

CHAPTER VIII

CONDONING INTOLERANCE: ANTI-NEGRO ATTITUDES

The relationship between control and tolerance was established in the preceding chapter. There, analysis indicated that, for the majority of those studied, tolerance was coexistent with an acceptance of external control; tolerance as a consequence of strong internalized controls was the rare exception. To further test the validity of these findings, anti-Negro attitudes were analyzed in a similar manner. Such analysis was particularly relevant in view of the fact that anti-Negro attitudes enjoy greater acceptance, both socially and legally, than almost any other form of ethnic intolerance.

Here it should be emphasized that controls are internalized only if the individual has erected barriers *within himself* against discharging tension in aggressive behavior—barriers which function adequately under almost all circumstances except those of self-defense. Such controls, once established, are relatively independent of prevailing mores and of who the object of aggression may be.

As pointed out in Chapter VII, the adequacy of a person's controls not only reflects the impact of controlling institutions, but also determines the degree of his hostilities. Thus a man may have developed strong and internalized controls precisely because his hostilities are over-powerful. Such a person may be tolerant, but he is not the most desirable member of a society striving for greater tolerance. He remains a deviate whose vital energies are spent not in constructive social action but in a personal battle with his own unintegrated hostility.¹

¹The example of the extreme pacifist seems to support this contention. The conscientious objector is a man whose conscience objects even to socially approved hostility. He obviously fears disapproval by his own controls more than condemnation by the rest of the citizenry, because the power of his own controls is stronger motivating forces than those exercised by society. In his case, temporary or even permanent societal attitudes toward aggression cannot influence his personal behavior. Conscientious objectors are usually characterized not only by their rejection of war-time aggression, but also by a consistent rejection of ethnic intolerance. Since aggression itself is prohibited by their controls, their attitudes of tolerance do not falter or

While fully internalized controls function relatively independent of the changing social picture, persons whose tolerance is due less to internal than to external controls, show significant differences in their attitudes. These differences depend chiefly on whether the external controlling institutions prohibit, disapprove, condone, or even approve of intolerance against a particular group. It is common knowledge that the institutional patterns and the informal mores of the community differ sharply for the Negro and the Jew. Imputed racial differences also affect the status and treatment of the Negro to a greater extent than they do those of the Jew. This was particularly true among members of the sample, as was indicated by many statements to the effect that the Jew was "white after all," or that there was "no racial difference" between Jew and Gentile. Social scientists may agree on the fallacy of thinking in racial terms. But a scientific study of interethnic hostility cannot overlook present day thinking in terms of "race" because of its widespread influence on attitudes and behavior.

Popular attitudes toward ethnic groups are based on a type of thinking which can neither be understood nor analyzed when it is conceived as being similar to that of the social scientist. For instance, the concept of

vary when confronted with different ethnic groups, even if society directs various degrees, or types, of hostility against one or the other of these groups.

Psychoanalytical study of some conscientious objectors has revealed that the unusual strength of controls which prohibited them from any discharge of hostility against other human beings was not a matter of rational conviction but a vitally needed defense against the fear of total disintegration. Their unconscious hatred of man originated in their hatred of some of the most significant figures of their family and was so overwhelming that they dreaded the consequences of discharging even the smallest amount of hostility against anyone. They behaved as though any lapse in control might lead to a total and uncontrollable discharge of hostility, including discharge against the original source and object of hatred—their parents or siblings. In one case, conscientious objection was traced to the fear that bearing arms on a home visit might accidentally lead to the killing of a particular member of the family. The only way to avoid such danger, this C.O. felt, was under no circumstances to touch any weapon, even if such behavior led to the most far-reaching consequences. One might add, of course, that no imagined consequences could possibly have been as far-reaching as the feared patricide.

Frequently it is the argument of the brotherhood of men which is put forward by pacifists. They feel they must avoid wartime service because to them it implies not only the killing of human beings, but fratricide. This fear of doing violence to a brother figure is likely to be a reaction-formation born of an animosity toward close relations.

Individuals who find no basis in their own feelings for fearing potential fratricide can more readily permit themselves to discharge aggression into socially approved outlets. They have fewer doubts about their ability to control aggressive tendencies. They can view the opposing soldier either as an enemy, or as a potentially lovable human being who is as unfortunate as they are in having to bear arms and to fight a war.

"race" has to the unsophisticated person a wealth of emotional connotations which relate it far more closely to mythical (magical) thinking than to reason. The "inscrutable" Chinese seems so uncanny, so alien, that the feeling of foreignness blocks most attempts at the real contacts differentiated from mere propinquity,—which might reduce differences to a comparable and an understandable level.

Similarly, it appears that German propagandists, in order to make the German people (or a sizable segment of it) accept genocide, had to employ the notion of racial differences, of the inferiority of the Jewish "race" and the danger that it might contaminate the "superior" German race. That genocide, where it was accepted, was approved of only on racial grounds is indicated by the fact that before the large-scale extermination of Polish and Russian people was launched, the idea of their racial difference and inferiority had first to be propagated with great vigor.

