

PK

Berkeley - Jan 1

The research project is an extension of studies into the nature and measurement of antisemitism previously begun by Dr. Sanford and his group in Berkeley. Since the American Jewish Committee has become interested in this study, ideas and techniques evolved by the Institute of Social Research have gained increasing importance in the project which is now jointly directed by Dr. Sanford of the University of California at Berkeley and Dr. T.W. Adorno of the Institute of Social Research.

The basic approach of the project as it now stands is an attempt to gain insight, in an indirect way, into the nature and scope of antisemitism. Questionnaires have been distributed which do not contain a single reference to the Jewish problem but are so formulated that they possess a high correlation -- capable of being statistically proven -- to the existence or non-existence of antisemitic bias.

The reasons for this indirect approach are the following:

(a) Antisemitism is an attitude rather than a matter of mere opinion, or, at least, it is a problem as to what extent it is something confined to the overt conviction of people and to what extent it is conditioned by deeper and often subconscious drives. It is self-evident that questions plainly referring to the Jews would not suffice to let us understand the attitudinal factors, whereas indirect questions might lead us to a more comprehensive and deeper understanding of the background of the whole phenomenon.

(b) Antisemitism is still regarded as something disrespectable. Many people when openly questioned about it would be reluctant to speak their minds.

Our indirect approach will help us to identify individuals and groups as being essentially antisemitic who might otherwise not be ready to admit their prejudice.

(c) Our interest is devoted as much to antisemitism as a potential danger as to its actual extent and strength. This potentiality may be gauged by our indirect approach.

We may find out which people are likely to be antisemitic in critical situations even if they themselves are not yet aware of it.

(d) Most of our studies converge in the result that antisemitism is intimately linked with destructive urges. Our indirect approach stresses items of a destructive nature and provides us with a means to objectively and concretely check the interconnection between destructiveness and antisemitism.

The general procedure is that two questionnaires are going to be successively distributed, one containing only indirect items and one containing overt questions on antisemitism, anti-Negroism and related opinional topics. The same people are to answer both questionnaires. We shall ultimately keep those questions or groups of questions of the first questionnaire which prove to be most differentiating in terms of the second questionnaire - that is, questions where the answers show a high correlation to antisemitic bias or its absence. We shall then have a completely condensed and short instrument consisting of only the most highly correlated questions.

The indirect questions themselves are not picked at random. They are either the result of theoretical studies, or taken from content analyses of the speeches of antisemitic demagogues, or based on the result of previous investigations into the psychological make-up of antisemites within the framework of the Berkeley project.

For technical matters the direct and indirect questions have so far appeared in one questionnaire which we shall now divide into two. The following may give

a more concrete idea of the nature of this questionnaire.

It contains a number of informative items of a socio-psychological nature (group membership, vocation, income, religion, politics a.s.o.) as well as questions regarding the life history of the interviewee with particular reference to his relation to his parents.

The main part of the questionnaire consists of "attitude scales", that is to say, of questions which are to be answered by figures from plus 3 to minus 3 indicating various degrees of agreement or disagreement on the basis of which statistical evaluation takes place. In the present questionnaire, which is usually answered in sessions of 1½ hours, there are 78 such items.

Overt items are (a) questions on antisemitism such as 16, 21, 26, 40 and 62. (b) questions on "ethnocentrism", that is, strong accentuation of in-group feelings and more or less outspoken hostility against all groups which "do not belong", such as 7, 29, 45 a.s.o.

The next group of questions referring to political and economic conservatism is somewhat inbetween direct and indirect questions. They are mainly on the opinion level but formulated in such a way that they may help us to ascertain subconscious and hidden tendencies. With regard to this group of questions it is our major hypothesis that the antisemites are pseudo-conservative, i.e. they profess beliefs in traditional American ideas such as rugged individualism, patriotism, private enterprise a.s.o., in a way that clearly shows the underlying tendency to use them as a cloak for eventually abolishing democracy in this country. Here belong e.g. questions 15, 18, 25, 41, 61, and 63.

The next major group, the so-called "F.-Scale" (scale on Fascist attitudes), contains the most decisive items referring to indirect indices of antisemitism. The following sub-groups may be enumerated.

(1) Conventionalism, the rigid belief in externally enforced standards rather than a strongly developed individual conscience. This syndrome is closely related to pseudo-conservatism. Here go questions 8, 19, 23.

(2) Questions which point to an inherent weakness of the ego under the impact of modern society which make it take refuge in strong repressive collective organizations. Here go questions referring to suggestibility, an exaggerated feeling of honor and privacy, and questions of social anxiety. Examples are 17, 47, 56, and 70.

(3) Aggressive trends shown in terms of acquisitiveness, anti-emotionalism and anti-intellectualism. Questions are for instance 1, 13, 60, and 78.

(4) Cynicism in the sense of a tendency toward vilifying human nature in order to vindicate the necessity of brutal authority. Examples are 42, 50, 54, and 59.

(5) Projection of repressed desires upon others who are blamed for the very same thing the individual has learned to repress within himself. Here go questions 30, 31, 46, 75, and 77.

(6) Items referring to the anarchic and destructive undercurrent noticeable within the apparently "conservative" but actually Fascist minded people. Here we have statements somehow urging illegal actions of the people (3,35) as well as questions of an entirely indirect nature indicative of destructive trends (14,73 -- both questions cope with germs and diseases and show in our preliminary breakdown a particularly high correlation with antisemitism); furthermore, questions tending toward identification with "mischief" in terms of expectancy of world catastrophes, belief in astrological forebodings, etc. (10, 43, 65).

The last part of the questionnaire provides the interviewee with the opportunity to express what might be called personality trends. Among the most

discriminating questions are: "If you knew you had only six months to live but could do just as you please during the period, how would you spend your time?" and "What great people living or dead do you admire most?"

High and low extremes on antisemitism identified by this questionnaire are being subjected to detailed case interviews in which the general patterns indicated by the questionnaire are followed up in terms of the individual psychology of the interviewee. The idea is to find out how stereotypy and emotional attitudes are related to each other. They subjects are also given a Rorschach and a Murray test in order to more fully elaborate the relationship between personality trends and proneness to antisemitic bias.

A new test on social apperception and case studies of "mediums" which may be characteristic for the average frame of mind of the population will be added.

The groups from whom we select our interviewees are primarily those which we may expect, for psychological reasons, to be most susceptible to antisemitic prejudice, such as members of the new "managerial" class, students of a school of technology, etc. However, we do not limit ourselves to these groups but try to get an idea of the general situation among the population. Of particular importance is a projected distribution of the questionnaire among prison inmates.

During the case interviews now carried on, the aspect of individual "therapy" of antisemitism through making people reflect upon themselves comes more and more into the foreground, and therewith the planning of effective counter-measures gains increasing importance.

Diff. | Extent per type of groups
 . | Specimen type