

STEREOTYPING THE MINORITY

A discussion of patterns of intolerance cannot disregard the reasons which the individual himself brings forward to justify his animosity. Among social scientists there is now general agreement that verbal expressions of hostility need not directly reveal their real causes. But many efforts to combat intolerance have been blind to this fact and have concentrated on disseminating correct information and on disproving the accusations of the intolerant. One of the basic hypotheses of this study is that intolerance is a function of deprivation and anxiety, while the intolerant person's accusations are ways to justify his aggressions. Nevertheless, a dynamic interpretation of the processes at work in the biased person should not lead one to neglect those reasons by which he justifies his aggressive tendencies.

Nor will it do to dismiss the intolerant person's stereotyped opinions in an off-hand fashion with such statements as: If there were no Jews they would persecute all those who have red hair. Such an approach overlooks the fact that even some psychotic persons can still exercise a modicum of reality testing. In order to justify his persecution of the red heads, the biased person must avail himself of rationalizations quite different from those employed to rationalize anti-Semitism; and they must be of such a nature as to permit a minimum of reality testing. These rationalizations, moreover, will condition the ways in which hostile feelings against the particular minority can be discharged. Similarly, the accusations which the intolerant person directs against Jews or Negroes must contain traces of testable observations; and these, too, will affect the manner and conditions under which hostility manifests itself.¹

¹ German history provides a tragic example. Jewish extermination was decided upon at a relatively late moment in the annals of National Socialism, as documented by the proceedings of the Nuremberg trials. So long as the accusation that Jews possessed wealth and power could be justified by a minimum of fact (i.e., as long as some relatively wealthy and influential Jews remained within Germany), discrimination by expropriation and defamatory laws satisfied most anti-Semites in their need for the discharge of hostile feelings. When such accusations could no longer be backed up even by shreds of evidence, the accusations became more and more extravagant. While propaganda had previously emphasized the Jewish control of business and finance within Germany, the emphasis then shifted to the thesis of a secret world conspiracy, an accusation no longer testable by the average German.

Freud has convincingly demonstrated that any delusional belief must rest upon some psychological reality (and it may be added here that this reality may be objectively insignificant when compared with the delusional bias). Some very hostile persons need intolerance as outlets for hostility which, if not somehow discharged, would destroy the integration of their personalities. If they are approached with requests to submit these beliefs to reality testing, their dim feeling that such testing would deprive them of much needed outlets for hostility will lead them to greater anxiety and thus more intense hostility.

Moreover, the prejudiced person senses that the reasons by which he justifies his prejudices are not the source of his actions. Therefore, all attacks on his reasoning seem only to demonstrate a lack of appreciation and understanding of his real motives. This convinces him that those who question his prejudices do not really understand him at all and he does not feel compelled to accept their arguments.

All intolerant veterans in the sample avoided reality testing to some degree. They seemed not quite able to see Jews and Negroes as individuals in their own rights, and as unique persons. Each of them made some statements about minorities which showed that they ignored the individual's uniquely personal characteristics; in short, they used stereotypes. As was to be expected, those who were only moderately biased, i.e., men who applied stereotyped thinking to ethnic minorities without being outspoken in their demands for restrictions, retained more ability to test reality. They were able to evaluate correctly those individuals whom they met, but clung to stereotyped thinking about the rest of the discriminated group. One veteran, for example, who was asked about "goldbricking" in the army, said that Jews were the greatest "goldbrickers," but elaborated that there were "some fine Jewish boys" in his outfit, for whom this was by no means true. Another man said:

"If there was a Jewish officer in the outfit he'd have a Jewish fellow with him; if there was any easy work to be done, he'd get a Jewish fellow to do it. I don't know what there is in it, but they always think they're superior. There was one Jewish fellow in our outfit whom I liked especially. He wasn't like the ordinary run of Jews, that's why I remember him."