Why, in the twentieth century, the racial idea was selected by various authoritarian governments as a central idea for arousing masses is a critical question. Recently, progressively larger groups have come to constitute ingroups. Historical development in the western world from the tribe, to the city-state, to the small country, and finally to the national state has led in the last century to the consolidation of empires on a national and multinational basis. Under the impact of modern technology which required larger and larger areas for effective economic organization as well as the earlier spread of common cultural and religious values, the recognition of "sameness" was gradually extended beyond national barriers. In most recent times there have developed alongside of nationalistic attitudes a number of ideological identifications which have further loosened national boundaries and are being used to extend the power of major nations—for example, communism and aryanism. If this process were to continue, extranational units based on common ideologies would eventually replace nations as the ingroups.²

One of the tests which permits one to determine who is a member of the ingroup is that of marital custom. If, for instance, one tries to understand "race" as it is generally conceived, no other single criterion seems equally as suitable as the taboo on intermarriage. Both in the law and in the mores some of the strongest taboos have been those against intermarriage between "races." In questions of exogamy it is

² The current and violent revival of nationalism in certain European countries may frequently be viewed as a defensive reaction against the explicit threat of outside aggression and the implicit realization of the passing of national identity.

consensus alone which determines who belongs to a different race. To the Germans, the Jews were exogamous—a dangerous alien “race” with whom one ought not to cohabit. (The first and most far-reaching anti-Jewish laws in Germany had for their central topic the problem of intermarriage.) In the United States, the Jews, though not particularly sought after as marriage partners, are nevertheless in the main accepted as “endogamous,” while intermarriage between whites and Negroes is still rejected as “exogamous.”³

In view of the prevalence of anti-Negro attitudes it was expected that those men whose control of aggression depended on the influence of external factors would follow the patterns set by controlling institutions with regard to their own attitudes toward Negroes, and hence be intolerant. On the other hand it was assumed that those subjects whose controls against aggression were truly internalized would be tolerant regardless of the mores of the community. But the nature of his controls is not the only determining factor of an individual's intolerance. It was also expected that whether or not a person's anti-Negro feelings transcended those of his community would depend on the degree of his personal feelings of deprivation and anxiety. In view of the prevailing attitude towards Negroes among the group from which the sample was selected, only those men, generally speaking, whose controls were fully internalized should have been tolerant of all interethnic groups. In all other cases, ethnic attitudes were likely to be influenced by the following factors: (1) the norms established by the controlling institutions toward the particular ethnic group; (2) the degree to which the individual accepted (or submitted to) external control; and (3) the intensity of feelings of deprivation and anxiety.

It should again be emphasized that the acceptance or rejection, the adequacy or inadequacy of controls mentioned in these pages are relative quantities, describing only differences in degree. As a whole, the persons studied were a group of law-abiding citizens. Hence they submitted to or accepted some measure of external control, or at least as much of it as was institutionalized in the law and its agencies. The acceptance of controls seemed to indicate a relatively high degree of conformity to social institutions and mores and was therefore expected to be paralleled by a tendency to adopt society's discrimination of Negroes, at least as long as they remained within legal bounds.

³ Lately another subdivision seems to have been created, with all mankind separated into two “exogamous” classes with respect to marriage—communist and noncommunist. In 1948, the Supreme Soviet approved a ban on all marriages between Russians and foreigners.

A study of the correlates of anti-Negro attitudes, and their comparison with anti-Semitic attitudes, seemed to corroborate these propositions.

Data in the previous chapter indicate that among the sixty-one men who were tolerant toward Jews there were only fourteen whose tolerance seemed due to fully or partly internalized controls, while the tolerance of the remainder seemed due rather to the external control of hostile tendencies. By contrast, half of those who were tolerant to the Negro (seven out of twelve) had internalized controls. It may be added that although twelve of the 150 men forming the sample were tolerant of Negroes, only nine were tolerant of both Jews and Negroes. Of these nine men whose tolerance embraced both Jews and Negroes, seven had fully or partly internalized controls. Only two of the men who were tolerant of both groups seemed to be motivated by external controls. Apparently, internal controls are necessary in order to remain free of accepted prejudice.⁴

Thus while disinterestedness was not uncommon, actual acceptance of an outgroup was relatively rare among members of the sample—as rare as truly internalized controls. The majority of the men tended to follow the dominant cultural patterns of the groups to which they belonged so long as they were not subject to the additional pressure of deprivation or anxiety.

Hostility, it may be said, is displaced not only from the particular object in relation to which it originated, but also from the incomprehensible and often intangible sequence of events which gives rise to frustration and anxiety. Such displaced hostility is often increased by hostility initially originating not only in the social but also in the most private sphere, such as a man's relations to his boss, or to his marriage partner.⁵

In general, such displaced hostility tends to be discharged against a weak group which cannot retaliate with threatening counteraggression, and hence creates no additional anxiety.

In the main, the life circumstances of the veterans were not too favorable for the development of independent ethnic attitudes. Most of them

⁴ This distribution of tolerance among both groups is in line with Freud's analysis according to which all social feelings which embrace individuals outside the primary group are based on internalization—that is, they are due to superego control: "Social feelings arise in the individual as a superstructure founded upon impulses of jealousy and rivalry against his brothers and sisters. Since the enmity cannot be gratified, there develops an identification with the former rival . . . the identification is a substitute for an affectionate object-choice which has succeeded the hostile aggressive attitude." Freud, S.: *The Ego and the Id*, London, Hogarth Press, 1947, p. 50.

