of the widespread misconception that designated minorities and women are underrepresented in the federal work force, these figures may well be dismissed as too fantastic to be believed. Yet, they are correct. In fact, as will be demonstrated later on in these comments, the figure for designated minorities is considerably understated. The calculations supporting these figures are attached as Enclosure 1. These figures have been extracted or derived from recognized governmental sources, and veterans preference has been factored into them. Factoring in veterans preference is necessary for two reasons:

(1) So that a valid comparison can be made between the female and designated minority composition of the federal work force and national work force. Veterans preference has a disproportionately greater effect on the composition of the federal work force than it does on the national work force. (The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, appearing on the MacNeil/Lehrer Report, said that 48% of the federal work force is veterans, male veterans, in contrast to 23% of the national work force. See Enclosure 2.) Unless the effect of veterans preference is eliminated in the beginning the comparison would not be valid. In essence, the comparison must be made between the non-veteran federal work force and the non-veteran national work force.

B

(2) So that the representation of designated minorities and women in the federal work force as determined by affirmative action programs can be measured in terms of the legal objective of those programs. As the Chairman of the Commission went on to say on the same television program mentioned above, one could argue that veterans preference is indeed an affirmative action program that worked and continues to work inconsistently with other affirmative action programs. The veterans preference program operates to discriminate in favor of veterans in the selection of government employees. Because 92% of all veterans are white and 97% are men (Enclosure 1), this program also discriminates in favor of white men and against designated minorities and women. The affirmative action programs on the other hand discriminate in favor of designated minorities and women and against white men.

The morality and constitutionality of both the veterans preference program and affirmative action programs can be argued, but the legality of the veterans preference program is unassailable. Its legal basis is the Veterans Preference Act of 1944. The express purpose of the Veterans Preference Act is to give preference to veterans in personnel matters, including selection and hiring. Until enactment of Section 7201, the legal basis for both the equal employment opportunity programs and the affirmative action programs was Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VII says that discrimination in personnel matters based on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin is unlawful. In some cases, the courts have held this to mean that discrimination is legal when the purpose is to achieve parity of employment for designated minorities and women and to remedy the adverse effects on them of past discrimination because of race, sex, and ethnicity. In no case that I know of has a court held that discrimination is legal when it is intended to remedy the adverse effects of veterans preference on designated minorities and women.

If it were assumed that one purpose of affirmative action programs was to remedy the adverse effects of discrimination on designated minorities and women because of lack of veterans status, then it would have to be assumed that these programs were invented by the federal bureaucracy as a device to frustrate the will of Congress by counteracting and offsetting veterans preference. This cannot be assumed.

Therefore, it is parity of employment after veterans preference is taken into account that is the legal objective of affirmative action programs. Once parity of employment is achieved--and it was achieved, and then some, years ago--there is no legal basis whatsoever for continuing affirmative action programs. Section 7201 does not change this; it simply says that parity must be achieved in every grade and series as well as in the overall.

Even without allowing for veterans preference, designated minorities comprise 16.7% of the national work force (Enclosure 3) and 21.6% of the federal work force (Enclosure 4). Therefore, they are overrepresented in the federal work force by 29.3%. Blacks are overrepresented by 56.9% (Enclosure 1). This situation

has persisted for some time. In 1969, the former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission reported that almost 20% of the jobs in the federal work force were held by designated minority groups and that the proportion of non-white persons employed in the federal government exceeded the percentage of non-whites in the national work force by almost 50%--16% as contrasted with 10.8%. (Enclosure 5.)

How did this happen? Back before the Kennedy administration, the federal government began giving preference to blacks probably because administration officials had vicarious feelings of guilt that sprang from a painful awareness of social wrongs that took place in the past and a felt need to atone for them somehow. Then, blacks, women, and finally hispanics formed single-interest political pressure groups. After that, it became politically expedient to discriminate in favor of these designated minority groups and women and against whites and men.

Are whites and men discriminated against by the federal government. Very much so. A rule of thumb for determining whether or not the employee selection procedures of an employer are discriminatory was established by the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978). These were adopted by the EEOC, the Civil Service Commission, the Department of Justice, the Department of Treasury, and the Department of Labor on September 25, 1978. The rule of thumb states that adverse impact will be indicated and the selection procedures of employers usually will be considered to be discriminatory when "a selection rate [from the applicant pool] for any race, sex, or ethnic group . . . is less than . . . 80 percent of the rate for the group with the highest rate." The 1976 Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinating Council Policy Statement of Affirmative Action (which is attached to the Uniform Guidelines as an appendix) postulates, as the first step in the construction of any affirmative action plan, a determination as to "whether percentages of sex, race, or ethnic groups in individual job classifications are substantially similar to the percentages of these groups available in the relevant job market who possess the basic job-related qualifications." Since the race, sex, and ethnic composition of the employer's applicant pool must also approximate that of his relevant job market, the sum of these two statements is that, unless an employer's work force includes a number in each sex, race, and ethnic group which represents, as a proportion, at least 80% of the proportion of that group in the relevant labor market from which the employer draws his employees, the employer's selection procedures will generally be considered to be discriminatory.

Calculations required to apply the rule of thumb are shown in Enclosure 1. Again, veterans preference is factored in. They reveal that 21.3% of the non-veterans in the federal work force are men compared to 36.5% of the non-veterans in the national work force. It is also evident that 30.4% of the non-veterans in the federal work force are white compared to 65% of the non-veterans in the national work force. Thus, the percentage of non-veteran men in the federal work force compared to the percentage of non-veteran men in the national work force is 58.4 and the percentage of whites is 46.8. Therefore, both men and whites are under-represented among non-veterans in the federal work force to a point far below the

80% rule of thumb. The inescapable conclusion is that the federal government's procedures for the selection of employees illegally discriminate against whites and men. The impact of these procedures on non-veteran whites and non-veteran men is quite evident and, were it not for the offsetting and obscuring effects of veterans preference, the impact of these discriminatory procedures on veteran whites and veteran men would also be evident and to the same extent.

What should be done? What would EEOC do if it learned that designated minorities and women were underrepresented in the work force of a private employer? EEOC would attempt to persuade or coerce the employer to implement an affirmative action program to correct the imbalance. Failing this, EEOC would sue. Would EEOC act the same way if it learned that whites and men were underrepresented in a private employer's work force? Although I know of no precedent for this, EEOC would almost have to. After all, both Title VII and the Uniform Guidelines apply to whites and men the same as they do to other races and women. Whites and men are entitled to equal protection of the laws under the U.S. Constitution the same as everyone else. Does it make any difference that the federal government is a public employer rather than a private employer? No. Both Title VII and the Uniform Guidelines apply to the federal government the same as they do to private, state and municipal employers. Is equal employment opportunity in the federal government the responsibility of the EEOC? It is now.

Clearly then, EEOC should apply its rule of thumb to every agency, agency component, and independent establishment of the federal government beginning with EEOC itself because whites and men are grossly underrepresented in its own work force. The EEOC work force is made up of 62.6% minorities (including 49.9% blacks) and 56.3% women (Enclosure 6). Of course, not all agencies, agency components, and independent establishments will be in the same situation. The percentages of designated minorities in selected agencies range from 39.4% for GSA to 8.0% for TVA. The percentages of women range from 62.3% for HEW to 8.9% for TVA (Enclosure 4). For most agencies, agency components, and independent establishments, the action required to correct imbalances would be to abandon their present affirmative action programs, to install and operate in their place affirmative action programs giving preference to whites and to men, and to continue them in operation until such time as a balance is restored.

EEOC should move vigorously on this for two reasons: First, private, state and municipal employers can hardly be expected to conform to a rule of thumb that the federal government itself does not conform to; and, second, the federal government is risking a massive class action suit for reverse discrimination that someone is almost bound to file sooner or later when the facts about this situation become more widely known as they surely will. Were such a suit decided for the complainant, the credibility and effectiveness of the EEOC and the whole EEO program would be greatly impaired if not completely destroyed.

It is against this background that the proposed regulations and attached EEOC guidelines should be discussed but, before doing that, it is important to look at what Section 7201 does and does not do. Section 7201 requires agencies of the federal government to implement continuing programs designed to eliminate

underrepresentation of designated minorities in the various categories of civil service employment within the federal service. By "categories of civil service employment" is meant each grade of the General Schedule, each position, and each occupational, professional, or other grouping within grade and position. By "underrepresentation" is meant a situation in which a designated minority group constitutes a lower percentage of the total number of employees within the employment category than the percentage that the minority constitutes within the labor force of the United States as determined under the most recent census or current population survey.

As indicated above, designated minorities are overrepresented by 91.2% and blacks by 132.3%. Section 310 of the CSRA 1978 (7201) is silent about actions to be taken to eliminate overrepresentation of designated minorities in the federal work force or to correct underrepresentation of whites. This is a curious omission. Section 7201 was no doubt passed by a benevolent Congress very likely laboring under the mistaken impression that designated minorities are underrepresented in the federal government--a common impression perhaps perpetuated by inadequate hearings on Section 310. Were there hearings at all?

There are three features of the proposed regulations and guidelines that I wish to comment on: (1) their ratcheting effect, (2) the inclusion of women, and (3) the EEOC calculations which result in the conclusion that designated minorities and women are underrepresented in the higher grades of the federal work force.

(1) There are two provisions of the proposed regulations that will contribute to a ratcheting effect for increasing the representation of designated minorities and women in the federal work force:

(a) Anytime that an underrepresentation of any designated minority group can be found in any grade or occupational grouping at any and all geographical locations, those underrepresentations are to be corrected. Underrepresentations of whites and men where found are not to be corrected.

(b) The designated minority composition of each agency's or agency component's work force is to be compared with that of both the local labor force and the national labor force. If the percentage of any minority group in the work force of an agency or agency component in any grade or any occupation and at any location falls short of either the local or national figure, an underrepresentation is considered to exist, and the agency or agency component must correct it. This is required regardless of the overall composition of the agency's or agency component's work force either for its entire work force or the work force at a particular location.

The Department of Energy (DOE) has a research center in Laramie, Wyoming. Recognizing that the OPM intends to publish more specific criteria in the future and that Laramie may not wind up as an appropriate agency component, let's take it as an example anyway. There are not many blacks in the State of Wyoming or surrounding states, but 13.3% of the non-veterans in the national work force are black. So, the guidelines will require that Laramie

hire blacks until at least 13.3% of its non-veteran work force is black. Where and how Laramie will find them and get them there will be a problem, but this is what Laramie must do under the proposed regulations. Laramie will have to be very careful about how this is done. If they get the 13.3% on board and then discover that they don't have that percentage in all grades and all series, they will have to hire more to fill up in those grades and series where they still have an underrepresentation.

DOE's Washington headquarters is in a different situation. It is located in a metropolitan area that has a work force that is, let's say, 30% black. So, the DOE headquarters must, under the proposed regulations, hire blacks up to at least 30% of its headquarters work force. If care is not taken as to how this is done by grade and series, the DOE headquarters may have to hire more than that so that no grade or series has less than 30%. All that can be said about these two provisions is that, implemented together, they will have the certain effect of exacerbating already serious racial and sexual imbalances in the federal work force.

(2) One must be intrigued about the fact that both the proposed regulations and the guidelines include women. Section 310 in my copy of the CSRA of 1978 is silent about women. Are there different versions of this law?