Thus attitudes were frequently found to indicate that while uncritically accepted and repeated opinions (nearly always unfavorable in character) were considered the rule, the individual's contrary experience was viewed as the exception. In this way it remained possible to retain the stereotyped attitudes which permitted discharge of hostility despite contrary actual experience.

Such limited amount of reality testing, however, did not seem to be available to strongly biased individuals. Their intolerance signified a much stronger underlying need for hostile discharge which had to be totally protected against possible disintegration through real experiences. In these cases the stereotype became their defense, and since the pretension of reality testing had to be maintained, the Jew was no longer tested against reality. On the contrary, instead of testing whether a Jew, or the majority of Jews, conformed to the stereotyped picture of the Jew which was used to justify anti-Semitism, the reverse procedure took place. Whoever fitted the stereotyped picture of the Jew was accepted as such and used to support the validity of the stereotype. On the other hand, whoever eluded the pattern was either not recognized as a Jew, or declared a rare exception. The classical expression of this attitude was voiced by the man who led the first modern party based almost exclusively on political anti-Semitism, the late nineteenth century Viennese lord mayor, Lueger. When questioned about his private and professional associations with individual Jews he declared: "I decide who is a Jew and who is not."

But even for the individual who must avoid any extent of reality testing, it is incompatible with his self-esteem to realize that he is waging a war of persecution against a comparatively helpless minority. Therefore, in order to fight it with justification and without damage to his self-esteem, he sometimes invents the existence of a powerful and threatening conspiracy aimed at his own well-being. This rationalization, in the case of anti-Semitism, takes the form of accusations, which in their mildest expression involve a widespread belief in Jewish "clannishness." This belief found its most exaggerated form in the Nazi's conviction that there existed an international conspiracy of Jewish plutocracy which was waging war against Germany.

However, the intolerant person cannot rely upon any obvious signs for demonstrating the existence of this powerful organization, since neither the Jews nor the Negroes have, for instance, any army to speak of—nor are they in positions of power among the great nations. Therefore, the existence of a secret organization has to be postulated, and this is exactly what many extremely intolerant persons do.²

² Here again the delusional mechanisms determining ethnic intolerance become obvious. In his claim that there exists a secret conspiracy, the thinking of the intolerant person may be compared with the rationalizations of the paranoid patient who uses the fact that nobody else recognizes the existence of his enemies to reinforce his belief in their cunning

The more violent the aggressions of the intolerant person are, the more he must justify them with a stereotyped belief in the danger of the minority's power. The greater he believes this power to be, the greater his anxiety becomes, which then spurs him to even more violent action. Thus he is caught in the vicious circle of his delusional system, which may be one of the reasons why, once interethnic aggression becomes rampant, it proceeds with self-perpetuating vigor. The violence of the persecution demands new and stronger justification. It also creates guilt feelings, which add to the anxiety already created by the stereotyped belief in the power of the outgroup.

The testimony of two men may exemplify the differences in degrees of reality testing which were found among them. One biased man who retained his ability to test reality to some degree said about the Jews in the army:

"They shirk their duty, they're not combat men. Some will fight, I'll give them that credit, but most of them are out for themselves. If he has a chance to save himself, he'll save himself. A Jew will never give you nothing for nothing either. (But) I've found a couple of good Jews, like in any nationality, but only a few."

On the other hand, confronted with the fact that in his own experience Jews behaved like other soldiers—namely that some tried to avoid the danger of combat, while others were courageous, another strongly biased man was still able to protect his stereotype from being dented. The average Jewish soldier, he implied, was incompetent, and the others, bloodthirsty. Thus he was able to negate the courageous Jew's behavior by means of another unfavorable stereotype.

Because the intolerant person's rationalizations are closely, though not obviously, connected with the reasons for his intolerance, he must find means to protect them. On the other hand, they also reveal the nature of his underlying anxieties. According to Freud, "The delusion is found like a patch on that spot where originally there was a tear in the relation between the ego and its outer reality."³ A study of stereotyped opinions about ethnic minorities may be likened to a removal of this "patch" in order to find the "tear."

