

CHAPTER VI

ANXIETY AND INTOLERANCE

One of the basic problems on which this study has tried to throw light was the question of whether intolerance is a function of the hostile individual's anxiety. Those factors most popularly associated with intolerance—economic status and other social attributes—have already been examined in Chapter IV, where it was shown that for the group studied, low income was less related to intolerance than the decline of a person's socioeconomic status. In addition, the data in Chapter V have shown that actual hardships in the army were relatively unrelated to intolerance, while subjective feelings of deprivation were closely related to aggressive feelings against an outgroup. All these data suggest that contrary to prevalent belief, intolerance is less a function of the objective situation and more one of personal evaluation. Since anxiety originates in past experiences and attaches itself to what are considered dangers of the present or the future, the investigation then turned to an analysis of subjective attitudes about present and future tasks.

Here an important reservation must be made. A person may evaluate his position as precarious and still remain tolerant because he blames only himself for the circumstances of his life. Psychological studies of depressed individuals have shown that depression is due to critical and otherwise hostile feelings which have been turned inward against the self. If this interpretation of depression is accepted, then feelings of intolerance will, psychologically speaking, originate in a middle area between feelings of security and competence, and those of great self-criticism and depression.

There were seven men in the sample who evidenced considerably greater anxiety and pessimism than was characteristic of the majority of tolerant men (see also footnote page 120, Chapter VII). Some of these seven who were tolerant indicated tendencies towards severe self-criticism and toward a desire for greater punishment by their parents and/or more rigid discipline in the army. However, in the initial statistical treatment of the data on anxiety, all persons showing anxiety are grouped

together in the following discussion, whether or not they directed their hostility toward an outgroup.

In studying the impact of anxiety on intolerance, it must be realized that although anxiety can be viewed as a psychological phenomenon, and as such is not directly related to events in the outside world, there are degrees of reasonableness in fear. Obviously a person whose position, experience, and special job-training make him relatively indispensable will have less reason to be anxious about a slight recession than a person without such security on the job. Therefore, an attempt to establish an unqualified association between intolerance and a fearful anticipation of what the future might have in store would have been erroneous. Persons who have valid reasons to be uneasy about the future, and who express such uneasiness freely, possess a different personality structure, and their apprehension is different in character, from those who are anxious about their future without valid reasons. Failure to discriminate between the two groups might have distorted the true picture of an association between anxiety and intolerance. The problem therefore arose of separating these groups, as it was possible to separate them in determining the actual deprivation they experienced in the army and their own evaluation of it (combat versus noncombat, wounded versus nonwounded men). The man who carefully evaluates his future and then correctly estimates it as bad is basically different from the man who is apprehensive without good reason.

Within the structure of this study it was relatively difficult to establish a reliable basis for evaluating how realistic a man's anticipation of his own future was. Therefore this was gauged by indirect methods. By asking the veteran to estimate future events, he was forced to base his answer on feelings of what the future had in store for everybody, rather than himself alone. In this way, his answers reflected his own feelings of optimism or pessimism rather than an evaluation of his personal life expectations. Such methods, moreover, had one great advantage—they eliminated to some degree the previously mentioned difficulty of isolating the person who is anxious about his future but finds it threatening because of his own shortcomings.

Questions about unemployment proved useful in learning about these anxieties. The depressive person who expected to experience failure because of his own incompetence was likely to begin with: "It won't be so bad, but as for me. . . ."

On the other hand, the person who tended to blame his failures on others rather than on himself was most likely to accept his fate not as

something personal, for which he would have to carry responsibility, but as the common fate of his group. Such a man usually predicted that things would be "terrible for all."

Rather than attempt the impossible, namely to examine degrees of anxiety in all the major areas in which male adults must function (including their sexual role as husbands, their emotional tasks as fathers, or their economic duty to provide) as well as their fears about their health, or political change, it was preferred to make a careful analysis of the veterans' expectations in a few areas, particularly in economic and political matters where it was possible to infer the presence of underlying apprehensions.

For each man a discharge from the army meant facing anew the economic problems of civilian life. Before detailed questions were asked about specific insecurities and apprehensions, an effort was made to gauge a man's general level of optimism. During the initial portion of the interview, for example, the veterans were asked how they thought "things in general" would turn out.

The expression of optimism, regardless of the veteran's definition of "things in general," was *significantly* associated with tolerance toward Jews, as can be seen from Table 1(VI).