(3) The guidelines determined by the EEOC and attached to the proposed regulations as an appendix make much over their conclusion that women and designated minorities are underrepresented in the higher grades of the federal work force. The EEOC uses a very simplistic formula to arrive at this conclusion--a formula which is naive in its conception and which ignores a half-dozen elements essential to a proper determination. The only thing that can be said for the formula is that it is simple. In fact, it is falsely simple, and the results are grossly misleading and deceptive. The elements ignored are: (a) the interruption of the careers of women for bearing and rearing children, (b) veterans preference, (c) English language ability, (d) age and experience, (e) education and (f) demonstrated aptitudes. Each of these will be discussed separately.

(a) The way that EEOC looks at it, if a particular minority group or women make up a certain percentage of the national labor force, then that minority group or women should make up that same percentage of every grade in the federal work force. For example, EEOC's statistics show that women comprise 41% of the national work force; therefore, EEOC contends that women should comprise 41% of every grade in the federal work force. The idea is ridiculous because it fails to recognize that children are gestated in the bodies of women and reared, for the most part, by women at home.

To perform this essential function, the great preponderance of women in the work force leave it one or more times for longer or shorter periods. Their careers are interrupted. Men on the other hand, keep on working, gather additional experience and get promoted. It is as natural that men

have higher grades than women as it is that the sun rises in the morning. It is what must be expected unless our children are to be hatched in electric incubators like chickens. It has nothing to do with discrimination.

In 1976, of the 23.5 million women 14 to 54 years old who were not in the work force, 14.5 million or nearly 2/3 of them gave as their reason for not working that they were keeping house (Enclosure 7). Ignoring an important fact like this is not reasonable or logical. Unless it is considered, any conclusion reached concerning the grades of women compared to men is bound to be erroneous.

(b) Veterans preference was discussed above. One may disagree with it or not, but it is the law of the land, has very significant effects on the federal work force in many ways and simply cannot be ignored. It is not well to belabor this point because the effects are well known but consider, for example, what happens in a reduction in force. The veterans (white men) stay and the women and designated minorities go. Who is still around afterwards for promotions when they come up?

(c) Early on in these comments, it was said that the figure on the overrepresentation of designated minorities were understated. The 91.2% figure for overrepresentation of designated minorities is understated because the total number of hispanics was included as a component of designated minorities for the national work force. Instead, the number of hispanics able to read and write English should have been included. In 1969, one-fifth of the hispanics in this country 10 years old and over could not read and write English (Enclosure 8). There are few, if any jobs in the federal work force that do not require an ability to read and write English and none at all in the higher grades. On the other hand, there are many such jobs, particularly at lower wage levels, in the national work force.

If information on English language ability were factored into the comparability calculations that produced the 91.2% figure for overrepresentation of designated minorities, this figure would be considerably higher, and hispanics might not appear as being underrepresented at all. Similarly, a far different picture would emerge regarding the underrepresentation of designated minorities in the higher grades of the federal work force.

(d) Both blacks and hispanics as a race and ethnic group are younger than whites (Enclosure 9) and, therefore, do not have as much work experience as whites. It is simply impossible to gather experience without aging at the same time. In time this situation may correct itself notwithstanding the effects of recent legislation on mandatory retirement. In the meantime, it is natural to expect that older employees with more experience will hold higher grades. Yet if the EEOC formula is allowed to stand, this essential element in the equation will be ignored.

(e) Neither women, blacks nor hispanics are as well educated as white men, and the quality of the education received by blacks and hispanics is often not as good (Enclosure 10).

(f) Whites do significantly better than blacks and hispanics on tests of aptitude, particularly in areas of science and math (Enclosure 11).

It is essential to the efficiency and productivity of every organization that it be staffed with the best qualified personnel in terms of their capabilities that can be found. This is especially important for higher level positions because persons occupying these positions exert a disproportionately greater influence on the organization than do lower level employees. Demonstrated aptitudes, education and experience are the best indicators of such capabilities. If not, what is? So it is vital to every organization that those who make personnel decisions be permitted to make selections on the basis of these factors. How else can it be done? But the natural result will be disproportionately more whites in higher level positions. It must be expected just as night follows day. It has nothing to do with racial or ethnic discrimination. Yet, the EEOC formula ignores all of these important factors.

The question that bothers me most is why the EEOC formula is proposed at all when it must be obvious to everyone that many essential factors are ignored. I suspect the answer to be that it is not actually possible to crank any but one or two of these factors into comparability calculations in a way that is statistically acceptable. If that is the case, there would appear to be only two other alternatives: don't make the comparisons at all, or make them without factoring in all essential data knowing full well that the results will be misleading and deceptive.

Admittedly, Section 7201 is not clear about how comparisons should be made to determine underrepresentation by grade, but I think the best interpretation of its intention is that these determinations should be made by comparing same grades in the federal work force and the national work force. For example, if 2% of the workers in the national work force in the GS-13 salary bracket are blacks, then it is intended that 2% of the GS-13's in the federal work force should be black. As stated before, EEOC interprets Section 7201 to mean that, if 13.3% of all workers in the national work force are black, then 13.3% of every grade in the federal work force should be black. The decision on which interpretation is correct will be critical because the results are far different.

Enclosure 11A compares the mean earnings of fulltime white, black, and female workers in the federal work force with the mean earnings of full-time white, black and female workers in the national work force. Notice that all three groups earn more in the federal work force than they do in the national work force. But, compared to their earnings in the national work force, blacks are paid proportionately more in the federal work force than whites are. For example, black men in the federal work force are paid 28.9% more than they are in the national work force, but white men are paid only 15.6% more. Compared to men,

the same is true of women. Therefore, it can be safely said that the 1976 average earnings--and, hence, average grades--of both blacks and women in the federal work force are not only higher than they are in the national work force but that they are also proportionately higher than those of whites and men in the federal work force when compared to the national work force. This conclusion is, of course, just about the opposite of the one reached by the EEOC.

To summarize these comments, it has been demonstrated that women are overrepresented in the federal work force by 12.2% and blacks by 132.3%. Because blacks are by far the largest of the designated minorities, the designated minorities as a whole are overrepresented by at least 91.2%. It has also been demonstrated that the EEOC guidelines do not succeed in making a case for the proposition that women and designated minorities are underrepresented in the higher grades of the federal work force.

If a balanced work force in terms of race, sex, and ethnicity is what is wanted, then it behooves the EEOC to begin promptly implementation of reverse affirmative action programs within the federal government for the purpose of reducing the representation of blacks and women and increasing the representation of whites and men. If that is not what is wanted, then affirmative action programs should be abandoned altogether everywhere. The country cannot have it both ways.

The better view is that it would be preferable to abandon affirmative action programs altogether everywhere. The federal government's continual tinkering with the racial, sexual, and ethnic composition of the work forces of employers with the hope of achieving some useful social and economic purpose is likely instead to result in grave and lasting harm to the government and the country. The sensible thing to do is to stop it and to allow supervisors to select persons for jobs who they think are best qualified regardless of race, sex, or ethnic group. That is what Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 demands and the taxpayers expect. It won't work perfectly; nothing does. There will be some discrimination as proscribed by Title VII, but probably no more than now.

Regardless of which way it is decided the country should go, the administration should ask Congress for a quick repeal of Section 7201 (the Garcia amendment). The proposed regulations and guidelines subject of these comments should be given a quiet and decent burial.

Sincerely yours,

151

Walter J. Lander

Enclosures

ANALYSIS
OF
THE NON-VETERAN WORK FORCE
FEDERAL AND NATIONAL

<u>Line</u>	<u>(Federal Work Force)</u>		<u>Source</u>
1.	Fed. WF (U.S. Govt.)	2,414,034	Encl. 4
2.	% of Fed. WF that is veteran	48%	Encl. 2
3.	No. vets in Fed. WF	1,158,736	Line 1 X Line 2
4.	No. non-vets in Fed. WF	1,255,298	Line 1 - Line 3
5.	No. women in Fed. WF	740,314	Encl. 4
6.	% women of non-vets in Fed. WF	59%	Line 5 ÷ Line 4
7.	No. non-vet men in Fed. WF	514,984	(Line 4 - Line 5)
8.	% non-vet men in Fed. WF	21.3%	Line 7 ÷ Line 1
9.	No. whites in Fed. WF	1,893,184	Encl. 4
10.	No. non-vet whites in Fed. WF	734,448	(Line 9 - Line 3)
11.	% non-vet whites in Fed. WF	30.4%	Line 10 ÷ Line 1
12.	No. designated minorities in Fed. WF	520,850	Encl. 4
13.	% designated minorities of non-vets in Fed. WF	41.5%	Line 12 ÷ Line 4
14.	No. blacks in Fed. WF	387,630	Encl. 4
15.	% blacks of non-vets in Fed. WF	30.9%	(Line 14 ÷ Line 4)

(National Work Force--Numbers in
Thousands)

16.	Nat. WF (Civ. Labor Force of the U.S.)	101,841	Encl. 3
17.	% of Nat. WF that is veteran	23%	Encl. 2
18.	No. vets in Nat. WF	23,423	Line 16 X Line 17
19.	No. non-vets in Nat. WF	78,418	Line 16 - Line 18
20.	% women in Nat. WF	40.5%	Encl. 1A
21.	No. women in Nat. WF	41,246	Line 16 X Line 20
22.	% women of non-vets in Nat. WF	52.6%	Line 21 ÷ Line 19
23.	No. non-vet men in Nat. WF	37,172	(Line 19 - Line 21)
24.	% non-vet men in Nat. WF	36.5%	Line 23 ÷ Line 16
25.	No. whites in Nat. WF	89,585	Encl. 3
26.	No. non-vet whites in Nat. WF	66,162	(Line 25 - Line 18)
27.	% non-vet whites in Nat. WF	65%	Line 26 ÷ Line 16
28.	No. designated minorities in Nat. WF	17,035	Encl. 3
29.	% designated minorities of non-vets in Nat. WF	21.7%	Line 28 ÷ Line 19
30.	No. blacks in Nat. WF	10,431	Encl. 3
31.	% blacks of non-vets in Nat. WF	13.3%	(Line 30 ÷ Line 19)

Enclosure 1

(Comparison Fed. WF and Nat. WF)

32.	% overrepresentation of women in the non-vet Fed. WF over the non-vet Nat. WF	12.2%	(Line 6 - Line 22) ÷ Line 22
33.	% non-vet men in Fed. WF compared to % non-vet men in Nat. WF	58.4%	Line 8 ÷ Line 24
34.	% non-vet whites in Fed. WF compared to % non-vet whites in Nat. WF	46.8%	Line 11 ÷ Line 27
35.	% overrepresentation of designated minorities in non-vet Fed. WF over the non-vet Nat. WF	91.2%	(Line 13 - Line 29) ÷ Line 29
36.	% overrepresentation of blacks in non-vet Fed WF over the non-vet Nat. WF	132.3%	(Line 15 - Line 31) - Line 31
37.	% overrepresentation of blacks in Fed. WF	56.9%	(Line 14 ÷ Line 1) - (Line 30 ÷ Line 16) ÷ (Line 30 ÷ Line 16)

Percentages of veterans that are men (97%) and white (92%) were extracted from William Raspberry's column that appeared in the Washington Post on 2/2/79. The foregoing computations assume that all veterans are men and white.