Among the veterans studied, as everywhere, stereotypes and stereo-

³ Quoted from Simmel, E.: "Anti-Semitism and Mass Psychopathology" *Anti-Semitism*, E. Simmel, ed., New York, 1946, p. 53. Besides the papers in this book, another psychoanalytically oriented discussion of anti-Semitism may be found in Fenichel, O.: "Psychoanalysis of Anti-Semitism," *Am. Imago*, 1: 2, March, 1940.

typed thinking revealed the individual's view of minority groups and indicated the blocks to the individual's ability to test reality. No statistically significant relationship emerged between the pattern of particular stereotypes which the individual held to be true of a minority group, and the degree of his hostility against that minority, as indicated by his demands for restrictions. But it was found that the more outspoken and intense the individual was in his feelings against Jews (or Negroes) the larger was the total number of stereotypes he employed (see Table 1 (III) below).⁴

TABLE 1 (III)
DISTRIBUTION OF STEREOTYPES

Number of Stereotypes Used	Anti-Semites Classified as "Stereotyped"		Outspoken and Intense Anti-Semites	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
0-3	14	33	11	23
4-6	18	43	11	23
7-9	9	22	18	39
10 or more	1	2	7	15
Total	42		47	

A comparison of the patterns of stereotypes used to characterize the Negro and the Jew revealed several important differences in the structure of group hostilities. The various stereotypes employed by the sample to characterize ethnic minorities are summarized in Tables 2(III) and 3(III) below.

An examination of the five most frequent Negro and five most frequent Jewish stereotypes reveals strikingly different results, with each set presenting a more or less integrated pattern. For the *Jew*, the five most frequent stereotypes were:

THEY ARE CLANNISH; THEY HELP ONE ANOTHER

"The Jewish are cliquish. I heard that they have a lodge that will appropriate money for one of its members to start a business and then he repays it. If we're

⁴ The analysis of stereotypes was based on a content analysis which combed the entire interview record for the presence of stereotyped assertions. Several questions, including some dealing with army life, were designed to reveal stereotyped thinking.

TABLE 2(III)

STEREOTYPES CHARACTERIZING JEWS

	No. of Veterans Mentioning Stereotypes
General	
They have the money	26
They control everything, (or have an urge to control everything); they are running the country	24
The Jew in business and industry	
They use underhanded or sharp business methods	24
They control most business	18
They are mostly in business for themselves	15
They monopolize industry; own most of the factories	13
They have the best jobs; they always get to the top	11
They control particular businesses	9
The personal characteristics of the Jew	
They are clannish; they help one another	37
They don't work; they don't do manual labor	19
They are overbearing; they are forward	17
They are dirty, sloppy, filthy	17
They are interested only in money	11
They are smart, especially in business	9
They are energetic	8
They are loud, noisy, and cause commotions	7

all created equal, it looks like the Jewish are in the driver's seat. . . ." (Veteran twenty-seven years old; one year high school.)

THEY HAVE THE MONEY

"They're pretty shrewd operators, I guess. Maybe I'm prejudiced against them. The one that screwed me up was a guy from California who said he had more reason than anybody to go back because he had a business to take care of. No family or anything else. He was a smart fellow, had a college education. He had a lot of money and would loan it to the guys and charge them interest. Any other guy would just hand it out and if he forgot to pay it back, O.K., you never asked him for it. Money is their God. This one got more passes than anyone else. Of course he was in the orderly room so he just wrote one for himself whenever he wanted one. He had a brand new Buick up at camp and drove it all around. He managed to get out before it was over. He went to the hospital every day; said it was his nerves. Probably was worrying about his business." (Veteran thirty-two years old; four years high school.)

