

CHAPTER VII

TOLERANCE: A FUNCTION OF CONTROL

The significance of anxiety as a factor contributing to ethnic hostility has been demonstrated in the previous chapter. It would be incomplete, however, merely to predicate that experiences which produce anxiety in the individual will necessarily contribute to overt hostility—either ethnic or otherwise. The fact that individuals experience anxiety without manifesting hostility in their actions, as well as the fact that they may behave aggressively without being intolerant in ethnic matters, shows that the relationship between ethnic intolerance and anxiety needs further elaboration. In terms of dynamic psychology, anxiety is experienced when the organism is flooded with excitation which cannot be mastered or manipulated. Vernacular speech has long recognized the relationship between explosive or hostile discharge and the inability to master emotions, by describing a person as having “lost control” of himself. Control, or more technically speaking, the ability to store tension internally, or to discharge it in socially constructive action rather than unwarranted hostile action, thus becomes a central problem in the study of intolerance.

Each individual who is not plainly psychotic is able to exercise some control over his discharge of tension. The predominant mechanisms of control which a person uses for dealing with inner tensions are among the most important elements characterizing his personality. Each of these mechanisms is more or less adequate for containing a particular type of aggression generated in the individual by anxiety. These controls or restraints remain adequate only if the level of tension does not become overpowering and thereby create unmasterable anxiety. At some level, for each individual, tension becomes disruptive of whatever controls the individual has learned to develop.

The problem which confronts the student of intolerance is not one of a total or long term (psychotic) breakdown of controls. Temporary breakdowns of control, including panic, such as may occur in race riots or other explosive outbursts of violence, are of major importance in the analysis of intolerance, but these remained outside the scope of this

study. Hitler's anti-Semitism, for example, was so devastating because—although irrational in origin as is all interethnic hostility—it was controlled enough to permit an effective anti-Semitic policy to be carried out step by step rather than in one big explosive action.¹

On the contrary, it may be said that interethnic hostility is a symptom of the individual's effort to maintain balance in his psychic economy by discharging tension through the channel of ethnic intolerance. Obviously, excess tension can be readily discharged when socially acceptable channels for such discharge are available. When no such channels are available, the capacity to discharge tension aggressively depends on the structure of individual controls opposing such asocial behavior. The problem which presents itself is thus at least twofold: (1) Why are some persons subject to controls strong enough to prevent them from discharging tension aggressively against outsiders; (2) Why, of all available channels, do other persons find it most expedient to discharge tension in interethnic hostility.

The foregoing chapter has established the positive relation between degree of intolerance and intensity of apprehension; in this chapter an effort is made to analyze the relationship between controls and intolerance.

The source of the individual's control lies in the impact which societal authority makes on his developing personality. The strength of his controls rests on the success he achieves in integrating these requirements into his personality. Clinical observations suggest the manner in which early childhood experiences determine the patterns by which the individual incorporates the demands of society. Short of the psychoanalytical investigation of every individual, it would have been impossible to reconstruct this process for each member of the sample. Nevertheless, and in terms of this study, an effort was made to isolate a number of important authority constellations in the lives of the subjects and to evaluate the individual's reactions to these institutions as a measure of the adequacy of his controls. This made it possible to examine the relationship between the individual's controls and his manifestations of ethnic intolerance.

At this point it should be stated that the *acceptance* of an authority in the shaping of which the individual exercises a relatively high degree of autonomy, (such as when changing party affiliation on purely ration-

¹Dr. Kelley, in his psychiatric study of the twenty-two main defendants at the Nuremberg trials, all of whom were anti-Semites, found only one of them to be psychotic in the clinical sense of the term. (Kelley, Douglas McG.: *22 Cells in Nuremberg*, London, W. H. Allen, 1947.)

alistic grounds), is radically different from *submission* to authority. As varied as religious and political institutions are and as varied as the men's reactions to them were, most of the men viewed them as relatively immutable. Only a very small minority felt that they could influence existing political parties to any extent or that their vote would make much difference. Although some men felt that they could protect themselves against the impact of another depression, none believed that their efforts (either alone or combined) could prevent its arrival. Political and economic systems, in themselves, seemed to them overpowering.

Because religious attitudes and religion as an institution have been more thoroughly analyzed, in dynamic terms, religion may serve as a prototype of an institution, the acceptance of or submission to which was to be related to tolerance. It may be said that unquestioning acceptance of religious values as taught by minister or priest indicates that the individual, in exercising restraint, tends to rely on a type of control in which conscious attitudes and actions are controlled by traditional and nonrational external forces. In contrast to such relatively external control, is a control exercised neither by minister nor priest but originating within the person although such inner control may originally have been achieved through their teachings. If the moral teachings of the church are accepted by the individual, not through fear of damnation or of societal disapproval, but because he considers them absolute standards of behavior independent of external threats or approval, then we say that the individual has internalized these moral precepts. They have become an internal control, but a control which is still only partially conscious and only partly rational. Such control is exercised over the individual by his "conscience," or, technically speaking, by his superego.

Markedly different from *external* control through outside institutions and from *superego* control which also depends for its effectiveness on props in the external world (such as parental images or institutionalized religion) is the rational control of irrational tendencies which forces them into consciousness and then deals with them along purely rational lines. The latter may be termed *ego* control. In actuality, the three types of control are nearly always coexistent, and in each individual case, control will depend in varying degrees on all three—external, superego, and ego control.

Therefore, it will not suffice to investigate the association between control and tolerance in general; it is equally necessary to discriminate between tolerance as related to external control, superego control, and to ego control over hostile tendencies.

Partial evidence of the relation between authority symbols and tolerance has been presented in the analysis of religious attitudes which indicated that veterans who had persistent religious convictions tended to be more tolerant. If the political party system is viewed as a norm-setting institution, then a similar relationship of at least partial acceptance or consensus with this basic institution was found to be associated with tolerance. Such stability of attitudes signifies an ability to store tensions, because acceptance of these institutions indicates the individual's reliance on them to solve his conflicts or at least to assist him in coping with those conflicts which created the tension. Frequent and sudden changes in attitudes are characteristic of persons who have inadequate control over their instinctual tendencies and who are unable to rely on existing societal institutions for providing stability.

Thus it becomes understandable that greater stability in societal status as well as in religious and political affiliations proved to be correlated with tolerance, since they were all phenomena closely related to the individual's relatively greater control over his instinctual tendencies, controls which were strong enough to prohibit immediate discharge in asocial action. Such delay in the discharge of tension permits its channelization into more socially acceptable outlets.

It was to be expected that attitudes toward symbols of army authority would follow the pattern of attitudes toward other representations of society. Army discipline was the specific representation of control within this particular institution and if tolerance was a function of control, then acceptance of army discipline had also to show a statistically *significant* relation to tolerance. This proved to be the case. About a fifth of the tolerant men thought army discipline was too strict while a third of the outspoken and intensely anti-Semitic men held that opinion. (Table 1(VII)).

Controls, it should be said, are not internalized by merely accepting society. On the contrary, general attitudes of acceptance toward existing society and its institutions are the result of previous internalization of societal values as personally transmitted by parents, teachers, and peers. Hence the acceptance of individuals who are representatives of societal values should be more closely related to internal control than the acceptance of discipline in general, which is more characteristic of external control.

Even an individual whose ego is deprived of adequate powers of control can submit to control; in fact, he often seeks conditions which will

help to protect him from being overpowered by dangerous instinctual or hostile tendencies. He then seeks external discipline or superego control to compensate for the weakness of his ego. Ego strength, on the other hand, is characteristic of the ability to master a task along rationalistic lines. In actuality, this means that the individual is able to come to terms with society and "get along" in it without giving up more of his rights to unique individual existence than is required by society.

TABLE 1(VII)
OPINIONS ABOUT ARMY DISCIPLINE

	Tolerant		Stereotyped		Outspoken and Intense		Total	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Was too strict	14	23	6	14	16	34	36	24
Was not too strict ^a	47	77	36	86	31	66	114	76
Total	61		42		47		150	

^a Includes respondents who declared army discipline was too strict on rare occasions but not generally.

It is the duty of army officers, for instance, to enforce such requirements as orderliness and regularity. This in itself would only constitute external control. But in their power to enforce obedience officers closely resemble parental figures whose actions and examples force the child to develop a superego. The child must internalize parts of the parental requirements in order to get along with them on a long-term basis. The soldier who remained unable to come to some terms with his officers more or less permanently (i.e., by internalizing some of their demands), was unable to behave in a soldierly fashion, except in the presence of officers or M.P.'s. He remained a "bad" soldier, though he may have behaved heroically in battle. Therefore, attitudes toward officers seemed suitable gauges of the individual's attitudes toward control. On the other hand, a democratic army expects an officer to induce soldiers to do their duty not merely by brandishing his punitive powers, but by setting, in the first instance, an individual example. He is indoctrinated to get his men to do their duties out of liking and respect. Most soldiers, in fact, evaluated their officers on exactly this basis of personal quality.

The tolerant veteran seemed able to make the better adjustment and

to maintain better relations with his officers; he was more willing to accept the authority and discipline of the army as represented by its officers. In general, his attitude was one of general reasonableness. When queried as to how the fellows in their outfits got along with the officers, veterans tolerant of Jews were *significantly* more prone to claim they got along well than were the anti-Semites (Table 2(VII)).

TABLE 2(VII)

"HOW DID THE FELLOWS IN YOUR OUTFIT GET ALONG WITH THE OFFICERS?"

	Tolerant		Stereotyped		Outspoken and Intense		Total	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Well	21	34	4	10	11	23	36	24
Some were good, and some were bad	34	56	26	62	27	58	87	59
Bad	6	10	12	28	9	19	27	17
Total	61		42		47		150	

It was assumed that men who claimed the fellows got along well with the officers were most probably projecting their own attitudes onto those of the men in their outfits. It might be argued that in interpreting these data, cognizance must be taken of the objective character of the officers, namely, that some were better than others. However, it is most likely that good and bad officers were randomly distributed. Moreover, the results of the Hawthorne research study of industrial relations,² as well as similar studies, indicate rather conclusively that human judgments about supervisory personnel are not objectively reliable, but reflect the individual's point of view. Therefore, the relation between getting along with officers and tolerance toward minority groups remained significant for this study.