TABLE 1(VI)

OPTIMISM

	Tolerant		All Anti-Semites	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Optimism	27	44	23	26
Pessimism	20	33	45	51
Other (including don't know)	14	23	21	23
Total	61		89	

This general question was followed by a number of related questions, one of which referred specifically to veterans. "Now that the veterans are back," they were asked, "how do you think they are going to get along?" This question allowed the veteran to project his own personal views on to the veteran public at large. The subjects who reported that veterans are (will be) getting along well, or very well, tended to be *significantly*

more tolerant toward Jews than intolerant. Those who reported that the veterans are (will be) getting along badly or very dissatisfied, were more intolerant than tolerant (see Appendix Table A(12)).

The similarity of reaction to these quite similar questions speaks for the reliability of the instrument. Posing the question was also in line with the conversational character of the interview and led on to a discussion of specific complaints and circumstances interfering with the welfare of veterans. No correlation was found between intolerance and specific gripes such as the lack of housing and decent paying jobs, or difficulties in getting former jobs back.

While general feelings of optimism or pessimism—and their relation to intolerance—could be studied from the reactions to these questions, they permitted no estimates of the reasonableness of the men's expectations. A more specific study of attitudes underlying optimism and pessimism was made on the basis of reactions to the government program for veterans, in particular the G. I. Bill of Rights. Responses to questions about the bill revealed a tendency among some veterans to feel both cheated and deprived because "not enough is being done for the veteran," and also a tendency to fear the future, where the men felt that the Bill provided inadequate assistance. The government aid program was available to all veterans on an equal basis. Therefore to criticize it as inadequate indicated either a feeling of deprivation (not receiving enough) or fearful anticipation (not being provided for in the future), or both. The belief that enough was being done for the veterans was *significantly* related to tolerance toward the Jews. The reversed pattern was encountered among the outspoken and intense anti-Semites (see Table 2(VI) below).

TABLE 2(VI)

"DO YOU THINK ENOUGH IS BEING DONE FOR THE VETERANS NOW?"

	Tolerant		Stereotyped		Outspoken and Intense		Total	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Enough	36	59	16	38	12	26	64	43
Not enough	16	26	17	41	27	58	60	40
Other	7	12	6	14	5	10	18	12
Don't know	2	3	3	7	3	6	8	5
Total	61		42		47		150	

In spite of the foregoing it would be incorrect to evaluate reactions to the government aid program without considering the realities of the veteran's life situation. Certain provisions of the program added to the earning power and well-being of men who were well able to support themselves and their families without such aid. They were relatively less satisfactory for men without means of livelihood who had also to care for dependents. Therefore reactions to the bill had also to be analyzed in terms of the man's economic status.

Statements about the adequacy of the veterans' program were compared with the veterans' actual income at the time of the interview and the two were found to be entirely unrelated. The following table shows that in all income groups the men were evenly divided in their opinions.

TABLE 3(VI)

"DO YOU THINK ENOUGH IS BEING DONE FOR THE VETERANS NOW?"

Income at Time of Interview	Number	
	Yes	No
Up to \$3,000	39	40
Over \$3,000	14	12
Unemployed	3	4
Student	5	3
Total	61	59

Thus while anti-Semitism was associated with the feeling of deprivation (that not enough was being done) this feeling was *not* related to current income level and the higher degree of security and comfort which higher income levels imply.

Intolerant men who feared that veterans would find it hard to get along tended to mix their personal difficulties with their estimates of the situation in general. Usually, their remarks elaborated in great detail the many sources of difficulty which they claimed were beyond the control of the individual veteran. For example, a veteran who was intensely hostile to Jews and Negroes declared:

"There's little prosperity today. On the whole veterans won't get along too good. They're running into the housing shortage, lack of funds, poor physical health, and difficulty in free enterprise. He isn't able to advance himself. He's hampered by people refusing to help him. If he tries to get into business—look at the cab company. If he wants to open a tavern he can't get a license. They

say they give him seniority, but they don't. If a man's been with a company for four years while the veteran was at war, he gets more money than the veterans. The company doesn't give the veteran seniority because he doesn't want to hurt the man who's been with him for these four years. The disabled veteran can't get hospitalization. There's a lack of sufficient hospitals. He can't get a physical checkup until his claim is settled. I was turned down at Hines (the local veteran's hospital). I filed my claim six months and haven't heard from it yet."