⁵ The role of displacement originating in poor sex relations, as evidenced by accusations against Negroes here, and Jews in Germany, should be mentioned in this connection.

had parents whose life histories and cultural levels were such that, excepting for events within their own family circle, they had no need to develop an independent code of interethnic behavior. There was no motive for disregarding the mores of the surrounding community in this regard. Thus the parents transmitted to their children their own viewpoints on larger social issues—opinions which were in accord with the values and standards of behavior which the controlling institutions of society also represented.

Independent opinions on social issues are often the consequence of either rebellion against parent and community, or of the child's having first internalized parental values only to find, later on, that they do not accord with the mores of the community. If this sort of conflict is successfully resolved through integration, ego strength may result, and, in the area of ethnic relations, a high degree of tolerance.⁶

Most members of the group studied experienced no inner conflicts about ethnic issues. The mores of their parents in this regard were those of the surrounding community. When a child rebels against his parents he needs the support of his own age-mates, and selects issues on which he is experiencing such support. These controversial issues confront the individual with the important task of finding solutions independent of parental mores. However, no such pressure for the integration of conflicting values about ethnic relations was experienced. Since parental behavior and external authority were in accord, the individual tended to follow the interethnic pattern already prepared for him. In the case of the sample, the selection of targets for ethnic aggression was relatively predetermined: they selected those of whom not only they, but also their parents, and their community disapproved.⁷

The validity of this observation was demonstrated by the anti-Semite of Chapter VII, who said: "Everyone has prejudices. You just have to have

⁶ Southerners have sometimes become fighters for tolerance. Their tolerance is not infrequently the result of rebellion against parental values, or those of the community in general. But those who do not solve their conflicts through integration remain eternal rebels and are not effective in their struggle for tolerance. For them, the tolerance movement is mainly an outlet for unintegrated hostility and is recognized as such by their opponents. Those who succeed in solving their conflicts emerge with a much stronger ego, and then their efforts, which are the consequence of effective sublimation, are of value to the community at large. They can succeed because they no longer hate their opponents and their opponents recognize that they are not merely being attacked.

⁷ Such attitudes are in marked contrast to those of certain types of college students who are all too frequently made the subject of interethnic attitude research, although few inferences can be drawn from such studies to the population at large. These students, often only in temporary revolt against parental authority, frequently embrace the liberal attitudes of the college community without lasting effect.

something to aim at." Apparently, if there are various groups available against whom to discriminate, that group is selected against whom discrimination is relatively least contrary to an individual's controls.

While "everyone has prejudices," the very intolerant men "hated everybody," as one of them put it. But one cannot live in society and hate everybody. Therefore some psychological methods must be used for dealing with these emotions and one such method is to displace all hatred onto persons or groups who are more suitable for the purpose.

It has been noted that the social mores select the particular groups against whom more or less hostility is discharged. It was therefore expected that those phenomena which were significantly related to anti-Semitism would be analogously associated with intolerance toward the Negro. It was also anticipated that since American society in general, and the group to which these men belonged in particular, is more apt to condone intolerance toward the Negro, these correlates would prove less selective. Therefore, for example, relatively small differences in anxiety might be expected to be associated with different degrees of intolerance toward the Jews, while such differences in anxiety would be associated with intolerance toward Negroes, although the instrument would not permit ascertaining the difference. Conversely, the nature or degree of control which seemed adequate enough to restrain hostile tendencies from finding overt anti-Semitic expression might not be strong enough to restrain an individual from making anti-Negro statements.

It must not be overlooked that, to the men studied, Jew and Negro appeared in quite different relations to themselves. To the men who aspired to higher social status the Jews often seemed to have been successful in this regard, while the Negro almost always seemed an inferior who should be prevented from threatening the individual's superiority. The analysis of the stereotyped pictures of Jews and Negroes showed that the Jew was predominantly seen as the person who should be reduced in status (who "should not own so much"), while the Negro was the person who should not aspire to or be permitted to gain equal status with the men. The desire to achieve the symbols of higher status with which the Jew was invested counteracted hostility to some degree, since the attitudes ascribed to the Jew were at least partially accepted by the individual as features of his ego ideal.

High degrees of ethnic intolerance are seemingly incompatible with the desire to match the status of the discriminated person. Actually total rejection and extreme hostility cannot be maintained if the feeling of envy toward the discriminated person comes to consciousness. To the

intolerant the superiority of his own group must always be assumed. In the sample, the intolerant men wished the Jews to have "less" than they themselves possessed, while tolerant men could admit they would like to have as much as they felt the Jews had. Partial identification which is implied in any wish to have as much as (be like) the other person is incompatible with high degrees of intolerance, and appeared to be wholly absent in the case of the Negro. In effect, the intolerant men wished the Jews not to be more successful than they were, and wished the Negro to remain definitely below their own standards. The last sentiment was only very rarely expressed in connection with the Jews, and then only by extreme anti-Semites.

A comparative analysis of the data gathered in this study bore out expected findings with regard to the Negro: the correlates of intolerance proved more selective for anti-Semitism than for anti-Negro attitudes. A higher degree of association was found between attributes of intolerance and anti-Semitism than anti-Negro attitudes although the degree of hostility against the Negro was much higher. Otherwise the data presented a pattern of similarity between the correlates of anti-Semitism and anti-Negro attitudes, with some few exceptions.

The five attributes most highly associated with anti-Semitism were the same as those for anti-Negro attitudes. When ranked in order they showed only a slight deviation for Jews and Negroes as may be seen below.

