A. INTRODUCTION

1. THE PROBLEM

If, as the foregoing chapters have indicated, failure in superego integration, inability to establish emotional relationships with others, and over-compensatory reactions to weakness and passivity are among the important sources of potentially fascist trends within the personality, should we not expect that a group of prison inmates would score particularly high on our scales? This, at any rate, was the thought which led us to consider our subjects from the San Quentin Prison\(^1\) as a key group.

The most extreme failures in superego integration are found in the psychopathic personality (see Chapter XIX), a type of character structure which has been given an important role in criminality by many authorities, e.g., Karpman (61), Lindner (74), and Glueck and Glueck (44). Traits which some writers assign to criminals in general, e.g., egocentricity, absence of sense of guilt, inadequate emotional control, are often regarded as aspects of the psychopathy syndrome. Inability to establish emotional relationships with other people is probably a mark of psychopathy, though it is a trait often assigned to the delinquent personality in general, e.g., by Lowrey (76). That the inordinate longing for status and power, the readiness for aggression against weaker or relatively defenseless people, and the demands for immediate recognition so common among criminals usually spring from underlying weakness, passivity, and homosexuality has often been noted, e.g., by Aichorn (4) and by Alexander and Healy (6). These considerations are in accord with the well-known role of criminal types in fascist movements; they are the “plug-uglies” who are assigned the task of terrorizing minority group members, active labor unionists, liberals, and radicals.

\(^1\)This study was made possible by the extended cooperation and assistance of Dr. David G. Schmidt, Chief Psychiatrist, San Quentin, California, and his staff.
At the same time, however, it was considered that there might be certain types of criminals who, exhibiting trends quite different from those noted above, would obtain relatively low scores on our scales. Thus in the "normal criminal" of Alexander and Staub (7) and in the "antisocial offender" of Sanford (103) rebellion against the status quo seems to be an important feature. This suggested that we might expect to find in some of the San Quentin subjects certain manifestations of a trend which in our major sample had appeared to favor low scores on the scales. Finally, in the "presocial offender" described by Sanford, the need for love and the sense of love deprivation are outstanding features, and it was considered possible that in some cases these trends might outweigh the displaced hostility that is basic to prejudice. There was no information concerning the frequency with which these anti-authoritarian and love-oriented patterns appear in the general population of penal inmates, though it seemed fairly certain that it was small compared with that of the authoritarian personality trends noted above.

2. SAMPLING AND ADMINISTRATION

The sample of inmates on whom the questionnaire statistics are based was selected as follows. The prison psychiatric department provided, upon request, a sample of the inmate population subject to the following conditions:

(a) A sampling of offense-groups should be obtained, roughly in proportion to their ratios in the total inmate population.2

(b) Inmates beyond maximum age of 55 should be excluded.

(c) Feebleminded inmates should be excluded.

(d) As far as possible, inmates with less than eight years of schooling should be excluded.

In addition to these restrictions, about twenty of the questionnaires obtained were subsequently excluded because:

(e) they were incomplete (eight or more items left unanswered);

(f) they belonged to Negro or Jewish inmates;

(g) they belonged to inmates in the prison psychotic ward. These exclusions left a working sample of 110, on which the statistics were obtained.

The inmates filled out the questionnaire (Form 45) in groups of six or eight.

2 The ratios of different offense-groups in the questionnaire sample are as follows: "check-writing" 40%; "robbery," "burglary," and "theft" 28%; "homicide" 11%; "sex offenses" 21%. The corresponding ratios for the prison population (1945) are as follows: "check-writing" 14%; "robbery," "burglary," and "theft" 54%; homicide 7%; "sex offenses" 11%. The chief difference between the questionnaire sample and the prison population is that the latter includes 26% fewer cases of "check-writing," and 26% more cases of "robbery," "burglary," and "theft." The E- and F-scale means for these two offense-groups in the sample are not significantly different. (See Table 5 (XXI).) All of the ratios given in this note, it should be remembered, refer only to the "present" offense; many inmates have committed previous offenses in different categories.

2 One subject included in the sample violated this condition; he obtained a Wechsler-Bellevue I.Q. of 48.

4 Actually, sixteen subjects included in the sample (including the feebleminded subject referred to in footnote 3) violated this condition.
at a time, in the prison psychiatric department. Instructions given were the same as for other groups, with one addition: An attempt was made to get across the idea not only that anonymity would be maintained, but also that this task had no relation to prison routine or authority. Such verbal reassurance could not, of course, alter the general atmosphere of the prison, which stresses compulsion and conformity. And it cannot be denied that such an environment is conducive to agreement with many of the conventional, authoritarian values represented in the questionnaire items. That this factor had a relatively minor effect upon the responses, however, is indicated by the wide inter- and intra-individual differences in answering the questionnaire. These differences appear in the fairly wide dispersion of scores obtained for most items considered separately, in patterns of agreement and disagreement for all except a few ultra-high scorers, and above all in some patterns of predominant disagreement (i.e., low scorers). There is also validating interview material. It deserves emphasis, moreover, that submission to surrounding authoritarian pressures is itself an index of authoritarian trends in the personality, of inability to maintain individualistic values in the face of counterpressure.

It is probable that items were sometimes misunderstood and answered incorrectly on account of external distraction, i.e., noise and crowded conditions. For inmates of low educational status, the possibility of misunderstanding would naturally be increased. It was discovered in follow-up interviews that some inmates had in fact misunderstood some items, and had answered them in a manner opposite to their intentions. This type of distortion appears to have been a minor (i.e., only occasional) factor, however.

Fifteen of the inmates were interviewed. Of these, eight scored high, four low, and three had scores placing them in what is, for most groups studied, the middle range. To avoid overcomplicating the picture, the interviews of these "middles" are not included in the discussion. Subjects were selected for interviews on the basis of E score (high or low), offense-group (to get some sampling of each major group), intellectual level (average or better, as estimated roughly from the data on the front page of the questionnaire and from the language used), and the suggestiveness of their responses to the Projective Questions. A further selection was imposed by the fact that a few of the inmates sought for interviews were in the sick ward at the time or could not conveniently be seen because of conflicting prison routine.

The interviewees did not come voluntarily to be interviewed, but were summoned by the psychiatric department. The examiner tried as best he

---

5 This anonymity was violated to the extent necessary to follow up certain inmates in interviews. It will of course be preserved here. To connect the names given to interviewees here with the numbers used in Part IV, see Key on the bottom of Table 1 (XXI).

6 This was before the prison I.Q. test data had been made available to us.
### TABLE 1 (XXI)
IDENTIFYING DATA FOR INTERVIEWEES IN THE PRISON INMATES GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Family Class Status</th>
<th>Years of Schooling</th>
<th>I. Q.</th>
<th>Pre-Prison Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pseudodemocratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Divorced 3 times</td>
<td>LL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>115(est.)</td>
<td>Grocery manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>LL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Plumber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbur</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>LL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Truck driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Widower</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Farmer; soldier-pensioner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fascist**

| Floyd  | 23  | Single   | LM                  | 11                | 125   | Irregular odd jobs |
|        |     |          |                     |                   |       |                       |
| Adrian | 30  | Single   | LU                  | 14                | 122   | Homosexual prostitute; occasional clerk |
| Buck   | 32  | Divorced twice | LM                  | 8                | 83    | "Cattleman"            |

**Low Scoring**

| Jim     | 28  | Single   | LL                  | 11                | 117   | Messenger; clerk |
|         |     |          |                     |                   |       |                       |
| Don     | 42  | 1st wife died; 2nd wife divorced | LM                  | 12                | 129   | Salesman |
| Dick    | 26  | Divorced; now engaged | UL                  | 12                | 112   | Clerk |
| Art     | 31  | Married 2nd time | UM                  | 14                | 130   | Commercial artist |

---

*a*As of November, 1945.

*b*These ratings are estimates by the examiner, using Lloyd Warner's categories: "Upper Upper," "Lower Upper," "Upper Middle," "Lower Middle," "Upper Lower," "Lower Lower."

**KEY FOR CONNECTING NAMES GIVEN TO INTERVIEWEES IN THIS CHAPTER WITH NUMBERS USED IN PART IV:**

Clarence: M664B  Floyd: M658  Adrian: M661A  Buck: M664C  
Jim: M619  Don: M620  Dick: M621A  Art: M621B
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Offense</th>
<th>Previous Delinquencies</th>
<th>Typical Self-characterizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder during gang robbery</td>
<td>Numerous thefts and burglaries</td>
<td>Robbed &quot;as a business&quot;; &quot;I always get married spectacularly.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killed mistress in quarrel</td>
<td>Check-writing; robbery</td>
<td>Was &quot;a good boy&quot;; &quot;hard-working... self-made...business-success.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check-writing</td>
<td>Eight drunk sentences; battery; robbery</td>
<td>&quot;I like to fight&quot;; &quot;I'm a little wild.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killed landlord in knife fight</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>One of the &quot;poor people&quot; whom &quot;the Greeks like to punish.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted rape (girl 12)</td>
<td>&quot;Molesting&quot; children; attempted rape (child)</td>
<td>Was &quot;a good boy&quot;; &quot;a follower&quot;; &quot;framed by the people in politics.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang robberies</td>
<td>Drunk-and-disorderly; several Army AWOL's</td>
<td>&quot;Everything I do is an act&quot;; &quot;my industriousness just doesn't exist&quot;; &quot;only one help I've got...my father.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery with cap pistol</td>
<td>Numerous drunk and (homosexual) &quot;soliciting&quot; sentences; others</td>
<td>&quot;Men irritate me...by...a superior attitude&quot;; &quot;I've got to have a God&quot;; &quot;my father haunts me.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check-writing while drunk</td>
<td>Fraud; statutory rape (girl 13); &quot;failure to provide&quot;; &quot;molesting&quot; own children</td>
<td>&quot;Money is the main object&quot;; &quot;you don't think I'm a sex maniac, do you?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While drunk, clubbed elderly woman to death</td>
<td>Several thefts: to buy necessities for mother</td>
<td>&quot;The only happiness we really know of is... here on earth&quot;; &quot;I look on God as mostly the goodness in all peoples.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank robberies (alone): to pay mother's debts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>&quot;Helping others all my life, it seems&quot;; &quot;beset by all sorts of emotional problems.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stole auto while drunk</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>&quot;I never did like to argue&quot;; &quot;when we were separated, I got a little wild.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check-writing while drunk</td>
<td>Check-writing while drunk</td>
<td>Doing an &quot;autopsychoanalysis&quot; of own &quot;Oedipus complex&quot; to improve social adjustment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This column gives the full-scale I.Q. score obtained on a Wechsler-Bellevue test administered by an inmate working in the prison psychiatric department.*
could to dissociate himself from prison authority. Some of the interviews suffered, like the questionnaire sessions, from external noise and interruptions. But except for one interview (with Wilbur, a high scorer), which for lack of space had to be conducted in an office where another person was working, it is believed that these factors did not seriously interfere with rapport or with smooth conduct of the interview (as compared with interviews held in freer circumstances).

3. PLAN OF DISCUSSION

As elsewhere in the book, the general order of presentation is from surface attitudes to successively deeper dynamic factors. The bulk of the discussion is concerned with interview material, although in each section relevant questionnaire statistics are given. The concepts developed earlier in the book, especially in Chapters IX–XIII, are here applied systematically to a group of key importance for understanding fascism, namely criminals.7 The more adequate interviews obtained for this group permit detailed exemplification of differentiating variables, combined with case studies of individuals who are followed as such throughout the chapter. An attempt is made to indicate in what respects the inmates are similar to other groups studied, and also what features seem to distinguish them. To help keep the interviewees in mind as individuals, Table i (XXI), which summarizes a few salient facts about each one, is presented.

One notable way in which the prison group is distinguished is the fact that some of the high scorers express openly fascistic attitudes. Three of the high-scoring interviewees differ sufficiently from the others in this respect to warrant special consideration. For each general topic, therefore, the interviewees are discussed in three groups: pseudodemocratic high scorers, fascists, and low scorers. For variables in which there is no notable difference between the two kinds of high scorers, some quotations from the fascists are often included under discussion of the pseudodemocratic high scorers. The distinction between these two differently organized types of mentality among the interviewees emerged empirically; it is developed inductively as various aspects of the fascist syndrome are taken up in successive sections of the chapter. The term fascist (as distinguished from pseudodemocratic, potential fascist) is used here to characterize anyone who expresses open hostility toward minority groups and endorses the use of force where “necessary” to suppress such groups; and who explicitly favors a “strong” government to protect business power against demands of labor unions and progressive political groups—even to the point of suppressing them by force.

7 The twelve interviewees considered in this chapter were a part of the total sample which formed the basis for the quantitative analysis presented in Chapters IX–XIII. This fact no doubt accounts in part, but only in part, for the similarity of the clinical results to be reported here and those which emerged from the analysis of our clinical material taken as a whole.
B. ETHNOCENTRISM

1. GENERAL QUESTIONNAIRE STATISTICS AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE

A statistical summary of E-scale results for the prison group is presented in Table 2 (XXI). The prison inmates obtained a higher group mean on the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>High Quartile Mean/Person</th>
<th>Low Quartile Mean/Person</th>
<th>D.P.</th>
<th>Over-all Mean/Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. (Zootsuiters)</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. (Negro rights)</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. (Foreign ideas)</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. (Negro foremen)</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. (Jewish businessmen)</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. (Marry a Jew)</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. (Negroes live)</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. (Jews alike)</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. (Jewish neighborhood)</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. (World organization)</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mean/person</td>
<td>61.34</td>
<td>27.82</td>
<td>33.52</td>
<td>46.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean/person item</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>5.5–7.0</td>
<td>1.6–3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6–7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Deviation: 1.28
Reliability: .65

E scale (45)—4.6 per item—than did any other group tested. Although there are a number of extreme high scorers, there are no extreme low scorers, and the low end of the frequency distribution is truncated. This truncation produces the lowest Standard Deviation for the E scale (Form 45) distribution found in any group studied. In terms of E-scale item means, the bulk of the differences between the inmates and other groups is accounted for by the inmates' high means on non-Jewish items—a result to be discussed later.

These gross findings point immediately to an important conclusion. The general run of criminals are not to be thought of as genuine rebels who act according to some principle, however dissident, and whose conflict with authority is accompanied by some consideration for the weak or oppressed.

---

8 See Table 17(IV).
9 The four lowest scores, in terms of mean per item, are 1.6, 1.8, 1.9, and 2.0.
10 See Table 17(IV).
On the contrary, they would appear to be full of hate and fear toward underdogs. Themselves disfranchised, prisoners and social outcasts, a kind of ultimate outgroup, they are yet unable to identify with other outgroups. This is in accordance with the common observation that most inmates do not identify with other inmates, but make moralistic distinctions between themselves and "ordinary criminals." The predominant tendency is for each inmate to be "an island, entire in itself." One of the high-scoring interviewees, Eugene, expressed this isolationism succinctly in his general attitude to the "race problem": "I'm strictly for havin' all of 'em segregated."

A second general result is that the (Form 45) E-scale reliability of .65 is somewhat lower than that for other groups. This can probably be attributed in part to misunderstanding of items and incorrect recording of responses, related to inadequate education and to environmental distractions. More of the reduction, however, is probably traceable to two statistical characteristics of the group results. One is the relative truncation of the lower end of the distribution. It is well known that cutting off either extreme portion of a bivariate distribution (including, of course, a split-half reliability distribution) tends to reduce the correlation. Secondly, the particular split of E-scale items used in computing reliability is such that one of the halves—the A items—includes precisely the five items on which the prison group means are most distinctively higher than those for other groups. The A set, moreover, includes the three items with the poorest D.P.'s (see Table 2 (XXI)). With these "handicaps," a reliability coefficient as high as .65 would seem to be all that could be expected (see Chapter IV).

The pattern of E-scale item means for the group is interesting (see Table 2 (XXI)). A very high mean was obtained on Item 45, which states that America must maintain complete independence in any world organization. Although this proposition always yields a high mean, the unusually high value for the inmates suggests that low scorers in prison may submit almost as much as high scorers to sufficiently strong nationalistic propaganda. This item would appear to lend itself particularly well to projection of the most severely frustrated strivings of prison inmates—their need to be free of restraint. Aside from this statement opposing world organization, the three items with the highest means (numbers 5, 10, and 20) have one thing in common: each expresses strong status anxiety with respect to outgroups perceived as submerged, namely "zootsuiters" or Negroes. The significance of this feature is indicated in the following discussion of interview material on Negroes (the only truly submerged outgroup specifically inquired about).

2. IDEOLOGY CONCERNING NEGROES: A SUBMERGED OUTGROUP

a. High Scorers. The content of anti-Negro ideology seems to be related to the fact that Negroes are almost universally perceived as a very submerged

11 See Table 17(IV).
outgroup—as contrasted with an imagined "dominant" outgroup such as Jews are thought to be. In the interviews, the principal traits ascribed to Negroes by high scorers are uninhibited sexuality, "laziness," "dirtiness," crude aggression, asocial acquisitiveness (petty thievery), pathological (infantile) lying, and exhibitionism. In a word, Negroes are held to be characterized by "untamed instincts," which keep them "primitive" and "childish." This imagery is partly expressed in questionnaire Item 32: Negroes are "lazy, ignorant, and without self-control."

The most conventional of the prejudiced interviewees, Robert, summarizes this idea in general terms: "They have more of a primitive nature . . . just want to exist as the cannibal type of man." The fascists tend to be more picturesque: "They're very closely linked with the jungle. They're built for it" (Floyd). Or, Negroes "originated from the apes" (Buck), and are "still half-African savage, no matter how dressed up they get" (Adrian).12

Implicit in these statements is the hereditarianism that pervades so much of potentially fascist thinking.

One of the most persistent preoccupations of the prejudiced interviewees has to do with the allegedly unsocialized sexuality of Negroes:

"There is more animalism in them. . . . (Animalism?) Well, a bitch dog runs down the street and five dogs jump on top of her. . . . Like the Latin race, they're hot-blooded" (Ronald). One of the fascists, though less graphic, seems more bitter: Negroes are "bestial, like animals. Wonder they don't have seasons for their heat" (Floyd). Another fascist affirms that Negroes are "very prolific" (Adrian).

More specific anxiety is expressed about sexual approach to "white women" by Negroes:

"One thing I can’t stand is to see a white girl with a nigger" (Ronald). "In here, when they have shows, the colored boys holler out about white women on the screen, ‘Oh, what a babe!’ . . . That don’t set right with me" (Eugene). "Under no circumstances," of course, should any member of "the white race . . . marry into the colored race" (Clarence). "Don’t think a white person should marry one" (Wilbur).

The other traits stressed vary in specific content. They have in common some reference to asocial instincts, and to Negroes’ alleged failure to develop superego restraints and ego-ideal drives. Thus Robert, who has struggled so hard to "make good" in business, is much concerned over the "laziness" of Negroes: "I don’t think they try to satisfy their ego." Then, pulling back—apparently because this phrasing touches a conflict between Robert’s own drive to get "up there" and his need to mask this power-seeking behind a pretense of "service"—he qualifies: "Not their ego, but their

12 Throughout the chapter, more than one quotation is generally given to illustrate each point. This is done not merely to multiply illustrations but because each interviewee is followed as an individual case study, on which some material is presented in each section.
fellow man. . . They don’t have a goal in life.” It is Robert also who expresses distaste for Negroes’ alleged failure to conform to cultural ideals of cleanliness: “They don’t wash themselves as cleanly.” Other characteristics assigned include the following:

Asocial acquisitiveness: “The majority of them have sticky fingers. They can’t let things alone” (Clarence). Aggressiveness: Negroes are “troublesome,” always starting trouble. . . . They get smart, start a lot of fights. . . . They always try to cause so much trouble—fight, trying to be big shots” (Eugene, who admits to a long record of getting in petty “trouble,” especially “fighting” when drunk). Pathological lying: “You can’t depend on him. . . . He’ll lie to you every chance he gets” (Buck, one of the fascists, whose protocol was discovered on checking with his social history chart to be filled with boastful lies on a grand scale). Being oververbal and grossly exhibitionistic: “Chatter like a bunch of apes when you get three or four in a crowd. Strut around like peacocks. . . . Take a look at their clothes” (Floyd, another fascist, who speaks in abrupt, blurted sentences and might be called “underverbal,” is exceptionally vain and preoccupied with his appearance, and even admits that, “Everything I do is an act”).

The prejudiced interviewees’ attitudes toward Negroes, as distinguished from their stereotypes of what Negroes are like, betray intense status anxiety—a fear lest “the black” rise up and challenge the right of “the white” to suppress him. Negroes must constantly be kept “in their place,” i.e., submerged, in order to save the high scorers from feeling severe anxiety. This status fear appears both in invidious comparisons of Negroes vs. whites, and in direct insistence upon Jim Crow policies. The following expressions are typical:

“I don’t believe in associating with them. I believe they should have their own schools. I don’t believe we should have to eat with them” (Clarence). “I figure they’re black and I’m white. . . . I won’t work with them. . . . Let them stay in their place” (Eugene). Negroes “should stay in their place . . . not mix with whites” (Wilbur). Robert wants to be “tolerant” by reducing discrimination in employment and living standards, but “by that I don’t mean that we should intermingle”; “there should be a separate section of town” for Negroes; and we “ought to do away with public office-holding” by Negroes.

Ronald complains: “The hardest thing for me to stomach is (Southern Negroes coming North) and taking advantage of opportunities. . . . They try to get themselves into a spot, not because they want it but just to annoy other people.” He goes on to describe an incident in the Negro section of a midwestern city, in which he forced a Negro to move from the “spot” next to him on a street car, was arrested by a Negro policeman, and subsequently fined. He expresses resentment against “the overbearing attitude they get when the odds are all in their favor.”