THEY CONTROL EVERYTHING

"Everybody blames the Jews. In a way that's right because they have everything. They control everything. They're in all the right places—in the offices, in politics. They're the ones running things. They always manage to get in at the top of everything. Like the Jews in the army. There were just three Jewish boys in our company, anyway. Then at the point of embarkation, just when we were ready to pull out, what did they do but yank them two off the ship. So those two Jews got left behind—no reasons given, they weren't sick or anything. That's the way it is with them all the time.

TABLE 3(III)

STEREOTYPES CHARACTERIZING NEGROES

	No. of Veterans Mentioning Stereotypes
General	
They are taking over; they are forcing out the whites	25
They have low standards; they are a lower class	18
The personal characteristics of the Negro	
They are sloppy, dirty, filthy	53
They depreciate property	33
They are lazy; they are slackers in work	22
They have low character; they are immoral and dishonest	18
They are ignorant; have low intelligence	18
They are troublesome; the cause of disturbances	14
They smell bad; they have a body odor	11
They carry diseases	10
They spend their money on a good front; they don't save	8

"They control all the liquor—that's one I know about. Just take a look around at the liquor stores, see one on this corner run by a Dago and he ain't got nothing, neither has the Irish or whatever else he may be—but look at the one that's got plenty and you'll see it's a Jewish place. They control it all. If your name is Goldberg, you get all you want—otherwise you don't get nothing. . . . 95 per cent of the liquor companies they still keep the same names, but the Jews got them now. It's the same in all business; but the liquor business is the one I know about." (Veteran thirty-three years old; less than eight years of school.)

"It seems like Jews are in back of every big outfit." (Veteran thirty-eight years old; four years high school.)

"They have power all over the world—in all the industries. Everything is Jewish. Marshall Field and all the big stores in Chicago are Jewish." (Veteran twenty-seven years old; two years high school.)

THEY USE UNDERHANDED BUSINESS METHODS

"I have a lot of trouble with the Jews, too. They're hard to deal with. They're too tight. Every time you go up to deliver something to them you have to have a fight with them first before you can collect your money." (Veteran thirty years old; two years high school.)

THEY DON'T WORK; THEY DON'T DO MANUAL LABOR

"Well, most of the Jewish people have all the factories so the white people are working for them. You don't see Jews working." (Veteran twenty-six years old; two years high school.)

For the *Negro*, the five most frequent stereotypes were:

THEY ARE SLOPPY, DIRTY, FILTHY

"He's lazy and he smells. Don't do any good for him to take a bath, he's born with it. . . . I just couldn't stand being near a nigger and I don't see how anybody could. They're colored, we're white. We just shouldn't marry them, we have no business doing it. They have a country, let them go back to Africa." (Veteran twenty-six years old; two years high school.)

"They should be taught where their place is, taught to be clean. Then you could stomach them more easily." (Veteran twenty-two years old; four years high school.)

THEY DEPRECIATE PROPERTY

"Why is it when a bunch of niggers moves into a building, it gets all broken down so fast? I just got no use for them. You can always tell one by his smell." (Veteran twenty-nine years old; two years high school.)

THEY ARE TAKING OVER; THEY ARE FORCING OUT THE WHITES

"I just don't like niggers, they're getting too big, will be wanting to take over. All these groups getting them to think they're so big—pretty soon, if they don't watch out, there's going to be a race riot. Why they push you off the street, now. Everywhere you go there's a bunch of niggers. You go downtown to a big department store and they're all over. Of course they got to buy things too, but it's sure getting bad. All these politicians are trying to get the nigger vote by putting them in white neighborhoods. Let them live together . . . they say. But there'll be a race riot if they keep up that stuff. Guess that's about all there is to do—get a riot going, start killing them—that's all. Then when 400 or 500 of them get killed, they'll find out that they got to stay in their place." (Veteran thirty-three years old; less than eight years education.)

THEY ARE LAZY; THEY ARE SLACKERS IN WORK

"There are Negroes working for my company but you always have to keep chasing them to keep them working." (Veteran twenty-five years old; four years high school.)