It was not assumed, however, that the acceptance of army discipline is identical with submission to external control or to superego requirements, nor that getting along with the officers as individual human beings is indicative of ego strength. Such a clear-cut relation does not exist. But the data permit another interesting comparison. The two preceding tables

² Mayo, Elton: *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*, Division of Research, Graduate School, Harvard University, Boston, 1933.

show that the same number of intolerant men rejected each type of control, the impersonal discipline and the interpersonal contact with individual officers (twenty-two and twenty-one respectively). The data for the tolerant men, on the other hand, show that in their case a distinction was made between the two types of control. (Fourteen thought the discipline was too strict, but only six got along badly with their officers.) Thus, among tolerant men, there was a greater acceptance of personalized control originating in individual officers than of the distant, immutable control of discipline. In summary, an analysis of the men's attitudes toward army discipline indicated that the individual's ability to deal with institutional demands by self-control or submission is associated with tolerance.

To more fully explore this relationship between tolerance and control, the responses of the individual to symbols of societal authority which signified external control were also studied.

Before that could be done, some relatively precise definitions were needed which would lend themselves to quantitative analysis. In modern society many of the individual's life activities are regulated by a variety of institutions, each of which may command a degree of authority and thus exercise control. A comprehensive index of the individual's relation to institutionalized, external control would have had to be based on his attitudes toward all of them. In this study two groups of institutions were analyzed separately. The first group, that of army control by means of discipline and officers' authority, has already been discussed. The second group is analyzed below. It is composed of significant representatives of civilian authority to which the men were relatively subject at the time of the interview.

The four institutions singled out as being most relevant were: (1) the administration of veterans' affairs; (2) the political party system; (3) the federal government; and (4) the economic system, as defined by the subjects themselves.

The veterans' views of each of these institutions were quite complex, and in some respects, ambivalent. Nevertheless, it was possible to analyze attitudes toward them on a continuum from complete rejection to complete acceptance. To prepare an overall measure of attitudes toward such representatives of external control, each of the statements about these institutions was classified either as acceptance, rejection, or intermediate.

Employing these categories the distribution of acceptance and rejection

of controlling institutions that was encountered is shown in the following table:

TABLE 3(VII)
ATTITUDES TOWARD CONTROLLING INSTITUTIONS

	Tolerant		Stereotyped		Outspoken and Intense		Total	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Acceptance	41	67	20	48	11	23	72	48
Intermediate	15	25	17	40	13	28	45	30
Rejection	5	8	5	12	23	49	33	22
Total	61		42		47		150	

More than three-fourths of the group was at least enough in accord with existing society to accept the control exercised on their lives by some of its societal institutions. Characteristic for the degree of dissensus was that more than a fifth of these men (who were predominantly of the lower middle and lower classes) rejected three or all four of the institutions.

If acceptance or rejection of the four representative institutions is compared with the degree of anti-Semitism, it appears that only an insignificant percentage of the tolerant men rejected them. On the other hand, nearly half of the outspoken and intense anti-Semites fell into the group who rejected these institutions.

Thus the relationship between acceptance of controlling institutions and tolerance was very marked. It was quite revealing to compare the attitudes of the men toward the political party system with their attitudes toward all four institutions of control combined (one of which was the political party system). This comparison is presented in the following table which compares data reported separately in Tables 7(VI) and 3(VII).

Among the outspoken and intense anti-Semites there was no marked difference between attitudes toward the political system alone and the four controlling institutions taken together. The attitudes among stereotyped and tolerant men, however, were markedly different. The more tolerant the men were, the greater was the difference between acceptance of controlling institutions as compared with acceptance of the political party system. A little more than a third of the tolerant men accepted

the party system, but two-thirds of them accepted the four controlling institutions. On the other hand, only a twelfth of the tolerant men rejected the four controlling institutions, but a little more than a fourth of them rejected the political party system.

TABLE 4(VII)
COMPARISON OF ATTITUDES TOWARD POLITICAL PARTIES
AND CONTROLLING INSTITUTIONS

	Tolerant		Stereotyped		Outspoken and Intense	
	%		%		%	
	Party System	% Institutions	Party System	% Institutions	Party System	% Institutions
Acceptance	39	67	24	48	30	23
Intermediate	33	25	43	40	23	28
Rejection	28	8	33	12	47	49

The question might be raised as to why the two-party system,³ which offers the men some choice, was less acceptable than the other institutions which permit no choice at all. It seems that while acceptance of existing institutions in general was positively related to tolerance, acceptance of those institutions which relieved the individual of having to make choices was more related to ethnic tolerance. On the other hand, no such marked difference could be seen in the attitudes of the outspoken and intense anti-Semites; the degree of their rejection did not seem materially influenced by the fact that the party system offered them relatively greater freedom of decision.

Compared with this relationship between acceptance of external and superego controls on the one hand and tolerance on the other, efforts to probe for statistically significant relationships between degree of tolerance and relative ego strength came to naught. Various questions were asked in an effort to determine the degree to which the individual felt able to master those problems of everyday living which confronted him. He was asked, for example, whether he felt he could insure his economic well-being within the existing economic system. The responses to this question have been summarized in Chapter VI, where it was reported that less than 5 per cent of the group felt they could count on their own

³ Almost none of the men were considering anything but a two-party system at the time of the interview.

abilities to protect them in an economic crisis, although another 5 per cent felt that their financial resources provided security. The rest of those who felt secure in their jobs also relied on external factors for their security in this area, such as being in civil service.

Lack of ego strength was further indicated by the men's responses to the problem of insuring a decent life for everybody. When asking about desired social and political action, particular courses of action were deliberately not suggested by the interviewer; instead, the individual was left to volunteer his preferred course of action and was then asked who ought to undertake such action. A similar procedure was applied to the problem of what might interfere with "our having a decent life." In both cases, the absence of references to individual action or to individual participation in group action was striking. Suggestions of group action by others seldom went beyond a reference to the vote, and even when voting as a means of improving conditions was mentioned, it implied no positive action by the individual, such as getting out the vote.

It has been mentioned above that the political party system was the one least accepted when compared with acceptance of other institutions of control. But despite this degree of nonacceptance of the party system, there was no desire to take action. When the men were asked whether they thought the ordinary individual had a chance to influence politics, the vast majority answered "No." These data are reported below in Table 5(VII). They indicate that no significant difference existed between tolerant and intolerant men in their hopelessness about the chance to influence political events.

The marked lack of feelings of competence in mastering anything but the most private events of one's life, as well as the tolerant men's willing-

TABLE 5(VII)

"DO YOU THINK THE ORDINARY INDIVIDUAL HAS ANY
CHANCE TO INFLUENCE POLITICS NOWADAYS?"

	Tolerant		Stereotyped		Outspoken and Intense		Total	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Yes	13	22	6	14	6	13	25	17
No	45	74	33	79	37	79	115	77
Don't know	3	4	3	7	4	8	10	6
Total	61		42		47		150	

ness to accept external control as regulating their lives, can be related to the characteristics of this group. True, the selection of the sample tended to produce a group of men of whom many were lacking in ego strength. That is, the system of selective service actually permitted the men some freedom of choice, particularly when they were willing to take the initiative. Those who took advantage of the chance to influence their fate within the selective service system were those least likely to be found among enlisted men in the army, although they were not absent there. Men of independence, whose ego strength permitted them to shape their own fate to some degree, were those, for example, who enlisted in the merchant marine, or tried to enter the navy while it remained a volunteer service. Others who had initiative may have succeeded in earning commissions as officers. Thus, men with sufficient ego strength to influence their lot even within the controlled situation of a wartime emergency were least likely to appear in the sample. On the other hand, these selective factors made the group more important for this study, which sought to determine the degree to which tolerance is related to acceptance of external controls. This sample, in fact, represented the most numerous group of our male urban population.

The ability to submit to external controls, as much as the internalization of a superego, or the development of a strong ego, depends to a large degree on childhood experiences. Therefore a discussion of relative ego strength, the absence of superego control, and frequency of control by external institutions would be incomplete without some reflection on childhood experiences. This study, however, was not a genetic study. Even when questions about the individual's past were asked, the intention was not to gain correct information, but rather to learn about the individual's present evaluation of past experiences. In the case of recollections of experiences during the depression (see Chapter VI) no effort was made to assess whether the individual had actually been exposed to deprivation during the depression, but only to learn how he viewed his own and his family's economic experience at that time. Similarly, questions about the individual's childhood were designed not to reconstruct the development of his personality structure, but to see how he now evaluated parental attitudes. Evidence from psychiatric sources abounds to show that recollections of childhood experiences as given in a first interview are very different indeed from those which slowly emerge during psychoanalytical treatment. Hence such first statements about the central experience in any individual's life, namely, his relationship to his

parents, have symptomatic significance alone. They are revealing of the man's present and conscious evaluation, different as that may be from the reality of his past. However, it may still be said that, by and large, an individual is more likely to recall his parents as kind when they were relatively "good" parents, while recollections of an absolute lack of parental love are reasonable indications that the relationship between parent and child was full of conflict.

Indirectly the men were led to recollect and to associate on childhood experiences in a section of the interview dealing with marital plans and problems. No direct questions were asked, but the men were queried on the number of children they would like to have, what they thought was the best way to bring up their children, whether they thought that ways of bringing children up had changed since their parents' time, how they would try to get children to behave, and whether they would bring their children up the way their mothers and fathers had. In seven cases, responses were not adequate enough to permit analysis. In all other cases, responses were classified into the two categories: affectionate parents and lack of parental love. A *significant* association was found between tolerance toward minority groups and the recollection of love and affection on the part of the parents, while intolerance toward minority groups was associated with the recall of lack of parental love and harsh discipline.

TABLE 6(VII)

RECOLLECTION OF PARENTAL ATTITUDES

	Tolerant		Stereotyped		Outspoken and Intense		Total	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Affectionate parents	40	68	18	47	21	46	79	55
Lack of parental love	19	32	20	53	25	54	64	45
Total	59		38		46		143	

The most interesting aspect of the association between intolerance and recollections of parental strictness is that there was virtually no difference (1 per cent) between stereotyped and outspoken anti-Semites. Therefore, it may be assumed that having had affectionate parents (or at least

believing so) is definitely related to tolerant attitudes, while the reverse, though having some influence on intolerance, hardly influences the degree of tolerance. If this should be so (and the data permit of little more than speculation) then one might think that adverse childhood experiences, particularly lack of parental love, have much to do with the need to discharge hostility in later life, but relatively little to do with the intensity with which such hostility will be discharged. This seems to corroborate the findings of other research workers which indicate that ethnic intolerance is acquired relatively late as compared with the development of a general need for hostile discharge.