Ronald’s bitterness toward the “overbearing attitude” of Negroes also illustrates another feature commonly found in prejudiced subjects: an inabil-
ity to conceive of genuine equality. This anxiety-laden blind spot leads to some curious distortions by the prejudiced interviewees:

“(Negroes) feel themselves better than the white person” (Clarence). “They think they’re better than we are” (Eugene). More fully elaborated: “When white people give them a little rope, they just think they are a little better than whites...take a bit too far advantage if you give them a chance” (Wilbur).

Despite the highly antidemocratic attitudes outlined above, 5 of the high-scoring interviewees present the type of pseudodemocratic façade described in Chapters III and XVII. To convince themselves and others that they conform to the democratic values of “The American Creed,” they try to disguise or deny their authoritarian hostility. They show reluctance to approve openly that violence against Negroes to which their inner anxieties predispose them.

“They’re human, just as we are...I don’t believe we should hold racial hate” (Clarence). “There’s a few good ones (who) go out of their way not to cause trouble” (Eugene).

Robert would even like to equalize some opportunities for Negroes—up to a certain point—so that they may be encouraged to suppress passive wishes and acquire a “goal in life.” It is as if Negroes symbolize for Robert his own suppressed desires to be more passive and pleasure-seeking, desires that he feels compelled to inhibit so as to drive himself to “get up there” and prove his masculinity. Even Ronald admits “there are a few good ones”; and when asked what might have to be done if Negroes continue to demand more equality, he wistfully restrains his vigilante impulses: “It isn’t so much what will have to be done as that nothing will be done under our democratic system.” When pushed further, he sums up an attitude implicit in many of the quotations so far—the high scorers’ ultimate pessimism as to any real solution of group tensions: “Well, there’s a problem I don’t think will ever be solved.”

Wilbur, however, shows a kind of transition stage between pseudodemocratic façade and open fascist readiness to abandon pretense of democracy. On the one hand he insists, “I have nothing against them if they stay in their place.” But if Negroes organize to demand equal rights, “plenty would have to be done...battle just like with the Japs.” Underdogs’ demands for equality seem to arouse in Wilbur a persecutory fear of being overwhelmed, so that he feels driven to “fight back” in paranoid desperation.

b. Fascists. The three fascist high scorers, Adrian, Buck, and Floyd, reveal essentially the same kinds of anti-Negro stereotypes, with even more intense status-anxiety. In addition, they show two interrelated characteristics that are more openly antidemocratic: undisguised hate combined with explicit readiness to suppress the outgroup by physical force “if necessary.”
Buck rages: “Goddam nigger, he’s no good at all. . . . I don’t want any near me. . . . They ought to be kept in their place. Shouldn’t let ’em come over here in the first goddam place! . . . Floyd is even more virulent: “Ignorant ______! . . . What ought to be done, but won’t be done, is to ship ’em back to Haiti or to Liberia. (What may happen if they continue to encroach on white men?) There’ll be bloodshed if it keeps up!”

Adrian’s protective pattern of submissiveness prevents this blustering type of expression of his tremendous hate. But he leaves no doubt as to his approval of violent fascist suppressions: Negroes “keep their place and that’s that. (What if the Negro doesn’t keep his place?) He does keep his place. (But if not?) They learn their place.” Further probing elicits the assertion that if Negroes should insist on seeking political representation, there would have to be “another civil war” to suppress them. Adrian makes clear the symbolic equivalence for him of Negroes and other submerged groups: (Should Negroes work in the same factory with whites?) “Yes, because if they’re working in a factory with whites, they’re poor whites anyway.”

c. Low Scorers. Despite the unusually high means obtained by the prison group on the three items expressing status-anxiety toward submerged groups, these items have fairly low means for the low quartile and therefore have quite high Discriminatory Powers (Table 2 (XXI)). This indicates the relative freedom of most low scorers from strong anti-Negro prejudice. Of the 4 low-scoring interviewees, however, none were found to be entirely free of prejudice against Negroes. But their attitudes are distinguished from those of the high scorers in several ways.

In the first place, they are much less hostile and far less rigid in such prejudice as they do disclose. In particular, they exhibit less status-anxiety toward Negroes. Three of them emphasize that “there should be no discrimination in jobs”; the other, Jim, expresses guilt feelings over his present prejudice on this issue (see below). On the basis of an individualized attitude toward people, these men tend to be more willing to accept Negroes as friends and equals. Thus Don, who was brought up in a Southern state, declares that he chooses friends “mostly on the basis of the individual, not the race.” Dick, raised in another Southern state, describes two Negro doctors whom he enjoys “talking to.” He hesitates “as far as having close friends goes,” but decides that “that would be all right, too, if they had the same education I had.” (Art’s and Jim’s views on this matter will be indicated in ensuing paragraphs.)

All four protocols, however, contain evidence of some barriers against complete freedom of social relations with Negroes. The clearest barrier, subscribed to in some degree by all four, is that they “don’t believe in intermarriage.” But even here these men are more relaxed and flexible than the high-scoring inmates. They typically ascribe to external social pressure the main basis of their own social distance in this respect:
This barrier is a custom “brought down from years and years in history” (Dick). “I am thinking mostly of the children” who might he “socially ostracized” (Don). “It isn’t socially accepted” (Art). The barrier is not regarded as rigid and eternal: “If I’d been raised in New York City (instead of in the South), I might have felt different” (Dick). In countries where intermarriage is generally accepted, it is “okay—not myself, perhaps; but I certainly wouldn’t want to be dogmatic about it” (Don). (How would you feel about intermarriage if it were generally accepted socially?) “I don’t know. It isn’t now. . . . I never thought about it” (Art).

Most of these men would appear to have genuinely democratic values and yet, as mentioned before, none of them is entirely free of anti-Negro prejudice. One reason for this is suggested by a feature of their ideology itself. This is a tendency to discount somewhat the seriousness and extent of antidemocratic oppression; a reluctance to assign blame in intergroup conflict—especially reluctance to identify and to blame those who are more powerful for antidemocratic attitudes or actions toward those who are weaker; and a tendency to adopt a “harmonizing” attitude that urges both sides to be “reasonable” and to avoid impatient extremism—as if both sides were equally at fault. Inferentially, it is as if these men experience a conflict between democratic values and the fear of actively resisting the antidemocratic behavior of “respectable” groups “on top.” One way of justifying an inability to mobilize aggressiveness toward what is strong and established is to “play down” conflicts between stronger and weaker groups, by a kind of false impartiality. Thus, Art declares: “The (Negro-white) problem is highlighted out of all proportion to what it is.” Unable actively to resist conventional antidemocratic sanctions (though he refers to having known a few Negroes casually), he prefers not to “conduct my social life with them—only from one standpoint: It is not socially accepted.” This explains why the “impartiality” is called false: it seems to give way, under pressure, to submission to antidemocratic status-quo values and policies. In order to justify this appeasement and maintain self-respect, such a person may turn around to blame the outgroup for being a source of “trouble”—as if it caused the trouble by not submitting quietly. The fact that democratic rights are being denied to the outgroup may be conveniently glossed over or denied. Thus, Art declares: Negroes “have equal rights with me, (but) many of them have set themselves apart.” Asked to elaborate, he pulls back to a more “impartial” position: “I don’t feel that they have set themselves apart; publicity has set them apart.” “Publicity” is sufficiently anonymous so that he can avoid blaming anyone at all. . . . Thus it is clear that even the lowest scorers in the inmate group are not free of “high” trends.

Where definite rejection of Negroes is expressed by the low scorers, they show a readiness to examine their own attitudes with some degree of introspective and self-critical objectivity. An example is Dick’s statement that, “If I’d been raised in New York City (instead of in the South), I might have
felt different." Jim illustrates this trait more clearly. He verbalizes open
guilt over having undemocratic attitudes toward Negroes, and describes
these attitudes objectively as a psychological part of himself. "I have a kind
of natural, instinctive dislike for working with them. My mind tells me that's
wrong, not fair... but I just feel that way." Jim sees the conflict as in himself,
and conceives the solution as requiring a change not in the outgroup (as the
high scorers tend to do) but in the attitudes of himself and the ingroup: "It's
certainly unfair according to all human concepts. We just seem to have a
natural antipathy toward them that will eventually have to be worked out,
because a person can't help being born a Negro any more than a white man
can a white man." Implicit in this last observation is another feature of unprej-
udiced thinking in this area: these men seem to have an ultimate optimism
as to the solution of intergroup conflict—it will "eventually have to be worked
out." Further: "As far as coming to the time when they won't be segregated,
I think that would have to come naturally... I believe it's becoming solved
more and more" (Jim).

Like other low scorers, these men tend, when they do attribute certain
character traits to Negroes, to offer sociopsychological explanations for such
traits in terms of environmental pressures. (As might be expected, this is inti-
mately linked with their ultimate optimism, just as the prejudiced men's
hereditarianism is associated with their ultimate pessimism.) This capacity
for sociopsychological thinking is usually combined with a readiness for
empathy with the outgroup member's inner feelings. Thus, Dick: "If (a
Negro is) kept under supervision, suppressed, naturally he's not going to
have any initiative, not going to care."

3.IDEOLOGY CONCERNING JEWS: A SUPPOSED
"DOMINANT" OUTGROUP

a. High Scorers. Anti-Semitic stereotypes differ markedly from the quali-
ties ascribed to Negroes. Specifically, they seem to reflect the notion of Jews
as a "dominant" outgroup. One of the questionnaire items (number 24)
which clearly differentiates high and low scorers, condemns Jews for monop-
olizing business (see Table 2(XXI)). This expresses the core of the preju-
diced men's typical imagery of "the Jew" and their attitudes toward the
latter. Jews are seen as embodying to a singular degree what seems to be a
central value-complex of our culture. This set of values revolves around ac-
quisitiveness and drive for "success" conceived in terms of "getting on
top" and staying there—that is, compulsive drive for status and power.
Every high-scoring interviewee gave spontaneous fantasies about extreme
acquisitiveness as a supposed Jewish trait. The following are typical examples:

"They like to be where there's money and take all the money and hang on to it"
(Wilbur). "You put (a Jew) on a rock and he'll make money... He's thrifty and
tries to get ahead" (Clarence). Jews have a "special drive" and "have always been after money and capable of making it" (Robert).

This drive is imagined to lead to Jewish dominance and power:

"I guess they run most of the things in this country," and "They run an awful lot of politics" (Eugene). "I believe that the Jews control a lot of the money in this country" (Ronald). Jews have "put themselves up there, where what they say counts" (Robert).

This power is secured, so the fantasies go, by combining acquisitive drive with "clannishness":

Jews are thought of as "stickin' together" (Eugene); as being "self-centered" and acting so that "when one Jews gets in, first thing you know there are about fifty of them" (Ronald); as being "good mixers among their own people, but don't mix much with other people" (Clarence).

It is noteworthy that none of the pseudodemocratic inmates ascribed to Jews a single id (primitive instinct) trait, of the sort described above in the anti-Negro stereotype. This striking difference in fantasies about an out-group imagined to be "dominant," as contrasted with an out-group perceived as "submerged," was a matter of the spontaneous emphasis of the inmates themselves.

The prejudiced men's attitude toward Jews also differs clearly from their attitude toward Negroes. Their attitude toward Jews seems to be associated with the image of Jewish dominance combined with exclusiveness. This attitude centers around fantasies of victimization by Jewish power, and a fear of being overwhelmed by that power. Here the personalization of ideology is even more striking than in the anti-Negro attitudes.

Thus, Eugene: "Say I have a grocery store. They'll come in and start a bigger one." They "get in a small town" (Eugene was raised in a small town) and "take over the grocery stores." Or Ronald: "You put a Jew in an office. First thing you know, you haven't got a job. You've got five Jews instead. . . . They act like they're better than anyone else, and anyone that doesn't think they are is nothing but a fool."

Of special interest is the anti-Greek ideology of Wilbur. He shows the usual anti-Semitic fantasies, but without as intense feelings as those characterizing his anti-Greek ideology, which serves a similar function and is more focal.¹³ This fact appears to have been precipitated by a specific experience with a Greek landlord. Following an argument over the rent, the landlord evicted Wilbur's family while Wilbur was at work. Wilbur sought him out in a rage, started a fight, and gave him a fatal wound (leading to Wilbur's imprisonment). Wilbur's emotional conflicts (to be discussed later) prevented him from merely rejecting the particular individual. Instead he de-
developed rigid delusions about "the Greeks," imagining them as "all alike" and as having deliberately "come over here" to "punish the poor people, pay low wages, make you work too hard," etc.

Significant is the fact that the prejudiced men's anti-Semitic resentment seems to have an ambivalent aspect, to be combined with a secret envy of, and longing to be accepted into, the supposedly "dominant" outgroup. Observe in the following examples the reluctant admiration of and implied wish to share in "Jewish power":

"God knows they're good businessmen, but all for the Jew" (Adrian). "Course they've got to stick together, but why at the expense of others" (Ronald). "Smart people, ain't they?" (Buck). "Still, if they can do it . . ." (Eugene). "Trouble is, they're so goddam clannish . . . won't mix and mingle like other people" (Floyd).

More positive (surface) identification with "Jewish" drive to "get up there" is illustrated in Robert, who seems to have experienced a severe struggle to internalize this same goal in the face of desires to relax and enjoy life (see p. 858). With a kind of inverted anti-Semitism, he expresses admiration for Jews' "knack to earn money, to control something," and for their having had "the foresight and drive and ambition to get there." His envy is plain: "I think it would be better if some white men had something put on their backs to get that drive." Floyd, a fascist who expresses contempt for himself for never having held a job for more than a few weeks at a time, stresses Jewish "industriousness" which he consciously envies: "They believe in working for what they get. . . . Talk to a little Yid kid, and he is studying for what he's gonna be ten years from now."

Despite the antidemocratic hostility implicit in their anti-Semitic fantasies, the same five men again maintain a pseudodemocratic façade. They ward off attention to their own hostility as such by focusing rigidly on "what is wrong with the outgroup."

Hence, it is often possible for them to believe that they are "strictly not prejudiced" (Robert); to declare that Jews have "got to have some place to live—can't run them out of the country" (Clarence); or that "however, I don't think they should be persecuted" (Ronald); or assert that "I don't have no trouble with a person (such as a Jew) if he don't bother me" (Wilbur); or that "I guess they're all right, I never had no run-in. They stay in their place" (Eugene).

Although these men may feel that perhaps Hitler faced a "real problem . . . with this domineering type" who "possibly controlled Germany quite a bit through big business" (Robert), they reject Nazi persecution of Jews as brutal and unwarranted.

The pseudodemocratic character of this façade is seen not only in the hostile stereotypes of Jews but also in responses to questioning about "what might have to be done if Jewish control goes too far?"

For example: "There might be no way to get them out except by revolution"
(Ronald). Wilbur reveals, rather pathetically, a similar pogrom mentality in his attitude toward “the Greeks”: “If they don’t stop (punishing the poor people), there’s going to be more American people in the penitentiary.” He feels “they” ought to be sent back to Greece.

b. Fascists. The anti-Semitic stereotypes of the three fascists are fairly similar to those of the pseudodemocratic high scorers. They focus on acquisitiveness as well as clannishness and monopolization of power. The fascist subjects stress a further trait attributed to Jews, however, which is not mentioned by the other high scorers, viz., excessive sensuality.

Buck refers especially to sexual obsessions and homosexuality among Jewish men: (What are Jews like?) “Most all of them Jews talk about sex mostly, or beatin’ a guy out of his money. . . . (What do they talk about sex?) About what they’re gonna do when they get out, or they’re gonna get a _______ tonight.” . . . Floyd, whose ambivalence is peculiarly clear-cut, complains that Jews “won’t intermarry.” An underlying orientation toward Jewish men is suggested by his phrasing: “Some of their women are really all right” (italics supplied). . . . Adrian does not himself introduce the topic of Jewish sensuality but does verbalize such fantasies quite readily: (Are Jews somewhat different sexually?) “They are more amorous than other people. Yes, and I know whereof I speak! More passionate, more romantic. Not that I like it, but they are.”

Like the other high scorers, the fascists reveal a fear of being victimized by Jewish power, along with an ambivalent wish to be accepted into the supposedly “dominant” outgroup. As in their anti-Negro ideology, the fascist inmates’ attitudes are distinguished by undisguised hate and by explicit readiness to suppress the outgroup by physical force. This goes along with open approval of specifically fascist aggressions against underdogs.

Buck feels that Hitler “done the right thing” to the Jews, who are “lower than a goddam snake.” In this country “they’ll have to watch out if they want to eat.” . . . Floyd grimaces with disgust as he speaks of “that harsh guttural voice.” If Floyd had been in Hitler’s place, “I’d have done the same thing he did!” . . . Adrian is again too ingratiating to bluster in this way, but is quite open as to his authoritarian hostility: (Is dislike for Jews increasing?) “No, just the opposite, and I deplore it personally!” He is willing to support fascist persecution in the form of arbitrary deportation of all Jews in America—“send them all to Palestine”—even though he feels compelled to “disapprove of the means (Hitler) took to rid Germany of the Jewish problem. Because they did monopolize industry, and something had to be done.” And “the Jews are just as apt to monopolize industry in this country.” While he justifies persecution of Jews for being allegedly too aggressive and powerful, Adrian also “wanted to let the Japs go into Manchuria” because the Chinese are “not aggressive enough!” “They have enough resources and could be a great nation if they had the aggressiveness of the Japs.”

This contradiction throws into relief a further aspect of fascist ideology that can be described as ideological opportunism. By this term is meant a disregard for ethical principles and truth-values, which are replaced by

14 Profane term meaning to have fellatio performed upon oneself.
opportunistic manipulation of ideas and "facts" in the service of Realpolitik ends. The contexts in which such opportunistic thinking appears are characteristically those involving dominance-submission conflicts. The aim of such opportunism is to maintain identification with those on top—whoever they are, whatever they represent—and to avoid at all cost the anxiety of being identified with those below. There is an essential indifference to content, i.e., indifference to any goals of human happiness. Power for power's sake is the ultimate end; ideological opportunism is one of the means. Such opportunism appears also in the thinking of pseudodemocratic high scorers, but in more disguised forms. (See Chapter XVII.)

Another facet of Adrian's opportunism is revealed by a superficial shift in his identifications which occurred "after the war began in Europe." His explicit sympathy with the aggressions of fascist Germany and Japan was modified, as American opinion became crystalized against the Axis. He rationalizes that Hitler's aggressions during the war "seemed to be more a matter of conquest than protecting against communism"; and "I certainly didn't expect (the Japanese) to go beyond China." That Adrian experienced no change in heart but only a superficial realignment so as to avoid conflict with a more dominant ingroup (America), is suggested by his present explicit approval of all aggressions by the Axis nations carried out prior to their open war with the stronger Allied powers.

Floyd's ideological opportunism is even clearer. He summarizes (and plainly approves) the "harmony" technique exploited by German industrialists, through Hitler, to "solve" class conflict: Hitler's "object wasn't the Jew. He wanted a scapegrace (sic) to get the different classes and provincials together, to fight one thing... To get together instead of having all this bickering and split power. (Was his cause just?) In the eyes of the German people, yes. (In your eyes?) Every man for his own country."

Buck, besides supporting Nazi persecution of Jews, exhibits an interesting mode of ideological opportunism in his behavior toward the interviewer. The first three inquiries about his views on "the Jewish problem" and "the most characteristic Jewish traits" elicited only pseudodemocratic denials of hostility. For example: "They got a right to make a living as much as anybody else... They got a way to make money is all I know. More power to 'em is all I can say... I don't know much about 'em." But with the fourth question he apparently sensed that he would not be punished for expressing hostility and might (judging from the interviewer's noncommittal attitude) even gain approval for having the "right" view of things: (Can you tell a Jew usually?) "You're damn right I can tell 'em as soon as I talk to 'em." From this point on, Buck drops his façade and exhibits intense aggressiveness toward Jews.

c. Low Scorers. The low scorers tend to reject anti-Semitic stereotypy as such. Thus Dick retorts that "it doesn't hold true" that there are any "char-
acteristic Jewish traits”; for “the Jews, in my opinion, are not a race but a religion.” Jim declares: “I don’t see why they should be picked out as being any different from anyone else.” More positively, these men actively condemn anti-Semitism.

“When a person gets too far off the base about the Jews or Negroes, I am liable to step in and tell him off” (Don). Art interprets the hostility concealed behind pseudodemocratic anti-Semitism; his own equalitarian ideology is apparent: “I have often heard the expression, ‘Some of my best friends are Jews.’ Well, hell, some of my best friends are people! It sounds like you are making a concession to them.” It is of interest that Art’s father is described as “a rabid Jew-hater.”

Further, in contrast with the narrow, personalized mythologies that dominate the thinking of the high scorers, these men exhibit a broader perspective. They seem to show a greater capacity for surveying human relationships in a detached way, which at the same time reveals compassion and respect for other human beings. One form this takes is empathy with Jews’ psychological problems as an outgroup and a tendency to construct sociopsychological interpretations of anti-Semitism.

Jim remarks that Jews may be “inclined to be egotistical”; and at first a typical anti-Semitic projection is expected, until he goes on to clarify his meaning: “Not exactly a trait, but I think a good many of them feel that they’re discriminated against. I think, in view of that, that they strive harder than most people do, and as a race they stick together and cooperate with each other to a large extent.” This is quite unlike Ronald’s complaint that “they act like they’re better than anyone else, and anyone that doesn’t think they are is nothing but a fool.” Don believes that “if they have any objectionable features” as a group (which he doubts), it is because they are “stepchildren of history” in the sense of having been restricted to certain occupations and living conditions. Art is more explicit: “The Jews way back in history were other than Christians, and were limited (by the Christians) in their spheres of endeavor. . . . So they became sharpies in the money department. . . . So they had attributed to them those traits that are most despicable: craftiness, greed about money, etc.”