Complaints of intolerant veterans who felt that not enough was being done for them were frequently characterized by a sense of being cheated or defrauded through no fault of their own:

"They're just putting up a big front and it's colorful on paper only. They're doing a few good things for the veteran but they're certainly not living up to what they said they would do. They should have jobs with a pay scale according to ability. The employers aren't giving credit for what the veteran learned in the service. They won't hire if the veteran hasn't had civilian experience and the veteran doesn't get a chance to prove his ability. They should also do something about living costs and housing."

By contrast, tolerant men who thought veterans were getting along well, gave responses which were usually less personalized and they revealed a willingness and ability to make more objective estimates of the situation as a whole. For example, one tolerant man felt that veterans fared "very well," and added:

"Most have seen enough of travel and are willing to settle down. It may take a little while for them to settle down. They appreciate home. It may take a little while for them to tone down. They may be nervous for six months to a year, but he'll be better than if he'd never been overseas. They've seen enough of the rest of the world to appreciate this country. England and France haven't a thing compared to this country."

Another tolerant man said:

"The majority are doing fine. Most of them are glad to get home, settle down, marry and have families. Ultimately, they'll reach the objective."

The responses of tolerant men tended to emphasize, or at least to recognize, the possibilities for individual initiative in availing themselves of governmental aid; they appeared more self-reliant in this respect. Two typical examples were:

"It seems like it (that enough is being done for the veteran). The state's trying to put through a bonus and there's all kinds of schooling if the veteran wants to take advantage of it."

"They've given them most every opportunity. The Employment Service gives them preference on jobs and they've encouraged the G. I.'s to continue their education under the G. I. Bill."

FEAR OF UNEMPLOYMENT

In discussing whether they had had a good or bad break in the army, or whether the V.A. program was adequate, the men were talking about matters on which they had reasonably adequate evidence for forming a judgment. When speaking of how things were likely to turn out, they had to speculate about what the future held in store for them and such speculation was strongly colored by their personal outlook on life. In terms of the characteristics of the sample, the economic well-being of most of the men would depend on their ability to secure employment. Therefore, in order to secure data on the relationship between intolerance and feelings of personal insecurity, the interviewees' fears about being unemployed were investigated. Anxiety about their economic future was not fully revealed in response to any one single question. Statements indicating fear of unemployment, or the conviction that, come what may, a man would always be able to make a living, appeared not only on direct question, but also in response to such questions as whether enough was being done for the veterans, or who should be given priority on the job. It was necessary to analyze an entire section of the interview in order to secure adequate data on apprehensions about unemployment. Table 4(VI) presents the conclusions of two independent analysts, who classi-

TABLE 4(VI)

APPREHENSION ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT

	Tolerant		Stereotyped		Outspoken and Intense		Total	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Low apprehension	17	28	5	12	4	9	26	17
Moderate apprehension	29	47	22	52	25	53	76	51
Great apprehension	15	25	15	36	18	38	48	32
Total	61		42		47		150	

fied this portion of the interview into three categories of high, moderate, and low apprehension about unemployment.¹ Examination of the table reveals a *significant* relationship between economic apprehensions and intolerance.

One-half of the sample showed an attitude of moderate apprehension, which was about equidistant from exaggerated fear and uncritical optimism. This attitude may be considered a "normal" evaluation of the chances for unemployment as they existed at the time of the interviews. This attitude was characteristic for approximately the same group which accepted army life matter-of-factly, without either enjoying the experience or being overcritical about it. Thus, again, the same percentage took a more or less matter-of-fact attitude on a central economic problem of our society.² That half of the sample expressed moderate apprehension about the future at the time of the interview has other important implications for an understanding of intolerance.

Table 4(VI) also shows that only the low apprehension group was considerably more tolerant. The middle group and the very apprehensive group displayed a similar pattern as regarded tolerant, stereotyped and outspoken attitudes toward the Jews. Still, a fourth of the men who had great apprehension about their future were, nevertheless, tolerant. Thus, although there was an association between apprehension and intolerance, there was little basis for believing that a high degree of apprehension was characteristic of a high degree of intolerance. If one dared to predict on the basis of these data, one might say that any shift from low to even moderate apprehension would be likely to increase the frequency and intensity of anti-Semitic feelings, while a shift from moderate to great apprehension might produce less marked consequences in this respect, provided the degree of apprehension did not become extreme—our data permitted no generalizations on the possible consequences of extreme apprehension.