HOUSEHOLD DATA
ANNUAL AVERAGES

44. Employment status of the civilian noninstitutional population and the white, black, and Hispanic origin components by sex and age

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status	Total		White		Black ¹		Hispanic origin ²	
	1976	1977	1976	1977	1976	1977	1976	1977
TOTAL								
Civilian noninstitutional population	153,904	156,426	135,569	137,595	15,945	16,514	6,843	7,154
Civilian labor force	94,773	97,401	83,276	86,207	9,293	9,738	4,146	4,391
Percent of population	61.6	62.3	61.9	62.6	58.9	59.7	40.6	41.4
Employment	87,485	90,546	78,021	80,734	8,053	8,384	3,668	3,953
Agriculture	3,297	3,244	3,029	2,993	276	212	204	217
Manufacturing and construction	84,188	87,302	74,992	77,741	7,967	8,172	3,465	3,736
Unemployment	7,288	6,855	5,255	5,373	1,301	1,355	478	438
Unemployment rate	7.7	7.0	6.2	6.2	13.8	13.9	11.5	10.0
Not in labor force	59,130	59,025	51,692	51,488	6,552	6,576	2,697	2,763
Males, 20 years and over								
Civilian noninstitutional population	64,561	65,796	57,422	58,516	6,101	6,253	2,720	2,891
Civilian labor force	51,577	52,464	46,178	46,960	4,582	4,710	2,288	2,445
Percent of population	79.8	79.7	80.3	80.3	75.1	75.3	84.1	84.6
Employment	48,486	49,727	43,704	44,784	4,068	4,214	2,076	2,262
Agriculture	2,359	2,308	2,153	2,123	173	158	145	151
Manufacturing and construction	16,128	17,029	14,551	15,661	1,895	2,056	1,931	2,111
Unemployment	3,041	2,727	2,474	2,176	514	496	212	184
Unemployment rate	5.9	5.2	5.4	4.6	11.2	10.5	9.3	7.5
Not in labor force	13,034	13,332	11,304	11,556	1,519	1,543	432	446
Females, 20 years and over								
Civilian noninstitutional population	72,917	74,160	64,231	65,104	7,619	7,832	3,171	3,270
Civilian labor force	34,277	35,685	29,059	30,853	3,992	4,188	1,403	1,603
Percent of population	47.0	48.1	46.2	47.4	52.4	53.5	44.4	44.9
Employment	31,710	33,199	27,634	28,930	3,578	3,675	1,246	1,321
Agriculture	511	537	477	495	29	33	34	35
Manufacturing and construction	31,215	32,662	27,157	28,436	3,459	3,642	1,216	1,287
Unemployment	2,545	2,486	2,025	1,922	464	513	162	148
Unemployment rate	7.4	7.0	6.8	6.2	11.6	12.2	11.5	10.1
Not in labor force	38,641	38,474	34,475	34,251	2,626	3,644	1,768	1,667
Both sexes, 16-19 years								
Civilian noninstitutional population	16,826	16,470	13,952	13,975	2,227	2,280	952	924
Civilian labor force	8,970	9,252	8,039	8,295	820	841	450	476
Percent of population	54.6	56.2	57.6	59.4	36.8	37.7	47.3	47.9
Employment	7,269	7,610	6,683	7,020	497	495	325	370
Agriculture	427	399	399	375	24	21	28	31
Manufacturing and construction	6,842	7,211	6,284	6,644	472	474	318	339
Unemployment	1,701	1,642	1,356	1,275	325	346	104	106
Unemployment rate	19.0	17.7	16.9	15.4	39.3	41.1	23.1	22.3
Not in labor force	7,455	7,218	5,914	5,680	1,407	1,389	503	448

¹ According to the 1970 Census, black workers comprised about 89 percent of the "black and other" population group. ² Data on persons of Hispanic origin are tabulated separately, without regard to race, which means that they are also included in the data for white and black workers. At the time of the 1970 Census, approximately 95 percent of this population was white.

Source: Employment and Earnings, January 1978, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Vol. 25, No. 1

Female Civilian Labor Force 1977 = Female percent of labor force
Total Civilian Labor Force 1977

$$\frac{35,685}{88,149} = 40.5\%$$

Campbell: "Well, I'm certain it is not the total cause because discrimination has many sources. However, one cannot get away from the fact that forty-eight percent of the federal work force is veterans, male veterans, in contrast to twenty-three percent of the national work force. In other words, a veteran is twice as likely to have a job in the federal government proportionate to the numbers there as in the private sector. One could argue that veterans' preference is indeed an affirmative action program that worked. And it continues to work, and in doing so is inconsistent with other affirmative action programs."

Excerpt from:

The MacNeil/Lehrer Report, "Veterans' Preference", Library #838, Show #4118, December 13, 1978

Enclosure 2

Table 6. Employment status of the noninstitutional population by race and Hispanic origin, quarterly averages, not seasonally adjusted

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status	Total		White		Black ¹		Hispanic origin ²	
	III 1977	III 1978	III 1977	III 1978	III 1977	III 1978	III 1977	III 1978
TOTAL								
Civilian noninstitutional population	156,764	159,235	137,870	139,822	16,374	16,678	7,320	7,829
Civilian labor force	98,690	101,841	87,135	89,585	9,962	20,431	4,599	4,978
Percent of population	63.0	64.0	63.2	64.1	60.8	62.5	62.8	63.6
Employment	91,978	95,786	82,001	84,997	8,513	9,125	4,163	4,523
Agriculture	3,600	3,801	3,324	3,447	228	270	257	255
Nonagricultural industries	88,379	91,986	78,677	81,550	8,286	8,855	3,906	4,267
Unemployment	6,712	6,055	5,134	4,588	1,449	1,306	437	456
Unemployment rate	6.8	5.9	5.9	5.1	14.5	12.5	9.5	9.2
Not in labor force	58,074	57,394	50,735	50,237	6,411	6,247	2,721	2,851

¹ Data refers to black workers only. According to the 1970 Census, they comprised about 89 percent of the "black and other" population group.

² Data on persons of Hispanic origin are tabulated separately, without regard to race, which means that they are also included in the data for white and black workers. At the time of the 1970 Census, approximately 96 percent of their population was white.

NOTE: Data for 1977 for total Hispanic origin are not strictly comparable with those published earlier. These estimates incorporate the expanded sample and revised estimation procedures introduced in the national sample in January 1978.

Table 7. Employment status of persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban origin, quarterly averages, not seasonally adjusted

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status	Total Hispanic origin ¹		Mexican origin		Puerto Rican origin		Cuban origin	
	III 1977	III 1978	III 1977	III 1978	III 1977	III 1978	III 1977	III 1978
TOTAL								
Civilian noninstitutional population	7,320	7,829	4,260	4,602	1,043	1,090	566	618
Civilian labor force	4,599	4,978	2,797	3,022	527	575	363	424
Percent of population	62.8	63.6	65.7	65.7	50.5	52.8	64.1	68.6
Employment	4,163	4,523	2,543	2,755	446	489	338	397
Agriculture	257	255	231	227	12	13	2	5
Nonagricultural industries	3,906	4,267	2,312	2,528	434	476	336	392
Unemployment	437	456	255	267	81	86	25	27
Unemployment rate	9.5	9.2	9.1	8.8	15.4	15.0	6.8	6.4
Not in labor force	2,721	2,851	1,462	1,579	517	515	203	194

¹ Includes persons of Central or South American origin and other Hispanic origin, not shown separately.

NOTE: See note, table 6.

Source: USDL 78-849, Labor Force Developments: Third Quarter 1978
Bureau of Labor Statistics, U. S. Department of Labor

$$\frac{\text{Total Civilian Labor Force Minus White Labor Force} + (.96 \times \text{Labor Force of Hispanic Origin})}{\text{Total Civilian Labor Force}} = \text{Designated Minorities as Percent of Total Civilian Labor Force}$$

$$\frac{101,841 - 89,585 + 4,779}{101,841} = 16.7\%$$

TABLE 3 - TOTAL AND WOMEN FULL-TIME FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES, BY MEMORITY GROUP AND SELECTED AGENCY (12,000 OR MORE EMPLOYEES) AS OF NOVEMBER 30, 1977