Art says that he is inclined to regard the Jews’ “reputation for sharp dealing” as unfounded, but “I don’t know whether it is true or not.” The important point is that the matter is not vital to him: he is not driven by inner conflicts to an insistence on projecting ruthless acquisitiveness onto Jews. Dick is more at a loss for ideas to account for anti-Semitism. He can only suggest that it is “just brought down from history.”

C. POLITICO-ECONOMIC ATTITUDES

1. GENERAL QUESTIONNAIRE STATISTICS

A statistical summary of results from the PEC scale for the prison group is presented in Table 3(XXI). On this scale, the prison group obtained the highest mean, 4.68, of all groups taking Form 40 or 45 except the Service
Club Men.\textsuperscript{15} It would seem that criminals tend in general to be conservative in their politics. With respect to the PEC scale quartiles, Table 3(XXI) reveals that not only is the high quartile mean fairly high, but the low quartile mean is definitely higher than in other groups—so high as to indicate that there could be few if any extreme low scorers on the PEC scale. As a matter of fact, only one inmate (out of 110) obtained a PEC score of 5, i.e., 1.0 per item. The two next lowest scores were, respectively, 2.2 and 3.0 per item. It is not surprising, then, to find that the average D.P. for the PEC scale is only 2.41, the lowest for any group which took Forms 40 or 45. (See Table 9(V).) Moreover, the correlation between the E and PEC scales for the prison group is only .14.

How can these results—the inmates' general conservatism, and the low correlation between E and PEC scores—best be explained? First, as to the general conservatism, interview material suggests that antidemocratic emotional attitudes play an important determining role. Another factor, partially "caused" by such attitudes, which may favor conservatism, is the lack of an informed and adequate frame of reference within which to evaluate politico-economic events.\textsuperscript{16} This phenomenon, the general significance of which has been discussed in Chapter XVII, seems on the basis of interview material more extreme in the inmates than in most other groups. Such a lack could be influenced partly by prison isolation, but also by disinterestedness deriving from preoccupation with private emotional conflicts as well as from the low educational level of many of the inmates.

\textsuperscript{15} See Table 8(V).

\textsuperscript{16} The relationship between lack of an informed and adequate frame of reference, on the one hand, and receptiveness to reactionary ideas on the other, has been discussed particularly by Cantril (17).
Since the reliability and validity of the PEG scale depends upon at least a minimal information and interest on the part of the subjects, the factor just discussed might help to account also for the low correlation obtained between PEC and E scores. Another factor that would reduce this correlation is the truncation of both distributions at their lower ends—i.e., the near-absence of very low scores. In addition, two special features of some high-scoring inmates might have helped to lower the E-PEC correlation by lowering their scores on certain items. One is superficially liberal attitudes among some high scorers (exemplified in interview material). These would seem to be related in part to reality factors such as marginal socioeconomic status, greater first-hand experience of economic insecurity, and so forth. The lack of genuineness in these attitudes is revealed in their personalized-persecutory tone, and in a readiness for antidemocratic approaches to politico-economic conflicts. A second special feature is the greater frequency among these high-scoring inmates of openly fascist politico-economic attitudes. Not only are these not measured directly by the PEC scale (see Chapter V) but to the extent that they are consistently fascist, they actually tend to lower scores on PEC Item 11. For while fascists share the conservative antilabor, pro-business approach, they differ from traditional laissez-faire conservatives in desiring “strong” government control (not, of course, social control over business, but control by business over labor).

The pattern of specific PEC item means and D.P.'s is consistent with the above interpretations of general conservatism among the inmates and of the slight relationship between PEC and E scores (see Table 3(XXI)). The reactionary implications of Item 7 (American way) are probably not easy to grasp without a rather positive liberal-internationalist political orientation. This item, as might be expected, has an exceptionally high mean and a rather low D.P. On the other hand, Item 17, condemning economic security, would be expected to have a relatively low mean because it touches the personal experience of both high- and low-scoring inmates; and this factor should also lower its D.P. These expectations are borne out. Finally, Item 3, urging stronger labor unions, should discriminate most clearly between high and low scorers: it presents in a fairly pure form the issue of political liberalism-conservatism and little sophistication is required to understand what it implies. This PEC item is in fact the most differentiating of all.

2. INTERVIEWEES GENERALLY

The interviews tend to confirm the supposition that most of the inmates are politically uninformed. The above-average intelligence and education of most of the particular inmates interviewed makes this fact even more striking. In addition to revealing general ignorance and confusion in discussing politico-economic affairs, a number of the interviewees directly admit their ignorance and lack of interest in this area.
"I don't know about politics. I never studied that much and I never talk about it. . . . I don't think much—only what I hear over the radio" (Wilbur). "That's something I don't know nothing about: politics" (Eugene). "I'm not a political-minded man" (Robert). "Don't know much about" the Roosevelt New Deal (Floyd). "I never did pay much attention about political things" (Buck). "I pay very little attention to it"; "I don't understand those things, but I prefer to do what the Republicans do, whatever that is" (Adrian). "A subject I never gave a lot of attention to" (Dick).

There are nonetheless important differences among the interviewees in their degree of political awareness (or lack of it), as well as in some of their general attitudes.

3. HIGH SCORERS

Differences between the politico-economic attitudes of the low-scoring interviewees and those of the pseudodemocratic prejudiced interviewees are not clear-cut. Four of the 5 pseudodemocratic men—Robert, Eugene, Wilbur, and Ronald—exhibit some pro-labor attitudes, though these are not consistent. For instance, in late 1945 or early 1946, all of these men believed that wage increases were justified by high prices and by the ability of employers to pay more wages. Each of them, however, revealed indecision as to how far trade union activity should go, especially where strikes might be involved. Typical is Robert's view that "the unions demand just a little more than they have a right to." All of these men condemned political activity by organized labor. In varying degrees, however, they support some social security legislation. Robert even endorses such measures as public health insurance and the general idea of government economic planning. But all of them oppose such equalizing restrictions as wartime salary limitations.

Clarence, on the other hand, is consistently reactionary. He seems to support the more hard-boiled policies of big business. Objecting strenuously to trade union activity and identifying with employer "toughness," he declares with satisfaction: "If a man can't make a profit in his business, he'll close it down." He complains that "it's the corporation they blame all the trouble on." Ronald asserts a similar view: "I believe in free enterprise. I believe that business should be able to conduct their own business." Clarence, Ronald, and Eugene, despite their own (pre-prison) submerged economic status, express marked status anxiety toward politico-economic outgroups and a persecutory fear of being overwhelmed by such groups becoming dominant—specifically, organized labor, "the Communists," and Russia. (Recall the problem of status-anxiety toward Negroes, and the fear of being overwhelmed by the latter if they should succeed in rising nearer to democratic equality.)

Clarence is afraid that "if labor keeps getting more power we'll be like Russia. That's what causes wars! . . . You take the C.I.O. The majority of the C.I.O. is communism (sic)! . . . Anyone who believes in communism ought to be deported!"
Ronald complains that labor unions are “so strong now that they’re trying to run the government.” Eugene fears that our government could become threatened by “the strikes” but even more by Russia: “We’re going to have to look out for Russia. . . . I think sooner or later we’re going to go to war with them.”

For 4 of these men (all except Robert), there is definite evidence that such liberal attitudes as they do express may be undependable. For these attitudes seem to be based not on genuinely democratic principles but on the same kind of personalization of ideology that was seen in their racism. On one side are fantasies of actual or threatened victimization, in which politico-economic processes are oversimplified into an imagined, purely personal conflict between forces of “good” and forces of “evil.” Thus, Clarence’s attitude toward unions seems to be determined by his fear of criticizing business power and by an overcompensatory “rugged individualism”: “I’ve worked all my life and I wouldn’t let no organization tell me when I worked and when I couldn’t.” His ambivalent attitude toward what he calls “the best form of government” is equally devoid of any reference to issues, and reflects a “good man, bad man” theory of society: “Of course, sometimes we get rotten politicians.” . . . Ronald’s paranoid interpretations of political events are suggestive of the kind of thinking we came to expect from Hitler and Musсолini. His first response to inquiry about his political views is that “We’ve got a persecutor in California for governor.” Declining to explain this, he goes on instead to attack President Roosevelt as another “persecutor.” He tells of how his father was “pushed out of a job” by the N.R.A. Then, making it clear first that “I don’t believe in communism,” he complains that “there’s so many little people who never have anything.” This prefaces another personal story—of his grandmother’s inadequate old-age pension, from which he concludes that the law ought to be changed to grant more liberal allowances. (He objects, however, to public health insurance because “there are plenty of private insurance companies.”) Asked his opinion of the then current 30 per cent wage increase demands, Ronald again personalizes the matter by referring bitterly to high prices in the prison canteen. He attributes these to prison “graft” and hints darkly at various people “getting theirs.” Prompted to return to the question, in one breath he denounces unions, rejects the idea of any government controls over business, and concludes that by “agreement” with business “the government should arrange higher wages without the union.” This is an unwitting description of the “impartial,” big-business-controlled fascist state. It is consistent also with his feeling that while “democracy is the best type of government,” it is “inefficient.”

Intimately linked with feelings of victimization by “forces of evil” are similarly personalized attitudes to the “forces of good,” viz., submissive-dependent leader worship. This is well exemplified by Eugene’s conception of President Roosevelt as a paternal hero who single-handedly saved America: “Just everything good about him. Took this country out of a rut. He
took guys on the street without a job and put them in the C.C.C.\textsuperscript{17} In other words, he's just tops, that's all.” . . . Wilbur, who is one of “the poor people,” also admires Roosevelt in a personalized way because “he fixed it so that people could have jobs and get food for their families.” Neither of these men shows any conception of the New Deal as a social reform movement induced by mass democratic pressure. Wilbur expressed as follows his concern (in December, 1945) over high prices and relatively low wages: “They’re trying to cut the little fellow off.” On the face of it this sounds like a strong identification with the economically oppressed. Such an identification is rendered suspect, however, by the personalization of Wilbur’s attitudes toward Roosevelt and by his lack of any generalized democratic philosophy. His persecutory anti-Greek delusions and general ethnocentrism increase this suspicion. It is not any economic circumstance but “the Greeks” which “punish the poor people, pay low wages, make you work too hard.” This suggests that Wilbur’s reaction to economic frustrations could easily be diverted into the fascist pattern of vigilante attacks against scapegoats.

A final comment on the dependability of Robert’s somewhat liberal views may be permitted. Doubt is raised on this point first by the authoritarian hostility of his racism, but also by his behavior at the close of the interview. Consistent with his seemingly universal reputation in childhood and youth as a “good boy” (according to social service reports), Robert submissively asks the interviewer, “Do you think I have the right view on things?” He repeatedly rejects the interviewer’s explanation that it is not a matter of “right” or “wrong” but of individual evaluations, and insists on being given “the answer.” This excessive need to conform with “the right views” implies a lack of internalized values and a readiness to change his opinions to accord with “the right views” of “the right people.” Such a “detachable” ethic does not augur well for his ability to resist fascist ideology.

4. FASCISTS

The politico-economic ideology of the fascists is consistently reactionary. It also differs from the “politics” of the pseudodemocratic high scorers in the same general way that the fascists’ racism was seen to differ from the pseudodemocratic men’s racism. This is, namely, in being openly antidemocratic. The fascists show an explicit readiness to use force against labor, toward whom they reveal intense status-anxiety. They also display contempt for ideals of equality; the concept of an élite, implicit in the thinking of the pseudodemocratic inmates, is made articulate by these men.

Floyd’s contempt for working men and his persecutory fantasies about unions show the violent anxiety of these attitudes. He fears that “we are going to be ruled by a lot of clowns, by a lot of labor unions. (How do you mean?) Look at all these

\textsuperscript{17} Eugene was in a C.C.C. camp for a year.
working stiffs, that don't know anything else but how to drive a nail. . . . They try to run things, because a few hundred thousand of them get together. (What ought to be done about it?) Straighten them out, show them where they belong. . . . Take away their charters. . . . Abolish them.” Strikes should be handled by “refusing to employ them or fine them.” Characteristically, Floyd wants to “get tough” with other nations, feeling that “we deal too loosely with other powers. (Which ones?) Oh, Russia, England—communism on the whole. I don't like any place where free enterprise is not.” . . . Adrian, whose contempt for “poor whites” has been noted earlier, states openly that “I really don’t believe in democracy.” Again: “I think the powers should be in a few hands. I’m not a democrat.” He makes clear the antidemocratic meaning of his obsessive fear of “communism”: “I've never seen a Communist who came from the right strata of society.” His readiness to support authoritarian aggression is not limited to approval (see pp. 833-34) of Nazi and Japanese-fascist aggressions: “I'd like to do to the Bolsheviks what the Bolsheviks did to the Russians” (i.e., the Czarists). . . . Buck is less articulate but leaves little doubt as to his élite identifications: he “never did figure much about” labor unions, because “you can't make no money unless you have guys workin' for you. . . . I expect in ten years or so I can retire. As long as I got the money, I can go out and buy cattle and make it (i.e., money).” His readiness for fascist aggression is plain: “Christ, we licked those other countries and now we're gonna feed 'em. . . . I think we ought to let 'em starve, especially them Japs. . . . Lucky I don't have any relations killed in this war, I'd go out and kill me some Japs!”

These men are consistently fascist in their longing for a “strong” antidemocratic government, to maintain monopolistic “free enterprise” by force if necessary against the challenge of democratic egalitarianism. The underlying wish to submit to antidemocratic “strength” and “leadership” is implicit in the pseudodemocratic ideology of the other high scorers. In the questionnaire, it appears most clearly in Item 30 (see Table 4(XXI)), which hints that “force may be necessary” to preserve the status quo. This item is quite discriminating even though its group mean is lower than that for most items. Very few low scorers agree with it. Two other items reflect similar attitudes much more indirectly, and discriminate either poorly (Item 23) or insignificantly (Item 22) (see Table 4(XXI)). But the idea is expressed more directly by the fascist inmates. The aspect of authoritarian suppression was illustrated in the previous paragraph. The Führer idea is also made explicit by these men:

Thus, Adrian: “I believe in government control because . . . if we know somebody's at the helm, we can't have revolutions and things.” He longs to go “back”: “I still believe in the Old Order, and I believe we were happiest under Hoover and should have kept him in”; “I'll always thumbs down anything new!” “I have never forgiven France for her Revolution, or Mexico.” . . . Buck’s authoritarian mentality requires no political sophistication to reach a similar conclusion. Concerning government controls, he has this to say: “You got to have somebody at the head of things to keep it organized.” . . . Floyd’s cynical approval of Nazi “coordination” was described earlier in discussing racism.

These men’s racism can be isolated only by artificial analysis from their
"politics." The examples given above for ideological opportunism in the race attitudes could serve almost equally well to exemplify politico-economic opportunism. Here are some additional examples, however, which do not directly involve racism:

Floyd's preoccupation with "toughness," power, and "efficiency" for their own sake—without respect for human aims or purposes—drives him into a striking self-contradiction. His submissive respect for business power leads him to say of government controls over business: "Modified form, approve of. Too stringent, no." But in the next breath his need for "strength" combines with his political confusion to produce this contradictory attitude toward O.P.A. price control (in December, 1945): "If they had an iron glove underneath their kid glove, be all right. They fine a guy (only) $100 for makin' $100,000." . . . Buck, who is intellectually duller than Floyd or Adrian, reveals directly the egocentrism behind his ideological opportunism. He evaluates public policies in terms of benefit to his local ingroup (in this case his home state): "Hell, at that, I was strong for Roosevelt. One thing he done for that state, he put that dam there. We didn't need the war, though!" . . . Adrian's views on inheritance taxes betray a similar egocentric motivation: "I think I would have had more money under (Hoover), too, and I don't believe in inheritance taxes. If I earn $100,000 by the sweat of my brow, I ought to be able to leave it to whomever I please. I really don't believe that all men are created free and equal." (At the age of 31, Adrian has by his own admission earned less than $2,000 in his lifetime "by the sweat of my brow," aside from the returns of homosexual prostitution.)

5. LOW SCORERS

None of the low-scoring interviewees obtained a low PEC score, and all of them displayed rather conservative attitudes when interviewed. Art and Jim are less conservative than Dick and Don. The latter two conceive themselves as ambitious young entrepreneurs in an expanding economy—a fact which definitely affects their politico-economic views. These individual differences will be somewhat neglected, however, in favor of what the four men show in common. Their present orientation is by and large conservative, although they seem to be less power-oriented than the high scorers and more willing to reconcile conservatism with democratic values. They appear to share the traditional belief in an expanding capitalist economy, conceived as largely self-governing and as "individualistic" rather than monopoly-dominated. They show some willingness to carry out "free enterprise" principles by controlling or nationalizing monopolies that destroy "economic freedom."

Typical is Jim's view that "I'd much rather see private industry control things than the government," but "in big organizations, monopolies . . . I think (the government) should control them." Dick expresses the same idea: "If a business gets out of hand, (government) should take it over. But if the business is run okay, they should keep hands off."

These men's conservatism poses a dilemma for their democratic values.
Faced with the conflict between business and labor, they are caught between their inclination to identify with labor and their conservative fear of resisting status quo power. This leads to the same gesture of impartiality which appeared in Art's views on "the Negro problem." Art says, "I don't like to divide people into classes." What he seems to mean is that he is reluctant to "see" existing conflicts between business and labor. For to "see" such conflicts exerts an implicit pressure to take sides; specifically, for a democrat such as Art, on the side of the underdog. But this arouses his anxiety about carrying through democratic resistance against established power. He protects himself from such anxiety by trying to deny the existence of economic power conflicts. This denial can only mean implicit support of the status quo and consequent resentment of what he perceives as "troublemakers" who stir up his anxiety by resisting the status quo.

Thus he objects to the C.I.O. Political Action Committee because "I don't believe they should ... set themselves off as a class." About the then current 30 per cent wage increase demands he declares: "Whether they are right or wrong is unimportant. The important thing is that they are grouping together." But Art is made uneasy by the fact that "grouping together" involves resisting powerful employers, and concludes: "As far as these demands, or uncalled-for strikes, they have set back their own cause." ... Don is also upset by the then current strikes, which "should be settled as quickly as possible, one way or the other." (Italics supplied.) By thus opposing conflict as such and ignoring issues, Don tries hard to maintain an appearance of impartiality; he pictures both employers and employees as giants and as equals. "I believe both labor and business sort of ignore the little fellow." More generally, "I am against special interests and pressure groups." But the illogicality of this position combines with the difficulty of avoiding sides, to push him into attacking labor and implicitly supporting the employers: "I am sort of bitter about this strike business. ... I feel labor should have more responsibility." ... Dick becomes even more conservative in his fear of "agitation": "I admire unions, but they shouldn't agitate. ... They shouldn't try to get more money, but should help people more (by trying) to keep prices down." Of the then current strikes, he decides that the employers should pay the wage demands if they can, but hints that they probably cannot "afford to." ... Jim's views seem to express a kind of transition stage. Fundamentally conservative in his laissez-faire orientation, he is nonetheless concerned that "politics are not really controlled by the people." Moreover, his conception of an ideal society reflects a tendency to identify with the economic needs of all people: "An ideal society would provide employment for all able-bodied citizens, and it would also take care of all those that weren't able to work, as well as the aged, and it would give every family a home and a car and a salary in sufficient quantities so that they might enjoy the privileges that we are aware of." Yet, despite his recognition that "the majority of the people do come under ... labor," he is made a little uneasy by the militancy of some C.I.O. unions: "The A. F. of L., I'm in favor of it very much. The C.I.O., formerly I wasn't in favor of it, but as time goes on, the people seem to accept it more and more. ... The (C.I.O.) unions in the beginning used pretty high-handed methods." His final conclusion hints at an inner struggle to accept C.I.O. resistance to established power: "But perhaps the end will justify the means."

The above examples indicate that these men suffer from inner conflicts in
relation to authority and power, which are similar to the power conflicts of the high scorers. Their difference from the high scorers seems to be mainly a matter of degree. The democratic identifications of the low scorers are stronger. Their ability to resist authoritarian power is somewhat greater, and aggressiveness toward unjust authority seems closer to conscious acceptance. Their relative freedom from ethnocentrism renders them less susceptible to fascist pressures.

D. MORALS AND RELIGION

1. GENERAL QUESTIONNAIRE STATISTICS: THE F SCALE

Since questionnaire results on some of the F-scale items, as well as corresponding interview material, are introduced in this section, it may be helpful at this point to present the general statistical findings for the F scale. Item means and D.P.'s are given in Table 4 (XXI). The over-all group mean per person per item for the F scale is 4.73, the highest mean obtained for any group studied. This provides further support for the implications drawn from the E-scale results, viz., that the types of criminals most frequently found in a state prison are antidemocratically repressivetoward themselves as well as others. Moreover, there are no extremely low scorers and only a handful of moderately low scorers: The low quartile range of F scores, in terms of mean per person per item scores, extends from 2.0 to 4.1, with a mean of 3.7. This suggests that nearly all forms of criminal behavior tend to be incompatible with the kind of liberalism reflected in very low scores on the F scale.

The F-scale reliability coefficient of .87 is satisfactory. That it is considerably higher than the E-scale reliability of .65 may be attributed in good part to the fact that the F scale is three times as long, so that factors like attenuation of the lower end of the distribution affect the reliability much less.

The E-F correlation is .59, somewhat lower than that obtained for other groups. This might be interpreted as due mainly to the factors responsible for the inadequate E-scale reliability, discussed in Section B of this chapter. Similarly, the very low F-PEC correlation of .23 might be attributed mainly to the factors discussed in Section C, regarded as impairing the validity of the PEC scale for the Prison Group.

2. HIGH SCORERS

In discussing the prejudiced inmates' moral-religious ideology, attention is centered upon their moral repressiveness toward themselves and others. Discussed more briefly are feelings of distrust-victimization toward people, and submissiveness to religious authority.