Since the fear of unemployment is, among other factors, a consequence of feeling unable to protect oneself against it, the veterans were questioned as to how well they felt able to cope with the problem of future unemployment. More than 40 per cent indicated that they had no resources with which to meet a depression. The few persons who claimed they need not fear a depression (22 per cent) were those who stressed

¹ The percentage error in classifying these data, as reported above, was 8.0 per cent.

² In terms of an ideal statistical distribution, it is significant that the curve, although normal in the middle area where half of the sample was located, was so obviously overweighted with respect to great apprehension. There, twice as many men were found as in the low apprehension group, indicating an imbalance toward fear.

that their current jobs were ones which offered security even in bad times. In the main, these were civil servants and public utility workers. Within this group the tolerant, stereotyped, and outspoken anti-Semites were evenly distributed. Apparently such "job security" had no direct effect on the degree of intolerance. Less than 5 per cent mentioned financial resources. Compared with such external security, only less than 5 per cent mentioned personal skill and social qualifications—the traditional bases for success and security in the United States.

By contrast, tolerant men who felt secure (low apprehension about unemployment) made relatively frequent reference to the fact that they were part of a family group which was so well knit that each member could rely on the support of the others.

"There are three of us working in my family. I don't think all of us would be out of work at one time. My sister works at the telephone company, and she works on pensions and if there were unemployment they would still have to have someone working in pensions. My other sister works in a hospital and she certainly wouldn't lose her job. People are always sick. I don't think it would hurt us very much."

In view of the fact that tendencies to react violently to frustrating experiences are by no means restricted to ethnic hostility, it may be mentioned that five of the seven men who predicted resort to violence in the event of another depression were also strongly intolerant toward Jews. All of them were also strongly intolerant of Negroes as well. A few examples may illustrate predictions of violence in the event of a depression. The last of them was most explosive and also provides an example of how violence in ethnic relations was spontaneously mentioned in response to the seemingly unrelated question of possible unemployment during a depression.

"The next depression will be pretty bad because you have a lot more children than you had in the last one, and a lot of these soldiers have been taught to use a gun and they'll use it. You know yourself, you're not going to see your children starve."

"My family will eat, and I will. I don't know how but I'll get it. I'm a believer in self-preservation."

"We'd better not have it. Chicago'll blow wide open. On South Park the niggers are gettin' so smart. We'll have a race riot that'll make Detroit look like a Sunday School picnic. So many are bitter about the part the Negro played in the war. They got all the soft jobs—in the quartermasters, engineers. They're no good for anything else. The white got his ass shot off. They're pretty bitter. If both whites and niggers get laid off, that'll be bad. I'm gonna eat. I know how to use a gun."

It was to be expected that recollections of the last depression would lead to fears about future depression, unemployment, and deprivation. Many answers indicated that the impact of the last depression was still keenly felt. Only seven veterans stated that they had no recollection of it because they had been too young. Only a fourth said that their families got along pretty well, while approximately 40 per cent stated that they and their families had suffered to some degree. The rest (nearly a third) said they had suffered very much.

When the men's recollections were classified on the basis of their anti-Semitic attitudes a *significant* difference in degree of intolerance was revealed as between those who claimed to have suffered to some degree and those who said that they got along pretty well (Table 5(VI) below). Those who got along well were the most tolerant.

Thus the individual's evaluation of his economic past and of his economic future were both shown to be statistically related to his inter-ethnic attitudes. Thus too, it seemed that the tendency to view things optimistically or pessimistically was more a function of the individual's personality—as was the degree of his intolerance—than of any particular

TABLE 5(VI)
RECOLLECTIONS OF THE DEPRESSION

	Tolerant		All Anti-Semites		Total	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Suffered to some degree	38	64	69	82	107	75
Got along pretty well	21	36	15	18	36	25
Total	59		84		143	

past experience. Further confirmation was found in the fact that the tendency to recollect the last depression as having been deprivational was associated to some degree³ with fear of unemployment in the future. However, it should be noted that this association was by no means as marked as the association between either form of pessimistic evaluation and anti-Semitism. In some measure it was to be expected that the link established between intolerance and subjective feelings of deprivation during the war would also hold true for recollections of the last depression.

³ Significant at the 0.06 level.