<i>Anti-Semitism</i>	<i>Anti-Negro Attitudes</i>
Feeling of deprivation	Feeling of deprivation
Social mobility	Social mobility
Rejection of controlling institutions	Rejection of controlling institutions
Economic apprehensions	General optimism
General optimism	Economic apprehensions

The greater selectivity of these attributes for indicating anti-Semitism than for indicating anti-Negro attitudes can be seen from their comparison.

The similarity between anti-Negro feelings and anti-Semitism was further corroborated by the fact that of the various other attributes for which the interview probed nearly all those which proved unrelated to anti-Semitism were also unrelated to the degree of intolerance toward Negroes.

Both age and education were statistically unrelated to anti-Negro attitudes, although, as in the case of anti-Semitism, those veterans who

were older or less educated tended to be more intolerant. Political party affiliations and religious denominations were also unrelated to intolerance toward Negroes. (See Appendix, Tables 14(A), 15(A), 16(A), 17(A).)

TABLE I(VIII)

ATTRIBUTES OF INTOLERANCE

Attitude	Coefficient of Contingency	
	Anti-Semitism	Anti-Negro Feeling
Feeling of deprivation	.249	.107
Social Mobility	.114	.098
Rejection of controlling institutions	.112	.072
Economic apprehension	.082	.030
General optimism	.049	.084

On the whole, newspaper reading habits among veterans of all attitudes toward Negroes did not differ significantly. (See Appendix Table 19(A).) However, as far as individual newspapers were concerned, the *Daily News* and the *Sun* had the most tolerant readers.⁸ The tabloid *Times* had a largely intolerant readership among the sample. It was the only paper significantly different from the others in this respect. It should be observed that the *Tribune*, as in the case of anti-Semitism, did not attract a more intolerant readership.

Family composition, as in the case of anti-Semitism, was not associated with anti-Negro attitudes. An exception was the *significantly* greater percentage of divorce found in the families of the outspokenly and intensely anti-Negro veterans. (Appendix Table 19(A).) In Chapter IV it was reported that a greater tendency toward both anti-Semitic and anti-Negro attitudes could be found in those families in which one parent was foreign-born as contrasted with families in which both parents were either born abroad or were native-born. (See also Table 13(A) in the Appendix.) Both of these indices of the absence of family cohesion—divorce and mixed nativity of parents—seem to emphasize that family disorganization may be an important source of intolerance, at least for the group studied.⁹ This observation is in line with findings reported in

⁸ As noted in Chapter IV, the *Sun* and the *Times* were New Deal papers as opposed to the *Herald-American* (Hearst) and the *Tribune*, with the *Daily News* falling somewhere between.

⁹ The absence of a significant relation between divorce and degree of anti-Semitism may be due to the fact that many more men were outspokenly and intensely anti-Negro than anti-Semitic and since only a small percentage of the sample came from broken homes the number of outspoken and intense anti-Semites whose parents were divorced was too small to make the relationship statistically significant.

Chapter VII that those men who recalled their childhood as deprivational were *significantly* more intolerant toward the Jews. They were similarly more intolerant of the Negroes.

A pattern similar to that of anti-Semitism was encountered with regard to social mobility. Outspoken and intense attitudes against the Negro were found most highly concentrated in the downwardly mobile group, while the pattern was significantly reversed for those who had experienced upward mobility (see Table 2(VIII)).

Those who had experienced no change in social mobility presented a picture midway on the continuum of anti-Negro attitudes. (The no-mobility group as a whole was *significantly* different from both the downward mobility and from the upward mobility categories. This stands somewhat in contrast to correlates of anti-Semitism where the no-mobility group more closely resembled the attitudes of the upwardly mobile group.)

While the no-mobility group was most generally in the outspokenly anti-Negro category, anti-Semitism in this group was milder in that it was

TABLE 2(VIII)
ANTI-NEGRO ATTITUDES AND SOCIAL MOBILITY

	Downward Mobility		No Mobility		Upward Mobility		Total	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Tolerant and Stereotyped	5	28	18	26	22	50	45	34
Outspoken	5	28	40	59	17	39	62	48
Intense	8	44	10	15	5	11	23	18
Total	18		68		44		130	

most generally in the stereotyped category. These data supply another crude index of the limits of intolerance toward minority groups in a northern urban industrial community. In the case of the Jew, the social norms were most likely to produce merely stereotyped thinking, while it was "normal" to be outspoken in one's restrictive hostility toward the Negro.

It has been argued above that stereotyped anti-Semites are potential outspoken and intense anti-Semites, should conditions of social mobility

be altered. The same reasoning appears applicable to anti-Negro attitudes, with the observation that downward mobility is likely to produce the extreme and unbridled hostilities.

As in the case of anti-Semitism, there was a small group of veterans who were upwardly mobile but intensely anti-Negro. Many more members of the upwardly mobile group revealed strongly anti-Semitic attitudes than revealed strongly anti-Negro attitudes; a comparison of Tables 4(IV) and 2(VIII) shows a difference of 32 per cent versus 11 per cent. It is suggestive to assume that this difference may be due to the fact that some members of this upwardly mobile group had reached the status of upper middle class, while their majority were still lower middle class despite their successful movement upward. As a group, they would now be in status competition with a group according to popular opinion more closely identified with Jews. On the other hand it is likely that as individuals they would be less likely to feel the impact of Negro competition.