SELECTED AGENCIES	ALL FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES		ALL MINORITY EMPLOYEES		NEGRO/BLACK		SPANISH-SURNAMED		AMERICAN INDIAN		ORIENTAL AMERICAN		ALL OTHER EMPLOYEES	
	TOTAL	WOMEN	TOTAL	WOMEN	TOTAL	WOMEN	TOTAL	WOMEN	TOTAL	WOMEN	TOTAL	WOMEN	TOTAL	WOMEN
TOTAL ALL AGENCIES	2,414,034	740,314	527,850	209,537	387,630	170,674	83,394	19,265	25,216	11,877	24,610	7,721	1,893,184	530,777
AVERAGE GRADE ^{a/}	8.22	5.93	5.54	5.62	6.32	5.66	7.07	5.36	6.01	4.88	8.67	6.69	8.59	6.04
DEFENSE TOTAL	(901,113)	(261,170)	(164,185)	(51,062)	(109,034)	(39,256)	(41,378)	(8,156)	(2,685)	(637)	(11,088)	(2,993)	(736,928)	(210,108)
AVERAGE GRADE	7.84	5.36	6.39	5.18	6.08	5.72	6.53	4.86	7.63	5.56	8.14	5.53	8.08	5.47
ARMY	520,433	101,670	54,052	19,930	36,986	15,753	12,758	2,737	912	218	3,396	1,222	266,381	81,740
AVERAGE GRADE	7.60	5.32	6.27	5.23	5.96	5.74	6.48	4.93	7.09	5.32	8.16	5.78	7.81	5.34
NAVY	272,162	64,163	55,108	13,720	40,889	11,348	8,350	1,316	384	114	5,285	942	217,054	50,443
AVERAGE GRADE	8.12	5.35	6.35	5.10	5.92	5.10	6.76	4.84	8.13	5.45	8.19	5.32	8.41	5.41
AIR FORCE	238,241	68,789	40,334	11,210	18,826	6,596	18,743	3,741	1,028	266	1,743	607	197,907	57,579
AVERAGE GRADE	7.63	5.24	6.31	4.92	6.03	4.96	6.34	4.77	7.61	5.60	7.68	5.18	7.83	5.30
OFFICE OF SEC. OF DEFENSE AND OTHER DEP. ACTIVITIES	24,656	9,744	2,939	1,203	2,285	1,001	354	98	18	9	282	95	21,717	8,541
AVERAGE GRADE	9.74	6.67	8.34	6.55	7.97	6.48	9.04	6.23	9.60	7.20	10.26	7.70	9.93	6.69
DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY	45,621	16,804	11,752	4,999	10,054	4,558	1,173	264	143	50	382	127	33,869	11,805
AVERAGE GRADE	8.00	5.58	6.54	5.49	6.39	5.52	7.24	4.91	8.56	6.30	7.63	5.38	8.37	5.62
STATE (INCLUDES AID)	15,905	5,794	2,953	1,640	2,421	1,497	380	76	19	13	133	54	12,952	4,154
AVERAGE GRADE	10.50	8.09	8.13	7.09	7.83	7.02	9.42	7.51	8.89	7.31	10.38	8.28	11.00	8.48
TREASURY	115,431	54,705	22,640	14,393	17,617	12,071	3,631	1,731	182	85	1,210	506	92,791	40,312
AVERAGE GRADE	8.03	5.64	6.27	5.74	6.07	5.78	6.45	4.76	7.51	5.15	8.16	6.31	8.42	5.75
JUSTICE	51,505	17,050	9,035	4,764	6,514	4,006	2,127	600	95	25	299	133	42,470	12,286
AVERAGE GRADE	8.66	5.88	6.48	5.23	6.04	5.18	7.56	5.34	8.87	5.96	7.68	6.05	9.13	6.13
INTERIOR	69,299	19,861	19,250	8,175	3,372	1,242	1,622	411	13,785	6,367	471	153	50,049	11,686
AVERAGE GRADE	8.28	5.70	6.12	5.07	7.05	6.20	7.32	5.48	5.66	4.77	9.13	6.52	8.99	6.12
AGRICULTURE	86,428	20,718	8,783	3,128	5,763	2,523	2,110	348	377	97	333	160	77,645	17,590
AVERAGE GRADE	8.47	5.75	7.28	5.90	7.15	5.94	6.98	5.32	6.94	4.64	9.70	7.19	8.59	5.72
COMMERCE	31,072	10,612	6,456	3,553	5,479	3,289	462	149	119	20	396	95	24,616	7,059
AVERAGE GRADE	9.50	6.50	7.41	6.20	7.02	6.13	9.11	6.60	8.27	5.50	10.48	7.93	10.01	6.45
LABOR	14,980	6,714	4,394	2,952	3,797	2,689	388	169	53	19	156	75	10,586	3,762
AVERAGE GRADE	9.35	6.88	7.44	6.17	7.19	6.12	8.88	6.04	10.79	7.89	8.87	7.59	10.14	7.44
ENERGY	17,657	5,399	2,121	990	1,151	710	634	177	129	31	207	72	15,536	4,409
AVERAGE GRADE	10.17	7.10	8.06	6.67	7.91	6.73	7.67	6.18	8.30	6.30	9.84	7.46	10.47	7.20
HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE	138,172	86,045	43,372	31,139	32,593	23,982	3,875	2,436	5,504	3,886	1,400	835	94,800	54,906
AVERAGE GRADE	7.83	6.59	6.51	5.98	6.49	6.08	7.32	6.23	5.55	4.78	8.51	7.52	8.39	6.93
HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT	16,822	7,575	4,522	2,909	3,802	2,537	458	229	71	39	191	104	12,300	4,666
AVERAGE GRADE	9.21	6.58	7.77	6.48	7.68	6.52	8.09	5.82	8.48	5.97	8.50	7.01	9.74	6.44
TRANSPORTATION	68,092	11,243	8,566	2,916	6,078	2,499	1,409	215	606	108	473	94	59,526	8,327
AVERAGE GRADE	10.87	6.53	8.88	6.15	8.38	6.16	9.90	5.83	10.02	5.91	10.48	6.97	11.13	6.66
GENERAL SERVICE ADMINISTRATION	34,825	11,520	13,704	5,350	12,114	4,947	1,070	234	125	39	395	130	21,121	6,170
AVERAGE GRADE	7.81	6.11	6.29	5.73	6.15	5.72	6.85	5.56	7.63	5.79	7.82	6.19	8.46	6.70
NAT'L AERONAUTICS & SPACE AD'M	23,994	4,543	2,035	755	1,338	603	400	85	47	18	250	49	21,961	3,788
AVERAGE GRADE	10.98	6.42	8.22	5.51	7.76	5.45	9.24	5.08	9.47	6.33	10.74	6.75	11.23	6.60
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY	39,445	3,526	3,150	406	3,019	393	37	4	33	1	61	8	36,295	3,120
AVERAGE GRADE	7.87	4.92	5.95	4.43	5.62	4.34	8.92	6.75	7.71	7.00	10.30	7.13	8.03	4.98
UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE	514,162	81,475	129,449	34,807	107,793	32,191	16,476	1,709	861	226	4,319	681	384,713	46,668
AVERAGE GRADE	None	None												
VETERANS ADMINISTRATION	192,531	100,045	53,860	28,225	46,344	25,102	4,996	1,714	372	174	2,148	1,235	138,671	71,820
AVERAGE GRADE	6.96	6.33	5.73	5.63	5.45	5.44	6.40	5.98	6.51	5.77	9.08	8.42	7.36	6.56
ALL OTHER AGENCIES	82,399	32,319	22,375	12,373	19,401	11,137	1,941	822	153	72	880	342	60,224	19,946

^{a/} Average grade for employees under General Schedule and equivalent pay systems.

Source: Civil Service News, Advance August 23, 1978, U.S. Civil Service Commission

See attached page.

Attachment to Enclosure 4

Full Time Designated Minority Employees
in Federal Work Force = Designated Minorities as Percent of
Federal Work Force
Total Full Time Employees in
Federal Work Force

520,850 = 21.6%
2,414,034

Full Time Designated Minority Employees
in the GSA Work Force = Designated Minorities as Percent of
GSA Work Force
Total Full Time Employees in
the GSA Work Force

13,704 = 39.4%
34,825

Full Time Designated Minority Employees
in the TVA Work Force = Designated Minority as Percent of
TVA Work Force
Total Full Time Employees in
the TVA Work Force

3,150 = 8.0%
39,445

Full Time Women Employees in the
HEW Work Force = Women as Percent of HEW Work Force
Total Full Time Employees
in the HEW Work Force

86,045 = 62.3%
138,172

Full Time Women Employees in the
TVA Work Force = Women as Percent of TVA Work Force
Total Full Time Employees
in the TVA Work Force

3,526 = 8.9%
39,445

Equal Employment Opportunity in the Federal Government

*Memorandum Report for the President From
Robert E. Hampton, Chairman, United States
Civil Service Commission. August 8, 1969*

You asked that I review the Government's equal employment opportunity program and report to you recommendations for policy and program changes. This is my report.

There is no program in the Civil Service Commission of greater importance than the effort to achieve full equality of employment opportunity in the Federal service. Assuring equal opportunity and eliminating any vestige of discrimination in employment practices is essential to the well-being of the Government and crucial to the nation. Race, color, religion, national origin, or sex must never affect the opportunity of an American to work for and advance within the Federal service.

Review

In making the review, we took the following actions:

- Studied the ways in which the Federal Government had organized in the past for equal employment opportunity and program effectiveness under each of these organizational approaches.
- Reviewed particularly the organization and results under the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, which exercised program leadership immediately prior to the Civil Service Commission's assumption of responsibility in 1965.
- Conducted a thorough analysis of efforts and results under Commission stewardship during the past three and one-half years.

In reviewing program activities and progress since the Commission was assigned responsibility by Executive Order 11246, we did the following:

- Requested and received recommendations from department and agency heads on future program direction.
- Met with agency equal employment opportunity officers and directors of personnel to discuss progress and problems and to receive program suggestions.
- Met with representatives of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, the Department of Justice, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, to obtain input from these Federal agencies having civil rights responsibilities.
- Met with the Commission's ten regional directors to gain their insights and program recommendations.
- Consulted, through our regional directors, with Federal Executive Boards and Associations to get program ideas from managers of Federal installations across the nation.

- Consulted at the staff level with minority group organizations to assure consideration of their points of view and suggestions.
- Met with representatives of women's organizations and Federal agencies to obtain recommendations relating to equal employment of women in the Federal Government.

We thus compiled a comprehensive base for overall assessment of the Federal equal employment opportunity program. We looked at its beginnings; we evaluated what has been done and what is underway; we attempted to assess our overall progress. Finally, we defined the challenges which still must be met and mapped out a proposed course of action.

Progress

We can report that the Government has made significant progress in equal employment opportunity. Much has been done to open the doors of opportunity to many for whom they had been closed.

—Since 1965, when the Civil Service Commission was given leadership responsibility for the Government's equal opportunity program, significant gains have been made in overall minority employment in the Federal service.

—One-half million jobs, almost 20% of the Federal workforce in the Executive Branch, are held by minority group Americans.

—The proportion of non-white persons employed in the Federal Government is almost 50% higher than the percentage of non-whites in the overall workforce in the United States—16% as contrasted with 10.8%, based on most recent data available. In addition, the Government employs over 70,000 Spanish sur-named Americans.

Total employment figures, impressive as they are, cannot tell the whole story, either of progress or of failures.

- Federal departments and agencies have engaged in action programs in their organizations and in their communities designed to improve equal employment opportunity.
- The climate in the Federal service for equal employment opportunity has improved greatly over the past few years.
- Equal opportunity is becoming recognized as an integral part of the responsibilities of each manager and supervisor in the Federal service.

The employment system is continually being reviewed and modified by the Civil Service Commission to assure that it is in fact open on an equal basis to all our citizens and at the same time meets the needs of Federal agencies for qualified manpower. The ultimate strength of the equal opportunity effort depends not so much on systems, however, as it does on the extent to which it becomes an inseparable part of management so that the commitment to equal opportunity is fully reflected in the day-to-day operations of the Government.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

PAY SYSTEM	TOTAL ALL EMPLOYEES			TOTAL MINORITY EMPLOYEES				NEGRO			
	No.	No WOMEN	% WOMEN	No.	%	No WOMEN	% WOMEN	No.	%	No WOMEN	% WOMEN
TOTAL ALL PAY SYSTEMS	2,358	1,329	56.3	1,477	62.8	858	58.2	1,178	49.8	720	30.6
TOTAL GEN SCHED & EQUTY	2,347	1,328	56.6	1,465	62.4	854	58.4	1,164	49.8	719	30.8
GS-2	15	14	93.3	11	73.3	10	66.7	8	53.3	7	46.7
GS-3	108	96	88.9	82	57.4	55	50.9	48	44.4	42	38.9
GS-4	184	167	90.8	119	64.7	107	58.2	96	53.3	90	48.9
GS-5	348	265	81.9	218	62.1	186	53.4	174	50.0	154	44.3
GS-6	136	129	94.9	107	78.7	101	74.3	93	88.4	89	85.4
GS-7	250	142	56.8	163	65.2	100	40.0	148	58.4	90	36.0
GS-8	11	10	90.9	9	81.8	8	72.7	8	72.7	7	63.6
GS-9	163	105	64.4	109	66.9	72	44.2	86	52.8	59	36.2
GS-10	2	1	50.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	1	50.0
GS-11	326	144	44.2	218	66.3	95	29.1	156	47.9	80	24.5
GS-12	278	95	34.2	178	63.3	56	20.1	130	46.8	45	18.2
GS-13	293	88	30.0	153	52.2	39	13.3	118	40.3	33	11.3
GS-14	117	30	25.6	81	52.1	11	9.4	44	37.6	9	7.7
GS-15	81	17	18.7	47	51.8	9	9.9	42	48.2	9	8.9
GS-16	19	4	21.1	10	52.6	3	15.8	8	42.1	3	15.8
GS-17	8	1	12.7	5	62.5	1	12.7	4	66.7	1	16.7
AVERAGE GRADE	8.99	7.41		8.80		7.20		8.68		7.24	
TOTAL WAGE SYSTEMS	19			10	100.0			10	100.0		
REGULAR NONSUPERVISORY	8			8	100.0			8	100.0		
WG-5	5			5	100.0			5	100.0		
WG-8	1			1	100.0			1	100.0		
AVERAGE GRADE (WG)	5.87			5.87				5.87			
OTHER WAGE SYSTEMS	4			4	100.0			4	100.0		
\$14,000-\$15,999	3			3	100.0			3	100.0		
\$16,000-\$17,999	1			1	100.0			1	100.0		
AVERAGE SALARY	15,200			15,200				15,200			
TOTAL OTHER PAY SYSTEMS	2	1	50.0	2	100.0	1	50.0	2	100.0	1	50.0
THRU \$ 7,999	2	1	50.0	2	100.0	1	50.0	2	100.0	1	50.0
AVERAGE SALARY	4,800	4,800		4,800		4,800		4,800		4,800	

Source: Federal Civilian Work Force Statistics, Equal Employment Opportunity Statistics, SM70-76B, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Personnel Management, Information Systems.