Typical of the responses of intolerant veterans recollecting deprivations during the last depression were the following:

"Very bad, hit us right between the eyes. It got so bad that we had to apply for relief until my brother and I were old enough to go to work. I had to go to sea for six months, because I wasn't old enough to work, and then came back and started working. That's why I didn't get to finish high school."

"Well, my old man worked until 1930. I was about ten or eleven when things got really bad, and the humiliations and insults are hard to take. I've seen so many of these relief workers they make you antisocial. This one bitch, a Polack, wanted to slap me on W.P.A. I got fired for nonsupport, so I got a private job at \$15.00 a week and that was pretty good. My family had to send me to live with another family because they couldn't afford to have me live with them."

Almost every member of our society is at least occasionally subject to feelings of uneasiness about his economic future. The men in the sample seemed particularly exposed to economic set-backs such as unemployment. The association between apprehension about unemployment and intolerance has already been established. The next question to be investigated was why the tolerant men were less fearful of unemployment and what gave them the security to look to the future with relative calm.

During the last depression, the assurance of at least the bare necessities of life depended, for many people, either directly or indirectly on governmental or other forms of public support. Since then, social security legislation has broadened that minimal basis still further. Moreover, the lessons of the last depression have not been forgotten and the nation is more prepared to combat a depression—particularly in its deprivational consequences for the individual. None of the men doubted that the government would have to supply relief in the event of large scale unemployment. Most of them were convinced that the machinery of unemployment compensation, works programs and so on would be more adequate than in the last depression. They were also more or less convinced that, as they put it, they "wouldn't starve." Why, then, were the majority of the intolerant men fearful in anticipation of future depressions, and the majority of the tolerant men much more secure in this respect? It may well have been that only those men could find security in the conviction that governmental help would be forthcoming, who were not only convinced they would get relief when they needed it but also felt themselves part of that large social community, the nation.

The history of the German republic provides some confirmation of this hypothesis. After the first World War, the socialistic and democratic

parties instituted a social security program. When large scale unemployment set in, unemployment relief aroused little resentment at first and then, only because it was inadequate. In general, it was accepted as a source of relative security, and was not regarded as a stigma on the individual. As a matter of fact, many workers took pride in the program as something they had fought for which was now helping the entire community. Moreover, it was administered by agencies of what those on relief still considered "their" government. At the same time, it was even then regarded as degrading by the small nondemocratic minority of workers who hated the government and who felt it degrading to accept money from a regime which stood for everything they detested. Similar reasons accounted for the hatred of the conservative officers' caste for the democratic government which nevertheless provided them with jobs and pensions. In terms of their caste mores, they felt it particularly degrading to have to accept money from persons and parties whom they despised. The fate of the German republic might have been different if these conservative circles had considered the democratic government "their" government and could therefore have been able to accept pensions without feeling degraded, or guilty for accepting money from a government against the very existence of which they conspired.

When German party coalitions changed and the conservative element held the balance of power, the attitude of nearly all recipients of unemployment relief seemed to change with it. Accepting relief from a hated government which was opposed to the relief program and distributed benefits only unwillingly no longer provided security but only a livelihood—if that—and added to the feeling of deprivation.

It might be assumed that those who feel part of the government can derive emotional security from being an integral part of it, while those who feel themselves outsiders, rejecting or feeling rejected by the government, will feel even more insecure just because of these factors.

The following analysis of political attitudes investigates the data assembled in this study on the validity of the proposition that economic security (and therefore intolerance) is related to a feeling of political identification with the nation.

POLITICAL ATTITUDES

It was of prime interest to learn whether the men felt that they had a real stake in the nation as a whole, whether they felt part of it, and how such feelings related to intolerance. How did the individual view our

political system? Did he feel overpowered by the system in general and the existing party system in particular? Did he believe that he as an individual could look toward political action in general, and his own in particular, as means which would help him to achieve his personal goals?

A study of political attitudes with objectives such as those of this investigation could not assume the veteran's ability or inclination to verbalize an explicit system of political opinions. Even the absence of such an articulate system of political opinions and values could hardly be accepted as evidence that they were nonexistent and that the individual was politically disinterested, or that he did not feel that politics affected him. The high percentage of "don't know" responses to political questions on many opinion polls is misleading in this respect. They may reveal something about the individual's attitudes toward existing parties and the limited alternatives they offer at the moment, but they prove little about the personal political opinions of the subject. There are many people who do not seem to view political problems merely as alternative collective actions with which the individual may or may not concur. A "political problem" frequently centers around an individual's personal concerns and the way in which collective action would affect himself, his income and his family. Therefore, in dealing with political problems, questions were asked which would encourage the men to state their political views as if they were dealing with personal problems. It was left to them to decide whether they wished to conceive of a problem, so introduced, as one which required personal action on their own part, or collective and political action on the part of a group.