While these observations seem to stress the socioeconomic factor in ethnic prejudice (but also the psychological factor of fear of failure in competition) it should be repeated that the majority of this upwardly mobile group was on the tolerant end of the continuum. An identical number (exactly half the group) had the most tolerant attitude on the three-point continuum both toward Jews and toward Negroes. Thus it seems that the generally optimistic outlook on life which one might expect in a relatively successful group, combined with the relative ego strength which goes with success, is considerably more important in conditioning attitudes of tolerance than the social and economic factor of competition.

Further insight into the difference between anti-Semitic and anti-Negro attitudes was provided by the socioeconomic correlates of anti-Negro attitudes. Here, in contrast to anti-Semitism, anti-Negro attitudes bore an association to certain of the indices of socioeconomic status.

The current salary range of the veterans as well as their rank at the time of discharge produced no statistically significant differences when related to anti-Negro attitudes, as in the case of anti-Semitism. (Compare Tables 3(IV) and 20(A).)

However, socioeconomic status, as measured by the Alba Edwards scale (see Chapter IV) was found to reveal *significant* differences in anti-Negro attitudes. (See Table 21(A) in the Appendix.) Semi-skilled workers were found to be more outspokenly or intensely anti-Negro. Other levels of socioeconomic status were not significantly related to intolerance. Among the clerks and kindred worker categories there was

no concentration of outspoken or intense attitudes against the Negro. Within the age group studied the white-collar workers, often accused of being particularly prejudiced, proved to be no more anti-Semitic or anti-Negro than any other group. The study of attitudes prevalent among semi-skilled workers, however, suggests that the group which is directly threatened in its economic (job) security is likely to be more intolerant of the group with which it feels it is in competition.

This observation was borne out by the higher concentration of anti-Negro attitudes in the semi-skilled category which accounts in substantial measure for the association between anti-Negro attitude and socioeconomic stratification, an association which was absent as regarded anti-Semitism. This distribution of anti-Negro attitudes is compatible with the positive relation between tolerance and social mobility. A relatively high proportion of the sample was concentrated in the semi-skilled category. There the pressure for upward social mobility meets with a minimum amount of success as a result of increasingly rigid class stratification. In particular, this group is directly subject to economic competition from the Negro in the mass production and construction industries. This may explain why apprehension about unemployment was *significantly* associated with anti-Negro attitudes.

All of the foregoing also seems applicable to the association between anti-Negro attitudes and the veteran's job aspiration. Dubious feelings or outright doubt that he would be able to achieve his occupational ambitions were *significantly* associated with the degree of a man's anti-Negro attitudes. On the other hand those veterans who felt they would succeed in achieving their occupational and economic aspirations were *significantly* more tolerant of the Negro. Such associations were not found in the case of anti-Semitism.

Reactions to war experiences and their relation to expressions of anti-Negro feelings followed closely the pattern of anti-Semitism discussed in Chapter V. In both cases, subjective feelings of deprivation were significantly associated with intolerance. The more objective criteria of conditions of army service (such as combat vs. noncombat, injuries sustained, length of service, and the like) proved unrelated to intolerance. While the men's overall statements about army experiences demonstrated that *significantly* more of those who felt subjectively deprived by army life held anti-Negro attitudes, definite convictions of having had a bad break in the army, or that time spent in the army was a serious setback, tended to be concentrated among those men who were outspokenly

and intensely anti-Negro, although this pattern was not definite enough to be statistically significant.

Remarks about army experiences which indicated the individual's tendency to identify with national goals were found to be associated with tolerance toward Negroes, as was the case with tolerance toward Jews.

During the discussion of army experiences the veterans were asked, "How did the fellows in your outfit get along with the Negroes?" Responses offered an indirect method of gauging the association between intolerance and personal contact with Negroes in the army. Almost 40 per cent of the men claimed to have had no contact with Negroes while in service (that is, close or sustained contact). Claiming to have had no contact with Negroes in the army was *significantly* associated with outspoken and intense intolerance toward the Negro. Of course, contact with Negroes in the army is not necessarily associated with decreased hostility toward them. However it is quite possible that outspoken and intense hostility toward Negroes may have been associated not only with a tendency to avoid contact, but also to deny having had such contact. (The percentage who claimed to have had no contact with Jews was too small to permit statistical breakdowns in terms of degree of anti-Semitism, so that no comparison with anti-Semitism was possible.)¹⁰

When the pattern of anti-Negro attitudes was viewed in terms of the structure of the men's controls, the hypothesis of intolerance as a function of inadequate controls tended to be confirmed. But while the thesis was qualitatively confirmed, its application in the case of the Negro shows that even relatively adequate controls were not strong enough to permit tolerance toward the Negro.