THEY ARE IMMORAL

"Well Negroes are an awful dirty class of people. There's more trouble with Negroes than with anyone else. They're always getting in hold-ups." (Veteran twenty-six years old; three years high school.)

"The trouble with them is they have no morals. If they're with whites, we can't trust the morals of the whites either, and we don't want a generation of mulattoes." (Veteran twenty-seven years old; two years high school.)

The composite pattern of stereotypes for the Jew did not stress personally "obnoxious" characteristics. Jews were not predominantly characterized as forward, pushy and overbearing, or loud and noisy by the members of this predominantly lower and lower middle class sample. In the main they were represented in terms of a powerful, well-organized group which by inference, threatened the subject. The most frequently mentioned stereotype was that Jews were clannish, and that they helped one another. In itself such a stereotype might be colorless, or it might indicate an underlying positive emotion. Contextual material almost invariably indicated that what the veteran was actually revealing was his social and personal isolation; he was decrying what he considered to be the unfair advantage in business and politics which accrued to the Jew who enjoyed greater social solidarity than himself. The following statement represents this attitude in its extreme form:

"Well it may not sound good, but I think Hitler had the right idea. Kill them all off. They make life miserable for everybody else. All they do is to look out for themselves." (Veteran twenty-two years old; one year college.)

The power of the Jews, it was felt, lay not in their strength; for that matter, neither physical nor intellectual ability was stressed. The Jews' power to control was felt to lie in their cooperation with one another (their clannishness) and in their possession of money. The wide range of stereotyping which surrounded the power and wealth of the Jew highlighted his ability to amass and keep wealth, largely through underhanded business methods and general cunning. Complementary to this was the observation of the stereotyped and aggressive veteran that Jews do not work, since they do not do manual labor.

On the other hand, the stereotypes of the Negro in this sample stressed the individual, personally "offensive" characteristics of the Negro. Just as the stereotypes of the group characteristics of the Jews implied a threat to the values and well-being of the intolerant white, so the stereotypes about the Negro were used to describe a conception of the Negro

as a threat to the white man's economic and social status, particularly because the Negro was "forcing out the whites"—for example:

"I say that the white race should get the jobs because I believe that they live at a higher standard than the colored and it would give the white race a more superior feeling over the colored than we've had in the last few years. I believe that the colored race is growing too strong. During the war they were kept in their place. Now they're learning white ways and stepping out of place. This was very evident in the service." (Veteran twenty-three years old; four years high school.)

While both stereotyped and outspoken anti-Semites used by and large the same kinds of stereotypes, there was, nevertheless, some marked difference in the frequency with which members of these two groups mentioned particular stereotypes. The greatest difference in the use of stereotyped thinking (between stereotyped anti-Semites and outspoken anti-Semites), occurred in connection with the charge that Jews exercise control. Twice as many outspoken anti-Semites made this statement as did stereotyped anti-Semites. Another stereotype made much more frequently by outspoken anti-Semites was that Jews are clannish and help one another. Stereotypes about Jews having all the money, using underhanded business methods and not doing manual labor were as frequently used by stereotyped anti-Semites as by outspoken ones. Thus stereotypes which may be related to superego tendencies were used twice as frequently by outspoken anti-Semites, while stereotypes related to id tendencies (shirking of hard labor, cheating, and hoarding money) were equally frequent among both groups.

These data may be compared with the frequency distribution of stereotypes applied to Negroes. The greatest difference in the use of stereotypes between stereotyped anti-Negro and outspokenly and intensely anti-Negro veterans was found as regarded the accusation that Negroes were sloppy, dirty and filthy. (Twenty-three per cent of the stereotyped anti-Negro men made such statements, while twice as many of the outspoken and twice as many of the intense anti-Negro men made such assertions.) Thus in the case of the Negro, stereotypes related to id tendencies were used much more frequently by men whose anti-Negro bias was more intense.