In view of the particular characteristics of the sample and of the role of external control in shaping their attitudes—particularly toward the ethnic minorities—it may be inferred that this was a group which had not succeeded in internalizing moral standards on tolerance. It was a group which relied on external motivation for most of its life activities and opinions, including its attitudes of tolerance or intolerance. For instance, only a very small percentage based their job choices and aspirations on motives originating in their own personalities or talents, or the assumed social importance of a job. Not only were their current choices of jobs due largely to external factors, but their future aspirations, too, were based mainly on considerations of income or job security.

CORRELATES OF CONTROL

Generalizations from statistical data become more hazardous as consequent analysis deals less with delimitable traits or attitudes than with such complex phenomena as psychological structure and its inner contradictions. In itself, statistical analysis of the relation between tolerance and specific opinions, fears, and expectations is justified. But present day statistical methods seem, as yet, too inadequate to permit refined discrimination as to whether tolerance is related to external or internal controls—and if the latter, whether it is related more to superego than to ego control or a combination of all these factors. In these areas of investigation statistical data can provide approximations which must nevertheless be elaborated by an individual study of each case. The cases were therefore analyzed in these terms and the findings reported below are summarized in Tables 7(VII) and 8(VII). A study of characteristic cases is also presented later in the chapter to support the propositions based on statistical analysis.

The analysis of individual cases proceeded differently from the content

analysis yielding the data in the foregoing portion of this study. Instead of evaluating responses to individual questions, or groups of questions, an independent rating of each interview as a whole was made on the basis of a variety of psychological attributes. It was felt, for example, that in addition to separately evaluating a man's hostility toward Jews, Negroes, officers, fellow soldiers, political parties, and foreign countries, his hostility as revealed by the whole interview record should also be evaluated and correlated with other factors studied. This overall evaluation covered such aspects as controls (external and internal), security, ego strength, hostility, frustration, isolation, and so on. This evaluation may be considered as lying midway between the reliably determined statistical analysis of factors which could be studied separately, and the examination of individual cases presented in the second half of this chapter.

It was evident that in rating the interviews, no norms external to this group could be applied to define low, average, or high degrees of control, hostility, frustration, and so on. The interviews themselves provided the measure of what, for this particular group, was an average, or greater, or lower degree of these attributes. It was intended, if possible, that the average group should contain approximately half of the total number of cases. With this average group as a gauge, deviate interviews could then be rated as higher or lower than the group as a whole. The category of isolation may serve as an example of this procedure. Each interview was read for the frequency with which the incidence or desirability of contacts with others, was mentioned. But the number of such associations was not the only factor taken into consideration; the frequency and relative importance of any one set of contacts were considered equally important.

Inspection of Tables 7(VII) and 8(VII) shows that the method was fairly successful since approximately half of the men fell into the middle group for the categories: security, ego strength, frustration, and isolation. This was not true for the two categories, hostility and controls. Since almost half of the interviews contained little or no indications of hostility, it was not possible to rate them as average for this category. Instead, they were classified as low in hostility, and the rest of the interviews were then divided into two approximately equal groups. A somewhat different procedure was used for controls since it was found possible to divide the men into three groups of approximately equal size.

Of the six psychological attributes, three (controls, security, and ego strength) were positively associated with tolerance toward Jews. Three others (hostility, frustration, and isolation) were negatively associated

TABLE 7(VII)

OVERALL EVALUATIONS—FACTORS POSITIVELY RELATED TO TOLERANCE

Total Cases	61		42		47		150	
	Tolerant		Stereotyped		Outspoken and Intense		Total	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Controls								
Adequate	32	52	9	21	2	4	43	29
Intermediate	22	36	18	43	15	32	55	36
Inadequate	7	12	15	36	30	64	52	35
Security								
High	22	36	5	12	4	9	31	21
Medium	26	43	23	55	17	36	66	44
Low	13	21	14	33	26	55	53	35
Ego strength								
High	14	23	3	7	5	11	22	15
Medium	39	64	28	67	24	51	91	61
Low	8	13	11	26	18	38	37	24

TABLE 8(VII)

OVERALL EVALUATIONS—FACTORS NEGATIVELY RELATED TO TOLERANCE

Total Cases	61		42		47		150	
	Tolerant		Stereotyped		Outspoken and Intense		Total	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Hostility								
High	2	3	8	19	30	64	40	26
Medium	10	16	18	43	12	25	40	26
Low	49	81	16	38	5	11	70	48
Frustration								
High	3	5	7	17	19	40	29	19
Medium	24	39	25	59	24	51	73	49
Low	34	56	10	24	4	9	48	32
Isolation								
High	12	20	12	29	16	34	40	26
Medium	27	44	23	54	27	57	77	52
Low	22	36	7	17	4	9	33	22

with tolerance toward the Jews. The negative association between frustration and tolerance supports, and in some respects amplifies, the basic hypothesis linking intolerance with anxiety. The correlation of generalized hostility with the particular outlet, ethnic intolerance, was to be expected. The link between isolation and intolerance which these data reveal is also in accord with the data reported on childhood recollections. Affectionate relations with parents apparently set the path for good interpersonal relationships later in life; liking people in general (and being liked by them) enhanced tolerance. The association between security and tolerance is also compatible with the findings on social mobility, economic security, and general optimism.

Of all these psychological attributes, the association between control and tolerance was the most important in terms of the problem of this chapter. It was, therefore, the category with which all others were compared.

An analysis of these tables shows that important generalizations can be made if persons showing each type of ethnic attitude are classified in terms of the structure of their controls.

TABLE 9(VII)
TOLERANT MEN WHOSE CONTROLS WERE ADEQUATE
(32 Men)

	Security		Ego Strength		Hostility		Frustration		Isolation	
	Per- No.	centage	Per- No.	centage	Per- No.	centage	Per- No.	centage	Per- No.	centage
High	12	37	13	41	0	0	0	0	4	12
Medium	15	47	17	53	3	9	9	28	13	41
Low	5	16	2	6	29	91	23	72	15	47
Total	32		32		32		32		32	

The *tolerant* men may thus be seen in their majority as relatively strong in controls, markedly low in hostility and frustration, and high in security. Nevertheless the impression received is that for many of them their controls were only adequate in a relative sense—mainly because they were low in hostility and frustration so that even relatively weak controls were adequate.

This overall evaluation also permits dividing the tolerant men into two types—those of a majority and a minority—on the basis of each man's adequacy of controls. Tables 9(VII) and 10(VII) show the distribution

of men with adequate and inadequate controls in relation to the other five categories. Those men whose controls were adjudged intermediate more closely resembled the majority.

These tables highlight the fact that the tolerant men who had adequate controls were also characterized by an absence of hostility and frustration. They also support the conclusion that adequacy of control for these men was relative, depending on the absence of strong feelings driving for discharge.

By contrast, the minority of seven tolerant men whose controls were classified as inadequate presented no consistent picture, as far as their psychological attributes were concerned, although the smallness of their number may have accounted for this. While the majority of the tolerant men showed common features, the minority consisted of men whose tolerance was associated with highly personal factors, differing from case to case, as can be seen from the case material.

In terms of these psychological attributes, no overall characterization

TABLE 10(VII)
TOLERANT MEN WHOSE CONTROLS WERE INADEQUATE
(7 Men)

	Security		Ego Strength		Hostility		Frustration		Isolation	
	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage
High	2	29	0	0	2	29	2	29	2	29
Medium	3	42	5	71	3	42	2	29	3	42
Low	2	29	2	29	2	29	3	42	2	29
Total	7		7		7		7		7	

of a positive nature was possible for the *stereotyped* anti-Semites. Their characterization was more of a negative nature; they were the "neither-nors." Their controls were predominantly intermediate and they were neither high nor low in security, ego strength, or hostility. They were moderately frustrated and isolated. On the basis of their strength of controls, they could not readily be classified into distinct groups. Their middle position, as well as the diffuse nature of their characteristics, permitted no such separation. In all six categories they stood midway between the tolerant and the outspoken anti-Semites.

As a group, the *outspoken and intense* anti-Semites were characterized

by the inadequacy of their controls. Their hostility was as high as their controls were inadequate to contain so high a degree of hostility. The majority of them were low in security, which tallied with their pessimistic outlook as reported in Chapter VI.

They could be subdivided into two groups on the basis of control. The two following tables (Tables 11(VII) and 12(VII)) compare the majority of this group, namely, those men who had inadequate controls, with the minority, namely, those who had some measure of control over their emotions.

TABLE 11(VII)

INTOLERANT MEN WHOSE CONTROLS WERE INADEQUATE
(26 Outspoken and 4 Intense Anti-Semites)

	Security		Ego Strength		Hostility		Frustration		Isolation	
	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage
High	1	3	1	3	22	73	15	50	13	43
Medium	10	33	15	50	8	27	14	47	15	50
Low	19	64	14	47	0	0	1	3	2	7
Total	30		30		30		30		30	

In comparing the two types of outspoken and intense anti-Semites, the outstanding difference was that one-half of the minority group had only low or medium hostility so that some measure of control was possible.

TABLE 12(VII)

INTOLERANT MEN WHOSE CONTROLS WERE INTERMEDIATE OR ADEQUATE
(15 Outspoken and Intense Anti-Semites Had Intermediate Controls
and 2 Outspoken Anti-Semites Had Adequate Controls)

	Security		Ego Strength		Hostility		Frustration		Isolation	
	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage
High	3	18	4	24	8	47	4	24	3	18
Medium	7	41	9	52	4	24	10	58	12	70
Low	7	41	4	24	5	29	3	18	2	12
Total	17		17		17		17		17	

In the majority group, on the other hand, there was not a single man whose hostility could be classified as low, while three-fourths of them showed a high degree of hostility. Data on frustration and isolation followed the same pattern.

These overall judgments about majority and minority types of tolerant and intolerant men, and about typical characteristics of the stereotyped anti-Semites may be exemplified (and corroborated) by excerpts from individual interviews. For each of these groups typical cases were selected for further discussion below.

CASE MATERIAL

1. TOLERANT MEN WHOSE CONTROLS WERE ADEQUATE. The first characteristic case to be discussed will be that of a *tolerant* man whose tolerance seemed to be the function of rigid control.

This veteran was twenty-three years old and had had one year of business college. He grew up in a lower class Catholic-Polish neighborhood in Chicago and both his parents had been born in Poland. The interviewer described him as being of medium height and stocky build; he was friendly but slow thinking.

His outlook on life was optimistic and accepting. In attitude he was consistently tolerant and of very reasonable character. Toward the end of the interview, for example, he spontaneously said:

"Why are there so many questions against the Jews? I've never had any trouble with them. I go out with them and never think about their being Jews. There may be bad Jews, but there are also bad Italians, bad Polacks and so on."