Table 60. MAIN REASON FOR NOT WORKING AT ALL IN 1976—NONWORKERS BY TOTAL MONEY INCOME IN 1976, BY AGE AND SEX

(Numbers in thousands. Persons 14 years old and over as of March 1977. For meaning of symbols, see text.)

MAIN REASON FOR NOT WORKING IN 1976, BY AGE AND SEX	TOTAL	WITH INCOME													SOCIAL SECURITY INCOME (1976)	FEDERAL INCOME (1976)	STATE INCOME (1976)							
		TOTAL	\$1 TO \$499	\$500 TO \$999	\$1,000 TO \$1,499	\$1,500 TO \$1,999	\$2,000 TO \$2,499	\$2,500 TO \$2,999	\$3,000 TO \$3,999	\$4,000 TO \$4,999	\$5,000 TO \$5,999	\$6,000 TO \$6,999	\$7,000 TO \$7,999	\$8,000 TO \$8,999				\$9,000 TO \$9,999	UNDER \$100	\$100 TO \$249	\$250 TO \$499	\$500 TO \$999	\$1,000 TO \$1,499	\$1,500 TO \$1,999
MALE																								
14 YEARS OLD AND OVER																								
TOTAL	57 618	29 747	2 310	1 250	2 577	2 998	3 566	2 824	4 660	2 882	1 734	2 235	1 156	1 916	2 800	20	8 227	35						
COULD NOT FIND WORK	1 789	962	108	76	110	89	96	72	147	90	51	61	25	39	2 527	120	1 967	121						
ILL OR DISABLED	7 740	6 730	159	210	561	828	1 164	767	1 235	609	375	358	186	236	2 229	33	3 570	48						
WENT TO SCHOOL	12 468	2 013	903	244	179	104	136	104	127	71	28	34	5	29	712	57	1 458	18						
KEEPING HOUSE	25 404	10 525	1 050	614	1 399	1 482	1 310	997	1 523	767	400	440	230	345	2 286	24	3 282	42						
ARMED FORCES	174	174	-	-	-	1	-	5	21	19	34	26	13	35	6 625	23	8 775	107						
RETIRED	9 121	8 490	50	81	269	428	778	636	1 551	1 091	801	1 245	653	1 219	4 572	54	6 028	70						
ALL OTHER REASONS	894	452	41	25	29	46	91	53	56	36	16	31	11	17	2 698	55	3 315	40						
15 TO 24 YEARS OLD																								
TOTAL	15 345	2 769	1 008	328	301	261	232	170	233	119	61	35	13	8	1 061	54	1 529	41						
COULD NOT FIND WORK	685	198	46	29	35	29	15	13	8	2	3	3	-	-	1 366	125	1 967	127						
ILL OR DISABLED	792	146	11	20	31	16	19	15	10	7	3	3	-	-	1 792	195	2 347	153						
WENT TO SCHOOL	12 041	1 765	681	226	170	137	111	82	82	47	19	11	2	2	604	78	906	42						
KEEPING HOUSE	1 908	492	54	51	57	70	58	47	105	40	6	2	3	2	1 127	114	2 217	21						
ARMED FORCES	110	110	-	-	-	-	18	5	17	18	28	18	8	-	801	333	4 659	223						
RETIRED	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	(B)	18	(B)						
ALL OTHER REASONS	306	59	16	3	8	8	10	6	2	3	2	-	-	-	(B)	(B)	(5)	(3)						
25 TO 34 YEARS OLD																								
TOTAL	16 576	5 387	2 327	344	486	478	541	407	801	535	264	331	143	218	2 511	50	3 455	64						
COULD NOT FIND WORK	817	518	54	41	62	30	53	45	88	66	29	22	11	10	2 722	158	3 120	143						
ILL OR DISABLED	2 286	1 602	75	78	187	229	247	165	306	205	101	129	65	41	2 228	76	3 664	40						
WENT TO SCHOOL	431	729	21	18	8	17	22	22	39	27	7	23	3	20	1 100	272	4 894	363						
KEEPING HOUSE	12 676	2 550	660	194	258	195	178	160	339	222	110	117	46	25	1 937	53	3 047	141						
ARMED FORCES	51	51	-	-	-	-	5	4	2	2	6	11	5	22	151	(B)	(B)	(3)						
RETIRED	114	97	-	-	-	-	-	4	16	2	6	12	10	31	6 852	1 012	9 812	1 316						
ALL OTHER REASONS	250	124	18	7	9	12	19	12	7	13	5	10	3	8	2 400	202	3 465	242						
35 TO 44 YEARS OLD																								
TOTAL	7 515	4 605	334	221	419	520	554	361	628	361	244	326	236	395	2 852	58	4 408	105						
COULD NOT FIND WORK	178	141	8	4	8	25	13	9	19	6	11	17	8	11	3 082	286	4 315	379						
ILL OR DISABLED	2 021	1 755	57	47	114	164	272	184	325	180	112	120	69	104	3 100	40	4 687	112						
WENT TO SCHOOL	15	10	2	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(5)						
KEEPING HOUSE	4 147	1 472	248	144	256	276	195	105	150	83	45	60	42	67	1 640	46	2 965	158						
ARMED FORCES	8	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	(B)	(B)	(B)	(3)						
RETIRED	1 033	550	13	21	33	40	58	124	87	79	127	116	10	169	6 876	7	1 977	107						
ALL OTHER REASONS	103	70	8	5	2	10	11	9	6	5	1	3	1	6	(B)	(B)	(B)	(3)						
45 TO 54 YEARS OLD																								
TOTAL	19 183	16 992	136	357	1 372	1 725	2 266	1 696	2 998	1 666	1 160	1 543	763	1 295	3 307	27	5 511	81						
COULD NOT FIND WORK	109	106	-	2	5	14	6	22	10	8	8	6	6	5	3 004	425	5 117	462						
ILL OR DISABLED	3 130	3 026	17	65	264	417	606	400	567	217	159	166	94	85	2 480	63	4 424	67						
WENT TO SCHOOL	10	10	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(5)						
KEEPING HOUSE	6 722	5 402	88	225	828	915	947	685	929	422	237	261	136	193	2 487	23	3 344	54						
ARMED FORCES	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	(B)	(B)	(B)	(3)						
RETIRED	7 973	7 843	31	54	266	388	715	578	1 411	1 002	746	1 107	557	987	4 876	55	6 519	70						
ALL OTHER REASONS	234	200	-	10	5	16	50	27	31	15	8	17	7	3	2 762	165	3 555	216						
55 YEARS OLD AND OVER																								
TOTAL	17 125	11 307	576	247	370	627	1 022	756	1 688	1 408	672	1 272	752	1 310	4 145	47	5 450	63						
COULD NOT FIND WORK	832	462	48	39	38	32	49	25	65	57	32	40	24	37	3 189	218	3 954	198						
ILL OR DISABLED	3 635	3 372	70	67	144	325	430	298	663	425	273	311	161	228	3 814	83	4 328	51						
WENT TO SCHOOL	5 863	940	411	97	71	89	59	61	67	37	14	23	3	17	800	68	1 684	107						
KEEPING HOUSE	138	111	5	4	7	5	15	9	19	18	7	5	7	18	3 218	34	8 210	83						
ARMED FORCES	170	170	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35	8 508	236	9 969	1 285						
RETIRED	6 112	6 054	19	30	95	192	413	340	1 023	816	612	961	516	994	4 141	79	6 600	92						
ALL OTHER REASONS	355	178	23	10	14	23	29	20	10	19	7	11	8	2	3 318	144	3 260	251						
15 TO 24 YEARS OLD																								
TOTAL	6 424	1 105	431	116	100	84	92	69	68	56	46	27	8	7	1 067	97	1 691	78						
COULD NOT FIND WORK	320	77	16	17	10	8	6	3	4	4	3	3	-	-	1 015	273	1 862	232						
ILL OR DISABLED	160	87	4	6	16	17	14	7	14	7	4	2	-	-	1 015	261	2 723	396						
WENT TO SCHOOL	5 683	806	401	89	63	58	55	48	40	25	11	7	-	-	1 015	48	1 458	71						
KEEPING HOUSE	11	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(3)						
ARMED FORCES	109	106	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	3 014	8	781	826						
RETIRED	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	1 610	1	1 610	(3)						
ALL OTHER REASONS	142	30	8	2	6	5	3	1	3	2	-	-	-	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(3)						
25 TO 34 YEARS OLD																								
TOTAL	2 064	1 703	93	53	95	122	207	126	274	210	115	165	84	116	3 421	43	4 467	142						
COULD NOT FIND WORK	355	262	27	20	22	27	15	42	43	22	22	10	10	9	3 322	249	3 770	412						
ILL OR DISABLED	1 216	1 062	39	47	60	106	166	84	167	144	75	100	54	27	3 260	109	4 370	417						
WENT TO SCHOOL	186	131	10	8	2	11	13	13	25	10	4	16	3	15	3 380	293	4 724	516						
KEEPING HOUSE	35	25	-	-	-	-	-	3	2	2	-	-	-	2	(B)	(B)	(B)	(3)						
ARMED FORCES	55	51	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	2	5	11	5	22	(B)	(B)	(B)	(3)						
RETIRED	78	79	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	2	5	10	10	28	(B)	(B)	(B)	(3)						
ALL OTHER REASONS	133	79	13	4	4	12	12	10	7	4	6	2	2	6	2 302	263	3 441	416						

1975, BY AGE AND SEX—Continued

(Numbers in thousands. Persons 14 years old and over as of March 1977. For meaning of symbols, see text)