It has been indicated above how these men's ideology is distorted by conceiving broad social processes in narrow, personalized terms. By contrast,
as the rest of this chapter attempts to show, they tend to impersonalize relationships which a healthy person might be expected to personalize, namely, personal relationships with other individuals and with themselves. In fact, it has been repeatedly indicated in this book that the failure to become solidly identified with other people and with one's real self is the basic cause of receptiveness to authoritarian ideology. Such ideology, instead of being an objective appraisal of social reality, tends to resemble a fantasy world in which unconscious impulses and fears are projected in personified form.

The tendency to impersonalize human relations takes an ideologized form in anti-instinctual moralism which has two aspects: authoritarian hostility toward "moral outgroups"; and moralistic repressiveness toward much of one's own feelings and impulses. Moralism has been exemplified earlier in discussing anti-Negro ideology. Examples from the questionnaire results include items expressing moralistic condemnation of "zootsuiters" (Item 5); rejection of people with "bad manners, habits, and breeding" (Item 12); and authoritarian aggression against "sex criminals" (Item 25), "immoral, crooked, and feebleminded people" (Item 34), and homosexuals (Item 39). (See Tables 2(XXI) and 4(XXI). For all questionnaire items referred to in the remainder of the chapter, see Table 4(XXI) unless otherwise specified.)

A related item reflects obsessive fears of contamination by "so many different kinds of people" (Item 18), who may symbolize dangers of instinctual contagion. All of these items are clearly discriminating except for Item 12, which yields one of the highest over-all means in the F scale. A possible interpretation is that Item 12 is especially calculated to appeal to the eagerness of most inmates to be accepted again by "decent people."

Similar moralism appears in the interviews with prejudiced inmates. In some of these men, the moralism has a religious coloring.

For example, Clarence asserts a rigid dichotomy between "good Christians" and "bad non-Christians": "The Christian tries to live a Christian life, and others go out and rob and steal, drink, carouse around, do a little of everything." When Clarence became a professional soldier, this meant for him living a "clean life." Wilbur has an equally moralistic conception: Being a Christian means "not to swear, use bad words, or down the other fellow," and "to behave and do right, live a clean life." Wilbur regards atheists as "pretty bad people." Robert, too, emphasizes submission to extrahuman absolutes: "Christians are people that at all times strive to do what is right, and abide by God's word."

The religious formulation is, however, incidental to the moralistic approach to life. This manner of thinking appears as a general characteristic in various personality topics yet to be discussed. Here are some examples of antiseosexual righteousness in the prejudiced men.

Clarence moralizes that "I don't think it's a very good subject to teach" children, for "they learn it soon enough." He speaks with approval of the fact that "when I was a kid . . . if you met a girl on the street, you'd blush." . . . Likewise, Wilbur,
### Table 4 (XXI)

**Results on the F Scale from the Group of Prison Inmates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>High Quartile Mean/Person</th>
<th>Low Quartile Mean/Person</th>
<th>D.P.</th>
<th>Over-all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (Obedience and respect)</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (Will power)</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. (Science)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. (War and conflict)</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. (Supernatural power)</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. (Cheerful things)</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. (Bad manners)</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. (Discipline and determination)</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. (Born with urge)</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. (Infection and disease)</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. (Honor)</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. (Rebellious ideas)</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. (Germany)</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. (Devoted leaders)</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. (Sex crimes)</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. (Weak and strong)</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. (Undying love)</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. (Astrology)</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. (Force to preserve)</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. (Prying)</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. (Earthquake)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. (Immoral people)</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. (Wild sex life)</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. (Talk less)</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. (Plots)</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. (Homosexuals)</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. (Artists)</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. (No sane, normal person)</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. (Familiarity)</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. (Suffering)</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total mean/person</th>
<th>Mean/person/item</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>174.15</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>5.4–6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110.31</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>2.0–4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.84</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.0–6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Deviation: .86

Reliability: .87
CRIMINALITY AND ANTIDEMOCRATIC TRENDS

asked what things annoy him most in others, expresses concern about "doing things before little children that you shouldn't," "doing anything out of the way to a little nine-year-old girl."... Ronald is alarmed by the "sexual perversion that you'll find in this country today: it's pretty bad. (Q.) ... fellatio ... sodomy." Robert's focus is somewhat less extrapunitive but reveals an equally externalizing attitude toward his own sexuality: Sometimes, he admits, "I have let myself slip, let my carnal self get away from me"; but in general he feels that he has "always lived up to" his mother's precept that "a woman is the most perfect thing in the world."

Similar nonreligious moralism appears in nonsexual contexts.

Eugene believes that "good persons... won't smoke or drink," and is "going to lay off drinking." His moralistic hostility against Negroes for "fighting" and "causing trouble" has already been described. ... Ronald finds himself disturbed by "petty habits" involving nose, muscles, or skin, such as "snorting," "twitching their shoulders," or "my wife's habit of picking at things with her fingernails." He is also upset by "greed": "I can't stand anyone who will take something without thinking about the other person." And he makes repeated references to "politeness," complaining that "it's changed around here (in the prison) now—getting so many of these young kids, zootsuiters: don't have any tact at all."

All 5 of these high-scoring men express generalized moralizations about money or work or both.

Several of them show inhibitions about enjoying money: Its importance is in having "just enough to get along on"; beyond that "it can bring a lot of unhappiness" (Eugene). "If it's not too much money, it can give you happiness. If it's too much, it won't." "To me the only thing you need money for is to satisfy your basic needs: food, clothing, shelter" (Robert). ... Work for the sake of "discipline" and "control" is exalted by all but Ronald: "I don't think you enjoy things as much when you work for them" (Robert). "I think it's a special privilege for a man to have some special handicap: it gives him a special drive" (Robert). "Work don't hurt no people. These child labor laws, I believe, are makin' more trouble than anything else" by preventing children from working to keep themselves "out of trouble" (Clarence). Asked how he and his wife are most alike, Wilbur declares: "Well, she don't like to run around so much and I don't either. We both like to work." Eugene, although he adds other similarities, says the same thing of his mother and himself: "She likes to work and so do I." ... This antipleasure submission to work and hardship as desirable is expressed also in questionnaire Item 44, which exalts the value of "suffering." This item has a fairly high Discriminatory Power.

The moralism just described appears to be an anxious attempt by these men to keep instinctual impulses repressed and externalized. Their anxiety toward their own impulses is suggested by their responses to the projective question, "What desires do you often have difficulty in controlling?" Their answers reveal efforts to separate their impulses from their conscious selves and to avoid awareness of inner feelings by focusing on external behavior
and situations. Three "desires" thus externalized recur with monotonous regularity: "drinking," "fighting" or "temper"; and "when I'm out with a lady" or "intercourse."\(^8\)

It is not necessary to rely on inference in stating that the prejudiced men's conscience is externalized and therefore undependable. Evidence for this appears in their violations of their own moralism.

Clarence's moralism about sex and drinking may be contrasted with his history of three separate offenses of attempted rape on pre-adolescent girls after getting them drunk. His insistence on the virtue of hard work, and overconcern about people who "rob and steal" is quite interesting in view of the prison medical examiner's opinion that he was "wrongly drawing Army compensation for years" on a claim of tuberculosis, and thus avoiding work. . . . The only gross moral violation revealed in Wilbur's interview protocol is his panicky homicidal attack upon his landlord. Despite his defensive paranoid rationalizations about this, he gives evidence of regarding it, in another compartment of his thinking, as "immoral" in his own terms: "Don't think I would be in so much trouble if I lived up to the church." . . .

Robert, with his moralistic "respect" for "woman" as "the most perfect thing in the world," has let his "carnal self get away" from him in relation to "the most perfect thing": While ostensibly still "in love" with his wife, he engaged in a violent affair with an extremely promiscuous woman whom he finally shot in a quarrel. And despite his insistence that one must work for things as a condition of "enjoying them," he served an earlier prison term for "enjoying" several hundred dollars' worth of forged checks. . . . Ronald's condemnation of "greed" may be compared with his long record of thefts and gang robberies which he engaged in, by his own description, "as a business." Also after condemning "sexual perversion" and especially homosexuality, he confessed to having had fellatio performed upon him occasionally in prison, but denied that this was homosexuality by disclaiming any emotional involvement in it. . . . Eugene's moralism against "drinking," "fighting," and "causing trouble," and his statement that he "likes to work," stand in contrast with his long history of "trouble," including eight jail sentences for drunkenness and one for battery, frequent fights, an earlier term for robbery, and the present term for a series of forged checks.

Relevant here are some suggestive statistical data for the 23 inmates whose present term is for a sex offense (rape, "molesting" children, etc.). The lowest E score obtained by any sex offender is 3.4 per item;\(^{19}\) the E-scale mean for all sex offenders is 5.1 per item, as compared with the general group mean of 4.7. This high degree of ethnocentric hostility toward outgroups is of particular interest, when it is considered that these men themselves are generally scorned as an outgroup by other inmates. But of even greater significance

\(^{18}\) In contrast, of the 7 inmates whose E scores fall in what would be the low quartile for most other groups (below 2.6 per item), none gives this type of response. Instead, all of them express inner conflict—especially over passivity strivings—e.g., "the impulse to say 'to hell with it' when confronted by a difficult problem."

\(^{19}\) This is excluding one sex offender who scored 2.7 per item on the E scale, but who was discovered in an interview (not reported here) to have answered the questionnaire rather carelessly. He indicated on questioning that on three E items (and several other items) he had inadvertently recorded "—3" where he had intended "+3."
is the fact that two-thirds of these men (15 out of 23) agree with Item 25, which states that "Sex crimes . . . deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse." Half of them (12 out of 23) agree with Item 39, which expresses punitive hostility toward homosexuals. Three-fourths of them (17 out of 23) agree with Item 35, which reflects projective fantasy preoccupations concerning the prevalence of "wild" sexual "goings-on." All but 2 (21 out of 23) sex offenders agree with at least one of these items; 16 agree with two items; 7 agree with all three items. These findings provide further evidence that moralism often involves a desperate attempt to keep one's own repressed impulses under tight control. Two of the interviewees (Clarence and a middle scorer not reported here) deny their (repeated) sex offenses, and insist that they were "framed." It is possible that they actually believe the memory distortions by which they seek to maintain a precarious self-respect. Prison authorities report that the majority of sex offenders deny their offenses, and, further, that such offenders are generally self-righteous and "good."

Evidence has accumulated in this volume to show that impulses which are moralistically condemned in others symbolize the feared impulses of the moralizer himself. Corresponding, on the other hand, to ethnocentric fears of being abused by fantasied "dominant" outgroups such as Jews, are feelings of distrust, victimization, and cynicism toward the world. Some examples have already been mentioned, such as Wilbur's feelings of being victimized by "the Greeks"; and the personal bitterness of Ronald (a recidivist) toward the governor of the state as "a persecutor"—associated with his resentment at not having been released because of the parole system's "nine thousand restrictions. . . . It stinks."

Analogous are Clarence's delusions about having been "framed" by "the people in politics" (his defense-rationale against remembering his sex offenses). Clarence expresses succinctly his suspicious conception of the world as a jungle: "Nowadays it's get the other fellow before he gets you." He seems to want to avoid the necessity of having to trust others, by avoiding dependence on anyone; thus the main value of having a lot of money is that a person "don't have to depend on anybody or anything." Associated with this diffuse distrust of people is a fear of "prying," resentment against people's "not being able to attend to their own business" (Ronald), against "a guy trying to butt in my business" (Eugene). . . . Robert, whose life goal is to "own three ——— stores," feels especially abused by "spongers . . . these so-called shoppers who . . . pick over all the ——— and pick out the one on the bottom."

This suspiciousness is expressed in several questionnaire items, such as those betraying a cynical view of "human nature" as inherently warlike (Item 6), fears of "prying" (Item 31), and fantasies about secret "plots" which "control our lives" (Item 38). The last item, which reflects the victimization theme most directly, has much the highest Discriminatory Power.

A further aspect of the high scorers' moral-religious ideology is their de-
pendence and submission to authority in religion and morals. Such basic submission is in striking contrast with their exaggerated fears of having to submit to domination by outgroups—Jews, Negroes, labor, "Reds," Russia, etc. Authoritarian submission in the moral-religious sphere is expressed in three main ways. In every prejudiced interviewee, as the foregoing discussion has emphasized, there seems to be a submissive self-negating overconformity to externalized, conventional moralism. This requires no further elaboration here.

A second aspect is the submissive emphasis on unquestioning belief in religious authority. Questionnaire Item 8, which is clearly discriminating, expresses the core of this attitude: Everyone should submit "without question" to the "decisions" of "some supernatural power" in whom he has "complete faith." In the interviews, the three most conventional high scorers are definitely traditionalists in religion.

Robert reiterates the point that "I believe pretty strongly along the lines of the Bible." Both Clarence and Wilbur declare categorically that they have never questioned any of the (fundamentalist) religious teachings of their parents. Religion is more remote for Eugene, who confesses that "I don't know" the Ten Commandments or Christ's teachings. But he states that the most important thing in religion is "belief... in Jesus Christ, the Bible," and "I've always believed in it." Even Ronald, who says that he no longer "believes," reveals that his is not the integrated philosophy of "a staunch free-thinker" who has no need for external props of "faith." Rather, he suffers from a hollow cynicism, and longs to surrender himself dependently to "God." The most important thing in religion, he declares, is "belief." "I think that belief in anything—that's the thing that holds you together." More personally: "It seems as if I want to believe in the Supreme Being, but try and keep it suppressed." The source of this conflict is suggested later in discussing Ronald's relations with his father.

The third aspect of authoritarian submission in religion on the part of these men is their submissive relationship to their deity, conceived as a dominating "supreme" power.

God is "someone a lot bigger and stronger than anyone on this earth (Robert), who "rules all things" (Clarence), and whose "word" in the Bible one is called upon to "live up to" (Wilbur) and "abide by" (Robert). Ronald's longing for such submission has just been mentioned. It is of interest that Eugene, who never knew his father, is the only one of these men whose conception of God appears to be quite blank: "Just believe in it and that's about all."

The prejudiced men's repression of a large part of their selves, their intellectual-emotional submissiveness in the moral-religious sphere, their anti-intracognitive narrowing of inner freedom—all these trends weaken their intellectual strength. Loss of conscious awareness of so much of one's self tends to undermine one's confidence in human ability to understand the world in general, and to render one susceptible to various forms of mysticism—especially mystical interpretations of human behavior. These trends are thus con-
ducive to agreement with such questionnaire items, all clearly discriminating between high and low quartiles, as those stressing the limitations of human understanding (Item 4), admitting belief in astrology (Item 29), and assuming a mystical-hereditary (externalized) explanation for some people’s “urge to jump from high places” (Item 16). The general tendency toward mysticism and intellectual defeatism appears as a formal characteristic of many quotations from the present high scorers.

3. FASCISTS

Certain attitudes implicit in the approach of the pseudodemocratic high scorers break through explicitly in the fascists. To begin with, the authoritarian hostility toward people implicit in moralism appears in the fascists as open hate and contempt for people, directed especially toward moral-outgroups. The attempt to bolster up self-esteem by identifying oneself with an (hereditary) élite, is also more openly expressed by these men.

Floyd shows the hatred for people in its most extreme form, when asked what things irritate him most in others. "Just that they're people! (How do you mean?) Oh, the majority are ignorant, close to animals as anything else. I mean *dumb* animals! (Can you elaborate on that?) They haven't got sense enough to see things as they are, they are easily swayed, crude, uncouth, they are like a pack. Show 'em a leader and they will go anywhere." . . . Buck's authoritarian hate is not "systematized" into an explicit ideology like Floyd's, but his interview protocol is filled with expressions of hate and contempt for "slummy women" and "goddam ch—-"; for "j—— o—— happy idiots," "sex maniacs," "goddam syphilitic people" (homosexuals); "people that go around stealin'"; other inmates—"Hell, you can't have real friends in here. . . . Stab you in the back. Can't trust many of them"—and everyone else regarded as outside "my own class of people." . . . Adrian is too deferential to use the same strong language as these men, but his antidemocratic hatreds seem clear. His contempt for "people who never had anything" and for workers generally has already been mentioned. Interesting is his emphatic dichotomy between men and women, and his authoritarian hostility toward both. It is men who evoke his deepest anxiety and hate: "A lot of people irritate me, a lot of men irritate me by what I think is a superior attitude that women don't usually have"; "all men are more or less supercilious." Having self-protectively identified himself with what he conceives as the submissive-dependent role of women vis-à-vis men—"I identify myself with the dependent kind" of woman—Adrian adopts an essentially paranoid attitude toward all men in terms of this identification: "I don't think men respect women, or anything about women, the way they ought to. . . . Women aren't inferior to men. If anything, they are superior!" (The possibility of equality is alien to his thinking; the only choices he knows are to submit or to dominate, to be superior or inferior.) Yet, in his role as would-be aristocrat, Adrian shares the same chauvinistic attitudes toward women which (in his paranoid submissive-"feminine" role) he ostensibly criticizes. As a persecuted "woman" he protests that "women make better business women than men do"; but as an aristocrat, "I don't approve of women in business." He even mentions an episode in which he was strongly condemned by a woman for his "supercilious" attitude toward her and toward women who work.
The lack of a genuine conscience is scarcely even concealed by a moralistic façade in the fascists. They display an externalized, undeveloped superego. One aspect of this is an absence of inner guilt over violation of values; no ethical values have really been incorporated into the self. What superego activity exists is almost entirely limited to fear of external punishment or social ostracism.

Buck suggests in almost so many words that his superego is merely an external mystical "power": "There must be some power over us to punish us. . . . He's sure givin' me hell, bein' in here." This "hell" is not the torture of a guilty conscience. On the contrary, Buck explains that being in prison "hurts my pride" and "hurts my business," when "I could be out there makin' money all the time." The cause of his delinquency (a long trail of bad checks, passed on an extended spree with a woman) is for him purely external: Lying about many details, he bemoans that "a man of my intelligence let some damn broad put me behind bars." . . . Floyd, too, shows no signs of actual guilt over his long record of delinquencies. On his admission to prison he is described by an interviewer as feeling "that his present series of violent robberies doesn't mean a thing." To the present examiner, he mentions these as "just something that happened." He is reported to have said on admission: "We heard about others getting caught but couldn't believe we would." . . . Adrian attributes his various delinquencies to drinking: "That's all my trouble is." According to the initial prison interview report, "he does not feel that he has any serious problem except a tendency to get very drunk when discouraged." Adrian's conscience, too, is organized chiefly around fears of ostracism and of punitive agencies mystically assigned to an "intangible something" outside himself: "I do believe in retribution. We pay right here. I've proved that in my own life. We think we can get away with things. It's an illusion." (Adrian has spent "most of my life" in jails, prison, or "on probation.") With respect to ostracism: "I have always been greatly concerned with what other people thought about me." As will be elaborated later, he is especially apprehensive over rejection by his father, who "haunts me" and whose approval is required to allay Adrian's anxiety: "I'm always wondering if he would approve of this or approve of that."

A second aspect of the fascists' undeveloped superego is its domination by the pleasure principle. They are quite unable to postpone gratification. Unable to pursue any integrated long-term achievement goals, they are at the mercy of an imperious oral-demandingness.

Describing with much braggadocio his sharp dealings in cattle trading (actually, he lost a sizeable inheritance by mismanagement and drunken neglect), Buck bemoans openly that ordinary ways of doing business are "too damn slow for me." (Recall his anti-Semitic projection about Jews' "beatin' a guy out of his money.") Admittedly, "money is the main object. . . . Can't buy nothin' without money. . . . Can't buy whiskey."

These attitudes are part of an essentially egocentric conception of reality. The following is one of many similar remarks made by Buck in his discussion of politico-economic affairs:

"I never paid no attention to that —— ; get me out of here and out on that damn

20 Buck obtained a Wechsler-Bellevue Full-Scale I.Q. of 83.
range is all I want." . . . Similarly, Floyd states that the $59 a week he received on his last job (which he held for a month) was "too slow" because "I started from scratch." "Had to acquire everything: clothes, quarters, the fundamentals." Detailing on admission to the prison some of the robberies and orgies of his gang, Floyd explains that "We had to have money to operate on. We spent $40 or so for our dinner parties." . . . Adrian admits that from infancy he "usually got my way." "In fact, all I ever had to do was cry about anything." At the several boarding schools where his father placed him after his mother's death (when he was 5), "I was incorrigible, left school when I pleased. I overdrew my charge account . . ." His self-centered definition of reality is made explicit: "When things don't personally concern me, they just don't exist for me."

Implicit in these men's weak conscience, their infantile-demanding impulses, and their egocentric view of the world, is a trait which governs their entire behavior. This is their extreme (personal) opportunism. The disregard of principle in their personal behavior corresponds with the ideological opportunism of their racism and reactionism. The personal opportunism is usually expressed in the service of infantile attitudes of omnipotence, and of trying to deny personal weakness.

Buck's pathological lying has been mentioned. As for his other offenses, he has served time for obtaining money on false pretenses, and for failure to provide for his children. He was arrested on one occasion for "molesting" his own children (girl then age 2–3, boy age 4–5), but it is reported the charges were dropped because the children were too small to testify. . . . Floyd's delinquencies are less dramatic, but equally capricious. They include two jail sentences for disturbing the peace; an Army record of alternating between the guardhouse and repeated A.W.O.L.'s until he was discharged; and a series of armed gang robberies undertaken as an easy way of making a lot of money "to operate on." Relevant here is Floyd's stated desire to marry a "wealthy woman," who should have "fair physical attractions" but whose personality he will "take as it comes." . . . Adrian's delinquencies include his self-styled "incorrigibility" at boarding schools (truancy, repeatedly overdrawing his charge accounts, etc.); numerous jail sentences for drunkenness and homosexual prostitution; and robbery. "I had probation, it seems to me, most of my life." He supported himself mainly by prostitution, and by his own statement "never had any (sexual) relations with anyone that didn't have money connected with it." He admits that some men attract him more than others, but "I never let preferences stand in the way. . . . The only thing I was ever interested in was the rent."