In general only those who possessed truly internalized controls seemed to have genuinely tolerant attitudes toward Negroes. In the case of anti-Semitism, the acceptance of or submission to external control seemed enough to support a relative tolerance. But where the Negro was concerned, the same degree of acceptance was accompanied by attitudes

¹⁰ In contrast to the type of random contacts with Negro troops for which the interview questions probed, a study by the Information and Education Division, U. S. War Department, reports that more favorable attitudes toward Negro troops were encountered in white soldiers who had direct combat experiences with Negroes. Some Negro platoons of infantry volunteers were employed with white infantry platoons in combat conditions in Europe. But although the use of Negro platoons alongside of white platoons represented relatively close contact between white and Negro troops, it was still a form of segregation since, both under actual combat conditions and while in reserve, the men were organized into color-line platoons and not completely intermixed. (*Report No. B-17*, Washington: Information and Education Division, Army Service Forces, U. S. War Department, 1945.)

which were largely stereotyped and outspoken rather than tolerant—for those were the corresponding norms of our society.¹¹

In the case of the Negro, societal controls exercise a regulating and restraining influence only on what would be classified as "intense" intolerance, or open expressions of the desire for violence. Such violence is generally disapproved of by the controlling institutions—while they approve, if not enforce, stereotyped and outspoken attitudes. Therefore, those men who were strongly influenced by external controls were, in the majority, stereotyped and outspoken but not intense in their expressions of intolerance toward Negroes.

This emerged quite clearly when the comprehensive index of attitudes toward institutions of external authority (see Table 3(VII)) was related to anti-Negro attitudes (see Table 3(VIII)).

TABLE 3(VIII)

ATTITUDES TOWARD THE NEGRO AND TOWARD CONTROLLING INSTITUTIONS

	Tolerant		Stereotyped		Outspoken		Intense		Total	
	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage
Acceptance	9	75	19	48	38	51	6	25	72	48
Intermediate	2	17	16	40	23	31	4	17	45	30
Rejection	1	8	5	12	13	18	14	58	33	22
Total	12		40		74		24		150	

The division between those who rejected and those who accepted external control came between outspoken and intense attitudes toward Negroes. To score "high" on the index of rejection for the four controlling institutions meant that an individual was likely to fall in the intensely

¹¹ The legal sanctioning of segregation, such as in restrictive covenants, does much to develop and maintain stereotyped opinions about Negroes. Not only do the consequences of segregation breed "dirtiness" and "negligence," they also lend support to the rationalization of such covenants by creating tangible evidence that the presence of Negroes devaluates property. Such regulations also tend to increase the habit of stereotyped thinking about Negroes. Real-estate values may decline due to the influx of Negroes, but while this is commonly stressed, the increase in return which the property often yields due to higher rents is usually neglected. The correlation which psychoanalysis has revealed to exist in nearly every instance, between anal preoccupation on the one hand and an interest in cleanliness and money (property) on the other, is highly suggestive. The common reaction-formation against anality, in our society, is wealth and "property." Therefore the rejection of dirt must, psychologically speaking, coexist with the accusation that such "dirtiness" rules out the maintenance of wealth and property.

anti-Negro category. Acceptance of external controls was not only inadequate in conditioning men to be tolerant of the Negroes, it was not even enough to prevent them from holding outspoken views in that regard. It served only to restrain demands for open violence.

These observations are further corroborated by a more detailed analysis of the relationship between attitudes towards the Negro and those toward specific symbols of authority. No significant association between tolerance toward the Negro and acceptance of those authority symbols selected for investigation could be established. The number of persons who were tolerant toward the Negro was so small in the sample that it may have influenced the findings to some degree. But the number of men who held merely stereotyped opinions—and were thus relatively more tolerant—was large enough to indicate a significant tendency had it been present.

Of all the social institutions which represent symbols or systems of authority, one stands alone at the top of the ethical scale: religion. Problems of expedience or momentary dissatisfaction may influence a man's attitude toward any one of the four symbols of social authority which were used in constructing the index. Therefore religion and religious attitudes were deliberately not included because religious authority seemed to rank on a different plane. In studying the association between religious attitudes and anti-Semitism it was found that stability of religious convictions was *significantly* associated with tolerance toward Jews. Such association was *not* encountered in the case of the Negro, thus demonstrating an apparent weakness of religious authority in this respect.¹² The fact that nearly all correlates of tolerance toward the Jews proved less discriminating for the Negro seems to offer a convenient explanation. Nevertheless, this seems a rather flimsy explanation for so strong an influence as the precept of brotherly love.

Historically speaking, one might have expected that Christian animosity toward the unbeliever would have induced men with stable religious convictions to feel more strongly about non-Christians (Jews) than about fellow Christians (Negroes). True, while medieval religious fervor often led to religious persecution, the modern American-Protestant interpretation of Christianity has tended towards greater tolerance. But tolerance of the Jews out of religious conviction cannot explain why no similar

¹² True, there are regions in the U.S. where segregation in church attendance is upheld and condoned. In such instances, the church performs the same function in attitude formation that the law does when it supports restrictive covenants in secular life. However, this was not true in Chicago where the study was made, and where on the whole the church has preached tolerance and has practiced it.

association could be found between stability of religious convictions and relatively greater tolerance toward the Christian Negro.

In the discussion of stereotypes in Chapter III it was mentioned that prejudice against Jews is rationalized differently from prejudice against the Negro. It was pointed out that according to psychoanalytic theory the psychological mechanisms underlying prejudice are those of projection and displacement—both of them efforts to retain or to reestablish a threatened intrapsychic balance. While various unacceptable tendencies can be dealt with in this way, the projections themselves, in order to remain within the limits of “normal” behavior, must withstand a minimum of reality testing. This means that there must be a nucleus of reality around which they must be built up (see p. 32 f) and it must be possible to rationalize them by means which are satisfactory to the individual’s controlling institutions and to the group to which he belongs. Reality is not tested out of context, nor are rationalizations developed independent of the prevailing frame of reference. Hence rationalizations which would frequently have to be reexamined or challenged for their compatibility with the individual’s life experiences would finally prove useless either to the individual’s superego, or to his ego. However such challenges would have to originate with members of his own group. Only if the ingroup challenges the rationalization does it become inadequate for protecting the projection or displacement which would thus lose its value in securing the individual’s integration, devious as that might be.