MAIN REASON FOR NOT WORKING, AGE, AND SEX	WITH INCOME														MEDIAN INCOME (DOLLARS)		MEAN INCOME (DOLLARS)	
	TOTAL	\$1 TO \$999	\$1,000 TO \$1,499	\$1,500 TO \$1,999	\$2,000 TO \$2,499	\$2,500 TO \$2,999	\$3,000 TO \$3,999	\$4,000 TO \$4,999	\$5,000 TO \$7,999	\$8,000 TO \$9,999	\$10,000 AND OVER	ALL	STATUS EXCEPT	VALUE	STAND. ERROR			
																TOTAL	LC55	LC55
MALE--CON.																		
25 TO 64 YEARS OLD																		
TOTAL	1 896	1 790	36	19	56	99	139	95	322	225	142	209	155	283	4 582	117	6 425	197
COULD NOT FIND WORK	99	86	5	3	5	17	9	4	9	6	3	11	8	7	3 030	603	4 337	453
ILL OR DISABLED	1 047	1 001	23	8	33	67	94	63	214	146	88	103	55	5	3 944	109	5 152	173
GOING TO SCHOOL	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
KEEPING HOUSE	23	14	-	-	2	-	3	1	1	3	-	-	-	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
IN ARMED FORCES	8	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
RETIRED	679	649	5	5	14	11	25	22	93	65	51	96	93	168	6 555	293	8 254	340
ALL OTHER REASONS	37	31	2	3	2	4	8	4	3	2	1	-	1	2	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
65 YEARS OLD AND OVER																		
TOTAL	6 740	6 710	16	29	119	313	585	466	1 224	917	670	977	495	900	4 658	55	6 971	79
COULD NOT FIND WORK	59	57	-	-	1	4	6	2	10	3	4	4	6	17	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
ILL OR DISABLED	1 212	1 207	3	4	34	120	179	135	275	132	107	106	42	67	3 451	78	4 359	121
GOING TO SCHOOL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
KEEPING HOUSE	69	69	-	-	1	5	9	7	15	12	2	3	7	9	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
IN ARMED FORCES	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
RETIRED	5 353	5 334	12	23	81	182	385	317	917	767	557	859	433	801	4 976	66	6 444	92
ALL OTHER REASONS	43	38	-	2	2	2	6	5	5	2	-	-	5	1	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
FEMALE																		
14 YEARS OLD AND OVER																		
TOTAL	10 464	10 440	1 734	1 003	2 207	2 371	2 574	1 879	2 772	1 273	761	857	403	607	2 370	16	3 143	35
COULD NOT FIND WORK	957	880	60	35	72	57	47	47	62	33	19	21	1	6	2 146	145	2 564	125
ILL OR DISABLED	4 105	3 358	89	143	417	523	734	469	552	184	102	87	27	31	2 346	24	2 702	43
GOING TO SCHOOL	6 614	1 073	492	147	108	85	70	43	59	34	14	11	2	9	652	69	1 273	75
KEEPING HOUSE	25 256	10 415	1 045	610	1 392	1 447	1 254	988	1 504	748	398	435	223	331	2 276	24	3 124	52
IN ARMED FORCES	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
RETIRED	3 009	2 826	31	51	204	236	365	295	528	255	219	254	147	221	3 458	62	4 552	91
ALL OTHER REASONS	538	274	18	15	15	23	62	33	47	20	6	-	3	8	2 550	130	3 352	249
14 TO 24 YEARS OLD																		
TOTAL	8 921	1 665	577	212	200	178	140	102	165	63	15	8	5	-	1 108	63	1 422	43
COULD NOT FIND WORK	365	121	30	12	25	20	8	10	14	3	-	-	-	-	1 361	140	1 494	129
ILL OR DISABLED	132	65	7	11	15	7	11	4	3	4	1	2	-	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
GOING TO SCHOOL	5 257	958	479	137	102	78	55	34	42	18	8	2	-	500	45	956	50	
KEEPING HOUSE	1 858	489	53	51	57	70	58	47	105	39	6	2	3	-	2 124	118	2 238	51
IN ARMED FORCES	4	4	-	-	-	-	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
RETIRED	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
ALL OTHER REASONS	164	28	8	2	2	3	7	5	2	-	-	-	-	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
25 TO 54 YEARS OLD																		
TOTAL	14 512	3 679	739	261	391	346	334	282	527	325	149	167	59	99	2 153	56	2 961	102
COULD NOT FIND WORK	462	256	27	21	34	26	25	29	46	23	7	10	1	1	2 271	169	2 473	135
ILL OR DISABLED	1 079	721	35	32	87	121	118	81	120	61	26	26	10	4	2 362	70	2 732	83
GOING TO SCHOOL	235	98	11	10	6	6	9	15	16	4	4	4	-	5	2 822	354	3 701	256
KEEPING HOUSE	12 592	2 535	659	191	254	192	172	159	336	220	110	115	46	84	1 935	82	3 049	122
IN ARMED FORCES	36	25	4	4	-	-	1	1	3	-	1	6	1	3	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
RETIRED	118	45	5	3	5	1	8	3	7	5	1	4	2	2	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
55 TO 64 YEARS OLD																		
TOTAL	5 618	2 815	299	202	363	422	416	266	306	137	107	117	70	111	2 147	40	3 125	138
COULD NOT FIND WORK	79	54	3	1	3	9	4	5	10	-	8	6	-	4	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
ILL OR DISABLED	454	754	33	39	86	99	178	120	111	34	23	17	5	9	2 339	48	2 628	88
GOING TO SCHOOL	12	7	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
KEEPING HOUSE	4 124	1 658	248	144	254	278	192	104	149	80	46	60	42	63	1 831	45	2 941	156
IN ARMED FORCES	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
RETIRED	354	302	8	15	19	29	33	33	31	20	28	31	23	31	3 429	345	5 038	412
ALL OTHER REASONS	86	39	5	3	1	6	4	4	5	2	-	-	-	4	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
65 YEARS OLD AND OVER																		
TOTAL	11 443	10 282	120	328	1 253	1 425	1 683	1 229	1 774	749	490	566	259	396	2 635	26	3 493	50
COULD NOT FIND WORK	50	49	-	2	4	1	4	4	12	7	4	5	-	2	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
ILL OR DISABLED	1 918	1 819	13	61	229	297	427	264	319	85	52	43	12	18	2 352	31	2 751	51
GOING TO SCHOOL	10	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	2	-	-	3	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
KEEPING HOUSE	6 653	5 732	88	225	827	908	872	678	914	410	236	258	131	184	2 469	27	3 207	54
IN ARMED FORCES	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(B)	(B)	(B)	(B)
RETIRED	2 677	2 507	19	32	185	256	331	261	494	234	157	245	124	187	3 449	62	4 490	70
ALL OTHER REASONS	191	162	-	8	7	14	44	21	32	13	8	17	2	2	2 706	167	3 373	220

Source: Current Population Reports, Consumer Income, Money Income in 1976 of Families and Persons in the United States, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Series P-60, No. 114, Issued July 1978

About 95 percent of all persons 10 years old and over reported the ability to read and write English. Each of the origin groups approached or exceeded this proportion except the Spanish, for whom approximately four-fifths reported the ability to read and write English.

Table 12. Origin of Persons 10 Years Old and Over, by Ability to Read and Write English
(Numbers in thousands)

Origin	Total persons 10 years old and over	Able to read and write English	
		Number	Percent
Total.....	159,611	151,709	95.0
English.....	16,299	16,069	98.6
German.....	17,126	16,935	98.9
Irish.....	11,520	11,374	98.7
Italian.....	6,222	5,743	92.3
Polish.....	3,567	3,403	95.5
Russian.....	1,983	1,925	97.1
Spanish.....	6,751	5,415	80.2
Other.....	80,854	78,704	97.3
Not reported.....	15,285	12,136	79.4

Source: Current Population Reports, Population Characteristics, Characteristics of the Population by Ethnic Origin 1969, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Series P-20, No. 221, April 30, 1971

Enclosure 8

NO. 24. POPULATION, BY SEX, RACE, RESIDENCE, AND MEDIAN AGE: 1790 TO 1976

In thousands, except as indicated. Total resident population excluding Armed Forces abroad. For definition of median, see p. xii. See also *Historical Statistics, Colonial Times to 1870*, tables A 73-81 and A 143-149]

CENSUS DATE	SEX		RACE				RESIDENCE ¹		MEDIAN AGE (years)		
	Male	Female	White	Black		Other	Urban	Rural	All races	White	Black
				Number	Percent						
CONTINUED U.S.²											
1790 (Aug. 7).....	(NA)	(NA)	3,172	787	19.3	(NA)	202	3,728	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
1800 (Aug. 4).....	(NA)	(NA)	4,308	1,002	18.9	(NA)	222	4,866	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
1810 (Aug. 8).....	(NA)	(NA)	5,822	1,378	19.0	(NA)	225	6,714	(NA)	(NA)	(NA)
1820 (Aug. 7).....	4,897	4,742	7,867	1,772	18.4	(NA)	693	8,943	18.7	18.8	17.2
1830 (June 1).....	8,332	8,234	10,437	2,329	18.1	(NA)	1,127	11,729	17.2	17.2	18.8
1840 (June 1).....	8,859	8,281	14,198	2,874	16.8	(NA)	1,848	18,224	17.8	17.9	17.3
1850 (June 1).....	11,838	11,254	19,653	3,629	18.7	(NA)	3,544	19,648	18.9	19.2	17.3
1860 (June 1).....	16,065	15,358	26,923	4,442	14.1	79	6,217	25,227	19.4	19.7	17.7
1870 (June 1).....	19,494	19,065	33,589	4,880	12.7	89	9,902	28,656	20.2	20.4	18.6
1880 (June 1).....	25,519	24,637	43,403	6,381	18.1	172	14,120	36,026	20.9	21.4	18.0
1890 (June 1).....	32,237	30,711	55,101	7,489	11.9	358	22,106	40,841	22.0	22.5	17.8
1900 (June 1).....	38,816	37,178	66,809	8,834	11.6	351	30,160	45,635	22.9	23.4	19.4
1910 (Apr. 15).....	47,332	44,640	81,732	9,828	10.7	412	41,999	49,733	24.1	24.5	20.8
1920 (Jan. 1).....	53,900	51,810	94,821	10,463	9.9	427	54,158	51,653	25.3	25.8	22.3
1930 (Apr. 1).....	62,187	60,638	110,287	11,891	9.7	397	68,955	53,820	26.4	26.9	23.5
1940 (Apr. 1).....	66,002	63,808	118,215	12,866	9.8	589	74,424	57,246	29.0	29.5	23.3
1950 (Apr. 1).....	74,533	75,864	134,942	15,042	10.0	718	96,468	64,230	30.2	30.8	26.2
1960 (Apr. 1).....	87,865	90,000	158,455	18,800	10.6	1,149	124,699	83,765	29.6	30.3	23.5
UNITED STATES											
1850 (Apr. 1).....	78,187	76,139	125,180	15,045	9.9	1,181	96,847	64,479	30.2	30.7	26.2
1860 (Apr. 1).....	88,331	86,997	158,832	18,872	10.6	1,620	128,269	84,054	29.6	30.3	23.5
1870 (Apr. 1).....	98,926	104,209	178,068	22,581	11.1	2,557	149,325	93,857	28.0	28.9	22.4
1871 (July 1, est.).....	100,445	105,775	180,411	23,084	11.2	2,725	(NA)	(NA)	28.0	28.8	22.5
1872 (July 1, est.).....	101,477	106,757	181,894	23,465	11.3	2,875	(NA)	(NA)	28.2	29.0	22.7
1873 (July 1, est.).....	102,240	107,619	183,032	23,796	11.3	3,031	(NA)	(NA)	28.4	29.3	22.9
1874 (July 1, est.).....	102,954	108,435	184,083	24,113	11.4	3,193	(NA)	(NA)	28.7	29.5	23.2
1875 (July 1, est.).....	103,712	109,320	185,141	24,435	11.5	3,456	(NA)	(NA)	28.8	29.8	23.5
1876 (July 1, est.).....	104,472	110,177	186,225	24,763	11.5	3,661	(NA)	(NA)	29.0	29.8	23.8

NA Not available. ¹ Beginning 1950, current definition. For explanation of change, see text, p. 2.
² Excludes Alaska and Hawaii.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *U.S. Census of Population: 1930*, vol. II; *1940*, vol. II, part 1, and vol. IV, part 1; *1950*, vol. II, part 1; *1960*, vol. I; *1970*, vol. I, part B; and *Current Population Reports*, series P-23, Nos. 814 and 643.