The essentially frantic nature of these men's approach to life suggests a desperate inner emptiness and lack of moorings. This hollowness may provide part of the basis for their wish to submit to "strong" political "leadership." Further, any religious leanings of these men might be expected to express cravings for authoritarian submission. This would be expected to differ from the religious authoritarian submission of other high scorers in two interrelated aspects. As in other conflicts in the fascists, the craving for religious submission might very well be explicit rather than implicit; and since dominance-submission conflicts are involved, this craving might be
expressed with open ideological opportunism. It happens that Buck "never did think much about religion," but Adrian and Floyd reveal these very characteristics clearly. Floyd's opportunism takes the form of highly egocentric (as well as confused) "criteria" for belief, with no apparent interest in considerations of evidence or truth-falsity.

Floyd states that before he was shot (almost fatally) in his last gang robbery, he was "reaching for something" and "wanted" to believe in God. (He had never had any religious training; his father was a free-thinker, and he had never known his mother.) But "I just couldn't feature that a human being, an intelligence, could be obliterated so easily." Having been thus let down "personally" by the God he was "reaching for" (in that his delinquency led to disaster), he could no longer "believe." . . . Adrian's religious training consisted of very early exposure to the Christian Science of a governess and living in Episcopal boarding schools from the ages of 8 to 15. At 15 he tried to submit to what for him seemed clearly to represent religious totalitarianism and voluntary self-emasculating: "I very seriously went into the Church of Rome at 15" to become a priest—not because of any specific religious convictions, but "because I believed and still do . . . that the Catholic Church is the only true church," since "she was the church founded by Christ." "She was the first" and therefore "the other churches had no real excuse to break away." His fascistic inclinations are stated openly: "I respect her as a political organization. I think it would be better to have everything under one head. It would save dissension." Adrian's father forcibly interfered, however, to prevent his entry into the priesthood. Adrian drifted until he became "very interested in Christian Science" with quite practical motives: "I'm not positive I believe in Christian Science, but there's much in it that seems to help me. . . . I don't try to apply Christian Science to physical things . . . but my worries, mental things—there's where it helps me most." In anticipation of parole, he wrote to two Christian Science practitioners for aid in lining up a job (a prerequisite to being granted parole). When both of them criticized him for "trying to manifest a job" instead of relying mystically upon "the Divine Employer," Adrian was "never so disgusted in my life." But Adrian admittedly has "got to have a God" to submit to, "So what do you think I took up!" The answer is "Hinduism," which "teaches you discipline" such as "cutting down on cigarettes." Adrian summarizes his approach to his latest ideological "manipulandum" in this way: "It's practical. That's the main thing."

4. LOW SCORERS

The moral-religious ideology of the low-scoring interviewees is quite different from that of the prejudiced men. They are relatively free of moralism, and sometimes verbalize explicitly antimoralistic sentiments.

Thus, for Art religion has "nothing to do with keeping laws, except the Golden Rule." Highly objectionable to Don is the idea of religion as "abiding by a certain set of rules." Probing reveals no sign of rejection in any of the 4 low scorers toward atheists or non-Christians.

They speak of religion primarily in terms of ethical values. Religion is "whatever spiritual qualities you have within yourself" (Art). This orientation is embedded in more individualized relationships to themselves and other people, as compared with the high scorers' impersonalization of such rela-
tionships. Different features of this ethical approach are stressed by each. Jim expresses most clearly the aspect of nurturant-affiliative attitudes toward people:

"I look on God as mostly the goodness in all peoples. . . . If everyone . . . carried out the principles that religion expounds, it would be a better world. (How do you mean?) To treat others as a person would wish to be treated himself, and to help those less fortunate than oneself, and to be a part of the community or society that one is in, to take an active part in it, and being kind and generous, and to more or less have a high regard for your fellow human being." Art, too, conceives of God, not as a person, but "more a power of good. . . . God is a force."

Another aspect is the emphasis on full expression of the individual personality and "happiness on earth."

Don declares that his concept of a hereafter was nicely expressed by a girl-friend who said that "if she believed in a hereafter it would mean developing one's undeveloped talents." For Jim "the only happiness that we really know of is here on earth; so why not try to enjoy the people and things on this earth, rather than a life somewhere else."

Further, a rich inner life is a religious value.

Religion "gives you some access to your thoughts" (Dick). Prayer is conceived not as a mode of securing gratification of personal desires or of paying obeisance to a parent-substitute God. Rather, prayer is something which in and of itself "can help a person" (Dick); which "helps form what you're to be" (Don); "a personal thing that happens when the lights are out before you retire. Not 'I want something or other,' but consciously putting into words so as to place whatever you are looking for into a positive plane" (Art).

Opposed to the prejudiced men's authoritarian submission in moral-religious matters is the insistence upon individuality in the credos of the low scorers.

"Religion is a personal thing. . . . Religion is as individual to me as my fingerprints, or as yours are to you" (Art). Dick explains his change from a Baptist to a Christian Scientist partly in terms of his objection to the teachings of a Navy chaplain, and especially the chaplain's efforts to "force us to come to church . . . I believe it's a man's personal affair." It happened that Dick "got hold of a Christian Science textbook, liked the ideas . . . the idea that they had an explanation for almost everything that happened." (Contrast Dick's emphasis on "ideas" and the implied internalization of Christian Science, with Adrian's externalized, opportunistic-manipulative approach.) Dick adds another value, however, which suggests some of that antiweakness drive that is usually typical of high scorers: "And another idea—they claimed that if you try to attain a goal, nothing can stop you."

It will be recalled that those who "believe" show submissiveness toward a God who is essentially dominating (whose "word" they must "abide by") and punitive (toward those who violate his "word"). The low scorers, on
the other hand, show an optimistic and trusting dependence toward a God conceived as kind and nurturant.

Although spoken of as "kind of an infinite being" rather than directly anthropomorphic, God is "something there you can turn to in case you need someone to turn to" (Dick); "someone to cling to in times of emergency or stress" (Jim). Actually, "I don't know if there is a God," but the most important thing in religion is "a genuine belief and a faith that things would always turn out all right" (Jim). Religion involves "a belief, without academic proof, of a higher power—of something you can depend on, of dependency" (Art).

The ultimate optimism hinted in these statements is consistent with findings about low scorers generally. However, the lack of inner self-reliance implied by their dependence on a supernatural power resembles certain trends found to be more typical of high scorers generally. This latter aspect is consistent with the fact that none of the low-scoring interviewees scored extremely low on any of the questionnaire scales.

E. DEFENSES AGAINST WEAKNESS

1. HIGH SCORERS

Defenses against weakness seem to be especially pronounced in the prejudiced inmates. All of the high-scoring interviewees show deep-seated fears of weakness in themselves. The meaning of weakness to these men seems to be tied up with intense fears of nonmasculinity. To escape these fears they try to bolster themselves up by various antiweakness or pseudomasculinity defenses. These can be grouped into four general themes, each of which may be expressed in a certain formula: (1) Power-strivings: "I am not on the bottom, I am one of those on top"; or, "I do not weakly submit, I dominate and control, I have power." (2) "Toughness": "I am not weak, I am strong"; "I am not soft, I am tough"; "I am not passive and feminine, I am active and masculine." (3) Flight into heterosexual activity: "I am not homosexual, I am heterosexual"; or "I do not love him, I love her." (4) Paranoid reactions: "I do not love him, I hate him because he persecutes me"; i.e., "I do not feel submissive-homosexual desires, I feel aggressive resentment toward men because they persecute me."21

The questionnaire item which reflects defensive masculinity attitudes (specifically, "toughness" and power) in purest form is number 26, which stereotypically divides the world into "the strong" (ingroup) and "the weak" (outgroup). This item has the highest D.P. in the F scale. Other items containing antiweakness themes are those exalting "will power" (Item 2), "discipline" and "determination" (Item 13), an exaggerated notion of "honor"

21 The formulae (3) and (4) are adapted from Freud (40).
(Item 19), as well as items already mentioned in another context, especially 14 (PEC), 23, 30, and 45 (E).

The relative emphasis placed on different aspects of masculinity façades, in relation to the fears underneath, differs from individual to individual. Therefore, instead of proceeding variable by variable, we shall discuss the weakness-antiweakness complex separately for each inmate.

Robert has centered his efforts to "prove" his "masculinity" around compulsive status-power strivings. He declares that from an early age "my greatest desire was to be somebody in life. . . . I wanted to be a success in business . . . and sometimes worried whether I would. . . . The future goal that I have set up is to own at least three . . . stores of my own . . . I was on my first store at the time of my arrest." This concern with status and power gives meaning to his anxious fantasy that Negroes "don't have a goal in life" but "just want to exist," and his envious stereotype of Jewish "drive and ambition to get there." Robert projects this compulsive power-drive onto others and reveals his inability to imagine any alternative to dominance or submission: "Every man has a certain ego that he has to satisfy. You like to be on top. If you're anybody at all, you don't like to be on the bottom." (Italics supplied.)

The submissive dependence behind Robert's power-seeking is shown in his attitudes toward friends and family. (What do friends offer a person?) "To me, friends offer satisfaction to myself that I've been doing a job well done, that I'm satisfying those people of their expectations. . . . (Q.) Well, I was referring to the business viewpoint." (Note the impersonalized use of people as primarily an external prop for what Robert calls his "ego.").) His main satisfaction with his younger brother was "the satisfaction he gave my ego. . . . He's patterned his life after mine. He's in the ——— business, too." Robert further expresses pride that "my folks have always classed me as a success in the ——— business." The deference toward the examiner ("Do you think I have the right view of things?") has been mentioned before.

Robert's power drive has apparently not stopped his fears of femininity, of heterosexual impotence, and possibly of latent homosexuality. Underlying identification with a feminine role is suggested by his own admission that "up until the time I left home, (my mother) always referred to me as her best daughter." The possibility of conflict over latent homosexuality is raised by several cues: e.g., by Robert's insistence, despite instructions not to bother with details, on exhibitionistically giving to the examiner (a man) a minutely detailed account of his first experience of intercourse; and by indirect "contact" with other men via a hostile affair with a highly promiscuous woman. This last behavior, which finally broke up Robert's marriage, suggests a common type of defense against homosexual wishes, viz., compulsive flight into heterosexual relationships which are extremely impersonal and hostile.

Ronald's ego-alien weakness is more transparent than Robert's. Mentioned
earlier was his unsatisfied dependent longing for authoritarian religious belief as "the thing that holds you together." Similar extreme dependence is shown in his conception of "friends" as "someone that you can ... talk to about your troubles, and vice versa" and "know that he's there at all times, and if you need any help at any time." Also, like Robert, he asked the examiner to reassure him at the close of the interview that he is not "too radical" in some of his ideas. This "too radical" was apparently a euphemism for "too aggressive" toward outgroups. Ronald has a history of severe chronic bed-wetting until the age of 12, for which he has no explanation to offer beyond an externalization of the symptom onto "my kidneys." He has no idea why his enuresis suddenly stopped at the age of 12. That bed-wetting may have represented in part a passive mode of sexual gratification is suggested by his homosexual conflicts. Earlier mention has been made of his righteous condemnation of "sexual perversion" including, explicitly, fellatio. He denies that he has ever "felt any desire of any kind" for homosexual relations, yet subsequently admits to having several times had such relations with a fellow inmate. He implicitly denies any "real" homosexuality in this (blaming it exclusively on prison sex deprivation), and says that he had no special reaction to the experiences except to lose respect for the other man. Ronald's paranoid "toughness" toward Negro men might perhaps be a defense against homosexual excitement aroused by them. Ronald's promiscuous heterosexuality, including several impersonalized, unusual marriage ceremonies, may also be understood as an attempt to deny homosexual impulses. "I always get married spectacularly"—e.g., "in a taxicab" or "my partner in a dance walkathon—married on the floor—no love, but received money for it from the spectators." Both weakness and compensatory "toughness" seem to be combined in Ronald's thefts and gang robberies carried out "as a business."

The chief prop of Eugene's defenses is a façade of toughness. He has repeatedly been involved in petty trouble, especially by fighting when drunk. "I've got quite a temper," and "I like to fight once in a while ... usually when I'm drinking." Moreover, "I'm proud of my people," the "Scotch-Irish," whose most prominent characteristic, according to Eugene, is that "most of them like to fight." When the examiner points out that this is precisely what Eugene resentfully says about Negroes, he differentiates on the basis that Negroes "go around looking" for fights, while he himself merely "likes" to fight (and does so frequently). The psychological reason why he likes to fight and has "quite a temper" seems to be largely unconscious; he "can't explain it." He explains, however, that Negroes "go around picking trouble" because they've "got an inferiority complex" and "try to be big shots"—which may be a projection of his own inferiority feelings and the "big shot" way he tries to compensate for them. The situations which evoke Eugene's temper suggest possibly more specific causes, namely homosexual
impulses, against which his impulsive aggressiveness may be a paranoid defense: "I was with a girl at a bar, and a guy got a little out of line ... talkin' dirty—not to her, but he was talkin' loud. ..."; or "maybe some guy calls me a name." Eugene himself associates his propensity for "trouble" with fear of heterosexual adjustment: "I'm just a little too wild to get married. I'm scared of it."

Clarence shows more obvious signs of ego-alien "weakness," and has less effective defenses against it. The army, he declares, "makes a man of you," but it did not succeed in overcoming Clarence's fear of rising above a private, because that would have meant "too much responsibility"—although "I'm pretty good at takin' orders." Discharged for tuberculosis, he drew government compensation for seventeen years and then lived "on the county." According to the prison physician, Clarence "claimed he still had T.B., but ... we failed to find any evidence of any active T.B. whatever. ... We felt that he was wrongly drawing government compensation for years." This avoidance of work contrasts strikingly with Clarence's moralistic glorification of the disciplinary value of hard work. Moreover, to the prison physician Clarence appeared "very neurasthenic and enlarged on minor and rather normal aches and pains; was very feministic." He did not marry until he was 38, to a woman 39, toward whom he was apparently quite submissive. Although "we weren't much alike in any way ... we got along good" because "I let her have her own way. Takes two to start an argument." It was only a few months after her death, eleven years later, that he was arrested for "molesting" four girls, ages 8 to 10, who testified that he felt of their genitals. Such behavior could well be a panicky attempt to deny homosexual impulses by "proving" heterosexual masculinity. Clarence claimed that the girls made up the entire story just to "get even" with him because he "wouldn't give them candy." Three years later, he was again arrested on a charge of getting two little girls drunk and attempting intercourse with one of them. He escaped conviction on these two occasions, but two years later the half-sister (age 12) of one of the last two little girls was picked up by the police at Clarence's home. This time he was convicted of attempted rape. Clarence seems to have denied this episode to himself by developing a system of persecutory delusions: He protests that he "worked for the people in politics in order to clean up the city," and that when his candidates were not elected the police "went after" him. This paranoid reaction is consistent with the interpretation that his heterosexual delinquency was a defense against homosexual panic.

Wilbur has also worked out a rigid system of paranoid delusions, but shows less obvious signs of underlying weakness than Clarence. For him, as for Robert and Ronald, friends mean primarily dependence; they offer "help in lots of needs, sickness, money—well, a friend can just help you in most any way." He indicates that, like Clarence, he has a very submissive relationship
to his wife: His wife manages finances, gives the discipline to the children, and, when he and his wife disagree, "I usually do just what she asks me to do." In view of his reactions to the landlord, Wilbur may well have experienced a deep threat to his masculinity and possible homosexual panic directed toward a "persecuting" father figure, when he and his family were evicted following a controversy. He felt compelled to "fight back" in desperation; he sought out the landlord, who happened to be of Greek descent, and attacked him fatally. Apparently unable to face emotional conflicts stirred up by this episode, Wilbur stereotypically impersonalized the relationship by imagining himself as an unfortunate victim of "the Greek people, who like to punish the poor people."

These men are distinguished not only by the intensity of their conflicts about weakness, but also by a special feature of their defenses against weakness in themselves: In addition to the pseudomasculine attitudes which they share with prejudiced men in other groups, the high-scoring inmates express antiweakness themes overtly in delinquent behavior. This behavior has a superficial appearance of being an uninhibited expression of basic impulses. But closer observation reveals that the acts referred to are by no means free or expressive; they have an aspect of desperate compulsion, and can be understood as a defensive attempt to deny weakness. This defensiveness actually conceals intense inhibitions (as is shown elsewhere in this chapter) against genuine heterosexuality and against straightforward aggression against real authority and parent figures. It seems as if these men's uninternalized conscience combines with especially intense disturbance about weakness to produce delinquency, as an extreme type of antiweakness defense. Such actions are perhaps even more unrestrained in those interviewees we have called openly fascist.

2. FASCISTS

The antiweakness defenses appear in more extreme form in the fascists, with more unconscious anxiety about inner weakness. Buck's deep fear that he may be a "sex maniac," his delinquent heterosexual behavior toward a 13-year-old girl and toward his own small children, have been discussed. Further hints of an obsessive fear of homosexuality are given in his reply to the questionnaire item asking what are the worst possible crimes. Besides rape and murder, Buck lists homosexual intercourse per anum. In the interview, he reveals graphic fantasies suggesting preoccupation with "any man that abuses any part of another man's body. . . . I could never see (he refers in profane language to sodomy and fellatio). Buck exhibits vain blustering in almost complete disregard of reality. He repeatedly interrupted the interview to protest, inappropriately, that "I can make money as well as the next guy." His emotional involvement in these unreal fantasies is suggested by his asking the examiner, "Do you think I can make it?"; and
by his interview explanation of his response “worry” to the questionnaire item asking “What might drive a person nuts?”: “Well, I’m worryin’ here, I gotta make it now, or I’m not gonna make it. I’m gettin’ pretty old. Well, not old—but it can’t be done by foolin’ around in the penitentiary.” His greatest ambition, he declares, is to “buy more cattle, more land.” Buck, as will be recalled, “made it” by leaving a trail of bad checks up and down the state.

_Floyd_ says “I laugh at homosexuals,” and he agrees very much with the questionnaire item that “homosexuals...ought to be severely punished.” His promiscuous sexuality has already been described. Nonetheless, his feminine identifications are almost conscious. Asked on the questionnaire what great people he admires most, he lists “Salome, Madame DuBarry, Mata Hari.” In the interview, he reveals that what he identifies with is their opportunistic rise from feminine submergence to positions of power. “Yeh, they did their share. (How do you mean?) I am particularly fond of women...I like a woman who is capable...DuBarry came up from a courtesan to be the indirect ruler of the country.” Floyd’s feminine-submissive-homosexual identifications appear also in his attitude toward his “crime partner,” to whom he is deeply attached. Note the peculiar context in which status considerations irrelevantly intrude: “He’s 30, but I guess we are intellectual equals if nothing else.” And observe the preoccupation with physical relationships, with a consequently inappropriate response: (What sort of person is he?) “Well, he is short and heavy and light. I’m tall and lean and dark. We’re physical opposites.” Floyd is so preoccupied with his dependent role toward the other man that even further probing fails to elicit any real description of the latter’s personality: (What sort of a guy is he?) “The best. (Can you give an example?) If he says something, he means it. And the thing that I thought most about him: the night—we walked into a police trap. The other fellow ran off, but he tried to come back and get me...He’s loyal.” Thus, Floyd’s devoted “lieutenant” relationship to his crime partner possibly enabled him indirectly to gratify submissive-homosexual wishes, at the same time as he was bolstering his masculinity as a “big operator” engaged in armed robberies.

For _Adrian_, the feminine-submissive-homosexual identifications require no inference. Since leaving school, he has lived as a homosexual prostitute, and “I look at all things from a feminine viewpoint.” There is abundant evidence that his homosexuality is an acting-out of hate-filled power conflicts. Not only do “men irritate me by what I think is a superior attitude,” but “I never did like homosexual affairs...The actual physical act always repelled me and still does.” It is as if Adrian is driven by some inner compulsion to “prove” to men again and again, by ingratiating effeminate behavior, that he is submissive and self-emasculated. He “could pet all night.” But since he “found you can’t get away with that,” he submits further by doing “just whatever they want to.” Adrian’s resentment against such utter submission
is expressed in opportunistic exploitation of the men who "kept" him: "I wasn't interested in anything except clothes and the rent." Frequent disagreements arose "about money—I never had as much money as I thought I ought to have. I'd always threaten to leave and go somewhere else. I usually got my way." The underlying wish to turn the tables and dominate the very men to whom he submitted is plain: "I ruled those roosts. (How do you mean?) I cooked what I wanted to cook and did what I wanted to do."

Adrian's "feminine viewpoint" is thus fundamentally sexless and loveless. He presents an extreme caricature of the façade which helps greatly to distinguish certain high-scoring women (see Chapter XI): exaggerated effeminacy of manner, ingratiating coyness, flirtatiousness, excessive attention to dress, ostentatious display of physical weakness with vague hypochondriacal complaining and appeal for pity, etc. The cynical exploitiveness hidden behind this façade is further exemplified in his favorite heroes of fiction—"Becky Sharp, Madame Bovary, and Ivy Lashton. . . . I don't admire anything in any of them. You asked me who I liked the best. Because they were all decidedly—what do you call it?—designing women." The power motif is even clearer in his identification with Mary Baker Eddy, whom he regards as "neurotic" and "I don't have much faith in (her) personally," but "I admire (her) immensely" as a "shrewd business woman."

Even Adrian, with his self-emasculated homosexual submission, made a stab at compensatory "toughness" in his present offense. While drinking in a bar, "I read in True Detective Stories about a girl who got herself up a bunch of hoodlums and raised herself a lot of hell. . . . And I figured if a little tiny thing like this girl could, I could." He proceeded to pick out from the customers at the bar the man who seemed "the most mean looking and corrupt," and suggested they do a robbery together. "I didn't intend to play the active role." "I thought he would do the dirty work but he wouldn't. So I had to." The man got Adrian a cap pistol and, by standing outside, gave him the moral courage to enter a store, where he held up "a very big man" and escaped with the cash register contents. Referring to this incident in discussing Hitler, Adrian himself formulates its fascistic implications: "I'm no leader, but I can follow. . . . Though I led when I had that gun, didn't I? . . . When you make people lead you, that means the same thing, doesn't it?"