A comparison of the distribution of stereotypes applied to Jews and Negroes, as indicated by this enumeration, with those used by the National Socialists in Germany permits certain observations. In Germany the whole list of stereotypes were applied to the Jews, which in the United States were divided between Jews and Negroes. In German anti-

Semitic propaganda, Jewish dirtiness and lack of morality were greatly emphasized. Thus there is additional evidence that within Western European-American culture the selection and use of stereotypes seems to depend on the needs of the person applying them, although the patterns revealed by the veterans permitted some significant qualification.

In the United States, where two or more ethnic minorities are available, a tendency has emerged to separate the stereotypes into two sets and to assign each of them to one minority group. One of these two sets indicates feelings of anxiety over the first minority's power of control (Jews exercising control, having power). The other set of stereotypes indicates anxieties aroused by the second minority's assumed ability to permit itself the enjoyment of primitive, socially unacceptable forms of indulgence or gratification (the Negroes'—and one might add the Mexicans'—dirtiness and immorality). Moreover, it would seem that when the two minority groups differ in physical characteristics, such as skin color, the minority showing greater physical difference is used for projecting anxieties associated with dirt and sex desires.⁵ The minority whose physical characteristics are more similar to those of the majority becomes a symbol for anxieties concerning overpowering control.

According to psychoanalytical interpretation, ethnic hostility is a projection of unacceptable inner strivings onto a minority group. Projection is a mechanism by means of which one tries to solve a conflict within oneself by ascribing to another person emotions, motives, and behavior which actually belong to oneself. For instance, if we hate another person without justification, that creates a conflict within us if our conscience does not approve of the emotion of hatred. Instead of solving this conflict by overcoming our hatred, we may try to get rid of it through projection. We project our hatred into the other person so that it appears to us not as if we hate him, but that he hates us. Thus in a devious way we not only try to get rid of an emotion which is not acceptable to our conscience (superego), we are also now justified in hating the other person if we so desire, because we think he is hating us.

Any survey of those characteristics to which the members of the ingroup object in members of the outgroups is frequently a list of all those characteristics which they fear in themselves.⁶ The outgroup provides

⁵ It may be mentioned that stereotypes frequently used by the veterans in speaking about Mexicans followed closely the pattern of Negro stereotypes.

⁶ For example, in the German concentration camp situation, both Jewish prisoners and Gestapo guards acted as if psychological mechanisms comparable to paranoid delusions were at work in them. Both believed that the members of the other group were sadistic, dirty, unintelligent, of an inferior race, and that they indulged in sexual perversions. Both groups accused each other of being interested only in material goods

subjects onto which they can project the rejected part of those tendencies which created an inner conflict. Thus they try to free themselves of the conflict and to reestablish their personality integration which has been endangered by demands of which their superego, for example, did not approve. That this is so can be seen from the fact that the outgroup is always accused of satisfying needs which are common to all men. No child wants to be and remain clean; everybody would like to live at a leisurely pace, to have money, and to enjoy sexual gratification. But often our conscience does not permit us to give in to these instinctual demands and fights against them.

Personal integration can be threatened by two opposing psychological entities: superego and id. Superego, by definition, controls human behavior in line with social standards. The economic system, particularly the necessity to work, and to work hard, seem suitable to represent superego demands, many of which the individual feels unable to meet. The indulgence in primitive desires represents id gratifications, the desire for which is felt by many individuals as a threat to their integration.

In the metropolitan area studied, there seemed to be a tendency, among the intolerant, to select the Jew for projecting onto him those tendencies rejected by the superego (for instance, the individual's desire to take advantage of others), while id desires were projected onto the Negro, whose supposed greater irrationality seemed to make him a suitable representative of the pressures originating in the irrational id. However, a projection may easily show features of both opposing forces since in all conflicts they are intertwined. Still, in each case one of the two opposing tendencies will dominate.