Probing for the men's conception of positive goals in national affairs was revealing only in so far as it showed that most veterans had given little thought to such problems. In response to such questions as "What do you think can be done to insure a decent life for us?" there was a marked absence of positive recommendations; almost nothing was evoked save criticism of existing conditions. The men were much more articulate about the obstacles which, in all likelihood, would prevent them from achieving their own individual ends. Then they repeated their gripes, but in more specific and elaborate form. The question which introduced this discussion was: "What will interfere with our having a decent life?"

The majority of the answers tended to be concerned with personal problems of an immediate economic character. Fear of inflation was mentioned most frequently, that is by almost a fourth of the group (24 per cent). Next most frequently came complaints about the greediness of people (21 per cent). It should be mentioned that at the time of

the interview most men found themselves buyers in a seller's market. Moreover, the two things many of them needed most, dwelling quarters and a car, were accessible only by catering to a group of people of whom many were profiteering. This may explain why greediness was so high up on the list. Disgust with politicians and political parties was also quite high (19 per cent), but again local conditions may have exercised some influence. Dissatisfaction with the local Kelly-Nash (Democratic) machine, which had dominated the city for many years, was widespread, and its deficiencies were well advertised. There was also considerable dissatisfaction with the Republican state government. Compared with these dissatisfactions, the conviction that another war would interfere with the enjoyment of life was not frequently mentioned (13 per cent), although another 10 per cent decried our too international foreign policy which might involve us in another war. Thirteen per cent mentioned big business and monopolies. In view of the widespread fear of unemployment, which emerged later in the interview, it should be noted that depression and unemployment were spontaneously mentioned by only 9 per cent of the group as factors which were likely to interfere with the prospect of a decent life.

The selection of a particular obstacle as interfering with a decent life bore no correlation to tolerance or intolerance toward Jews.

None of these dissatisfactions seemed to reveal underlying attitudes. They seemed to be repetitions of current slogans, although each man emphasized different gripes. Reflective of what seemed more persistent attitudes were answers to the question: "Do you think that what the government has been doing these days is affecting the liberties of the ordinary people?" A third of the veterans thought that their liberties were impaired by governmental interference. They were *significantly* more tolerant than those who felt either that government action was not affecting their liberties, or that it was necessary or helpful.

Attitudes toward governmental actions which might be characterized as interfering with the liberties of the ordinary people may, in parts, have been influenced by the men's attitudes toward the party in power. In order to be certain that the relationship between tolerance and identification with the nation was not due to an equation of the government in power with the nation as a whole, another measure was employed to gauge acceptance of the existing political system. A man might violently reject the party in power and still feel himself identified with the nation's political institutions, if he assumed for instance, that at some future date his party would be able to exercise an important influence on the state.

TABLE 6(VI)

"DO YOU THINK THAT WHAT THE GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN DOING THESE DAYS IS AFFECTING THE LIBERTIES OF THE ORDINARY PEOPLE?"^a

	Tolerant		Stereotyped		Outspoken and Intense		Total	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Gov. is affecting liberties	20	33	14	33	22	47	56	37
Gov. is not affecting liberties to any great extent	24	39	12	29	15	32	51	34
These restrictions are necessary; are helpful	11	18	11	26	3	6	25	17
Some Americans have too much freedom	0	0	1	2	1	2	2	1
Don't know	6	10	4	10	6	13	16	11
Total	61		42		47		150	

^a The level of significance in this table is .05.

TABLE 7(VI)

ATTITUDE TOWARD PARTIES IN GENERAL

	Tolerant		Stereotyped		Outspoken and Intense		Total	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Rejected the major political parties	17	28	14	33	22	47	53	35
Accepted major political parties	24	39	10	24	14	30	48	32
No opinion or indeterminate	20	33	18	43	11	23	49	33
Total	61		42		47		150	

Thus another estimate of a person's identification with our political system, and hence the nation, could be found in his acceptance or rejection of the party system which characterizes the political life of this nation.