Implicit in the "moralism-immorality" and "weakness-antiweakness" complexes of the pseudodemocratic high scorers, is a feature that becomes explicit in the fascists, namely, externalized self-contempt. This is termed externalized because what is despised is not regarded as really a part of the self but as somehow alien or accidental, something for which the subject does not really accept responsibility. Floyd's self-contempt is expressed in such remarks as "Only reason (anyone is) unemployed is they're lazy like me," and "My industriousness . . . just doesn't exist . . . just a black horse." He speaks of this as if it were an isolated trait unrelated to his personality as a whole—an ac-
cident of heredity "from the other (maternal) side of the family." Floyd says he was as a child "a typical fresh Irish kid. . . . Snot-nosed they used to call it"; "I didn't grow up"; "Everything I do is an act." . . . Buck, even in the same breath in which he blames all his troubles on "some damn b——," declares that "I'm kind of ashamed; I'm the only black sheep in the family." Mention has been made earlier of his concern that "You don't think I'm a sex maniac, do you?" and "Do you think I can make it?" (i.e., money). This anxiety, combined with Buck's previous sex offenses, his gross financial mismanagement and fabricated financial exploits, suggests intense, externalized self-contempt. Adrian exhibits the most profound self-contempt of all. He describes himself as "spoiled," "selfish," "neurotic," dominated by "moral laxness," etc. Further, "I get along very well with old maids. I guess I'm kind of an old maid in my mental make-up." About homosexuality: "The whole subject is repulsive to me now. I'd just as soon forget I ever lived that sort of life." This last statement was made just before a short-lived parole, in which he quickly reverted to drinking and to homosexual prostitution.

3. LOW SCORERS

As mentioned before, the low-scoring interviewees, too, show some signs of conflicts about "weakness," but usually with this difference: Such conflicts are in these men more ego-accepted, instead of being denied by the anti-weakness pretenses appearing in the prejudiced men. The greater capacity of the low scorers to face these emotional problems seems to facilitate more constructive attempts at solving them, especially through persistent achievement-strivings (not a quest for external success only, but a striving to satisfy inner standards of self-expressive attainment). Related to this is a more general feature of their approach to life: the development of self-expressive interests that seem to be more than escapist distractions or ways of gaining status. Likewise, these men's more relaxed attitude toward masculinity (as compared with the prejudiced men) seems to have permitted them to develop soft-passive-feminine character traits and sublimated expressions of love-oriented homosexual impulses (not the ego-alien, hostile-submissive homosexual conflicts of the prejudiced men).

Art's "weakness" has been expressed primarily in his search for a nurturant mother figure on whom he could be dependent. When frustrated in this, he "arranged" to get himself into prison by writing bad checks and taking no precautions against being caught—in order to satisfy his dependency needs by using the prison as "mother." This is his own interpretation—worked out by consciously trying to understand his behavior in retrospect—by "auto-psychoanalysis." Art also verbalizes openly his "feeling of inferiority." His compensatory ambition is expressed in striving to satisfy inner values, to demonstrate his inner "abilities and capacities," to an extent that seems neurotically insistent: "I don't like to think of limits . . . on my own abilities and capaci-
ties.” Deeply admiring his mother’s “intellectual ability,” Art was “very conscientious” in school and “was disappointed one time when I got a 'B' instead of all 'A's.'” Having been “imbued” by his mother “with the idea that my body was a precious possession and that I should take care of it,” he trained himself rigorously as “an athlete” and set a world’s ______ record while still in high school. A leg injury at this time interrupted his further athletic career and prevented his entry into Annapolis; he was in bed with a cast on his leg for nine months. Significantly, during this period of enforced, and complete, dependency on his mother (and to a lesser extent an older sister), Art “broke training” by “smoking for the first time in my life” and also “started drinking.” It was as if, unable to accept this dependence and deprived of an important part of his male ego identity as “an athlete,” he needed to assert his independence of maternal moral precepts and to prove that he was a “big guy.” . . . Art prefers “fine art” to his (and his father’s) vocation of commercial art. The former arouses real enthusiasm in him: “I’m immensely happy in that type of work . . . tremendously interested in it.” His main interests are (as he describes them) explicitly intellectual and aesthetic.

Jim has a more disorganized background. His father, after years of violently maltreating the entire family, deserted them when Jim was 13. The main burden of supporting the family now fell upon Jim. Although he had done well enough in school to skip a grade, he now played truant for two semesters, while struggling along on a paper route, odd jobs, and relief allotments. The mother reports that when a doctor urged that she eat more fruit for the sake of her health, Jim sometimes went without eating in order to buy fruit for her. It was during this period that he engaged in several petty thefts; he was arrested once, but the case was dismissed. Not long after the father returned, following an eight-year absence, Jim began to work for him. But when the father “scolded and nagged him one day,” according to the mother’s report, “he refused to work for his father any more.” This may help to explain Jim’s apparent resistance to the two employers he has had: the one private employer he worked for (as a messenger-clerk, for about fifteen months) reported a generally uncooperative work adjustment. Also, Jim was discharged from a C.C.C. camp for refusing to work (no details available). In contrast with this resistance to father-figure authorities, is behavior suggesting a quest for a “good father” who might deserve his love: a government relief investigator refers to Jim’s “disposition to stay with a man much older . . . than himself. This man . . . supposedly took an interest in (Jim) and was attempting to lend every aid at his disposal . . . was somewhat of a drinking man, but according to (Jim), during (Jim's) stay with (him) he stopped drinking; and so the living together was considered mutually beneficial.” In prison, where Jim has been given increasing responsibility, his work adjustment is reported as “excellent.” When last seen, he was working as a kind of counselor to other inmates coming to the psychiatric department
for advice. He declared that most of them seemed to feel much better after releasing their feelings to a sympathetic person (such as himself), and expressed the feeling that he himself had grown in self-insight and maturity as a by-product of listening to other inmates' problems. Meanwhile, his earlier expressed wish to achieve success as a "business executive" has given way to a desire to do some sort of personnel work when he is paroled.

The conventional "drive for success" motive has played a larger role in the thinking of Don and Dick, even though this seems to be integrated into an internalized value-system. From the time Don's parents were divorced, when he was 12, he has been fully self-supporting. Through high school he lived with a group of other youngsters who were also working, and somehow found time to play in the school band and on the football team. Meanwhile, having earned the grades necessary for entering college, he had saved $4,000 with the intention of working toward a medical degree. A three-year siege of meningitis "busted" this goal. His subsequent work-history, he says, has been "more or less accidental." Going to work in his stepfather's business, Don became a _______ salesman. This has been his main occupation, for a period of some years as manager of his own business, in which he was "very successful." His primary goal was "security," which he lost when he began to loan money heavily to his mother, and finally to steal for her—an episode to be described later. Since being in prison, he has seriously developed a boyhood hobby of photography, which he now plans to continue as a vocation in partnership with his son-in-law. As an inmate he has worked into a position that involves photographic work with some supervisory capacity. Photography represents "a form of salesmanship—meet people and analyze them"; it has a "terrific future" as a result of technical advances accomplished during the war. Don's other interests include a variety of sports and reading a great deal. He is described in the initial prison psychiatric interview as "one of the most talkative inmates to cross this interviewer's desk," as showing "a genuine curiosity" and continually "interrupting the interview to ask questions . . . regarding prison life, inmates, and characteristics of various officials."

Through the interview with Dick there seems to run the theme of being what he calls "too easy-going" (suggesting open passivity as an inhibitory defense against expressing aggression). He "never did like to argue with anyone." (This may well be related to his fear of "agitators" and his anxiety that unions "shouldn't agitate." ) Thus, Dick avoided having "any fights with other kids." Later, when his parents objected strenuously to his marrying a girl with whom he was in love, because she had a crippled leg, he "didn't argue—just listened to them and told them my side. I couldn't agree with them." Apparently unable to withstand their pressure, he subsequently married another girl while he was in the Navy. Despite continuous conflict, they stayed together seven years for the sake of their child, and then separated. Dick
then "broke loose" from some of his inhibitions and "got a little wild ... doing a lot of drinking" which led up to the present term in prison. (More of this later.) Dick might have been better able to sublimate his inhibited aggressions if his early ambition to become a doctor had not been blocked by financial difficulties: he "used to dream I was a doctor delivering babies and cutting people open." While in prison, however, he has developed a thoroughgoing interest in watchmaking as both vocation and hobby. It is interesting to speculate whether the focus on close detail in such work may serve as a compulsive means of holding down certain (aggressive) feelings—perhaps allowing less (indirect) expression of those feelings than medicine, but nonetheless a highly sublimated form of control. It is of interest that Dick has learned watchmaking during his spare time from "one real close friend," who is a sex offender. His accepting attitude to the latter contrasts with the prejudiced men's hostile righteousness on such matters. At the same time, the question may be asked whether this friendship involves some indirect satisfaction of latent homosexual impulses, as was suggested for Jim's close friendship with an older man. Such impulses are hinted in a slip that Dick made in describing his childhood friendship with the crippled girl whom he later wanted to marry: "She always used to come to me for advice. . . . If a boy asked her for a date, she would come to me to ask whether I—or rather she should go out with him." (Italics supplied.)

F. HETEROSEXUALITY

1. HIGH SCORERS

As was to be expected from their antisexual moralism, their anxious imaginings about the "animalism" of Negroes, and their intense fears of sexual approach to "white women" by Negroes, the prejudiced men show an impaired ability to combine sexual and tender feelings toward the same woman. Moreover, they exhibit signs of underlying resentful disrespect for women generally. These men tend to keep both sexual and hostile feelings toward "respectable" women partly split off from conscious awareness. They do this by making a rigid distinction between two stereotypes, in terms of which they classify all women: "pure," "sweet" (unsexual) women (like "mothers"), and "bad" (sexual) women. Toward "pure" women there are superficial gestures of respect; the artificiality of such attitudes suggests that they may be based on defenses which hold down sexual and aggressive feelings underneath. This inference is partly confirmed by expressions of open disrespect and hostility toward "bad" women, along with impersonalized sexual attitudes toward them. Further confirmation appears in some direct break-throughs of hostility to "pure" women, and in the fact that all heterosexual relationships tend to be distant, stereotyped and either dominating or submissive-dependent. (See Parts III and IV.)
In one form or another, this pattern appears in every prejudiced interviewee. Robert formulates succinctly the stereotyped notion of two kinds of women. His mother, he declares, taught him “something that stuck with me all my life, that a woman is the most perfect thing in the world”; he reveals the split-off resentment behind this seeming respect by adding, “that is, the right kind of woman.” His sexually frigid wife, whom he calls “the sweetest wife in the world,” apparently represented the “perfect thing” stereotype. What Robert admired most about her, he indicates, was her subservience toward him: “that she was willing to do whatever I did.” Their life together is revealed, in his descriptions, as a constant round of mutual accusations of spending money carelessly, jealousy on her part over his going out alone, and “every little thing... she’d immediately run to mother and stay all night.” She filed suit for divorce on discovering an affair he was having with a waitress, who seemed to represent “the other kind” of woman. The latter relationship was characterized by extreme hostility, exploitation, and disrespect. The woman was quite promiscuous with other men, Robert says, during the affair with him. Further, “she was often drunk, and liked to battle and fight and argue and fuss... Once this woman climbed a pole and got in my window, and another time she threw whiskey through the window at me in bed.” On discovering his former prison record (for forgery), she began to blackmail him. He finally shot her (unpremeditatedly) in a violent quarrel.

Clarence and Wilbur describe a still more distant, empty relationship to their wives than does Robert, with the difference that they rather than their wives were the more submissive. Although Clarence had “quite a few” experiences with prostitutes, he remained unmarried until the age of 38. He was attracted to his wife, he says, mainly by such external features as “her looks and manners.” “We weren’t much alike in any way” and were “a little different in taste about things. (Q.) Most anything!” But Clarence and his wife “got along good,” by virtue of his subservience: “I let her have her own way... in most anything.” Shortly following his wife’s death, Clarence, who as a boy would “blush” if he “met a girl on the street,” began to “molest” young girls, getting them drunk and attempting rape on them. Wilbur’s relationship to his wife has likewise been that of a subordinate. He indicates that she managed the finances, the children, and usually made the family decisions. When they disagreed—e.g., “she likes to stay home on Sunday and I don’t”—Wilbur would “usually do just what she asks me to do.” A few minutes later in the interview, however, when asked in what ways he and his wife are alike, he says: “Well, she don’t like to run around so much, and I don’t either.” A further, equally external “commonality” is that “we both like to work.”

Ronald’s sexual history is more colorful. In addition to a number of “one-night relationships,” he has been married three times—each time quite briefly.
With the first wife "the sex relationship was more enjoyable," he declares, "because there was nothing deep between us." (Italics supplied.) He left the second wife after a week, because "I just got tired of her"; although he "went back to her after seven or eight months" and stayed with her for a short time until the police caught up with his trail of robberies. The third wife was "pure"—a business woman who "didn't know anything about life. . . . We didn't get along too good sexually, because she was kind of on the frigid line." But whereas Ronald had been unable to feel tender toward more "sexual" women, this frigid "purity" seemed to attract something in him. He decided that he was "actually in love with her, and I still am," although "I don't know if she was in love with me. . . . I'd like nothing better than to go back to her."

Eugene's sexual relationships have been "mostly here or there." One lasted six months and was characterized by frequent "disagreements." "She tried to get me to quit drinking, and I wouldn't and didn't." There was much mutual jealousy, Eugene indicates, with charges such as "in a nightclub, she might keep staring at another guy." Also, sometimes "I'd make a date to take her some place and not show up." The inhibitory respect for female "purity" is expressed in Eugene's statement that "I have a bad temper when I'm drinking, except toward a woman," and in his report of how some of his fights start—e.g., going out of his way to pick a fight with a stranger at a bar, for "talking dirty" near Eugene when he was with a girl.

2. FASCISTS

The fascists reveal a heterosexual orientation which is even more externalized, contemptuous, exploitative, and dichotomistic than that of the other high scorers. Buck scarcely disguises his contemptuous use of women as mere physical objects. "I always thought," he declared, after having described his own rather promiscuous sexual activities "that was meant to be tampered with." He shows an obsessive bitterness toward prostitutes and "loose" women, with whom he indicates he has had a good many experiences. Likewise he expresses resentment of his first wife's efforts to obtain financial support for their children. His second wife he curses as being extremely promiscuous during their marriage; and as mentioned before, he blames "that damn _____" entirely for his present situation. Also mentioned before was his statutory rape of a neighbor's 13-year-old girl, because he "had to have some sex" and "it was there to get." Toward "good" women, however, Buck manifests an inhibitory respect. He "never did try to play around with" his first wife before marriage, because "she comes from a pretty good family." Nor did he have intercourse before marriage with his second wife, who "seemed pretty respectable." He later decided, after falling out with her, that "she was playin' good to get me to marry her." Buck formulates his stereotypic dichotomy between "good" and "bad" women in
Floyd, who was only 21 at the time he was apprehended, refers to "a few" passing heterosexual relationships "here and there," typically with "a married woman as usual." He describes as an example "one (who) was about 22 years old, married, beautiful, dumb." But, like Ronald and Robert, Floyd seems to require frigidity in a woman before he can feel respect and become attached to her. As reported in the prison case file, "his principal interest has been a supposed passionate devotion to one who is almost sexless." This was again a married woman, whom he wanted to marry if she would divorce her husband. When she "rediscovered her loyalty" to her husband, however, Floyd "got fed up from her sheer stupidity." Now he wants to marry a "wealthy woman... preferably anywhere between 28 and 30... (of) fair physical attractions" whose personality he is satisfied to "take as it comes." Specifically, he is "looking forward" to marrying a Jewish actress "I got my eye on," whom he claims to have met once at a party in Hollywood. Her appeal for him he characterizes as only "physical." (What else?) "I don't know. She's just 'it,' that's all." This appears to be stereotypic fantasy expressing inverted anti-Semitism about "their women," who as Floyd says in referring to the Jewish actress "are really all right"; he admittedly has not "communicated" with her and doesn't know what her feelings toward him might be.

Adrian's few heterosexual relationships have been with women "all older than me, and they weren't anything but physical." "I never get romantic or emotional over a woman." With women as well as men, "I never had any relations with anyone that didn't have money connected with it." This applied to the business woman of 30 to whom he was married for a few weeks at the age of 18: "she had money and I didn't." Like the frigid "pure women" to whom other prejudiced men seem to become attached, she was "cold as a clam sexually." After an annulment, Adrian continued to correspond with her (as he still does also with his childhood governesses) for over a decade, "until she got married a year ago"; although (or because) "she treats me like a two-year-old." Adrian's deep-seated inhibitions against expressing genuine sexuality are revealed directly in response to a question whether he has any present heterosexual fantasies: "I don't have fantasies in the sexual sense. . . . I am a lot more sentimental than I am sexy."

3. LOW SCORERS

All 4 of the low-scoring inmates reveal definite disturbance in their heterosexual adjustment. Specifically, they appear to suffer conflicts based on unsatisfied love-dependency longings directed toward women as mother figures. These longings are associated with reciprocal love-nurturance toward women. At the same time, these men show ambivalence toward women that
is near-consciously inhibited (instead of being split off and denied by moralistic dichotomies, as is the high scorers' power-ridden ambivalence to women). Such ambivalence seems in their case to stem primarily from frustration of the love-dependency longings rather than from fear-hate, dominance-submission conflicts as in the case of the prejudiced men. Moreover, in contrast with the latter's underlying contempt for women, the low scorers show greater basic respect for women as individuals and as essential equals. Their relationships with women stress common values and interests.

Art partially interprets his "dependency complex" himself. As the result of his "autopsychoanalysis" during his present term in prison, he spontaneously refers to this problem in the first minutes of the interview. All of the women with whom he has been intimate, he points out, have been older than himself, "business women, wage-earners, and providers," like his mother. He "simply transferred my dependency on my mother" to "my wife" and then "onto the (prison) authorities." After getting himself fired from his job, he made only half-hearted efforts to secure another one, until his first "wife as provider and support was no longer a tolerable condition consciously." Then he "got plastered" and wrote some bad checks as "unconsciously a way of transferring dependency." After a six-months jail term, she took him back. He was "repentant, but soon got plastered and did it again." This time she divorced him, though apparently on friendly terms. Art reports complete amnesia for his second wife, a woman twelve years older than himself, whom he also put in the position of supporting him. He lived with her only a short time when this situation became intolerable to him: another check-writing episode then landed him in prison. Unlike Buck, who led the authorities a merry chase before being caught for his check-writing, Art "knew I was going to get caught" and had unconsciously "arranged" to "transfer my dependency" to the prison "mother."

Despite Art's conflicts over "dependency," in describing his first marriage he emphasizes shared experiences and expressed genuine respect for his former wife: She was "an artist also, and a really thoroughgoing individual. She had a tremendous amount of scope, both intellectually and individually.... I liked her interests, her intellect." He is self-critical of his role in the marriage: "I wasn't in love with her.... though I wouldn't admit it to myself.... Though I was very fond of her.... At that time I was too self-centered to be in love with anyone.... I did admire and respect and like her.... Today, I think we could have a better chance of making a go of it... because I have grown up sufficiently." Art's second wife continues to correspond with him, despite his "amnesia," and he is grateful for her "loyalty." Her letters, he says, indicate that she stresses "social functions" and the like, which are "of little consequence to me." Although they plan to reunite, he says that he will not remain with her if their interests and attitudes should prove uncongenial.
Art's continued "amnesia" for his second marriage suggests that he has by no means resolved the conflicting feelings involved in his "dependency complex." Jim's offense illustrates more directly, if gruesomely, the negative side of such an ambivalent attachment. His history includes one extended sexual affair in high school with a girl a year older than himself. When she finally broke off the affair because of his poor prospects (he was struggling to support his mother), he became very despondent and, according to the mother's report, attempted suicide with gas (the mother stopped him). This turned-inward aggression suggests reproachful inhibited hostility toward the girl for withholding love and frustrating his love-dependency needs. Both the emotional dependence and the inhibited hostility are revealed in one of Jim's prison "Progress Reports" when he speaks of "life goals": "Secondly I would like more than anything on this Earth to meet the girl of my dreams. . . . I desire to provide for her and take care of her with Love and Charity in my heart and with a real understanding of whatever little faults she may have. We all have many defects, but it takes a good man to minimize the defects in others and search his own conscience for whatever bad thoughts dwell in him. When I do meet the one girl for me, I shall explain all my past life to her, because I do not believe that happiness can be based on lies." (Italics supplied.) It is interesting that Jim was "out with an older woman with whom he was drinking (as reported in the prison case file), when at the age of 20 he stole an auto for the night. (This led to a year in a reformatory.) His inhibited, oral-dependent hostility to ambivalently regarded mother-figures was expressed directly in his present offense, committed at the age of 21. According to the case record, he "attacked a woman, 50, out for a walk . . . hit her on the head with a club, causing two skull fractures which resulted in her death. The victim's body showed also that he kissed and chewed her breasts. . . . She was totally unknown to him." This act was committed while Jim was very drunk and apparently in a dazed, fugue-like state—i.e., while his defenses were weakened to permit a direct expression of near-consciously inhibited impulses: subsequently he seemed to become at least partially amnesic for the episode.