He was also relatively tolerant of Negroes. As regarded working with them, he said:

"As a matter of fact, I do. I work in a large office and the niggers are all very pleasant. Not being in real close contact with them, it's O.K. True, with some, I'd rather quit than work alongside of them, but there are many others who're all right."

A reliance on external control for shaping his life was most strikingly evident in remarks about his army career which included thirty-seven months overseas and participation in the amphibious landings at Salerno and at Anzio. Despite this prolonged combat experience, he felt he had had a good break in the army. About army discipline, he said:

"It was too lax. That might sound funny. The army with all of its discipline—but I still think they were too lax."

Originally, he had hated having to join the army.

"I was fancy free and when they wanted to put me under discipline, I wasn't sure that I was the type that could be bossed around. I could have resented it like the others did, but I didn't. I was a good boy.

"Before I went into the army, I was babied and pampered but I came out of it self-reliant. I'm now getting more independent about myself. It knocked more sense into me. It made me more serious. It made me think more seriously than before and it made me conscious of how I dressed and of my general appearance . . . I didn't think I would like the army but it did me a lot of good. The army made a man out of me."

Thus, the army taught him what parents are expected to teach their children: how to dress, to think seriously and, out of choice, to submit to discipline. His need for being controlled was also revealed by the way he criticized his upbringing. He felt he had been spoiled too much and thought the best way to bring children up was for parents

"to agree on religion, the Catholic religion. They shouldn't baby the child. It makes them too soft. You should make them self-reliant. Children nowadays lose respect for their parents far too much. The old ways were better. Then they used the whip, and that seemed to have a better effect than the modern way of bringing up a child."

He continued:

"Use the whip if they do something they shouldn't have done instead of bawling them out, which goes in one ear and out the other. One should use the whip where it hurts most."

His parents "used the whip moderately"; off-hand, he thought not enough. Then he added:

"If they had used the whip more I'd be more impressed with the necessity of doing the right thing instead of doing the wrong thing."

He fully accepted control by societal institutions and it was his opinion that veterans were being reasonably well cared for. He also felt that the existing economic system, as well as the government, functioned adequately. Nevertheless, he asserted that the individual had no chance to influence the institutions of society; nor could he, by himself, do anything to influence politics or the government. There was nothing, he felt, that could or should be done about depressions, which were "inevitable." For his economic security he relied on his civil service job with the post office.

In summary it may be said that this man's attitudes were representative of a group of eleven tolerant men whose tolerance was closely related to strong tendencies to submit to external control. Most of them felt rela-

tively secure within the circle of their families and at their jobs. In a matter-of-fact way and without complaining, they accepted their inability to influence the larger events of their lives which they saw as entirely controlled by societal institutions. They felt the need to be controlled and they accepted such control, even when it was quite stringent. Without such control, they feared that the functioning of society would be impaired.

In general, they were men who had experienced adequate love but inadequate control in childhood. They were, therefore, unable to internalize control through identification with their parents. But since they had experienced parental love and had achieved a measure of economic security, no excess hostility pressed for discharge through intolerance toward Jews. Life experiences after they had left the family circle showed many of them the need for controls which they now sought in externally enforced discipline. Experiencing discipline led these men to submission, and also to belated partial internalization in the form of superego control. Basically, their controls remained a combination of external and superego control. This is what many of them meant who said: "the army made a man of me." Since they were submitting to control rather than exercising it, they could not conceive of the possibility of exercising a measure of rational mastery over their fate—of exercising ego control. They were convinced that the whip was needed to teach people to conform.

Quite different in origin and functioning of controls was the tolerance of a twenty-seven year old veteran of Irish-French extraction with high school education. He was born and raised in Chicago. The interviewer described him as of medium height and weight; his manner was friendly, informal, and completely at ease.

His outlook on life was optimistic and accepting. Of the Jews in the army he said:

"They were treated all right. I wouldn't say that they had a lot of friends. In my outfit everyone got along. We had one Jew. He was a good Jew. I liked him."

He also felt that:

"The Jews are in the same class of people as we are."

This man, too, felt that discipline was essential and that nowadays, in bringing children up, discipline was too lax; but his conception of discipline differed materially from that of the man cited above. It was of the

nature of internalized control, and to some measure, of ego control; it was, therefore, quite different from the external control advocated by the first veteran discussed. His parents brought him up well although his father died when he was eleven years old. They educated him, he stated,

“by treating me as a person who had ideas, and although they were childish, they weren’t necessarily wrong. Mother started early talking to me and I just behaved.”

Consequently he felt that the best way to rear children was

“to treat them as persons who have their own viewpoints. Children have intelligent minds. They see a lot more than they talk about.”

Religion was very important in his life. He and his parents were Catholics.

“My mother’s parents were very devout Catholics, and Mother taught me to believe along the same lines; that if you’re in earnest and if what you want is good, then proper prayer will help you in getting it.”

Throughout the interview he revealed great love and respect for his parents, particularly for his mother. Yet despite his great appreciation of his mother and his happy childhood relationship to her, he was now quite independent.

“I like living alone and being my own boss, and I like that. I don’t have to explain what I do. My mother lives on the North Side and that’s why I don’t get to see her too often.”

His reaction to the army was most revealing of the dynamics by which he developed some internal control of his own life activities. He felt he had had a good break in the army, in which he spent five years, including twenty-seven months in the Pacific as a rifleman. As in the former case, he praised the army because it had forced him to develop independence:

“It made a man of me. I want to repeat that, it made a man out of me. It also taught me to think for myself, and it taught me not to rely on other people.”

But in contrast to the attitudes toward discipline expressed by the tolerant man discussed above, this man showed an independence from and even resentment of external control in his statements about army discipline. He particularly resented

“the unnecessary regimentation. At times it was too strict, and at times they didn’t treat you as if you were even human, but treated you like machines with their ‘do this and do that.’”

Although this man seemed rather self-reliant, with well-developed superego controls and some measure of ego strength, the dependency gratification offered him by the army still seemed exceedingly important to him.

"The biggest thing about the army was that I didn't have any worries about my next meal, and I knew that I'd be taken care of as far as all my needs were concerned."

He accepted governmental institutions and felt that those organizations were most dangerous to society which "defy the government." The economic and political systems were working very well in his estimation, yet he did not feel the individual could influence them one way or the other.

As far as his job was concerned, he was very happy: "I don't have any gripes." By occupation he was a crash fireman at an airport, which he considered a very soft job. He did not even mention its dangerousness.

In summary it may be said that his case was characteristic of the group of fourteen tolerant men who showed some measure of ego strength, although their tolerance was closely related to acceptance of external authority—an acceptance which was combined in their cases with some internalization of controls. However, in contrast to the externally controlled group first described, these men possessed a measure of ego strength.

The reaction of both types of tolerant men showed their need to experience external control as a support before their latent tendencies to develop internalized controls could become manifest. One may speculate as to why these men were able to develop some measure of internalized control and even ego strength, while the first group was unable to do so. Perhaps, it was a result of happy childhood experiences, particularly their good relationships to their parents, combined with the fact that, as children, they had been treated as human beings, able to make decisions for themselves.

For these men it was not enough, apparently, to have had loving parents in order for them to develop adequate internal controls, not to speak of ego strength. It may well have been that their social and economic situation subjected them to overpowering, though ill-defined, political and economic controls which prevented them from developing that feeling of mastery over their own fate which is required for ego strength. To such men the army with its comparatively clear-cut regulations limiting

the number of ways of action and regulating nearly all life activities was a haven of security. For some of them, successful testing of ego strength became possible for the first time. Moreover, their equipment, their personal tasks, and their responsibilities gave many of them a sense of power and accomplishment which civilian life could hardly afford. One man, for example, reports the great feeling of power he experienced in combat when swinging around the turret and firing the gun of a medium tank.

It must have been tremendously gratifying to these men to realize that they bore themselves well under difficult conditions which also allowed them to compare themselves with others in terms of their own most significant values. For example, one man's opinion of himself was materially enhanced when, during a critical battle situation, repairs on his tank became necessary. Without much ado four of the five crew members (including himself) jumped out in the face of enemy fire. The fifth did not follow but remained inside the tank even after he was ordered out. The veteran recounting the experience derived self-respect from the fact that even without having been told, he showed more courage and resourcefulness than the fifth man who, incidentally, was the athlete of the company. For these, and similar reasons, some men said the army made "a man" of them. In like manner, the army permitted them to use such experiences for developing ego strength under conditions where army control no longer seemed entirely externally imposed, but to some degree self-chosen.

Development of ego strength was also aided by the fact that reliable and predictable gratification of the most pervasive biological needs was assured. As psychoanalytic studies of the development of ego strength point out, dependable and ample gratification of physiological needs is necessary in developing internalized controls.

Love alone is not sufficient for a child to develop adequate internal controls, and what has here been designated as ego strength. Parental love may result in an optimistic outlook on life, may promote the conviction that the individual is lovable and will be loved. It may also permit the formation of satisfactory interpersonal relationships. But love alone will not give the individual a sense of permanent security and the feeling that he is able to master successfully the situations he must meet. For that, love must be combined with a conviction that adequate gratification of biological needs such as intake and elimination, rest, motility, warmth, and shelter will always be available. The example given above seems to indicate that parental love prepared the basis for the development of

independence and those self-controls on which it rests. But the controls only reached mature development in the army where gratification of the most primitive needs was assured and where success was experienced under conditions which allowed for comparison with adult peers.

Examples of the intolerant men, on the other hand, show that in their case the personalities they had developed long before entering the army prevented them from internalizing controls. They violently resented the external controls of the army and also tended to run into actual disciplinary difficulties because of their rejection of all controls.⁴ The conclusion may be that only a personality which is so structured by early experiences that internalization of controls is possible can permit the individual to accept external control. The men whose personalities were better integrated were also better able to use the army experience for internalizing controls.

Harsh discipline by parents does not necessarily lead to intolerance if other factors, such as good interpersonal relationships and actual success in life experiences, compensate for it. This may be illustrated by the case of a twenty-eight year old veteran with one year of college education. Both of his parents were born in Italy, but he had been born and brought up in Chicago. The interviewer described him as stocky and of average height; he was very responsive and patient.

He too had an optimistic outlook on life. At the time of the interview, he was tending his own bar, an occupation which he enjoyed because he "liked to meet the crowds" as they came in for drinks.