In Chapter IV it was reported that no significant association was encountered between intolerance and nominal political party affiliation. Table 7(VI) above shows that a *significant* relationship exists between ethnic intolerance and attitudes toward the existing major political parties in general. Those veterans who rejected or condemned the political party system, regardless of whether they declared in favor of one of the two major parties or claimed to vote for it, were *significantly* more intolerant than those who accepted or approved of political parties as they were currently set up.⁴

Despite this rejection of the two major parties and of the existing political system, there emerged no tendency on the part of the intolerant veteran to display a sense of genuine individualism. The contrary, in fact, appeared to be true. Among the men who rejected the existing political party system were those who threatened violent action in the event of serious economic difficulties. They expressed a desire for action which could be characterized as explosive and chaotic, but without stable direction. Nevertheless, these men did not conceive of their actions as leading to a change in the structure of society.

The absence of any sense of genuine individualism emerged most clearly from the responses to the question of who should be the agent to take action in their behalf. The particular suggestions as to what should be done to assist the veteran in adjusting to civilian life were closely connected with specific gripes. Of those who had specific suggestions to make, more than 40 per cent designated the government as the proper agent to implement them. The veterans themselves were mentioned by only 9 per cent of the group, while another 5 per cent invoked the symbol of "the people."

The selection of the agent who should undertake the reforms or provide the assistance suggested by the veteran was *significantly* related to their depth of intolerance. The intolerant group (whose tendency to reject the existing political system and to think government interfered too much was mentioned above) was most prone to call upon the government to aid the veterans. Fifty-eight per cent of the outspoken and intense anti-Semites thought the government should take care of the

⁴ The analytical categories of acceptance, rejection, or indeterminate were applied to the entire section of the interview dealing with political parties, since no single question was adequate.

veterans, or should at least assist them considerably more than it was doing. Only 38 per cent of the tolerant men expressed similar views. While such demands may seem reasonable for the tolerant veterans, whose tendency to accept the existing political system has been established, it certainly reveals an apparent contradiction in attitudes among the intolerant group. This may be exemplified by the statements of two intensely anti-Semitic men.

One of them made disparaging statements about both political parties throughout the interview. He could not "see either one of them in power." His notion of the working of the two-party system was confused, and his hatred for both parties was so great, that he felt "we should have a split ticket and let them fight it out. We shouldn't have more than half of each in power." He was very critical of governmental efforts in behalf of the veterans; as a matter of fact, he was most critical of anything the government did, or might do. Nevertheless when asked who should provide the abundant assistance for the veterans which he considered the required minimum, he answered: "The War Department, since it put him (the veteran) in the position he's in."

The other man was also highly dissatisfied with both parties, and felt that aid to veterans was a far cry from being adequate. But when asked who should better things, he replied: "The veterans will never do anything for themselves. The government will give them the benefits coming to them."

Thus, while many tolerant men felt either that enough was being done for them and thus approved of governmental actions in their behalf (or felt able to take care of themselves without added assistance), the intolerant men tended to reject the political system on which the government rested but to call on it for the help which they felt otherwise unable to secure. It should not be overlooked that statements such as those quoted above, which were quite characteristic for men who rejected the government, nevertheless showed a certain expectation that the government would "give them the benefits coming to them."

Some insight into this attitude may be found in the collective findings of this study on tendencies which prevailed among the intolerant group: They rejected the government, they felt that not enough was being done for the veteran, they were apprehensive about their economic future, and they showed a lack of identification with national symbols. It seems altogether likely that these attributes were closely connected with one another in the intolerant men's personalities. Perhaps their feelings that not enough was being done for them originated in their insecurity about

governmental help, which was due in turn to their rejection of the existing political system which again therefore, could not provide them with a feeling of security. Perhaps, on the other hand, those who felt that ours is a workable system of government and a true provider for the needs of the people, derived considerable comfort from the conviction that the government would fulfill its role in providing at least a minimum standard of living.

If this analysis were valid, then the reason for the intolerant men's inability to find security in the thought that the nation would carry the burden for their well-being in times of need may well have been psychological rather than economic. Why did the intolerant men's conviction that they would be cared for by the government to some degree fail to provide them with security? Very possibly the prospect of receiving economic help from that large family, the nation, offered security only to those who felt themselves emotionally part of the social community. To those who rejected their community and its representation, the government, accepting help took on a degrading character. Such help, therefore, could offer only physical comfort but not emotional security, for that requires the feeling that one's self-respect, if not one's status, be protected. By contrast, it should be recalled that some tolerant men found security as regarded their future in the fact that they could rely on receiving help from other members of their family.