NO. 25. RATIO OF MALES TO FEMALES BY AGE GROUPS, 1910 TO 1976, AND BY RACE, 1976

[Represents number of males per 100 females. Total resident population]

AGE (years)	1910 (Apr. 15)	1920 (Jan. 1)	1930 (Apr. 1)	1940 (Apr. 1)	1950 (Apr. 1)	1960 (Apr. 1)	1970 (Apr. 1)	1975 (July 1)	1976 (July 1)			
									Total	White	Black	Spanish origin ¹
All ages.....	106.8	104.1	102.5	100.7	98.6	97.1	94.8	94.9	94.5	95.4	96.8	95.8
Under 14.....	102.1	102.1	102.6	103.0	103.7	103.4	103.9	104.1	104.2	104.8	101.4	108.5
14-24.....	101.2	97.3	98.4	98.9	98.2	98.7	98.7	101.3	101.5	102.4	98.1	99.3
25-44.....	110.2	105.1	101.8	98.6	96.4	95.7	95.8	96.6	96.6	98.6	84.0	84.4
45-64.....	114.4	118.2	109.1	105.2	100.1	95.7	91.6	91.7	91.8	92.5	85.9	83.8
65 and over.....	101.1	101.3	100.5	95.5	89.6	82.8	72.1	69.3	69.0	68.4	72.3	75.4

¹ March data. Persons of Spanish origin may be of any race. Computed from *Current Population Reports*, series P-20, No. 310.

² Includes "age not reported."

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, based on *U.S. Census of Population: 1950; 1960; and 1970*, part B; and *Current Population Reports*, series P-23, No. 643, and earlier issues.

228-000 O - 77 - 4

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States 1977

Among the seven specific origin groups identified in the survey, the most numerous were the English and German. Each of these two groups accounted for approximately one-tenth of the total population. Groups of intermediate frequency included the Irish, Spanish, and Italian.

Persons of Spanish origin were youngest with a median age of about 20 years, whereas persons of Russian origin were oldest with a median age of 46 years.

Table 1. Origin of the Population, by Age and Sex

Origin	Total population		Percent distribution by age						Median age (years)
	Number (thous.)	Percent	Total	Under 14	14 to 24	25 to 44	45 to 64	65 and over	
Total.....	193,214	100.0	100.0	27.8	18.6	23.5	20.7	9.5	28.0
English.....	19,060	9.6	100.0	21.0	16.1	24.2	24.9	13.9	35.7
German.....	19,961	10.1	100.0	20.4	15.3	27.3	23.6	13.4	35.5
Irish.....	13,282	6.7	100.0	19.6	15.4	25.7	26.3	13.0	36.7
Italian.....	7,239	3.7	100.0	19.8	15.5	26.4	27.2	11.0	36.1
Polish.....	4,021	2.0	100.0	17.4	13.7	25.5	31.9	11.5	39.8
Russian.....	2,152	1.1	100.0	12.8	13.6	22.1	33.6	17.9	45.8
Spanish.....	9,230	4.7	100.0	37.5	21.2	25.3	12.8	3.3	19.9
Other ¹	105,633	53.3	100.0	33.3	20.0	21.4	17.8	7.5	23.1
Not reported.....	17,635	8.9	100.0	19.0	20.3	26.8	23.0	10.8	32.9
Male.....	95,356	100.0	100.0	29.4	18.3	23.4	20.5	8.4	26.9
English.....	9,014	9.5	100.0	23.1	16.0	24.6	24.8	11.5	33.8
German.....	9,978	10.5	100.0	21.1	14.6	27.6	24.6	12.1	35.3
Irish.....	6,187	6.5	100.0	20.8	14.9	26.2	26.7	11.4	35.9
Italian.....	3,539	3.7	100.0	20.7	14.9	27.3	26.1	10.9	35.5
Polish.....	1,972	2.1	100.0	18.7	13.4	25.1	31.9	9.9	38.7
Russian.....	1,064	1.1	100.0	12.5	14.8	22.3	32.5	17.9	45.2
Spanish.....	4,499	4.7	100.0	39.7	20.1	23.9	13.0	3.3	19.2
Other.....	50,392	52.8	100.0	35.5	19.9	20.6	17.3	6.7	21.8
Not reported.....	8,711	9.1	100.0	19.3	20.2	28.6	22.8	9.2	32.4
Female.....	102,258	100.0	100.0	26.3	18.6	23.6	20.9	10.5	29.2
English.....	10,046	9.8	100.0	19.1	16.1	23.8	25.0	16.0	37.4
German.....	9,983	9.7	100.0	19.8	16.0	26.9	22.5	14.8	35.6
Irish.....	7,095	6.9	100.0	18.5	15.8	25.2	25.9	14.5	37.4
Italian.....	3,700	3.6	100.0	19.0	16.1	25.5	28.3	11.2	36.7
Polish.....	2,049	2.0	100.0	16.2	14.0	24.9	31.9	13.0	40.9
Russian.....	1,088	1.1	100.0	13.2	12.3	22.0	34.7	17.8	46.5
Spanish.....	4,732	4.6	100.0	35.4	22.2	26.6	12.6	3.1	21.0
Other.....	55,242	53.7	100.0	31.3	20.2	22.0	15.3	8.2	24.2
Not reported.....	8,924	8.7	100.0	18.8	20.5	25.1	23.3	12.3	33.6

¹Includes all origin groups not shown separately above, of whom about 20 million were Negroes. See page 28, item 28.

Source: Current Population Reports, Population Characteristics, Characteristics of the Population by Ethnic Origin 1969, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Series P-20, No. 221, April 30, 1971

No. 216. YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED, BY RACE: 1940 TO 1976

[Persons 25 years old and over as of March of year shown, except as noted. 1970-1976 based on Current Population Survey; includes members of Armed Forces living off post or with families on post, but excludes all other members of Armed Forces. Beginning 1973, excludes inmates of institutions. See text, p. 1]

AGE AND YEAR	ALL PERSONS					BLACK PERSONS					Median school years completed ¹
	Percent—				Median school years completed ¹	Percent—					
	Not high school graduates		With 4 years of high school or more			Not high school graduates		With 4 years of high school or more			
	Total	With less than 5 years of school	Total	College, 4 years or more		Total	With less than 5 years of school	Total	College, 4 years or more		
25 years and over:											
1940 ²	75.5	13.7	24.5	4.6	8.6	92.7	42.0	7.3	1.3	1.7	1.7
1950 ²	65.7	11.1	34.3	6.2	9.3	87.1	32.9	12.9	2.1	4.6	4.6
1960 ²	58.9	8.3	41.1	7.7	10.6	79.9	23.8	20.1	3.1	8.7	8.7
1970.....	44.8	5.3	55.2	11.0	12.2	66.3	15.1	33.7	4.5	9.9	9.9
1973.....	40.2	4.5	59.8	12.6	12.3	60.8	12.6	39.2	6.0	10.2	10.2
1974.....	38.8	4.4	61.2	13.3	12.3	59.2	12.9	40.8	5.5	10.7	10.7
1975.....	37.5	4.2	62.5	13.9	12.3	57.5	12.3	42.5	6.4	10.9	10.9
1976.....	35.9	3.9	64.1	14.7	12.4	56.2	11.3	43.8	6.6	11.1	11.1
25-29 years:											
1940 ²	61.9	5.9	38.1	5.9	10.3	(NA)	27.7	11.6	1.6	7.0	7.0
1950 ²	49.5	4.7	52.8	7.7	12.0	60.4	16.8	22.2	2.7	8.6	8.6
1960 ²	39.3	2.8	60.7	11.1	12.3	62.3	7.0	37.7	4.8	9.9	9.9
1970.....	24.6	1.1	75.4	16.4	12.6	43.9	2.5	56.2	7.3	12.2	12.2
1973.....	19.8	1.0	80.2	19.0	12.7	35.8	1.5	64.2	8.1	12.3	12.3
1974.....	18.1	1.2	81.9	20.7	12.8	31.7	2.1	68.2	7.9	12.4	12.4
1975.....	16.9	1.0	83.1	21.9	12.8	29.0	.5	71.0	10.7	12.5	12.5
1976.....	15.3	.8	84.7	23.7	12.9	26.1	.9	73.8	13.0	12.5	12.5

NA Not available. ¹ For definition of median, see p. xii. ² As of April.

No. 217. YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED, BY RACE AND SEX: 1960 TO 1976

[Persons 25 years old and over. 1960 data as of April 1, based on 25-percent sample; 1970-76 data as of March, based on Current Population Survey, see text, p. 1. For definition of median, see p. xii. See also *Historical Statistics, Colonial Times to 1970*, series H 602-617]

YEAR, RACE, AND SEX	Persons 25 years old and over (1,000)	PERCENT OF POPULATION COMPLETING—								Median school years completed
		Elementary school			High school		College			
		0-4 years	5-7 years	8 years	1-3 years	4 years	1-3 years	4 years or more		
1960, all races.....	99,438	8.3	13.8	17.5	19.2	24.6	8.8	7.7	10.6	
White.....	89,581	6.7	12.8	18.1	19.3	25.8	9.3	8.1	10.9	
Male.....	43,259	7.4	13.7	18.7	18.9	22.2	9.1	10.3	10.7	
Female.....	46,322	6.0	11.9	17.8	19.6	29.2	9.5	6.0	11.2	
Black.....	9,054	23.8	24.2	12.9	19.0	12.9	4.1	3.1	8.0	
Male.....	4,240	28.3	23.9	12.3	17.3	11.3	4.1	2.8	7.7	
Female.....	4,814	19.8	24.5	13.4	20.5	14.3	4.1	3.3	8.6	
1970, all races.....	109,310	5.3	9.1	13.4	17.1	34.0	10.2	11.0	12.2	
White.....	98,112	4.2	8.3	13.6	16.5	35.2	10.7	11.6	12.2	
Male.....	46,606	4.5	8.8	13.9	15.6	30.9	11.3	15.0	12.2	
Female.....	51,506	3.9	7.8	13.4	17.3	39.0	10.1	8.6	12.2	
Black.....	10,059	15.1	16.7	11.2	23.3	23.4	5.9	4.5	9.9	
Male.....	4,619	18.6	16.0	11.1	21.9	22.2	5.7	4.5	9.6	
Female.....	5,470	12.1	17.3	11.3	24.5	24.4	6.0	4.4	10.2	
1975, all races.....	116,897	4.2	7.4	10.3	15.6	36.2	12.4	13.9	12.3	
White.....	104,065	3.3	6.6	10.6	15.0	37.3	12.8	14.5	12.4	
Male.....	49,259	3.6	6.8	10.5	14.0	33.1	13.6	18.4	12.5	
Female.....	54,806	3.0	6.4	10.6	15.9	41.1	12.1	11.0	12.3	
Black.....	11,096	12.3	14.3	8.5	22.3	27.1	9.0	6.4	9.9	
Male.....	4,925	15.3	14.7	8.1	20.2	25.2	9.7	6.7	10.7	
Female.....	6,171	9.8	14.0	8.9	24.0	28.6	8.5	6.2	11.1	
1976, all races.....	118,848	3.9	7.1	9.7	15.3	36.3	13.0	14.7	12.4	
White.....	105,603	3.0	6.4	9.7	14.7	37.3	13.5	15.4	12.4	
Male.....	49,951	3.2	6.6	9.7	13.8	32.9	14.2	19.6	12.5	
Female.....	55,651	2.9	6.2	9.8	15.6	41.2	12.8	11.6	12.4	
Black.....	11,375	11.3	13.9	9.2	21.7	28.2	9.0	6.6	11.1	
Male.....	5,048	14.1	15.5	8.7	19.3	26.5	9.4	6.3	10.6	
Female.....	6,327	9.1	12.6	9.7	23.7	29.5	8.6	6.8	11.4	

Source of tables 216 and 217: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *U.S. Census of Population: 1940, 1950, and 1960*, vol. 1, and *Current Population Reports*, series P-20, Nos. 207, 243, 274, 295, and unpublished data.