His upbringing had been strict and submarginal, partly because his parents knew no better and partly because they were poor—but not because they were not fond of him. As he put it, they educated him "with a big stick over my head." Nevertheless, he felt that their disciplinary efforts could not have been too bad, since he and his siblings turned out well enough. He planned, however, to bring up his children quite differently. He intended, he said, to

"give them everything I didn't have. A good education, and I'll see that they have everything that they need. I'll treat them decently. One shouldn't make the child feel that you are the big boss, with a big stick. You have to meet them half-way and use reason."

In this man's family the Catholic religion was quite important and he planned to make it so for his children.

⁴ All of these observations hold true only for the middle, and by far the most common, area of experience. Implementation of army discipline by deviant officers may, of course, have resulted in counterreaction.

While he felt competent on his job and enjoyed it, he felt that reliance on the government, and particularly on the President as a person, was the only way a person could derive security in view of the very difficult political and economic situation. In general, he thought things looked pretty well and that all that was needed was for everybody to

“get behind the President 100 per cent, then everything should be O.K. He knows what he’s doing. One person has to think for the country, for the majority at least.”

When asked who ought to instigate and execute necessary actions, he replied emphatically, “the President!” When asked who should protect our liberties, and who could do it, he asserted “only the government.”

For those who complained, he had no compassion: “They’re a pretty poor bunch, these gripers.” When asked if the individual had any influence on politics, he answered: “That’s not for me to say.” On being pressed, he repeated:

“No, I don’t think so. The individual can’t do anything by himself. It used to be the people, but now it’s a clique.”

His attitude toward the Jews was consistently tolerant. About the Jews in the army, he said:

“They were O.K. They got along all right. There was no trouble.”

When asked if the Jews made good soldiers, he answered:

“These are ticklish questions. They were just as good as any. They were swell fellows, the ones I knew. We had one Jewish officer who used to take my place on Sunday mornings so I could go to Mass.”

Then he added:

“You hear so much and as far as I’m concerned, nothing should be done about the Jews. It’s all right as it is, they all get the same chance. This country was formed for all.”

In summary, it may be said that this man, and five others whose life history and attitudes were similar, managed despite harsh upbringing to develop into citizens who were competent, self-reliant, and independent in their own private spheres. They felt they could control their personal and private affairs, but lacked the confidence to think they could influence the broader aspects of their lives or of society. Control they could accept, and to some measure exercise, because they had been brought up under the control of accepting parents and of the church. The relative

satisfaction they found in their own family lives (the man described was happily married and had a daughter of whom he was very fond), together with the pleasurable contacts they enjoyed with others, more than balanced the frustrations they experienced because of their inability to influence larger social issues, in which, moreover, they were not too interested.

This case was fairly typical for a small group of men who held to the ideals of the lower middle-class businessman. They got along with everyone and found gratification both in their jobs and in their families. To the larger societal issues they were indifferent. But this type of man was comparatively infrequent among the sample.

2. TOLERANT MEN WHOSE CONTROLS WERE INADEQUATE. While the three types described above represent the majority of the tolerant men, there were a few more or less specific constellations of individual reasons for tolerance. All of the seven men in this category shared a pessimistic outlook on life.⁵ Their tolerance may be characterized by the fact that it did not preclude their holding to some unfavorable stereotypes about the Jews.

Among the particular reasons for being tolerant and understanding of an ethnic minority group was, for example, the feeling of having been subject to discrimination by the majority of one's own family, that is, of having oneself been treated as an outcast.

One more or less typical case was that of a twenty-five year old Protestant veteran of high school education who was raised in Chicago. Both parents were born in Lithuania. The interviewer described him as good-looking and friendly, verbose and vague.

His outlook on life was rather pessimistic, thus setting him apart from the majority of the tolerant men. The pervading feature of his attitude toward life was that "everything's all wrong." He complained continuously of the "big shots" who were "running everything" and "didn't give the

⁵ As indicated briefly in Chapter VI, depressive attitudes may be viewed as hostility turned into self criticism (or feelings of guilt), and as such may form another basis for tolerance. That is, with aggressions turned inward, there is no need for the persecution of an outgroup, and the mechanism of projection need not take place; integration is maintained as the ego accepts persecution by the superego instead of fighting it. Frequently too, the guilt feelings of the depressive will look to the outside for additional "punishment." In this sense, some of the men were probably voicing their own needs when they cautioned against sparing the rod in child rearing. Furthermore, to the extent that tolerant men enjoyed (approved) of the rigid if not punitive discipline meted out by parents or other institutions of authority, to that extent they could afford to be tolerant since part of their hostility was directly or vicariously discharged on their own persons. Their hostility was gratified in a way typical for the sadomasochistic personality: by identifying temporarily with the aggressor, in our case the punitive parent or the strict officer.

little guy a chance." If you wanted to get ahead in life, he said "it's like bucking a brick wall." He had great anxiety about the future.

✓ "It's going to be pretty bad. Yes, I think there's going to be another depression. Maybe I'm wrong, but it will be a miracle if we don't. People will be sorry for what they believe. It's a hell of a mess."

Emotionally he was quite unstable, and particularly so since his discharge from the army.

"I'm nervous a lot, now that I'm out of the army. I don't know what it is exactly, but I just feel nervous a lot, and a lot of times I break out in a cold sweat. Like the other night, my wife got real scared because I started perspiring like everything. The pillow and the bed got all wet."

His attitude toward Jews was characterized by statements such as:

"I tell you, there's nothing wrong with the Jews. Naturally, they control a lot of business. On the other hand, a lot of them don't. It's not right to have one nationality that you're against. They're just trying to make a living like anyone else."

He accepted the stereotype of Jewish control of business, an opinion which must have made them obnoxious to him since he hated the "big shots who didn't give the little guy like me a chance." But he controlled himself and qualified his stereotyped statement by saying it was not true for all Jews.

Suggestive of the sources of his controls were his ideas about educating children:

"Well, some people say, always talk to the child and he'll listen, but that doesn't work for most, from what I see. I don't mean that you have to break all the bones in the little child's body, but spank him a little bit and don't forgive the child right away. Like some people spank the child a little, and right away hold him close and say, 'I forgive you.' So the child goes right ahead and does it again. But if you spank him and don't forgive him right then, well, he'll hate you for a little while but he'll get over it. And then he'll mind after that. You do have to use the hand to rule your child, I think."

The main problem of his life was his hatred for and jealousy of his older brother.

"Well, I'll tell you. I had an older brother and when he wanted something, he always got it, but I didn't. They never gave me what I wanted, never gave me the things they gave him. It was always like I was in bad, not exactly neglected, but not handled as good. If I wanted anything, I would have to get it myself. For example, he got a car when he was very young. But when I wanted a car, I had to go to work to get the money for a car. I don't think

that's fair, to do everything for one and nothing for the other. If they're your own, why, treat them equally. Even if one is worse, treat them the same, on an equal basis. If you neglect one, he might turn out better than the other one, anyway, so you can't tell. On the other hand, it might be very bad for the child to be neglected that way. I don't know. But I do know you should treat them equally and fairly."

Thus this man's desire for equal treatment for all originated in the particular set of interpersonal relationships which prevailed in his family and forced him into the position of the helpless and the oppressed. It is possible that he was able to contain his hostility against the Jews, despite his opinion that they control business, because of his hatred for his brother. This hatred was so all-pervasive that all his tensions were discharged into private feud, and no other channel for discharge of hostility, such as minority discrimination, was necessary for him. Of course, this feeling of being an underdog supported his efforts at being objective about a minority, since he felt so strongly that he had been discriminated against as a minority at home. Moreover, his opinions about child rearing, while indicative of his hostility, were also revealing of his general need to control—be it his child, or himself.

Quite different was the pattern of tolerance in a twenty-nine year old veteran of French-Italian parentage who grew up in a small community in Illinois. The interviewer described him as a short man, of pleasing appearance who responded in a patronizing manner. His education had ended after two and a half years of high school.

His outlook, too, was very pessimistic. Everything, he thought, was going to

"turn out bad. I can see the handwriting on the wall. Things are going to turn out worse than we expect. Maybe even you can see the handwriting on the wall."

At another point, he suddenly exclaimed, "But Jesus, I hope we don't have another depression."

About his own children, he declared:

"I'd like to have good, healthy kids. Fight a little, steal a little—I did. No incubator kids for me. If I had a kid and he was thirsty and asked for a drink and he was standing there with his tongue hanging out I wouldn't get one. Too much trouble."

He had always been isolated:

"I've always been a lone wolf, you might say. Familiarity only breeds contempt."

He was very strict with and critical of himself and thought poorly of his own abilities. His attitude toward his father was revealed by the following statement.

"He and Mother were divorced. The family visited him once a week, but not me. My mother still can't understand why I didn't go out to see him, even when he was dying. She and my sisters visited him when he was in the hospital, and often before that time. I didn't see him for five years. My mother said that I'm hard. Well, I am, but that's not the reason. I didn't want to go to see him. It's too much trouble to explain."

His attitude toward the Jews was characterized by statements such as the following:

"I don't have any feeling about Jews. When they're smart, they're smart. Most of them are. They'll do things a white man seldom does—and they get ahead."

One may assume that the "too much trouble to explain" and "Mother said I'm hard, but that's not the reason" show that there were certain strong emotions underlying the man's attitudes. He may have been afraid of being overwhelmed by them and may therefore have had to protect himself by attitudes of coldness and indifference. Thus he must have been a man who possessed strong controls over his emotions. If he had not been so controlled, his feeling about the "smartness of the Jews" combined with his conviction that he was unable to take care of himself might have led to open hostility which would then have placed him in the anti-Semitic group.

If one wished to generalize about the group of men who were tolerant although pessimistic, one might say that, as in the last two examples, their tolerance (as opposed to that of the majority group) was not due to the absence of tension or hostility. They were men who were rather high in hostility, frustration, and isolation, and low in security and ego strength. But they were able to restrain themselves from interethnic hostility although such restraint did not usually originate in ego strength or super-ego control but rather in a particular life history or family constellation.

Within the psychoanalytical frame of reference it may be said that most of the tolerant men with adequate controls succeeded in integrating their hostility. The controls of other tolerant men succeeded in directing the discharge of tensions into other than anti-Semitic channels, such as successful competition in their occupations. The "deviate" tolerant men were not quite so successful in restraining their hostility. It broke through the dams of their controls and revealed itself in occasional stereotyped

statements about the Jews. But as such discharge of hostility became conscious, the controls asserted themselves and intolerant remarks were immediately qualified or retracted.