It frequently happens that the impact of the environment on the individual may force him to change the objects onto whom he projects unapproved inner tendencies. Thus the question arose of the possible effects of army experiences with Jews and Negroes upon patterns of projection, as revealed in stereotyped thinking. In the absence of pre-war interviews, only limited inferences could be drawn.

Men brought into the army the forms of stereotyped thinking which they made use of in civilian life. In the army, enough of the practices and forms of civilian life were continued to permit ready application of

and of having no respect for ideals, or for moral and intellectual values. In the case of each group there may have been individual justification for some of these beliefs. Nevertheless this strange similarity indicates that the two groups were availing themselves of analogous mechanisms of defense." Bettelheim, B.: "Dynamism of Anti-Semitism in Gentile and Jew," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 42: 2, April 1947.

existing stereotypes. Moreover, at the time of the interview the men were back in civilian life, trying to regain their places. This would have tended to revive attitudes previously formed in civilian life. In addition, the pressure of army life was likely to increase many individuals' need for protecting their personal integration by the use of defensive mechanisms, including projections.

Nevertheless, the army experience threw many men into new and varied contacts with Jews and, to a lesser extent, with Negroes. Such experiences could have been viewed as new opportunities to realistically test their conceptions of minority groups. In particular, the fact that men were asked to join with these minorities in a common task might have led them to re-examine their attitudes. Thus whether associations with Jews in the army influenced the patterns of projection is an important issue for the understanding of intolerance.

TABLE 4(III)
CHARACTERIZATION OF SOLDIERS

	Jews		Negroes	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
They were not used in combat (had rear-echelon jobs)	30	20	19	13
They were poor combat soldiers	25	17	65	43
They fought like others	87	58	39	26
Don't know and other	8	5	27	18
Total	150		150	

Analysis showed that the stereotyping of Jews in the army was in good measure an extension of the conceptions of civilian life onto army experiences. Table 4(III) above presents the veterans' responses to the question: "Did the Jews make good soldiers?" From this table it can be seen that the number of veterans who were free of negative stereotypes in their characterization of Jews as soldiers equaled the number of men tolerant toward the Jew as measured by the overall index of intolerance (approximately 60 per cent in both cases).⁷

Closer examination of the interview records of intolerant men reveals

⁷ Since this question was included in the construction of the overall index of anti-Semitic attitudes, some association was to be expected. However, the percentage was almost the same for this question as for the overall index, composed of eleven groups of questions, each consisting of several items.

how civilian patterns of stereotypes were uncritically applied to the army setting and that the experience of living together did not markedly influence these patterns.

The civilian characterization of the Jew as a powerful figure, with business ability and cunning, was merely enlarged to signify a series of traits which enabled the Jew to succeed regardless of the context in which he found himself. To intolerant men, being a Jew meant possessing this basic ability. This emerged clearly in many of the statements about the Jew in the army. For example:

"There were only a few Jews in our outfit. One of them was a master sergeant. They did get up faster in rank and promotion, but we couldn't do anything about that. They would do favors for the officers and get promoted." (Veteran twenty-two years old; two years high school.)

Even if personal attachment and respect bound a man to a particular Jew, the stereotype of his greater ability "to get things" remained.

"Oh, there was one Jew, Lt. ——— . . . almost forgot about him. He lived right over here a few blocks, too. He took pictures of me and a buddy of mine the day before he was killed. He knew somebody on the *Sun* and was always sending in pictures of the guys. He was really white. At first I didn't like him and he knew it and picked on me at first too. But then I changed my mind. He took care of his platoon all right. To show you how much they liked him, they all got together at Christmas time and bought him one of those fancy lined sleeping bags—which is something, cause otherwise none of the G.I.'s did nothing like that for the officers. He took good care of his men. He saw to it that they had things they needed. They had cigarettes all the time when there weren't many around. *That's the Jew in him—he was good at getting things like that.* He'd do anything for his men and they'd do anything for him." (Veteran thirty-three years old; less than eight years of education.)