But the rationalization of prejudice does more than just allow for displacements. It also serves more important and more devious purposes. Initially the superego objects to a tendency which must therefore be displaced. But for the same reason that the superego initially rejected the tendency, it not only comes to approve of the persecution of the individual onto whom the tendency was displaced, it even demands it. As a matter of fact, persecution on the grounds of morality has had superego sanction throughout history. This was particularly clear in cases of religious persecution where the pagan’s destruction was not only permitted, but demanded by the superego. Such persecution is one of the instances in which the superego permits gratification of hostile and sadistic tendencies which must otherwise be warded off. Thus the usually restraining function of the superego over instinctual (id) tendencies is for all practical purposes perverted into its opposite. A major function of the superego is to demand—or so at least one would hope in our society—that the weaker group, the minority, should not be persecuted. But because of the rationalization it has invented to justify the persecution, and because of

the unacceptable tendency it has displaced onto the minority, the superego now demands the minority's persecution.

In a way, this form of behavior is no more than a continued "persecution" of the self for its own objectionable tendencies and would, if it came to consciousness, be experienced as guilt. Therefore the ego in its defensive function rids itself of the guilt by externalizing it and displacing it on persons who thus become "guilty" instead, so that the ego itself can go free. In its synthesizing function the ego tries to eliminate all conflicts between id and superego by externalizing tendencies originating in one or the other and displacing them onto other persons. If such displacement is directed at members of an ethnic outgroup, the phenomenon of ethnic intolerance ensues. Once id tendencies are thus dealt with, for instance, the outgroup may then be experienced vicariously as enjoying filth. If superego tendencies are dealt with in the same way, the outgroup is experienced as persecuting the ingroup. The feeling of guilt which originally "persecuted" the self within its structure is now gone, for the persecution has been externalized. Thus, in a way, no persecution of a minority group takes place where the majority group does not feel "persecuted" by the minority.¹³

Eissler has pointed out that in those cases where tendencies rejected by the superego are displaced on members of an outgroup, the rationalizations for persecution of the outgroup induce the superego to join its energy to the id's asocial impulses. In this way the instincts are supplemented by seemingly moral convictions and support the ego's attempt to satisfy the tendencies of both id and superego.¹⁴ If this analysis should be valid, it would follow that the fury with which an outgroup is persecuted, and the degree of guilt which such aggressive behavior entails, would depend to a large degree on whether the externalized conflict as well as the rationalizations applied to justify the persecution were of such a

¹³ This projection of guilt, which makes individual members of the group projecting the guilt feel persecuted, is by no means restricted to phenomena of ethnic intolerance. In most wars known to history each warring group has accused the other of having "started" the war, i.e., of having persecuted the other group. This was usually explained as "hypocrisy" on the part of one or both warring parties. The view that this phenomenon is a rationalization by means of which each group tries to justify its case offers only a partial explanation. The justification of aggression by rationalization is only an addition to the primary phenomenon of guilt projection. Most members of the warring groups simply feel guilty about their own aggressions set loose. They project this persecution by their own superegos onto members of the other group, who thus become, psychologically speaking, the true persecutors. The fight against them then becomes true "self-defense," i.e., defense of the self against tendencies which threaten its integration.

¹⁴ Eissler, K. R.: "Incidental Observations During Psychiatric Surveys on Seven German Prisoners of War," *American Journal of Psychotherapy* II:53, 1948.

nature that the superego could join forces with the id. If rejected id tendencies are externalized and if rationalizations used are in line with the superego's moral demands (as for instance when an outgroup is accused of disorderliness or laziness) then id and superego join energies in the persecution. If, on the other hand, superego demands are displaced, because they are too overwhelming or too contrary to the pleasure drives, then tendencies are externalized, which are still basically in line with the superego demands, although rationalizations may be used which are unacceptable to the superego. Therefore such "persecution" will never be quite free of guilt feelings, and never be as vicious as the persecution of amorality.¹⁵

In present-day U. S. society, unacceptable id tendencies are mainly displaced onto Negroes (sex libertinism, dirtiness, laziness). Therefore, the superego can lend full support to their discrimination, since these are tendencies against which it fights continuously. Religion, the representation of superego demands, is thus much weaker as a mitigating influence on intolerance of the Negro than on intolerance of the Jew. This may explain why stability of religious convictions was so markedly associated with tolerance toward the Jew but failed to be associated with tolerance toward the Negro.

This theoretical analysis seems to be borne out by the data on stereotypes (see Tables 2(III) and 3(III)). In terms of frequency, the two stereotypes most often applied to the Negro were that they are dirty and that they depreciate property. Both of them are related to id demands, and both contain symbols which are closely connected with anal preoccupation; the first directly, the second as the accusation that the Negro destroys what is the frequent, and in our society, the most highly esteemed reaction-formation against anality: wealth. The acceptance of dirt and the interference with a reaction formation against it are therefore most obnoxious to a culture which maintains that "cleanliness is next to godliness."