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States 1977

Enclosure 10A

NO. 221. ILLITERACY—AGE, SEX, AND RACE: 1959 AND 1969

[Persons 14 years old and over. Relates to civilian noninstitutional population. 1959 excludes Alaska and Hawaii. Based on Current Population Survey; see text, p. 1. Persons unable to both read and write in any language classified as illiterate. Information on illiteracy was obtained only for persons completing less than 6 years of school. See also *Historical Statistics, Colonial Times to 1970*, series H 669-688]

AGE AND SEX	1959 (March)					1969 (November)				
	Population (1,000)		Percent illiterate			Population (1,000)		Percent illiterate		
	Total	Illiterate	Total	White	Black	Total	Illiterate	Total	White	Black
Total, 14 and over.....	121,373	2,619	2.2	1.6	7.5	143,137	1,433	1.0	.7	3.6
14-24 years.....	25,118	144	.6	.5	1.2	36,853	87	.3	.2	.5
25-44 years.....	46,143	575	1.2	.8	5.1	46,501	237	.5	.4	1.3
45-64 years.....	35,205	929	2.6	1.8	11.3	40,985	449	1.1	.7	5.5
65 years and over.....	14,907	971	6.5	5.1	25.5	18,798	650	3.5	2.3	16.7
Male, 14 and over.....	58,378	1,480	2.5	1.7	9.8	67,306	708	1.1	.7	4.3
14-24 years.....	12,063	100	.8	.7	1.7	17,484	61	.3	.3	.6
25-44 years.....	22,486	363	1.6	1.0	7.1	22,272	118	.5	.4	2.1
45-64 years.....	17,059	548	3.2	2.0	15.6	19,513	257	1.3	.8	7.4
65 years and over.....	6,770	469	6.9	5.3	28.3	8,037	272	3.4	2.1	17.2
Female, 14 and over.....	62,995	1,139	1.8	1.4	5.4	75,831	727	1.0	.7	2.9
14-24 years.....	13,055	44	.3	.3	.7	19,369	37	.2	.2	.3
25-44 years.....	23,657	212	.9	.6	3.4	24,229	121	.5	.5	.6
45-64 years.....	18,146	381	2.1	1.6	7.3	21,472	191	.9	.6	4.0
65 years and over.....	8,137	502	6.2	5.0	23.0	10,761	378	3.5	2.4	16.2

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports*, series P-20.

NO. 222. PERCENT ILLITERATE OF POPULATION—STATES: 1900 TO 1970

[Relates to population 15 years old and over for 1900 to 1930 and 14 years old and over for 1950 to 1970. Beginning 1950, data are estimated. Persons unable to both read and write in any language classified as illiterate. See *Current Population Reports*, series P-23, No. 8, for method of estimating illiteracy by States]

STATE	1900	1920	1930	1950	1960	1970	STATE	1900	1920	1930	1950	1960	1970
United States.....	11.3	6.5	4.8	3.3	2.4	1.2	S.A.—Con.						
New England:							Virginia.....	24.3	12.2	9.7	4.9	3.4	1.4
Maine.....	5.5	3.6	3.0	2.0	1.3	.7	West Virginia.....	12.6	7.2	5.5	3.5	2.7	1.4
New Hampshire.....	6.7	4.9	3.0	2.0	1.4	.7	No. Carolina.....	30.1	15.0	11.5	5.5	4.0	1.8
Vermont.....	6.4	3.3	2.4	1.7	1.1	.6	So. Carolina.....	37.4	20.9	16.7	7.9	5.5	2.3
Massachusetts.....	6.5	5.3	4.0	2.8	2.2	1.1	Georgia.....	32.1	16.7	10.4	6.9	4.5	2.0
Rhode Island.....	9.2	7.2	5.5	3.1	2.4	1.3	Florida.....	23.4	10.2	7.7	3.9	2.6	1.3
Connecticut.....	6.5	6.9	5.1	3.1	2.2	1.1	East So. Central:						
Middle Atlantic:							Kentucky.....	18.1	9.4	7.3	4.3	3.3	1.6
New York.....	6.1	5.6	4.1	3.5	2.9	1.4	Tennessee.....	21.9	11.3	8.0	4.7	3.5	1.7
New Jersey.....	6.5	5.8	4.3	2.9	2.2	1.1	Alabama.....	35.1	17.3	14.0	6.2	4.2	2.1
Pennsylvania.....	6.9	5.7	3.5	2.7	2.0	1.0	Mississippi.....	34.1	18.8	14.8	7.1	4.9	2.4
East No. Central:							West So. Central:						
Ohio.....	4.5	3.2	2.5	1.9	1.5	.8	Arkansas.....	21.3	10.2	7.6	5.0	3.6	1.9
Indiana.....	5.2	2.5	1.8	1.7	1.2	.7	Louisiana.....	39.6	23.4	15.1	9.8	6.3	2.6
Illinois.....	4.8	3.8	2.7	2.3	1.8	.9	Oklahoma.....	11.7	4.1	3.7	2.5	1.9	1.1
Michigan.....	4.8	3.4	2.2	2.0	1.6	.9	Texas.....	15.6	8.9	7.3	5.4	4.1	2.2
Wisconsin.....	5.4	2.8	2.1	1.7	1.2	.7	Mountain:						
West No. Central:							Montana.....	6.6	2.5	1.9	1.3	1.0	.6
Minnesota.....	4.6	2.1	1.4	1.5	1.0	.6	Idaho.....	5.1	1.7	1.2	1.3	.8	.6
Iowa.....	2.7	1.2	.9	.9	.7	.5	Wyoming.....	4.4	2.3	1.8	1.7	.9	.6
Missouri.....	7.0	3.4	2.5	2.1	1.7	.8	Colorado.....	4.5	3.6	3.1	2.0	1.3	.7
North Dakota.....	6.1	2.5	1.7	2.3	1.4	.8	New Mexico.....	35.7	17.4	14.9	6.6	4.0	2.2
South Dakota.....	5.8	1.9	1.4	1.5	.9	.5	Arizona.....	30.0	15.9	11.0	6.2	3.5	1.8
Nebraska.....	2.6	1.5	1.3	1.2	.9	.6	Utah.....	3.6	2.2	1.4	1.4	.9	.6
Kansas.....	3.3	1.8	1.4	1.3	.9	.6	Nevada.....	13.8	6.4	4.8	2.2	1.1	.5
South Atlantic:							Pacific:						
Delaware.....	13.2	6.6	4.4	2.7	1.9	.9	Washington.....	3.4	1.9	1.1	1.3	.9	.6
Maryland.....	12.1	6.1	4.2	2.7	1.9	.9	Oregon.....	3.7	1.6	1.1	1.3	.8	.6
District of Columbia.....	9.4	3.0	1.7	1.8	1.9	1.1	California.....	5.3	3.6	2.8	2.2	1.8	1.1
							Alaska.....	40.6	24.6	20.5	6.3	3.0	1.5
							Hawaii.....	35.2	21.2	17.5	5.4	5.0	1.9

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, unpublished data.

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States 1977

Enclosure 10B

About one in every five persons 25 years old and over had completed at least one year of college. That the Nation is becoming better educated is evident from the finding that while about 19 percent of the population 35 years old and over had completed some college, about 30 percent of young adults 25 to 34 years of age had this much education.

Every origin group showed improvement in the percentage of persons completing at least one year of college in the age group 25 to 34 years compared to the age group 35 years and over. Persons of Russian origin reported the highest percentage of persons completing some college at both age levels, about 70 percent for persons 25 to 34 years and about 30 percent for persons 35 years and over.

Table 13. Highest Grade of School Completed by Persons 25 Years Old and Over, by Ethnic Origin

Origin	Total (thou- sands)	Percent distribution by years of school completed						Median school years com- pleted	
		Total	Elementary		High school		College		
			0 to 7 years	8 years	1 to 3 years	4 years	1 to 3 years		4 years or more
Total, 25 years old and over.	106,224	100.0	13.8	13.4	17.6	33.9	10.3	11.0	12.2
25 to 34 years old.....	23,884	100.0	4.5	4.8	17.4	43.5	14.7	15.2	12.5
English.....	2,301	100.0	4.3	4.6	15.5	41.2	15.8	17.6	12.6
German.....	2,848	100.0	1.6	4.1	14.8	47.4	14.6	17.5	12.6
Irish.....	1,670	100.0	2.6	3.7	18.8	45.1	15.9	13.9	12.6
Italian.....	902	100.0	5.3	3.3	16.3	50.4	12.7	11.9	12.5
Polish.....	503	100.0	1.3	3.0	10.6	53.8	15.1	16.2	12.7
Russian.....	209	100.0	0.7	0.7	3.7	24.7	17.7	52.5	16+
Spanish.....	1,239	100.0	19.2	10.0	23.5	32.2	9.3	5.3	11.7
Other.....	11,625	100.0	3.6	4.4	17.5	43.3	13.6	15.6	12.6
Not reported.....	2,585	100.0	6.2	7.2	20.3	43.6	10.9	11.8	12.4
35 years and over.....	82,400	100.0	16.5	15.9	17.6	31.1	9.1	9.8	12.0
English.....	9,698	100.0	11.9	13.7	17.8	31.7	11.1	13.6	12.2
German.....	9,977	100.0	10.6	22.0	16.1	34.2	8.6	8.5	12.0
Irish.....	6,960	100.0	14.3	16.3	18.8	32.9	8.4	9.3	12.0
Italian.....	3,780	100.0	23.5	17.7	20.0	27.6	5.2	5.9	10.3
Polish.....	2,266	100.0	18.5	19.0	19.2	30.9	5.2	7.2	10.9
Russian.....	1,375	100.0	10.8	12.1	11.9	35.1	11.7	18.4	12.4
Spanish.....	2,576	100.0	43.0	14.4	14.9	17.5	5.7	4.5	8.5
Other.....	37,661	100.0	16.5	14.3	17.5	31.1	9.9	10.4	12.0
Not reported.....	8,106	100.0	20.4	17.3	17.6	30.0	7.4	7.4	11.1

Source: Current Population Reports, Population Characteristics, Characteristics of the Population by Ethnic Origin 1969, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Series P-20, No. 221, April 30, 1971