This hypothesis found support in clinical observations of persons who had fallen out with their families, who rejected their relatives and felt rejected by them. When in need, the majority of them would accept help from the hated members of the family. But little security was derived from such help because it was detrimental to their self-respect. They looked forward to receiving it as just one more emotional (though not economic) deprivation which was being forced upon them.

Yet in spite of the foregoing, anxiety cannot be inferred solely from a man's economic apprehension and his estimate of governmental assistance in that regard. In the modern world—torn by national rivalries and the actuality of their eruptions—the individual's reactions to the threat of war are also a measure of his anxiety. Economic security is by no means the only protection which a well-functioning government provides for the people. The government is also looked upon as a securer of external and internal peace. If the previous assumptions were valid, it was to be expected that those tolerant men who showed their tendency to accept the government would derive relative security from the thought that it would also be able to fulfill its protective functions. On the other

hand, men who rejected the government would feel insecure about the government's ability to provide security in these respects.

Intolerant men did in fact reveal a tendency to feel threatened by future events which were in many ways related to security. Such feelings were often coupled with feelings of despair about the chance of altering the course of events. Feelings of political inevitability and vague anxiety about the future characterized the intolerant veterans.

Opinion on the chances for a long peace, for example, was divided about evenly among those who thought the chances were good, those who thought they were poor, and those who thought it depended on circumstances. Those who felt the chances were good were *significantly* more tolerant than those who felt they were poor (Table 8(VI)).

TABLE 8(VI)

"WHAT DO YOU THINK ARE THE CHANCES FOR A LONG PEACE?"

	Tolerant		Stereotyped		Outspoken and Intense		Total	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Good	23	38	15	36	11	23	49	33
Poor, slim	19	31	10	24	20	43	49	33
Depends	19	31	17	40	16	34	52	34
Total	61		42		47		150	

The relation between intolerance and a general inclination to feel threatened was also encountered in other respects. For example, when asked, "Do you think there are any threats to peace inside the country?" about 40 per cent of the sample declared, in effect, "There aren't any at the moment." This response, was found to be *significantly* concentrated among those veterans who had the least amount of intolerance. The number of responses were too small to differentiate statistically among other frequently employed symbols of threat on the part of the intolerant veterans. The latter tended to refer to labor disputes, foreign diplomats, and "spies." Ten veterans mentioned race riots or racial problems, and eight of them were either outspokenly or intensely intolerant.

The most frequently attributed threat coming from outside the United States was Russia (59 per cent). The next most frequently alleged was England (10 per cent); while only a small minority (16 per cent) felt secure enough to declare that there were no external threats to the

United States. When these responses were classified by anti-Semitic attitudes, there was a tendency—although not statistically significant—for Russia to be labeled as a threat more often by the intolerant veterans.

As an index of the individual's attitude toward politics, the veterans' use of the symbol "common man" when referring to themselves in the context of political problems was tabulated and analyzed. The contextual use of the phrase leaves little doubt as to what meaning it implied for the individual, or what purpose it served him. It was an expression of his rejection of personal involvement in politics. It bore none of the equality or self-assertiveness associated with earlier democratic ideology. On the contrary, it represented an inability to cope with politics as well as a lack of personal self-reliance. It gave expression to the individual's desire to abandon political decisions to other men and may well have been expressive of feelings of inferiority.

TABLE 9(VI)
REFERENCE TO THE COMMON MAN

	Tolerant		Stereotyped		Outspoken and Intense		Total	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
References to the common man	19	31	16	38	25	53	60	40
Absence of such symbols	42	69	26	62	22	47	90	60
Total	61		42		47		150	

The use of this symbol⁵ was *significantly* related to the expression of ethnic intolerance (see Table 9(VI)). Of the sixty veterans who made use of the phrase, about one-half made repeated use of it. Not only was intolerance related to use of the symbol, but there also appeared to be a rough association between the *amount* of intolerance and the frequency of using this stereotype. This was particularly the case among those who employed the phrase more than four times in the course of the interview. Thus ethnic intolerance was found to be positively associated with this symbol of personal and political insecurity.

⁵ The symbol "common man" was defined to include "little man" and "ordinary man."