3. THE STEREOTYPED MEN. The *stereotyped* anti-Semites showed less ability to integrate their hostilities. For most of them, controls were relatively effective in exercising some restraints, or their stereotyped opinions would have led them to develop a higher intensity of intolerance. But they had failed to integrate them. Although stereotyped opinions which should have led to a demand for action were not restrained by controls, no demand for action ensued. The reason for this may either have been that the controls were not strong enough to contain the hostility, or that the tension generating the hostility was too great. Examples may illustrate this analysis.

A typical example of a stereotyped veteran, whose controls were strong enough to block the logical consequence of his opinions was that of a thirty-three year old veteran of Czechoslovakian parentage. He was born and raised in Chicago and had completed two years of high school. The interviewer described him as a handsome, well-built man, quite self-conscious of his own "bad tendencies" but generally secure.

When asked who the "goldbrickers" in the army had been, he replied spontaneously:

"The Jews. A known fact. They used excuses, pain, lies, combat claims, physical disability, everything. Lack of energy and stability, too, so they usually failed on the job. They took all the soft jobs they could get, too. I knew one in Salt Lake City. It didn't bother him. He was proud of getting out into a soft job. They got the soft desk jobs, all of them."

When asked what should be done about them, he said:

"Why do anything? We haven't before. Why should we now? Just let them live like anybody else."

This man continually depreciated himself; he saw himself as the black sheep of the family. Whenever he made critical remarks about people in general, he always included himself.

"Greed is what interferes with our having a decent life. Everybody's greedy. That's too bad. We're all greedy; that's the problem."

Of the veterans, he said: "We all expect too much now," and he repeated several times that the veterans, including himself, made unreasonable demands and should not be given special consideration. He did

not feel that the individual could influence politics or the economic system. ("He has no influence, none whatever.")

All of his conscious life he had felt very guilty. As a child he had been "a very bad boy." At five, he set fire to his parents' home and he connected his misdeed with their death which was unrelated to it, but occurred a short time later. After their death he was brought up in a Catholic orphanage where he formed his notions of education.

"The right way to bring up children is to bring them up in the fear of God. I was the black sheep of my family; that's why I would be sure to trip up any kid of mine that was like me. Education isn't as strict these days as it should be. Parents aren't as good as our parents were. They followed the rules more strictly. They used more discipline and you have to use it, too. It's a good idea. After my parents died, I knew the discipline of the orphanage. This discipline was very good for me. In order to make children behave, stop them off the bat. I mean, correct it right away. Discipline them. My parents didn't spare the rod and I think that I won't either."

He approved strongly of the moral teachings of the Catholic religion. "Religion was life itself in our family." He also described army discipline as necessary and good.

In order to understand the general pessimistic attitude of most of the anti-Semites, their frustrations, their hopes, and the gratifications they desired, this man's statement may be quoted for its evidence of the craving for primitive gratification. He was asked whether there was anything about army life which he now missed and his answer was:

"The food. We got the best food out there. We could sleep late, we always knew we'd be taken care of, no matter what you did. Your room and board was free and you had no worries. You had security and relaxation because when your work was finished, you were free. There was no clock to punch."

Here, a potentially outspoken anti-Semite (as indicated by his derogation of Jews in the army) restrained himself to a milder form of anti-Semitism because his guilt prevented him from demanding discriminatory action. Since childhood it had been impressed on him that hostile impulses are dangerous if they are permitted to express themselves in hostile actions. Therefore he submitted to rigid control, as may be seen from his statements about discipline.

The strength of their controls prevented most stereotyped anti-Semites from asking for discriminatory actions against the Jews. This is further illustrated by the statements of a twenty-one year old veteran of German-

Scotch parentage who was born and raised in Chicago. His denomination was Presbyterian but religion was not very important in the family.

The interviewer described him as a slight, boyish, and pleasant-looking man who was very obliging. His remarks showed a clear ambivalence toward the Jews. They also demonstrated that his hostility pressed for discharge but was contained by his controls as soon as his aggressive feelings become conscious.

"The Jews always seem to have a name for going somewhere, they're go-getters. I don't know how, but they get there. In a lot of cases, the Jews use a lot of underhanded methods. They're always blamed for it, then I feel sorry for that. The Jews don't get along with anybody but themselves. Well, the way they have of getting places irks me most. I wouldn't care to have them use underhanded ways to push me out. As individuals, they have a right to take a job."

With each derogatory statement about Jews, his controls forced him to protest the accusations as somehow unjust.

The role which discipline played in his upbringing may be indicated by his statement about his own education and by his ideas about child rearing.

"Well, my father never spared the rod but I don't know if this new modern way would work. I think I'd bring up my children the way my parents brought me up. Definitely not by bribing. I think it best to make them pay for wrongs they've done. That's probably against modern methods, but I think the old ways worked. There are many spoiled brats from families where the mothers have read too many books on modern methods. Well, we at home had a stick about four inches wide and half an inch thick, that hung on a nail on the back door. When one of us stepped out of line we had to go and get the stick and take a licking with my two brothers present. It scared us pretty much. It really worked. I think it was the right way. I don't regret it now. I like my folks just as well as if they hadn't punished me this way. When I was young, I thought it was wrong, but I'm pleased now. My brothers are, too."

He was able to accept this harsh parental discipline and also to internalize it in some measure because mutual love was an important feature of his relationship to the disciplining parent; this permitted identification with the parent and acceptance of his discipline.

"My father was never mean. He was the harsh disciplinarian but he was a pretty happy-go-lucky man. You realize things like that when you're older."

The manner in which superego control prevented a man from advocating discriminatory action despite his stereotyped opinions about the Jews was further illustrated by a thirty-three year old man of British

descent, who was brought up in Chicago. The interviewer described him as a short, slender man who spoke in a compulsive and almost oratorical fashion.

Although he had only had a high school education he was very ambitious, intellectually—one of the few men who had decided on a career. He wanted to become an artist. This desire led him to embrace opinions and to develop attitudes which he considered to be those of the well-educated person.

His open ambivalence, indicative of underlying hostility against the Jews, was barely contained by his rational efforts as may be seen from the following quotation:

“There should be no discrimination just because a man is a Jew. He’s a member of the white race. He’s of the Semitic branch and we’re the Caucasians. But I don’t want any business dealings with a Jew. He has an inherent something in him that will always cause him to win, but I have no prejudice because of that. Much of the problem is due to the individual Jew. The cultured, refined Jew doesn’t see what the kike is doing for his race. The kikes do a great deal of harm. They’re overdressed, noisy, and loud.”

About the Jews in the army, he said:

“The Jewish boys were all right. We didn’t say a lot to their face unless they were ignorant fellows without manners. They’re peculiar people. Some have bad traits that came out in different ways. One of the Jewish soldiers was a kike but I don’t care for the kike part in Gentiles either; some of them may also be loud-mouthed and overassertive. Some Jews can’t help their gestures and the way they talk. Lot of them tried to get out of combat outfits and tried to stay in the States. They call quartermasters the Jewish infantry but if he’d been in the clothing business before, he was better in the quartermaster than he would be any other place, and probably better than someone who hadn’t been in that business.”

He felt that the Jews should be let alone, although

“they control a lot of business but I don’t think we’ll have a Jewish ascendancy.”

When asked how the Jews should be dealt with, he summed up his attitude:

“If we discriminate against different groups, then we’ll have to change what’s at the foot of the Statue of Liberty.”

His upbringing had been relatively strict:

“I was raised strictly enough. Discipline was important in my family. Mother taught me to divide my toys and also to have respect for my elders. I was

taught how to eat properly. Mother didn't want to have oranges every morning, but we did so I would learn to use an orange spoon. Supper was extremely formal with a complete set of silver, different forks and spoons so I would learn how to use them. I thought everybody had been trained the same way until I was about seventeen or eighteen years old. I was very carefully trained to read because Mother had been a school teacher. If children aren't trained more properly, they'll become delinquent morally and it'll be the downfall of the country."

Another example may illustrate the degree to which the strength of his controls prevented even a bold and adventurous veteran who held many stereotyped anti-Semitic views from expressing himself with outspoken or intense hostility. He was nineteen years old, of Polish descent, had been born and raised in Chicago, and had just reenlisted in the army. In response to the question of whether Gentiles should receive job preference, he replied:

"No. If the job has anything to do with business, the Gentiles aren't as gifted as the Jewish."

Then he burst out:

"That's a peculiar question to ask, and I refuse to give an answer."

When asked why, he said

"I refuse to give an answer to that one also. About two weeks ago, in all the theaters in the neighborhood, they had something called Brotherhood Week. It actually made me sick."

At another point, he said: "The Jews own most of the country. State Street anyway." Nevertheless, at no point in the interview did he ask for any restrictions of Jews.

His view of civilian life was very negativistic. His experiences in the service he had enjoyed very much. There he "found something very exciting, terrifying." At the time of discharge he had planned to go to school.

"I got out some of my old school books but then I knew I could never stand it. I want something more exciting. I like nothing about civilian life. That's the reason I decided to reenlist in the army. I couldn't stand just working and going to bed at night. It was deadly. I nearly went crazy before I reenlisted. What this country needs is more discipline, like the discipline in the army. But even in the army discipline wasn't strict enough."

Generally, he complained about lack of discipline:

"Here, it's disgraceful, the way things are done in Chicago. There's no discipline whatsoever. They're far too lax and it's a disgrace. I like the English

army much better because it's much stricter. I sometimes felt that Germany was progressive in a way and on the right way, and was building up a beautiful country. They only went too far."

It seemed to him that

"the children back here are disgusting. They're softies and they're given entirely too much freedom. They're not brought up right. I was also not brought up the right way. Mother babied me too much. I wouldn't want my wife to do that to my child. My mother was good to me, but she did everything for me and that spoiled me. It made me too dependent. I got out of it. The army's good for that, as long as one doesn't yield to its sordid atmosphere. You should be fair to your child but you should make him obey. I always did what I was told."

He was also full of suspicions:

"There are a lot of very harmful organizations. Our enemy had a network of spies in 1939 and 1940 and the same is true now. You probably read about the young lieutenant who was caught stealing the details of the atomic bomb. We're too lenient with the Russians."

In more than one way, this man had the leanings of a fascist follower. But his desire for discipline kept his anti-Semitism within the limits of stereotyped opinions. It was as if he sensed that his desire for excitement and adventure might easily land him in difficulties, and from these the rigid external control of the army seemed to offer protection. It is not difficult to speculate about what the attitude of such a man might be if external controls, instead of quietly condoning and officially disapproving of anti-Semitism, should openly approve.

In general, it may be said of the stereotyped anti-Semites that it was the relative presence of their controls more than anything else which prevented them from taking a more outspoken and discriminatory stand on what they considered the Jewish problem.