Again, in the army as in civilian life, the Jew's power position was ascribed to his special characteristics—in particular, money and education.

The equation of the Jew as civilian to the Jew as soldier was summarized by one thirty year old corporal: "The Jews don't work or fight."

In the case of the veterans' views of the Negro soldier, the stereotypes seemed also to follow the previously mentioned pattern of stressing the Negroes' personally obnoxious traits. The fact that Negroes were in fact used chiefly as rear-echelon and service troops, tended to reenforce the existing stereotypes about the Negro's being lazy and inefficient.

"I have yet to see a good Negro soldier. Well, for instance, when we were aboard ship we had three white companies and one Negro company; and every time we had a drill, it would take three minutes for the white companies to be

at their stations, and fifteen minutes later the Negro company was not at their stations."

The actual position of the Negro in the army appears to account in part for the 13 per cent of the sample who responded that the Negroes were not used in combat (Table 4(III)). More important was the fact that the characterization of the Negro in the army was colored by the sexual mores which developed between white women and the Negro troops in the European theater of operations. To complete the foregoing analysis of attitudes Table 5(III) summarizes the men's responses to the question, "How did the fellows in your outfit get along with the Jews (with the Negroes)?"

TABLE 5(III)
"HOW DID THE FELLOWS IN YOUR OUTFIT GET ALONG
WITH THE JEWS (WITH THE NEGROES)?"

	Jews		Negroes	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Had little contact	6	4	59	39
Did not get along	26	18	45	30 ^a
Got along all right	96	64	35	23
Got along very well	11	7	3	2
No answer	11	7	8	6
Total	150		150	

^a Includes responses: "Got along as long as they stayed in their place."

For negative answers, the reason most often volunteered in the case of the Jews was their clannishness. For Negroes, however, allegations of friction hinged around the topic of Negro-white sexual relations. Those who expressed attitudes on this subject were uniform in their condemnation, not of the white women, but of the Negro soldiers.

"There was lots of trouble, lots of fighting and shooting. The main trouble was about girls—they was taking out the white girls all the time, in Italy and in France. They told the white girls they were American Indians. They don't know any better. The girls thought they were pretty good, I guess, because the niggers would buy them a lot of things. They were so anxious to get girls that they would spend a lot on them. And they were there close to all the supplies so that they would steal stuff to the girls. . . .

"Sometimes, maybe one company would come into a small town where a big colored unit had been stationed for a long time, and we'd just stay to

ourselves and not go into the town at all. It would just start a lot of children. Like one time a guy was talking to a girl and a colored soldier came walking down the street, she said so long to the white guy, I have a date with him, and went walking off with the nigger. But what could you do about it? So we just stayed away from them. Course there were plenty of fights, a hell of a lot of shooting." (Veteran thirty-three years old; less than eight years of education.)

"Negroes were scared of their own shadow in combat. The Negroes went out with white girls in England; in fact you'd see 'em kissing white girls. Boy, those fool girls thought they were American Indians, but as soon as more white troops landed we took care of that. I remember one incident. A white guy was dancing with an English girl and a Negro came in and the girl left the white guy for the Negro. They'd do it over there. Well, the white guy got mad and came up asking what the big idea was, that that man was a Negro. The Negro was mad too, and told him that when he got home, he'd be going out with the guy's own sister. . . ." (Veteran twenty-five years old; two years high school.)

These data and many similar statements support the hypothesis that the individual's stereotypes are not only vitally needed defense mechanisms, but are persistent, even under the impact of such immediate and realistic experiences as service with Jews and Negroes under conditions of war. But were there more basic life experiences which forced the individual toward a new and different integration of hostile and anxious impulses? This raised the question of which types of life experiences are likely to modify an individual's intolerance? If we were to find significant differences between the life experiences of tolerant and intolerant men, we might assume that some of these experiences favored ethnic tolerance. The task of the investigator thus became one of isolating those life experiences which were associated with intolerance.