Don, too, shows signs of strong emotional dependence toward loved and respected women. His first wife's death "was quite a blow. I never recovered from it, until I got this jolt" (i.e., the present incarceration); "I'm getting over it now." He "got along fine" with his second wife, "until I got involved in Mother's affairs," which broke up the marriage. Don refers here to his series of bank robberies to obtain money for his mother in her neurotic involvements; these will be discussed in the section on parents. "I have always felt guilty about it towards my wife." Although "I was fortunate in being perfectly mated to my wife—sexually, that is," Don admits directly what might be expected from his continuing overattachment to his mother (see below, page 885): "I have always been rather inhibited about sex."
Dick, whose "Mother was much more free about (sex) than Father" and with whom he was "pals more than Father," also verbalizes sexual inhibitions directly in discussing his former wife: "She's very hot-blooded and I'm just the opposite. . . . Sexual intercourse once a month would be okay for me." Parental pressure had prevented his marrying the boyhood sweetheart to whom he had been engaged (because she was crippled). Dick had then "married the first white woman I saw," on three weeks' acquaintance, after returning from overseas, because he was "lonesome." This didn't work out "worth a darn." In particularly they "argued about how to take care of the child, mainly . . . she always nagged the kid—wanted to use force on the kid." When they finally broke up, Dick escaped "into the Marines" where, disconsolate, he "got into the habit of doing a lot of drinking." While drinking with a girl-friend, he "picked up a car" (like Jim) and drove with her to Reno, where he "got married again while drunk." They sold the car. In the aftermath, Dick made civil restitution for the theft and had the marriage annulled; he is making additional restitution in prison. Meanwhile, when the crippled girl "back home" had "found out I was married," she too had sought emotional consolation by doing "the same thing: married the first man who came along. It turned out equally badly" and also ended in divorce. Now, she and Dick are corresponding again and plan to marry on his release—at last with parental approval. His attitude toward her seems to be genuinely nurturant: "She always used to come to me for advice. At a dance, I was about the only person she would dance with. And we studied together." At the same time she seems to represent for Dick (who is in other ways, too, more conventional than the other low-scoring men) a somewhat inhibitory figure with conventional moral values, on whom he can depend to "steady" him: she is "sort of refined. Not wild—steady. . . . Quiet, settled, doesn't get mad or express her views. . . . Very particular who she associates with."

4. SUMMARY

The contrasting sexual orientations of the prejudiced and unprejudiced interviewees suggest certain crucial personality differences. The unprejudiced men seem to seek, above all, love—which they also have some capacity to give. Despite frustration and conflict their approach to life is influenced by basic respect for themselves and other people. This makes for democratic identifications with other people, and for an inclination to identify with underdogs. The prejudiced men, on the other hand, seem to feel basically rejected and to have almost given up hope of experiencing genuine love. They speak as if they dislike and fear themselves as well as others. Their main energies seem to be devoted to defending themselves against any sense of weakness, chiefly by striving for external status and power and "proofs" of masculinity. The result is a power-oriented character structure driven to attack outgroups as symbols of their own suppressed characteristics.
G. ANTI-INTRACEPTIVENESS AND CHILDHOOD

1. HIGH SCORERS

All of the material so far presented supports what was stated earlier: that the high scorers anxiously avoid letting themselves think and feel freely, especially about psychological matters. For such inner freedom might lead them to "see" things they are afraid of in themselves. So they externalize their feared impulses, weakness, and conflicts with other people, onto outside situations and events and onto scapegoats. To the extent that these men let themselves feel their real feelings and impulses at all, they tend to keep them undifferentiated and to experience them as alien, as coming from outside their conscious self. Above all, what seems to be the emotional origin of their deepest conflicts—namely childhood and relations with parent figures—tends to be split off by them and regarded as discontinuous with their adult personality.

Thus, Robert declares that, "As far as home environment, I've had the best." He was "a good child" and "a good boy up until the age of 16." It was his "carnal self," he believes, that made him commit a few forgeries and thefts at the age of 18 and later engage in the hostile affair which led to his present term in prison. He regards these actions as quite "accidental," with no relation to life-history conflicts such as ambivalence toward parentally coerced "goodness."

Wilbur even more clearly denies to himself the childhood roots of his present personality and behavior: (Which one influenced you more—your uncle or your aunt?) "Well, that which I have today is that which I have made of my own self. (Q.) Well, as far as givin' me my own disposition, ... I more learned it since I have been on my own." Asked what he was like as a child, his answer is moralistically empty of personal content: He was "just a working boy ... never in no trouble."

Eugene, like Robert, was "pretty good up to the time I was about 17 years old—never in trouble, never smoked or drank." He sees no connection between his submission to self-suppressive "goodness" in childhood and youth and his long history of "trouble" since then. He "can't explain" his violent "temper" or frequent drunken "benders." Concerning his gambling, he declares mystically that "I haven't got that in my blood."

Clarence, too, describes himself in childhood as "a good boy" who "didn't run wild" but "started to work" at a very early age. Not only does he deny any causal connection between this moralistic childhood self-suppression and his later avoidance of work (by probably "wrongly drawing government

---

22 Wilbur's parents separated when he was an infant, and he never knew either of them. He was raised by an uncle and an aunt.
compensation for years”) and attacks on little girls; his panic makes him deny, by means of paranoid delusions, that he ever exhibited such behavior. In Ronald’s case the splitting off of crucial aspects of childhood is more equivocal. For instance, he does criticize the severity of childhood discipline by his father: “They say, ‘Spare the rod and spoil the child,’ but I don’t think it worked out in my case.” It is shown in the next section, however, that Ronald is unable to carry through this criticism in a principled way but only in a paranoid-victimization context and by capricious rebellion.

2. FASCISTS

The fascist inmates reveal a similar “split” between childhood and later personality. Adrian shows some “break-through” of childhood conflicts in what sounds at times like the beginnings of insight. But this is negated by lack of emotional realization and by failure to accept responsibility for his own personality. Instead he feels only cynical, ego-alien self-contempt, with no real interest in changing what he despises in himself. Thus, Adrian observes at one point that “my selfishness is something I can almost blame (my father) for. His attitude and that of the whole family led me to believe that I was . . . the whole universe.” In a later discussion, the cynical nature of this superficial “insight” is clearer: “All I want to know is how to put the best into this life. I should say get the best out, not put in, since I am selfish.” Adrian’s “explanation” for parental “influence” on deeper impulses behind his symptoms is mystically hereditarian: “If I ever did anything wrong, it was the Latin in me, which is the side I have more of an affinity for—my mother’s side: I look more like them.”

Floyd also avoids identifying with his own personality development as a life-experience process. Instead, he adopts hereditarian explanations: “All the inheritance is from the male side of the family for some reason or other. Except for my industriousness . . . that just doesn’t exist. . . . I guess I just got that from the other side of the family.”

Buck, when questioned rather persistently by the examiner as to what he was like as a child, just “doesn’t know.” Asked which of his parents had the most influence on his personality, he becomes very defensive, assuming falsely that the examiner must be moralizing about his delinquencies. Ignoring the examiner’s efforts to correct this misunderstanding, he persists in his own obsessive moralism: Both parents, he protests, “always tried to teach me the right thing”; being in prison is “not my folks’ fault.”

3. LOW SCORERS

More characteristic of the “low” interviewees, with whatever partial inhibitions, is a general readiness to accept the causal continuity between present emotional problems and childhood emotional conflicts with parents. This has been previously exemplified in Art’s self-interpretation of the effect
of his dependence toward his mother upon his marriages and upon his delinquence. Similarly, Don volunteers that "in prison this is the first time that I haven’t been beset by all sorts of emotional problems" centering around "my mother and father." No such striking single quotations are available for Jim and Dick, although the "inner continuity" of their lives is implicit in some of the discussion of parents, to be presented shortly.

H. ATTITUDES TO PARENTS

1. HIGH SCORERS

Certain critical aspects of the prejudiced inmates' ideology—"racial," politico-economic, and moral-religious—have been explained as attempts to deny personal dispositions by displacing them onto things outside. Their ideology seems to express fearful oversubmissiveness to authority and power, "antiweakness" façades, and displaced hatred of imaginary power figures (e.g., Jews); as well as desperate fear of their own impulses, especially sexual aggression toward "respected white women." These men's unconscious, split-off anxieties may in turn be traced to deeper sources, namely fear-ridden attitudes to parents. All of them reveal, above all, a loss of inner integrity by self-negating oversubmissiveness-out-of-fear to parental authority. Such an attitude is shown especially toward the parent who is regarded as "stronger," typically the father. This submission is betrayed by a striking inability to criticize parents' basic values; by inhibitions against making principled criticisms of parental harshness; by acceptance of suppression imposed by parents; and by stereotypic overidealization of parents. The last feature seems to be an anxious attempt to suppress hostility by showing the opposite—awed "respect." The false quality of this "respect" is revealed by its empty clichés, referring mostly to external stereotypes such as the parents' status, the "sacrifices" they made for the family, etc. Positive feelings tend to be oriented not toward "lovable" personal qualities of parents but rather toward what parents have "done" for them, or "given" to them; i.e., they reflect an exploitative dependence-for-external-things. Self-negating submission and dependence toward parents may well be the ultimate origin of that "weakness" in themselves which these men so frantically try to deny. But fear prevents their resentment from leading to real self-assertion or to independence of their parents or other established authority. Sometimes they express feelings of victimization toward parents and other authorities (recall Ronald's "persecutor for a governor"). But these feelings are overpersonalized: the prejudiced men cannot really criticize antidemocrativeness as such; instead, they feel themselves singled out—as individuals, as "the poor people" or

23 The statistical comparison of high- and low-scoring interviewees generally, with respect to attitudes toward parents, is reported in Chapter X.
whatnot—for "persecution." Their furtive resentment of parents and other authorities can be expressed only in pseudo rebellion, often delinquent or fascist; and in prejudice against mythically "dominant" groups such as Jews, who symbolize the hated parental power and values—i.e., by "growling" defiantly while expressing the very authoritarianism "growled" against. There are signs that, to bolster their weakened masculinity and independence, these men have tried to identify with the external aspects of the resented parents—i.e., parental authoritarianism, status and power, especially that of the father. This involves, not solidly internalized character traits, but only vicarious participation as a "lieutenant" in the parent-leader's strength. This narcissistic identification is also a way of disguising masochistic submissiveness to the parent-leader.

A further consequence of the prejudiced inmates' submission to parents is splitting-off of sexual impulses toward the first heterosexual figure, the mother. These are kept split off by developing reverence for the mother's imagined asexual "purity." By emphasizing the mother's "sweetness" and "goodness," she is in fantasy deprived of sexuality. Such distortions help to protect these men against their own feared sexual impulses, and provide a basis for their later inability to fuse love and sex. Their fear of Negroes' approach to "white women" may well be a projection of their own repressed impulses toward the mother.

Several questionnaire items indirectly reflect submissiveness to parental authority and denial of any hostility to family figures. These include an overemphasis on "obedience and respect for authority" (Item 1), rejection of "rebellious ideas" (Item 21), condemnation of those who do not feel "love, gratitude, and respect" for parents (Item 27), and rejection of any hostile impulses toward "a close friend or relative" (Item 42). While these items are differentiating, even the low quartile means on them are rather high. It may be suspected that prison has stirred up considerable guilt over rebellion and hostility, in both low and high scorers.

Robert's submissiveness is underlined by his insistent repetition that he was "a perfect son to my parents, a perfect brother to my sisters and brothers." His mother is the "most terrific person in the world to me," and he is quite unable to evaluate her objectively: "I truthfully can't say she has any definite shortcomings." Yet his conception of her is empty and distant. Probing as to what sort of person she is draws a complete blank, except for references to her antisexural moralism (about "woman" as "the most perfect thing") and her "self-sacrificing" gratification of dependence: "I think she has devoted her life to making her mate (my father) and her children very happy. Has never taken much interest in outside social affairs; is concerned with her family." Even this "devotion" is regarded with mixed feelings: "I don't really think she has any (shortcomings)—except maybe too wound up in her home and didn't take more interest in social affairs." Robert overidealizes his father
in an equally empty way as "very good—I couldn't ask for a better father." He then proceeds furtively to "undo" this praise by expressions of feeling victimized: "He was a little strict at times," and "I haven't had everything I might have wanted from him." (Note the dependence-for-things.) "I would have liked to have a nicer home, better position." His underlying submission, however, impels him to pull back and "apologize": "Possibly at the time I couldn't realize" the reasons for punishment, and "all in all, I was very happy to be one of his boys." Most interesting are Robert's comments about his father's economic status: "Not a successful businessman.... Instead of improving himself, I think he went down a bit.... Since I got out of school, he's always worked for wages." Thinking of the family's frequent moves which deeply upset his mother, Robert has "often tried in later years to analyze my father's wanderlust." Robert decided that in moving so often, his father was "apparently seeking business success." In this respect, "My mother," who "always referred to me as her best daughter" because "I've always tried to do everything to make her happy"—(note the submissive feminine identification)—"has remarked that I'm just the opposite of him." According to Robert, his mother in no way criticized the father's obsession with external status; she objected only that he did not "stay put" in seeking it and was not "successful" enough. But this seems to have provided a rationale for Robert, while submitting to his father's notion of economic "success" as the end-all of existence, to assert: "To me, looking back now, he's not the type of a man that I want to pattern my business after." Robert's ambivalent ego-ideal of "business success" is, so he likes to think, "the opposite" of his father's ideal. This might help to explain the inversion of his anti-Semitism, in which he expresses mainly envy of Jewish "drive and ambition to get there," with only furtive signs of his hostility against "the Jew." "The Jew" perhaps symbolizes less his father directly than it does a superficially differing father-ideal toward which Robert's resentment is even more repressed than toward his actual father. This father-ideal is difficult for him to rebel against even by way of displaced resentment against the symbol of "the Jew," because under moralistic pressure from his mother he is deceived into thinking that his submission to this ideal is itself an assertion of independence from his father's values.

Ronald's resentment has broken through more openly. After the divorce of his parents when he was 3, he lived with his (paternal) grandmother. He was "taught...that (my mother) had deserted my father and brother and I." Upon his father's remarriage, Ronald went, at the age of 7, to live with his father and stepmother. From the beginning there seemed to be "a mutual understanding between my brother and myself that we didn't like her." Her position as only a secondary mother figure seemed to enable Ronald to express resentments toward her directly. His stepmother, he says, "didn't take any interest at all" and "resented us": "We always felt that we were in the
way.” A hint of possible homosexual fixation on the father is suggested by jealousy that his father “was more interested in her than in me or my brother.” Ronald expresses much disappointment in the father, and feelings of being victimized by him: The father “was dependable, but he changed”; “worked his way up . . . then drinking caused him to go down.” “He never shirked at the idea of anyone helping him, especially financially. . . . I know he used some of my grandmother’s money to buy real estate with. And I know he lost it, and it didn’t seem to bother him.” The father gave Ronald an allowance of only fifteen cents a week, which Ronald still resents: “I’ll never forget that.” For the most part, however, he blames his stepmother for being “never satisfied” and “greedy.” Even here, his guilt makes him pull back, as if sensing that he may be projecting onto her some of his own feelings: “I thought she was greedy. ’Course it might have been for other reasons—wanting to save something.” Most striking is his almost complete displacement of hate for the father’s harsh discipline, onto the stepmother. Telling how his father “didn’t believe in sparing the rod” and “laid it on pretty thick,” he declares: “The hard part about it was that my stepmother would tell him that my brother or I had done things, and he wouldn’t give us a chance to explain.” Ronald actually “ran off twice,” but “it didn’t cause me to hate him. I held it mostly against her.” (Just as Ronald now “holds it mostly against” those of lesser status and weak position, not those who represent real power.)

Wilbur’s parents died in his infancy. He was raised by an aunt and uncle, with whom his main satisfactions, he says, were limited to “board and room, a place to sleep.” The aunt was a “good woman” (i.e., “pure”). Specifically, she gratified Wilbur’s dependency-for-things; she was “good to the children: clothed, fed, took care of us when sick.” “I couldn’t think of any” faults in her, except perhaps that “she would never like to go no place—stayed at home all the time” (like the woman Wilbur later chose to marry). He is unable to make his “idealization” of his aunt meaningful by any details; she was “just a good woman,” “good to me.” He “never did” confide in her. Wilbur’s monosyllabic answers to the examiner’s inquiry indicate that his childhood was dominated by the harsh rule of his uncle, whose regime he was apparently too submissive to think of questioning. He says that his uncle whipped him several times a month: (Did you ever question whether he was right about it?) “No.” The uncle, he declares, “treated me okay,” but from a very early age “made me work pretty hard. (Q.) Sun-up to sun-down. (Q. How did you take that?) We did what the elders told us to. (Q. Did you ever question that?) Well, I never questioned.” Wilbur was able to rebel only when he could create a persecutory rationale by feeling singled out: “Only one disagreement—he wanted me to do more work than his own children.” Wilbur reacted to this rationale with explosive defiance—still submissively unable to criticize his uncle’s authoritarianism as such—by abruptly leaving home at the age of 15. With all this, Wilbur in another context describes
his uncle as "pretty easy to get along with." Then, in almost the next breath he reveals that "he would stay away at night and drink, sometimes come home drunk. My aunt went off in a corner." Wilbur indicates that he didn’t dare to think seriously of criticizing the uncle or of protecting the aunt: (What was your reaction?) "Didn’t think much about it."

*Clarence*, too, describes his (real) father as "easy to get along with." What he admired most about the father was "the way he treated me. (Q.) Never did abuse me or scold me." Later, Clarence betrays the reason for his freedom from physical discipline, namely, his own cowed submission to stern parental authority. Although the father would "tell us what we should do, what he wanted us to do, and what he expected us to do," "there wasn’t much (discipline) to exercise," simply because "we just did what they said." A moment later, Clarence unwittingly reveals the parental intimidation that forced such utter submission from him: bemoaning the independence of children today, he declares that if he had ever answered his parents back the way he thinks children do now, "I wouldn’t be able to sit down!" Clarence has justified his parents’ intimidation of him by adopting the same general philosophy of authoritarianism: "Children didn’t run wild in those days like they do nowadays... If they have to whip them, I believe in whipping them. I don’t believe in sparing the rod and spoiling the child." This submissive acceptance of parental authoritarianism helps to explain Clarence’s inability to evaluate his father objectively: he "didn’t know (my father) had any weaknesses." His description of his mother is equally superficial and moralistic: "She was a nice, easy-going woman—good mother." What he admired most about her, he states, was the "way she handled me—always tell me how good I was." Clarence’s distant, stereotyped attitude to his mother is further suggested by his purely physical conception of the way in which "I take after my mother more than my father. (Q. In what ways?) Well, in my complexion. (Q. What about personality traits?) That I couldn’t answer."

After Eugene’s father “ran away when I was 2 years old,” his mother went to work as a waitress and “took care of me all my life.” Thus she was both mother and father to Eugene. His remarks about her suggest the fear which forms the basis of his “idealizing” her—namely a desperate dependence on her to “do things” for him: (Note the similarity in phrasing with Eugene’s submissive-dependent "idealization" of Roosevelt, who “did things” for Eugene via the C.C.C.). “She’s good. In fact, the best. In other words, she’s just tops with me... Does everything for me she can. Writes me all the time. (Q. What do you admire most about her?) Just about everything. (Q.) Well, I guess her being so good and friendly to everybody, especially me. (Q. What’s an example?) Well, always trying to do everything for me. Very seldom go uptown without bringing something back for me. (Q. What else?) When Father went away, Mother took care of me all her life, where she could have put me in a home some place. She always stayed with me in
trouble.” This dependence, this fear of loss of support, may have been a powerful force driving Eugene to submit to his mother’s righteous repression. She is described as having taught him not values but absolutistic moral rules: “She always taught me the difference between right and wrong, the things I should do and shouldn’t.” Her moralism, as he describes it, smothered any chance of answering the implicit hostility behind it, because the hostility was veiled by a fog of self-righteousness: She would characteristically “just bawl us out” in a way that “made it seem like it was hurting her more than it did us.” “She’d look hurt,” with the result that “it just hurt. I never sassed her back or said a mean thing.” The implied struggle to hold a desire to “sass her back” is illustrated further in a striking contradiction. The only thing Eugene can imagine that might have prevented his long record of “getting in trouble” is more strict moral repression by his mother: “To tell the truth, I don’t think she was strict enough with us.” As evidence for this, he mentioned that he sometimes “came home later than I was supposed to.” A minute later, unaware of the contradiction, he declares: “She was pretty strict about that being home on time!” Eugene submitted to his mother’s moralism by being “pretty good, up to the time I was 17 years old.” His subsequent “trouble”—gambling, drinking, fighting, and sexual promiscuity—suggests a belated reaction against this submission. Meanwhile, the hostility which her “hurt” moralism made him suppress causes him to feel guilty and therefore obligated to “do things” for her. Asked what his main satisfactions were in the relationship with his mother, this guilt evokes the inappropriate response that “I guess I haven’t made her very happy, but when I’m out there and going straight, I’ll always take care of my mother. . . . I feel I’ve never treated her like I really should.”

2. FASCISTS

The 3 fascist men show, in more extreme form, essentially the same pattern of attitudes to parent figures as do the other prejudiced men. Especially notable is their fearful submission to the father, in which homosexual aspects are hardly even disguised.

Buck verbalizes fairly directly his fear of sexuality in relation to his mother: “I’d kinda feel embarrassed if my mother ever brought up a subject like (sex).” His conception of her seems to be exclusively that of an agent to “do things” to gratify his dependence: “She was a hard-workin’ lady, took care of us kids.” In fact, when asked what were his main satisfactions in his relationships with his parents, his response is limited to the purely external fact that “they gave me most anything I wanted.” As for his parents’ personalities, Buck’s orientation toward the external leads him to ask: “You mean the people they associated with?” He cannot go beyond the most superficial references to their external roles, such as giving things to himself, being “hard-working” or a “businessman,” “got drunk,” “gave orders,” etc.
This inhibitory block against any personal relation to them is consistent with the absolute submission which his father forced upon him. Buck “never did see any weaknesses in him.” His blind acceptance of his father’s “rightness” about everything explains why: His father, he protests repeatedly, was “generally right when he says something,” “always trying to show us the right view of things,” “always right in the things he said.” Buck “always figured I had it comin’” when he was “licked,” and in his fright “knew right from wrong right away” as an absolute distinction never to be questioned. Hence his father usually needed only to “give us one look and we’d know what he meant.” Buck’s fear leads him to say that his parents “never argued . . . even when he (the father) got drunk.” A moment later he naively reveals the reason for the lack of arguments, with no apparent awareness of the contradiction: “Mother didn’t say anything.” “If they did” have any disagreements, “they never did let us kids know.” This denial is followed a few sentences later by a description of how sometimes “Dad would go into a rage and walk away . . . and Mother would go into a room and cry; but she’d get over it right away.”