4. THE OUTSPOKEN ANTI-SEMITES WHO POSSESSED SOME MEASURE OF CONTROL. The stereotyped anti-Semites stood midway between the tolerant men and the *outspoken anti-Semites*, because their controls were less adequate for containing anti-Semitism than those of the tolerant men, but more adequate than those of the outspoken anti-Semites. Similarly it might be said that the minority of the outspoken anti-Semites (seventeen men), who possessed some measure of control, formed a group whose position on anti-Semitism was somewhere between that of the stereotyped and that of the majority of the outspoken anti-Semites who were more markedly characterized by the inadequacy of their controls.

The two outspoken anti-Semites whose controls were adequate were both unique cases. One of the two, for example, was a very recent immigrant to the United States. He came to America after the start of the war in Europe and transferred to this new country attitudes which really belonged to his previous environment. His controls seemed in process of adaptation to the new setting, and it was probable that as he grew into the pattern of this country they would become more effective; eventually, they might become strong enough to restrain his anti-Semitism to such a degree that he would then fall into the category of stereotyped anti-Semites. Equally unusual reasons accounted for the second case of this type, so that neither of them seem in need of further discussion in a study not mainly concerned with the behavior of exceptional cases.

The following excerpts from one of the interviews may illustrate those characteristics which were typical of men who, in spite of intermediate controls, were nevertheless outspoken in their anti-Semitism.

It is the case of a twenty-three year old man whose father was of American stock, and whose mother had been born in Austria. He himself was born and raised in Chicago where he went through grade school and high school. The interviewer described him as a tall, thin, well-built man; his personality was pleasant and he seemed friendly and humorous.

In his demands for restrictions against Jews he was quite outspoken. Gentiles, he felt should be given preference on jobs:

“Take the Jewish race. Financially they’re better off than the Gentiles. I believe that we should let the Gentiles get to where the Jewish is today, and in that way we’ll be on an equal basis. The Jews made good soldiers, as good a soldier as the Gentile, but only when there wasn’t a group of them together, or not too many in one group. Four or five in a company was all right, but if there was twenty in a company they’d stay together and not mingle with the other men. Nevertheless, we got along all right. We had no trouble, but I do think that the Jews should be held down and not given too much power. The biggest percentage of merchants are Jews, and that’s why prices should be held down, so they won’t get an abundance of money.”

On the other hand:

“I don’t think that the Jews should be forced to leave the country. After all, most of them have established themselves as citizens, and as long as they stick to the law and have their citizenship papers, they shouldn’t be forced to leave.”

He was also unopposed to intermarriage, nor did he object to working with Jews. He did, however, object to the idea that a Jew might live next door to him:

"They more or less have their own sections. I'm from an Irish neighborhood. I'm Irish and I'm used to Irish neighbors."

Thus, although he was quite outspoken in his discriminatory statements about the Jews, a modicum of rational control was still operative.

His outlook on life was rather optimistic. The future, he thought, looked bright, at least for him. "The condition in this country is a lot better than it was before the war." As he saw it, the individual could exercise some influence on politics.

"I guess that most everyone has an influence on politics, down to the last person. Of course one person can influence things only a little bit."

His general acceptance of existing society was epitomized by his statement that the government was run by "intelligent people."

"They had to be, by the way they handled the country and the situation we've just been through."

His upbringing had been strict on the part of his father, affectionate on the part of his mother:

"My dad used the cat o' nine tails. Yes, he really did. But I believe that reasoning with children is lots better than getting rough with them. Mother reasoned with us, and through that way she could teach us things. You always have respect for your mother, and whatever she tells you, you listen to her. Father used force, and then mother would reason with us and tell us what was wrong. I didn't like my father using force, but today I can appreciate that what he did has probably had a good effect.

"I believe I was brought up the right way—just don't go too far in using force—then it's all right. A good crack won't hurt any kid. After I got a good one, it put me in line for about a week."

His attitude toward discipline was ambivalent. He rejected as too harsh the discipline of his father, but admitted that some discipline might be needed and have beneficial effects. His position on army discipline was halfway between rejection and acceptance. Army discipline was "in some cases too strict, but only in some cases."

Here was a man whose hostility was not too intense. He could, moreover, accept some external control and his upbringing had probably led him to integrate some of it. Therefore, although he readily permitted himself to voice stereotyped criticism of the Jews and although he even asked for some discriminatory legislation, his anti-Semitism was, nevertheless, tempered by controls.

5. THE OUTSPOKEN ANTI-SEMITES WHOSE CONTROLS WERE INADEQUATE.
The controls of twenty-four of the outspoken anti-Semites were quite in-

adequate for restraining anti-Semitism, and the interview records showed no attempt on their part to qualify derogatory statements about the Jews. On the contrary, their remarks often became more violent, the longer they talked. It was as if their inadequate controls, once pierced by unfavorable statements about Jews, led to more unfavorable associative material and finally gave way under the added pressure of hostility aroused by such associations.

Typical for the attitudes of this group were those of a twenty-five year old Protestant, of native-born parentage who had been born and raised in Chicago. This man had had two years of high school education and was described by the interviewer as a short, heavy-set man of flashy appearance. His behavior during the interview revealed his aggressiveness. Looking through a book which the interviewer left lying on the table, he found a personal letter, which he provocatively started to read, obviously testing the interviewer's patience. When she failed to react, he dropped this tactic.

His attitude toward the Jews was characterized by statements such as the following:

"As for the Jews, run them out of business because they already control most of the business in the United States. Or make them work as anybody else. In the army there were no Jews in our outfit, but when we were inducted I know the Jews angled around and got out of it. When they were in, they always got the best jobs. Send the Jews back where they came from because they don't get along over here. All the people are against them because of how they do business and control most business."

He objected to a Jew moving in next door to his residence:

"They aren't liked, the way they act and do business. They lower neighborhoods, keep things pretty dirty."

He was unwilling to have a Jew work on the same job "because they would probably knock me out of my job."

It was obvious that his attitude toward the Jews was closely connected with his great insecurity about his abilities and with his anxiety about his future. He felt sure that things

"are going to turn out pretty lousy. Everything's going to be bad, and going to be worse. Nothing is being done for the veteran beside all the talking. The ordinary individual has no influence on politics, none at all. If a depression should come it would hit me hard, harder than most others, I guess. It'll be very bad."

He had been brought up "the old-fashioned way." But contrary to the reaction of most tolerant men, he resented his childhood experiences as having been "far too strict." He felt that his parents punished him far too often, though he later admitted that he was punished only rarely. Although religion had been very important in his home, he had little use for it; even in the army he went to church less frequently than he had before that time.

Both the high degree of his hostility and the absence of any desire or ability to control it were revealed by statements such as the following which he made spontaneously when discussing the Negroes in the army. He had been speaking of Negroes dancing with white girls in Europe and related that on one occasion this had led to an argument between a white and a Negro soldier. The Negro made some disparaging remarks without threatening the other physically. At that:

"The white guy shot the Negro right there—killed him. He didn't even get court-martialed for it. He got off clean, and that's O.K. That's how it should be all over the place."

He liked his life in the army, although he disliked army discipline. Since his discharge he particularly missed his "jeep and all the girls." When asked who gained because of the war, he answered, with a broad smile:

"Hum, the French girls gained a lot. I like the girls over there in France and those in Germany. I like them all. Girls are girls."

This man hated army discipline (and all other types of discipline, including parental and governmental control) but liked his army experience for the sexual freedom and the outlet for aggressions which it provided. His strong hostilities were barely controlled and he harbored great anxieties about his economic future and private affairs. Moreover, he felt that the government provided no security since it consisted of "nothing but crooks."

Another outspoken anti-Semite who showed more or less the same pattern of psychological attributes was a thirty year old man of Bulgarian extraction. He was born on a farm in Ohio. This man was described by the interviewer as a short, very thin man who was shabbily clothed. He felt insecure about everything, including his relationship to the interviewer, whom he accused of wanting to put something over on him. When she reassured him, he said: "It's always the smoothest talkers that take you in." His opinions about the Jews were:

"They don't work or fight. I'd always give preference to a non-Jew. In the army the Jews weren't treated very nice. There was always a grudge, the Jews against the Gentiles. There was a grudge against the Jew because of his being intelligent and getting ahead faster. The Jews always held down good jobs and good ratings, and the boys disliked them for that. They made good clerks. As field soldiers, no. They don't fall into the routine, they were bad combat soldiers because they'd never stick. To their face we seemed to get along with them, but behind their backs we raised Cain. There are too many of the Jews around here now. They should never have allowed so many in here. Their population is too great. You can't chase them out—then we'd be another Hitler. We should close immigration to them. They're producing so fast that we'll have trouble with them here, a great deal. There's no place to send them. They're not even wanted in Palestine."

When asked about questions of policy toward Jews he answered:

"I'd object against a Jew moving next door. They raise too much stink and too much commotion. The low Jews are filthy, and the higher class always think that you're doing wrong. Those who own stores on Milwaukee Avenue are filthy, and you should see the alleys behind the stores—they're terrible. I wouldn't want to work with a Jew because he wouldn't want to do the manual labor. He wouldn't share the work. I just can't get along with them. I can't get accustomed to the way they do things—they always want to take advantage."

His insecurity about his own future and that of the country was revealed by remarks such as the following:

"People are too unsettled. Everything in general is unsettled. Things will slide downhill right into a depression. As a matter of fact we have a depression right now. Thirty-three per cent of the people in Chicago aren't employed, including the veterans.⁶

"People like me will starve. We don't have the education or the money to exist."

Not enough was being done for the veterans, in his opinion; there, too, he felt that everybody was taking advantage of him and other veterans.

"There are a million in Chicago that have made a million off the veterans. Look at me, for example. I wanted to go to school, and a high-pressured salesman came by the house here one evening and sold me a course on electricity, which isn't in my line at all, and now I'm stuck. That's how you get gypped on anything."

He was as dissatisfied with the world as he was dissatisfied with himself:

"No party is any good now. The ordinary people don't have a chance. There are too many ways of holding them down."

and:

⁶ This statement was made at a time when unemployment in Chicago was extremely low.

"Just now I'm taking a course in electricity. The course is no good. They push you through too fast and the person with a low education like me can't understand what it's all about. They have one teacher for about forty people. They don't explain things to you, just tell you to figure out the problem yourself. I spent about five hours last night trying to figure the problems out and I can't. I'm on problem four and the class is on problem eleven, so you can see how I'm getting along. When I ask for help they tell me to figure it out myself. If I were out on a job I wouldn't be able to ask people how to do things. I get very discouraged."