The two stereotypes most often applied to the Jews were that they are clannish and help one another, and that they have the money. Helping one another is certainly a superego demand. (True, this stereotype

¹⁵ This can be observed, for instance, in a classroom situation where the mediocre students may sneer at intellectual achievements in others—a reaction which is not free of guilt and therefore relatively mild. On the other hand, if such a classroom group attacks one of its members because of dirtiness or bad smell, the persecution will be much more vicious, and free of guilt. In this case, the students feel their own balance threatened by the example of someone who is getting away with undesirable behavior. Against such a threat, the students who discriminate against the "dirty" one will be restrained in their actions only by societal sanctions.

is frequently combined with the depreciatory one of clannishness. But basically the accusation of clannishness implies nothing but a restatement of the otherness of this different "clan" and as such is without ethical connotation. It acquires its depreciatory flavor only through fear of the strange outgroup, and through envy—as discussed on p. 39.) Interest in the possession of money—quite apart from the high status it provides in our society—is certainly a reaction-formation, developed under societal and superego pressure, against the primitive interest in dirt. Thus the rationalizations used for justifying anti-Semitism are closely related to superego demands.

It now becomes understandable why external controls, as the creations, representations, or symbols of superego demands, lend support to the discrimination of those groups on whom id tendencies are displaced, while they mitigate the discrimination of groups on whom reaction-formations against id tendencies are displaced. In view of these observations it was to be expected that the lack of association between tolerance toward the Negro, on the one hand, and acceptance of the four societal institutions or stability of religious convictions, on the other, would also hold true for the other symbols of authority which were studied. The acceptance of or submission to army authority, for example, proved unrelated to tolerance toward the Negroes. Those who got along with their officers and those who felt that army discipline was "all right" were neither more nor less tolerant toward Negroes than the rest of the group.

In summary, a study of attitudes toward symbols of external control supports the impression received from the earlier evaluation of individual interviews: only integrated attitudes make for true tolerance. Only a strong ego is able to synthesize the opposing tendencies of pleasure and reality in line with the pressures of the environment. Only a strong ego manages to gratify instinctual tendencies without having to resort to "persecution" and only such a strong ego is able to maintain balance without projecting or displacing those strivings which in a weak ego lead to unmanageable inner conflicts.

While the study of anti-Semitism indicates that, other things being equal, the acceptance of or submission to external controls seemed sufficient to assure a moderate, if not tolerant attitude, the study of anti-Negro attitudes suggests that such moderation in feelings about Jews is of a rather tenuous nature. It will perhaps be maintained so long as another outgroup provides objects for the displacement and persecution

of instinctual tendencies which threaten the person's integration, and so long as external controls favor a tolerant attitude toward Jews.

The study has revealed a few deviant cases in which men displayed tolerant attitudes toward both Negroes and Jews despite the absence of strong egos, but each of them was due to unusual combinations of circumstances. One man, for example, was tolerant of Jews and Negroes although he had the characteristics of those men whose egos were weak, and applied the same mechanisms for maintaining his integration which characterized the intolerant men. The fact was that he had displaced almost all of his unacceptable and externalized id tendencies on Russia and communism (and in turn felt persecuted by them) so that he needed no other "scapegoat."

Men who relied on nonintegrated controls—whether in the form of external authority or nonintegrated superego pressures¹⁶—for maintaining their defense against asocial instinctual pressures could not function without discriminating against some minority group or other. Their tolerance of the Jews was due mainly to the fact that Negroes presented more "suitable" objects for discrimination. This suggests that the specific problem of anti-Semitism, as opposed to intolerance in general, can never be viewed as isolated but must always be analyzed within the context of the societal structure in which it occurs. The same must also hold true for discrimination of the Negro, or of any other ethnic minority. If two or more such minorities are available for the displacement of internal conflicts, and if their position in society makes one more "logical" for displacement of id tendencies, while the other seems more suitable for displacement of reaction-formations against id tendencies, then the first of the two groups will usually experience more serious discrimination.¹⁷

Personality structure alone, then, cannot entirely explain why people set out to discriminate against particular ethnic groups, or why they are more discriminating of one group than another. The defensive needs of the individual, the economic and social structure of the community, and the ethnic realities of the moment must also be taken into account. From

¹⁶ One veteran who held stereotyped opinions about minorities made statements which revealed considerable anxiety about his economic future and also displayed other attitudes characteristic of an intensely intolerant personality make-up. However, his ethnic aggressions were restrained by an overstrict, unintegrated super-ego. This was indicated by his remarks about the importance of strict upbringing, when he said: "Nowadays children are too free. There's not enough discipline. I was ruled with an iron hand and it sure served a good purpose. The good old tanning system is best."

¹⁷ This is why it would be erroneous to apply lessons learned from German anti-Semitism, for example, to settings such as the United States, without making ample allowance for differences in the social structure of the two countries.

the preceding discussion it appears that in the United States and in a northern metropolis, the stereotyping and discrimination of Jews is currently fulfilling certain defensive personality needs, while the stereotyping and discrimination of the Negro fulfills others. It might well be that in the absence of one of these two ethnic minority groups, all or most of these defensive needs would be satisfied by "persecution" of the remaining one, or so at least might be inferred from the German example. But in the city studied—and in most other important United States centers of culture and policy formation—these two ethnic minorities exist, occupy differing positions in the community, and are made use of accordingly.