Of particular interest, in connection with Buck’s fantasy that “most all of them Jews talk about sex mostly . . . about they’re gonna (have fellatio performed on them) tonight,” are some remarks about the ways in which his father (symbolized by Jews?) used to “talk about sex.” The only sex instruction Buck had, he declares, consisted in his father’s frequent warnings to “watch out for these ch______” in order not to be exploited. In another context he relates how his father began, during his middle teens, to give him money for the express purpose of visiting prostitutes. Whether truth or fantasy, this is highly suggestive. It is not difficult to imagine that Buck may have been sexually overstimulated, rather crudely, by his father.

After Floyd’s parents separated in his infancy, he rarely saw either of them. Until he was 7 he was raised by a foster mother who boarded children. From age 7 to 14 he lived with his father and a newly acquired stepmother, until he was sent away to boarding school. Floyd describes himself as grossly neglected by the foster mother: “Those people always had something to do from dawn to dusk, and as a kid I never had anything to say.” He “didn’t get along too well” with the other children. Discipline was “more corporeal than anything else . . . for any infraction of her so-called rules.” The stepmother he scornfully resented as “just another woman, I guess,” “just somebody that was there,” and as “mean” and rejective toward himself as “that other woman’s child.” He jealously contrasts her with his father as different “in every way. She wasn’t his equal in anything—intellectually.” This phrasing raises a suspicion that Floyd wanted to replace his stepmother and adopt the same “lieutenant” role toward his father as he seems to have adopted toward his crime partner. Indirect evidence for this hypothesis is to be found in his “mixed-up loyalty” to his real mother, suggesting definite identification with her feminine role: “I wish she had a husband, and that’s the pitiful part of it—a woman
shouldn't be alone.” There is much further evidence of Floyd's intense, if ambivalent homosexual father fixation. He describes his father as a “very, very fine man, intelligent, understanding. Excellent father... in every way... a man everybody in the community looked up to.” As to what he admires most about his father, he “couldn't singularize on that. Just all of him.” The one shortcoming which he can think of in his father is aggressive abruptness in criticizing: “Well, he was outspoken... If he thought you were no good or doing something wrong, he didn't hesitate to tell you.” But Floyd's fear of his father compels him to justify even this: “That's as much of an asset in ways.” In fact, Floyd cannot mobilize sufficient aggression toward his father to make a single criticism of him, not even of the father's virtual abandonment of him during the first seven years of his life: “Just always been away, that's all.” He denies that his father ever punished him unjustly. A significant reason for Floyd's anxious splitting-off from conscious awareness of all negative feelings toward his father may be similar to the preoccupation of Eugene toward his mother—fear of complete abandonment. This is suggested by Floyd's description of the quarrels between his father and stepmother. These were “very sharp, and their remarks were lasting and bitter, like, 'We never should have taken him home.' And Father would be confused. ... Then he would punish me, once very hard; then he would talk to me until I went to sleep.” This dependence, as well as further signs of homosexual attachment, would seem to be expressed in the following remarks: “There's only one help I've got, and that's my father”; although “he's never been close to me,” he “has stood by me... This affair has brought us closer together than before”; and “he has written me a beautiful letter.”

Adrian's case reveals in rather pure form the dynamics of a power-ridden type of inverted Oedipus complex: fear-driven homosexual submission to a hated father, and underlying identification with the mother's role as subordinate. His mother, who died in her early twenties when he was only 5, seems to have been a very infantile person with “no sense of humor.” She neglected Adrian entirely except for flaunting her sexuality in his face, and then terrifying him by her “way of punishing me.” She was “a very beautiful woman,” “very vivacious,” “came out in—society... spent most of her life going out to dinners. ... She mostly ignored me, but she always came to show me how she looked before she went out. ... Except that my nurse said I was this or that, she didn't seem to know personally what I was about.” Her punishments, “usually for something petty” such as “stealing fudge off a shelf,” were capricious and deeply traumatic: “She locked me in dark closets—scared me to death,” or “threatened to give me to a neighborhood woman whom she said was a witch.” Yet the fearful dependence of a little child apparently forced Adrian to repress the hate such treatment must have excited: for in the same breath in which he reveals her self-centered cruelty, he idealizes her and is unable to criticize her for these things. (How did
you feel toward your mother when she punished you?) “I loved my mother. I was very crazy about my mother. (Did your mother ever punish you unjustly?) No. She lost her temper unjustly. She was very vacillating—up one minute and down the next; never knew what she was going to do next. People just had to stay out of her way when she was that way.” Questioned about her weaknesses or faults, Adrian declares: “In my memory, she just doesn’t have any faults.” His mother’s intimidation alone might be thought to have discouraged Adrian’s heterosexual development. But fear of a stern father appears to have combined with this to “stampede” Adrian into complete homosexual submission to the father and adoption of the mother’s manipulative techniques. The father, who died several years ago, was a military officer who was “not the least bit demonstrative. . . . He disapproved of any show of emotion of any kind.” Adrian was awed by “his consistency.” “He was a stickler for rules. . . . I thought of him as a sort of tyrant.” Yet, though he seemed “hard as nails with everyone else,” he was “very easy with me,” because “if my father punished me, (my mother) was so upset that it didn’t go.” Adrian describes specific episodes that would seem to have encouraged a fearful “feminine” attitude toward the father: “Incidentally, whenever she cried, I cried, too. . . . She often threw tantrums, and father just put on his hat and went out, which only made her all the madder. And I would always cry with her. . . . I always felt when he scolded her, he was scolding me.” Adrian indicates that from earliest infancy he adopted his mother’s techniques for manipulating the father: “I hollered . . . usually got my way. In fact, all I ever had to do was cry about anything, and he’d do whatever it was that upset me.” “And remember,” says Adrian in explaining his father’s coddling him as the father coddled Adrian’s mother, “that I look like my mother.” Note the continuing father fixation: “I missed him very much when I was at the boarding house. . . . When I was sick, I used to . . . daydream about his coming to see me. . . . I’ve saved all my letters to him. . . . He very dramatically returned all my letters, like to an old love. I loved my father very much.” Quite unable to assert any genuine inner independence, Adrian’s furtive resentment broke through his weak superego in the form of delinquent rebelliousness: “I became such a worry to him . . . left school when I pleased. I overdrew my charge accounts, and he was ill.” This was followed by an endless succession of delinquencies as an adult. “When he died,” however, “and when I realized I could never see him again,” Adrian began to feel intense shame over his delinquencies and to feel even more deeply submissive to his father: “I put him on a pedestal now he wasn’t on for me as a child. . . . He haunts me: I’m always wondering if he would approve of this or approve of that. . . . His judgment was always right. . . . And when I hear opinions expressed, I wonder if they would be his opinion.” Adrian has even made a belated stab at catching up with father-masculinity identifications. Before his short-lived parole, he asserted that he was through with
his "repulsive" homosexuality, and that although he would have been "happier as a woman," he had "more determination than I am given credit for" and "can live a man's life, since this is a man's world." As we have seen before, his "determination" lasted for only about two weeks.

3. LOW SCORERS

In contrast with the high scorers' submission, the low-scoring interviewees exhibit more underlying independence toward parents, especially toward the father. This includes some capacity for objective evaluation of parents, as well as some ability to resist parental authority on the basis of principle. In each case the preferred parent is definitely the mother, who is loved and respected as an individual. At the same time, each of these men reveals a deep ambivalence toward the mother, which is (almost consciously) inhibited, but not denied by masks of overidealization and reverence. The ambivalence appears to center around frustrated love-dependency longings. It is this primary love-orientation, however, which forms the basis of genuine liking for people and for democratic identifications. And to the extent that these men carry out identifications with underdogs and show resistance to status quo injustice, a basis was formed in early assertions of independence as underdogs in relation to parental authority. Their failure to carry out such identification fully may be due to inhibitions against asserting full independence from parents.

By his "autopsychoanalysis," Art has made partly conscious his "Oedipus complex"; or, as he says he prefers to call it (denying specifically sexual feelings toward his mother)—his "dependency complex," later displaced onto mother substitutes. After the death of the father when Art was 9, several factors combined to intensify this complex. His sister and (paternal) half-brother went to stay with relatives. This left Art alone "at home with Mother, who had an advertising job." Their relationship, he indicates, was quite close, but with himself in a dependent role (though with reciprocating nurturance) toward his mother-provider: "I stayed at home and cooked the meals and did the housework." She apparently overstimulated his sexual fantasies, in a way that made it harder for him to overcome the mother fixation, by glorifying his body as a "precious possession." And when he was "about 14" she presented to him "the business of childbirth and conception . . . in a very cold-blooded way" (note the almost-conscious ambivalence toward the mother) including an arrangement for him to watch several childbirth operations surreptitiously. Withal, Art's image of her stresses inner, psychological values: "An intellectual and a very well-educated person. Her principal gift seems to be that of perception. And a musician—pianist— . . . not by trade but certainly by nature." Her frailties include "a psychological disturbance as great as mine. Fortunately didn't cause her as much trouble, but certainly caused her as much anguish." The mother's emotional support
seemed to help Art assert considerable independence of his father: e.g., explicitly rejecting the latter’s anti-Semitism; evaluating him with some criticalness as “spoiled” by his “rich parents” as “an only child”; criticizing his discipline as having “not much consistency”; and rejecting his father’s discipline when it seemed unfair, in which case “you got nothing but a lot of argument from me.” The mother was in some ways a better model: her discipline “deprived us of privileges” but “had more effect” because of her greater consistency—“she meant what she said.” The father’s capriciousness, as a masculine model to identify with, seemed to confuse Art’s conception of his own ego-identity. For instance, in pursuing the career of artist and having to compromise by becoming a commercial artist, Art was following his father, who “of course was fostering any particular art ability I had.” But “curiously enough, I don’t think I have any particular art ability” though “no one else thinks it is either ordinary or mediocre.” Instead, “I think I could become a good musician, pianist” (like his mother); although he admits on questioning that “I don’t play the piano at all.” Art even makes explicit his conflict over internalizing the father as a masculine model: though the father “championed my causes... I didn’t like my father as champion—preferred my mother as champion.” Art recognizes that his father was “temperamental,” “running away from something, too... managed to dissipate a rather large fortune” by drinking and gambling which caused “considerable domestic strife: I didn’t like it.” Yet having himself “started drinking,” done some gambling, chafed against “commercializing” his artistic bent by getting fired from several jobs, and “transferred my dependency” onto prison by check-writing—Art senses that he has “probably got some of (my father’s) extravagant qualities.”

Don’s life, too, has been dominated by a neurotic overattachment to his mother. His underlying love-dependency has been masked, however, by his reciprocal role of nurturant protector to his mother. In pre-adolescence he became actively involved in the “bitter quarrels” between his parents concerning the father’s “going with women.” He took the mother’s side, strongly criticizing the father, who repeatedly “licked my pants off” for intervening. “At the same time, I tried to bring them back together; they still care for each other.” But his efforts at mediation were unsuccessful: his parents were divorced when he was 12, and from then on Don supported himself, living with several other boys. (One wonders if Don’s experience of being squeezed between his two adult giants partly determines his opinion that “both labor and business sort of ignore the little fellow.”) Years later, in the mother’s third marriage, her husband “took her” for a great deal of money, which he lost in a succession of wildcat schemes. Eventually she went into debt, mortgaging the old family farm. Don, having tried in vain to persuade her to divorce the man, and inhibiting conscious wishes to kill him, borrowed heavily to keep her in funds. He then carried out a series of
bank robberies (by himself) to make these debts good, and to continue supplying money to his mother. On the last one, after a wild automobile and foot chase by a bank manager, he let himself be caught rather than shoot the unarmed man with his loaded gun. Don recognizes that his mother is "governed by emotional biases," by "willingness to accept and believe too much... generous to a fault... not too practical, forbearing to a fault... not assertive enough." But he respects her deeply as "quite a person" who "has taken up something every year of her life.... She has recently learned to play the accordion; she studied music all her life." Don's ego-identity, like Art's, seems to be confused with respect to mother-versus father-identifications: he feels that he takes after his father in not being "governed by emotional biases as Mother is." This conflicts sharply with his statement that prison is "the first time that I haven't been beset by all sorts of emotional problems." Ambivalence toward his mother's "emotional biases" is indicated by his first, abrupt response to questioning about his mother's weaknesses: "Let's call it emotional and let it go at that."

Jim's involvement with his mother is still deeper, with respect to both love-dependency feelings and nurturant protection of her, as well as strong hostility close to the surface. Conflict with the father is also more violent. Jim has been very close to his mother, as to an intimate sweetheart: "I could talk to my mother about any subject under the sun. No embarrassment there. I was interested in the same things.... Both of us are a little sensitive in temperament, kind of quiet. I think we both like a certain amount of solitude. I used to like to take her out to dinner, to the theatre quite often." During the depression, as he struggled against poverty to support his mother, she says that he was "a prince, and went without eating himself to buy fruit for me." Jim is able to criticize her as "not social enough... by herself too much" and as "having a little temper," but he formulates his near-conscious ambivalence: "It's a little difficult to find weaknesses in one's mother.... We usually tend to overlook a mother's weaknesses.... I find it difficult to find very many frailties." At another point Jim indicates unmistakably the process of consciously struggling to inhibit, by what he calls "insight," resentments toward his mother. Citing, in response to questioning, an occasion on which she had spanked him impulsively for something that wasn't his fault, he declares: "At the time I resented it. Today I don't. I know she did things the best she could. I didn't have enough insight then." Of the father, who deserted the family for eight years during the 'thirties, Jim says: "My dad used to get drunk quite often, and he would beat (my mother) physically.... He's a little crude, socially. He's very happy-go-lucky. He likes to fish. He's very egotistical, I think a little too much so. Very stubborn in argument. If he believes a thing, why that's it. He probably has an inferiority complex which he never admits to himself." The mother expresses the view that Jim was reduced to "a hopeless state of mind... due to his father's hardness and cruelty." But note
Jim’s love-oriented wish to believe that his relation to his father was none-theless “a very friendly relationship. He was pretty much of a pal. We liked to go places together, fishing, play cards, etc. We had a lot of good times.” (Recall Jim’s close relationship with an older man whom he persuaded to stop drinking, and who was in turn kind to him.)

Dick, too, was closer to his mother than to his father. “I always like to putter around the house with Mother. Mother and I were pals more than Father... I confided in Mother a good deal. (What’s an example?) Well, sex. Mother was much more free about it than Father.” Nonetheless, Dick’s conception of her is more “moral” and conventional than that of the other low-scoring interviewees, and reflects some dependence-for-things: He describes her as a “good housekeeper, always interested in the kids’ welfare. Liked to putter around the house.” He admired most in her “the fact that she’s always looked after the kids the best she could, and kept a very nice household and dresses nice. Personal appearance always kept up to snuff. Doesn’t smoke and doesn’t drink.” Dick is also unable to criticize her directly: (Weaknesses?) “Well, might say my dad is her principal weakness. He can talk her out of most anything.... (Other weaknesses?) By golly, I don’t know. I can’t think of a one.” His hostility toward her for her greater strictness, as compared with the father, is not difficult to infer: “Dad tried to” exercise the discipline, “but he was too easy-going, so Mother did.... Never had a whipping. She used to take privileges away... for not coming home on time. That was the main thing.... I got a wild streak for about six months before I went into the service. First got the use of a car then. Neglected my studies for picnics and dates in the evenings.” (One may wonder if this was not in protest against his mother’s moral strictness). As for the father, who “always found something to laugh at—very easy to get along with,” Dick mentions his main weaknesses as violations of the mother’s strictness: “Might say he’s a sucker for anybody’s sob story,” and “pretty lenient with his kids... would let us play hookey, would let me have the car a bit too often; too easy with money for us kids,” whereas the mother was a “little more careful about money.” (Recall that Dick’s fiancée, the crippled girl “back home,” is “not wild—steady”; she might be a mother figure who could help him to inhibit resentment against his mother’s strictness.)

I. “CRIMINALITY” IN HIGH AND LOW SCORERS

1. GENERAL

What relations may exist between “criminality” and the antidemocratic trends? Two kinds of data are available: mean scores on the scales for subgroups composed of legally defined offense categories, and certain interview material. Table 5 (XXI) presents the E- and F-scale means for the legally
defined offense categories—murderers, robbers, etc. None of the differences between means of different offense groups are statistically significant. As for the relevant interview material, the heterogeneity of offenses combined with the small number of cases would seem to discourage general conclusions. But perhaps if an appropriate level of generalization can be found, a brief review of this material might be rewarded with further insight. Such a review is now presented, considering the interviewees one by one.

2. HIGH SCORERS (INCLUDING FASCISTS)

Complete details are not available as to the exact circumstances of each of the interviewees' offenses and their attitudes toward these offenses. Nonetheless the material obtained is highly suggestive.

Robert's murder of his hostile, despised mistress was the climax of a flight into sexual promiscuity which has been interpreted as an unconscious attempt to quiet fears of nonmasculinity that his wife's frigidity may have intensified. Ronald's habitual gang robbery "as a business" appears to have represented an easy way of obtaining money as well as an effort to "prove" himself a "big operator." Eugene's delinquencies consist of a long history of "trouble": getting easy money by check-writing, gambling, drinking, and especially fighting, of which he is both proud because of its manliness and ashamed because of being "a little wild." In contrast with his submissiveness to his moralistic mother, by being "good, up to the time I was 17 years old," this behavior sounds like a belated protest of "masculinity." Wilbur's murder of his landlord following eviction, and his development of paranoid anti-Greek delusions, appears to have been a desperate defiance of an emasculating father figure, in order to reassert his own threatened masculinity. Clarence's sexual assaults on children, with his accompanying paranoid delusions of being "framed by the people in politics," seem to be attempts to
“prove” masculinity and suppress homosexual panic. Buck's statutory rape of a young girl and molesting of his own small children probably have similar meanings. His drunken check-writing spree with a despised prostitute seems to have been an attempt to bolster his masculinity by means of heterosexual promiscuity and “big-shot financier” behavior. Floyd's gang robberies were undisguised attempts to be a “big operator,” to be “tough,” and to gain easy power. Similarly for his disturbing the peace by drunken brawls, and his repeated Army A.W.O.L.'s, which characteristically involved a spree with “a married woman as usual.” Adrian's cap-pistol robbery was, by his own statement, an attempt to “prove” that he could “lead.” He himself attributes this act in part to some glandular treatments he had just completed a week before, which he feels made him “more masculine.”

The one feature which all of these offenses have in common is that they represent attempts to “prove” something. What they seek to “prove” is toughness, strength, power, all of which signify “masculinity.” More significantly, they are attempts to deny something, namely, what to the subject means psychologically “weakness” and “nonmasculinity”—whether this be nonheterosexuality, impotence, homosexual impulses, submissiveness, dependence, softness, or passivity. In a word, the high scorers' crimes express the emotional complex that seems to dominate their lives: desperate fear of their own “weakness,” which they try to deny by a façade of masculinity. Thus what superficially looks like direct, uninhibited expression of impulses in these men, turns out to be a cover-up for intense inhibition and fear.

3. LOW SCORERS

Art has himself interpreted his check-writing, in which he made no efforts to avoid getting caught, as an unconscious attempt to transfer his ambivalent dependency from his wife onto the prison “mother.” He ascribes the origin of this complex to his attachment to his mother. Don's bank robberies for his mother express a similar mother attachment, in which his own love-dependence is closely associated with nurturance toward his mother. Near-conscious ambivalence is verbalized toward the emotional biases by which her behavior is governed. Jim's clubbing of a middle-aged woman and then kissing and chewing her breasts—all carried out while drunk and in a dazed, fugue-like state, with later partial amnesia—suggests a direct expression of primitive mother-oriented ambivalence. His earlier theft of an auto for a joy ride with an older woman may well have been related to the same general conflicts. Dick's theft of an auto to drive a woman to Reno to marry, while both were drunk, seems to have been part of his near-conscious search for consolation, after the frustration of his love-dependent-nurturant desire to marry the crippled girl “back home.”

Each of these men's offenses suggests different aspects of a common constellation which dominates their lives: longing to be loved by and to love
a mother figure who will both "mother" them and let them "father" her—with near-conscious ambivalence to women, caused by frustration of this striving.

The crimes of the high and low scorers thus seem to express their different central strivings or life-themes: antiweakness defenses versus ambivalent quest-for-love. They do not appear to be differentiated, with respect to the manifest violence of their offenses. It seems that the same legal offense, and the same degree of violence, may spring from quite different underlying personality structures; accordingly, as other writers have noted (51, 103), the legal offense per se is a poor index of susceptibility to rehabilitation. There is a strong suggestion, however, that low scorers offer considerably more promise of rehabilitation than do high scorers. This follows from the apparent greater capacity of the former to establish genuine relationships with other people; just as their criminal behavior seems to have followed upon frustration of the need for love, or upon some crisis in their love relationships, so would the establishment of new relationships offer the basis for changed behavior. In the high scorers, on the other hand, relationships based primarily upon love would seem to be very difficult of achievement; rather, we should expect new relationships in their case to conform with the old pattern of dominance-submission, something which, though it might induce conforming behavior for the moment, would in the end only strengthen those personality structures which are basic to their criminality—and to their fascist potential.