All he hoped for in the future was that he might eventually earn \$3,000 a year, but he felt that the chances for that were slim:

"I don't think I'll ever work on a job that pays that much. I don't have much education and I don't know the right people."

His childhood recollections were unpleasant:

"I had to work too much and that was a hindrance to my education. My parents were too strict. I got shoved in a corner; I had hard discipline, and got hit around. I lost faith in my parents because they didn't treat me right, although I admit I deserved most of it."

About religion he said: "There are foxhole atheists. In fact, I'm sitting here." The only thing about the army he liked was "the uniform and the discipline."

One of his biggest gripes was that most of his friends had married and were being prevented by their wives from spending time with him.

The asocial attitudes of some of the outspoken anti-Semites may be indicated by the statements of a twenty-four year old man whose father was of American stock and his mother, German-born. He had had two and a half years of high school education and was described by the interviewer as a handsome young man, about six feet tall. He sneered throughout most of the interview, and seldom gave precise answers.

Characteristic of the explosiveness of his reactions were statements such as the following:

"If they don't do enough for the veterans, they're going to start shooting. They've put up with enough. They better see to it that the veterans get along all right or there'll be plenty of trouble."

He was not only afraid of the Communists, but also of the British:

"People would like to have us fight for the British. If people start shooting the Jews, the Jews will have us in another war."

When speaking of army officers, he said:

"The soldiers didn't have no use for them. They'd just as soon shoot them as the Japs."

In referring to the Jews he was one of the very few who used the term "Yid." But anti-Semitic though he was, he still made occasional qualifying remarks which showed that a minimum of control was exercising some restraint and was pressing for rational elaboration of hostile statements.

"There are different kinds of Jews. There were some who were obnoxious, but there were some who got along as one of the crowd. It's hard to say what the Jew really is."

The best way to influence politics, he said, is to "get a gun." His outlook on life was very pessimistic and asocial:

"Things are bad and are going to be worse. Me? All I ask is to be left strictly alone."

When talking about a depression and unemployment, he was certain that it would come, and with it, an outbreak of violence.

He was unwilling to discuss his own childhood recollections or how children should be brought up. This was probably indicative of his hostility against his parents, as was his desire for isolation.

"Kids? No one in his right mind would have any. I can't understand how anybody would like to have any of them."

He had always been lonely, never associated with others, never went around with the gang.

"I sure am a lone wolf. All I want is to live in a cabin in the woods, all by myself, and see nobody all year long."

His hostility and isolation were epitomized by his recollection of his own outfit as a place where "everybody hated everybody."

Nevertheless, this man had some insight into the mechanisms which accounted for his own ethnic hostility, although the pressure of his hostility was so great that he could not act in terms of this insight. When speaking of the Japanese-Americans, he said:

"The Japanese will never get rid of their slant eyes. That makes them stand out. It makes them a target for all kinds of prejudice. Everyone has prejudices. *You just have to have something to aim at.*"

These examples of outspoken anti-Semites, even the last one, show that they possessed some, even if inadequate, controls.

A final case may illustrate those few extreme outspoken anti-Semites who rejected almost all discipline and authority. A thirty-five year old man of Italian parentage, born and raised in Chicago, exemplified the type of outspoken anti-Semite whose controls were entirely inadequate. In addition to those psychological attributes which he had in common with other outspoken anti-Semites, he was also characterized by strong feelings of persecution.

The interviewer described him as a stout man who became very angry and shouted during the interview; so much so at one point, that he stopped himself for fear the neighbors would think there was "a madman in the house and call the police." His case was of additional interest because he was one of the few men who specifically asked for a third political party. His attitudes toward Jews were characterized by such statements as:

"Jews have all the money and they all stick together. They'll never work in a factory.

"The Jews in the army got away with everything. They all had jobs in the rear. The Gentiles did all the fighting.

"Send them all back to Palestine. All they're after is money. The Jews should be forced to leave the country."

He was afraid things were going to turn out very badly for the country in general and for the veterans in particular.

"Nothing's being done for the veterans. Employers don't give a rap for them. From the White House down to the greedy capitalists, everybody's against the veterans. They were all right when they were in uniform but now nobody cares. Nobody's fair to the veterans, though they enlisted to help the country. A friend of mine told me the other day that the people in Germany treated him better than he's been treated since he came back to this country. The people don't have any influence on politics. Nothing is done by the people or for the people. All is done for the politician. Roosevelt should have been impeached before Pearl Harbor. There are nothing but crooks in Washington."

He was against both parties and all in favor of a third party.

"Put the whole old parties in a washing machine and run the whole thing through the wringer. I don't think there's an American in the White House. Even the English imperialists run the F.B.I. The country's going to the dogs. What we need is to get some real Americans in the White House. Everyone seems to want to give our country away. Only if the English and the Com-

munists would get out of the White House and let old-fashioned Americans in there, then somebody could get in who'll be for the American people, people that'll pull for this country. We haven't had such for a long time. And I don't mean the Republicans, either. But chances for that are very slim. When I was in contact with the Italians I heard the story of Mussolini. Roosevelt and Churchill are just the same as he was. We need a third party. The third party is the only solution."

His fears about his own future were great, particularly that unemployment would hit him very hard. He felt sure he would have to go on relief. All his life he had had nothing but bad breaks: "The international bankers are the reason for our miseries."

All he wanted was to make \$3,000 a year, but he felt that the chances for even this were very bad, unless, for once, he got "a lucky break."

In his opinion, army discipline had been unreasonably strict:

"The higher-ups had far too much authority. They could railroad a fellow like nobody's business, if they didn't like him."

At this point it may be stressed that a steady increase in hostility and a steady decline in the adequacy of controls could be observed as one moved from the least intolerant to the most intolerant men. But all were subject to some controls. These controls formed a continuum from adequate to inadequate as the degree of anti-Semitism increased. But they also formed another continuum, although it was not quite so clear-cut. It was the continuum from internalized to external control; from ego control, to superego control, to willingly accepted external control, to external control under grudging submission, and finally to controls which were so inadequate that they could only assert themselves occasionally and ineffectually.

The last group in the continuum of tolerance to intolerance, that is, the intense anti-Semites, fell beyond this continuum of controls. Their controls were not so much inadequate or external, as they were absent, so far as the restraining of interethnic hostility was concerned.

6. THE INTENSE ANTI-SEMITE. The group of six *intense anti-Semites* was characterized by low security, high hostility, high frustration, and social isolation. Nowhere in the interview could an assertion of control over interethnic hostility be observed.

In addition, these men were all characterized by strong feelings of persecution as in the case of those outspoken anti-Semites whose controls seemed entirely inadequate.

However, as irrational as were some of the statements made by intense

anti-Semites, the men were not totally without control, or they could never have maintained themselves in society. The question then arose of why control was so lacking in the case of ethnic hostility. The following hypothesis may account for this phenomenon, with the feeling of persecution by an ethnic minority as a necessary clue.

As regarded ethnic hostility (and perhaps other areas of interpersonal contacts) the intense anti-Semite had externalized controls by the mechanism of projection.⁷ The price he paid for thus freeing himself of restraint by his own controls was to feel persecuted by the minority and this minority was now the vicarious carrier of his control over ethnic hostility. But while he felt controlled by the members of the hated outgroup, he could now give free reign to ethnic hostility which was no longer held in check.

A twenty-six year old veteran may serve as an example for the group of six intense anti-Semites. He completed two years of high school education, was of Czechoslovakian parentage and had been born and reared in Chicago. The interviewer described him as a good-looking, well-built man who spoke with a decided lisp. Throughout the interview he maintained a flippant but suspicious attitude.

His hostility against the Jews may be characterized by the many spontaneous statements he made about them. For instance, when asked whether there were any groups of people who might be harmful to the country, he replied:

"Well, the nigger. They're getting a lot out of hand. And then the Jews. They should run all the Jews out of the country. On jobs, Gentiles should always get preference. Well, most of the Jewish people have all the factories, so the white people are working for them. You don't see Jews working. Another thing, how about this Jewish boat that came across—what was it?—with fifty thousand of them. Why are they bringing them in here? They just persecute us Gentiles."

When asked what he hated about the army he said:

"What I hated most?—the officers, especially the Jewish ones. I just love the Jews—I'd like to hang them all up."

Referring specifically to the Jews in the army he said:

"They were treated like kings. They got away with more stuff than we did. They were poor soldiers. They haven't got the fighting ability. The best thing would be to get rid of them, export them. Well, if they'd move all the Jews out, I've reasoned it out—if they moved them all out, there'd be no more wars."

⁷ For a detailed discussion of this mechanism, see Chapter VIII.

His animosity against other ethnic groups was equally strong. For instance he felt that the best thing to do with Japan would be to sink the islands and thus kill all Japanese.

He was extremely fearful about the future and felt certain that things would turn out very badly. His anticipation of unemployment was full of aggression and anxiety. He was sure he would "starve to death."

"We'll have a lot of unemployment and a lot of crime. Why shouldn't there be? We learned a lot of tricks, how to handle a gun, and we'll use them."

He was convinced that all political parties consisted only of crooks. One should "do away with all of them." The government was "all against the people."

Recollections of his childhood were pleasant but he planned to bring children up much more harshly.

"Children nowadays get away with too much. Well, if you can't talk to them, then tan their hides for them. Of course, I'm going to do that.

"My parents were too good, but I never have done much wrong. I was just naturally a good kid. My parents never had any trouble with me. Well, my next to the youngest brother, he wasn't so good, he always got the spanking, but it sure was good for him."

In summarizing the impression received from all interviews, and not solely from the excerpts above, it may be said that no final understanding of the group is possible on the basis of the association between relative strength of controls, relative degree of hostility, and anti-Semitism. The intention was primarily to show the general relationship between these psychological attributes. This underlying relationship remained the same when the anti-Negro attitudes of the group were examined, but in that case the group as a whole appeared much more hostile and far more intolerant. In the case of the Negroes, controls gave way much more readily, as will be shown in the following chapter.

It has already been stated that the analysis of controls as it relates to interethnic hostility is twofold. The adequacy of controls of some individuals for restraining interethnic hostility has now been discussed. The reasons for which some individuals select interethnic hostility as a channel for discharging hostility remains to be analyzed. This question may be discussed in connection with the related problem of why controls asserted themselves so much less vigorously with regard to one type of interethnic hostility, anti-Negro feeling, as compared with another type of interethnic hostility, anti-Semitism.