

CHAPTER III

THE STUDY OF ANTI-SEMITIC IDEOLOGY

Daniel J. Levinson

A. INTRODUCTION

One of the most clearly antidemocratic forms of social ideology is prejudice, and within this context anti-Semitism provides a fruitful starting point for a social psychological study. As a social movement, organized anti-Semitism presents a major threat to democracy: it is one of the most powerful psychological vehicles for antidemocratic political movements and it provides, for reasons which are largely politico-economic and beyond the scope of this discussion, perhaps the most effective spearhead for a frontal attack on our entire social structure.

From a psychological viewpoint as well, anti-Semitism is particularly important and revealing. Much that psychologically oriented writers have already said about anti-Semitism and about fascism suggests that the deeper psychological sources of these ideologies are very similar. The irrational quality in anti-Semitism stands out even in casual everyday discussions. The fact that people make general statements about "the Jew," when the Jews are actually so heterogeneous—belong to every socioeconomic class and represent every degree of assimilation—is vivid evidence of this irrationality. This striking contrast between the Jews' actual complexity and their supposed homogeneity has suggested the hypothesis that what people say against Jews depends more upon their own psychology than upon the actual characteristics of Jews. For example, when the belief that Jews possess financial power out of all proportion to their numbers persists in the face of overwhelming evidence to the contrary, one is led to suspect not only that the individual holding this belief has an unusual preoccupation with power but also that he might himself wish to assume the kind of power which he supposes Jews to have. It is clear that research into the emotional sources of ideology is required for the understanding of such phenomena as these.

These considerations, which suggest the advantage of making anti-Semitism a point of departure for research, were also some of the hypotheses that guided the research as a whole. The study of anti-Semitism may well

be, then, the first step in a search for antidemocratic trends in ideology, in personality, and in social movements.

Anti-Semitism is conceived here as an ideology, that is, as a relatively organized, relatively stable system of opinions, values, and attitudes concerning Jews and Jewish-Gentile relations. More specifically, it involves *negative opinions* regarding Jews (that they are unscrupulous, clannish, power-seeking, and so on); *hostile attitudes* toward them (that they should be excluded, restricted, kept subordinate to Gentiles, and so on); and *moral values* which permeate the opinions and justify the attitudes.

Numerous questions concerning the structure and content of anti-Semitism were raised in Chapter II. These and other questions guided the construction of an opinion-attitude scale for the measurement of anti-Semitic ideology. The source material for the scale included: the writings of virulent anti-Semites; technical, literary, and reportorial writings on anti-Semitism and fascism; and, most important, everyday American anti-Semitism as revealed in parlor discussion, in the discriminatory practices of many businesses and institutions, and in the literature of various organizations which are trying, with small success, to counter numerous anti-Semitic accusations by means of rational argument.

This scale, like the others used in the present research, had several functions. It yielded a quantitative measure which could be correlated with measures of other, theoretically related, variables. It provided a basis for the selection of criterion groups of extreme high and low scorers, who could then be subjected to intensive clinical study. It permitted, as part of a larger questionnaire, a relatively detailed, quantifiable study of large groups of subjects. Finally, it was constructed in such a way that statistical analysis of its properties might reveal much of the structure, scope, and content of anti-Semitic ideology.

B. CONSTRUCTION OF THE ANTI-SEMITISM (A-S) SCALE

An opinion-attitude scale is a series of statements dealing with a given topic, in this case anti-Semitic ideology. The subject is asked to respond to each item by agreeing or disagreeing. His responses are converted into scores in such a way that a high score indicates a great amount of what is being measured—for this scale, anti-Semitism—a low score the opposite. The scoring procedure is discussed below (Section C).

The Likert method of scaling (73, 84) was used. It is easier to apply and requires fewer items than the Thurstone method (118), but yields equally high reliabilities and generally comparable results (22, 84). It was desired to avoid the assumptions and difficulties in the use of judges which the latter method entails. Also, since it was anticipated that in further stages of the research the items might be modified in wording, it was highly desirable to

avoid the repeated use of judges. A measure of intensity of opinion and attitudes is obtained, in the Likert method, by having the subject indicate the degree of his agreement or disagreement with each item; this makes possible a more adequate determination of subtle group and individual differences, and facilitates the qualitative analysis of individual response patterns. This method also permits the covering of a wider area of opinions and attitudes. Finally, the Likert technique of item analysis (see below) was particularly suited to the general theoretical approach of this research.

1. GENERAL RULES IN ITEM FORMULATION

The procedure used for selecting and formulating items, in contrast to a frequent practice, did not involve the testing of several hundred items as a basis for selection of a final short scale. Rather, fifty-two items were formulated and all of these were used throughout the statistical analysis of the preliminary form of the scale. (To anticipate a result presented below, only a few items were statistically inadequate, and this inadequacy is interesting in its own right.) In successive stages of the research there were, however, no qualms about modifying, deleting, or adding items.

The present scale differs from most opinion-attitude scales in that it contains only negative items, that is, they all state the anti-Semitic position regarding the issue in question. The reasons for the use of negative items only and an answer to some possible criticisms, presented in detail in a previous publication (71), may be summarized here. One advantage of negative items is that they tend to be more discriminating. Also, negative items can be so phrased that they express subtle hostility without seeming to offend the democratic values which most prejudiced people feel they must maintain. Since the scale attempts to measure receptivity to anti-Semitic ideology, it seemed reasonable to use only anti-Semitic statements in the scale. The main argument against the present procedure is that it might produce a "set" or mechanical tendency consistently to agree or to disagree. This argument is answered on the ground that (a) most individuals show variability of response, as indicated by item intercorrelations averaging .3-.4; (b) there is a tendency to vary in order to avoid an extreme position; (c) very similar results have been obtained in later stages of the present research when an all-negative scale is inserted randomly into a longer series containing positive items; and, most important, (d) since the "set" argument implies that high scorers are not necessarily anti-Semitic nor lows anti-anti-Semitic, the final test is the validity of the scale, that is, the demonstration that high scorers are significantly different from low scorers in a variety of meaningful characteristics. The scale does, as will be shown later, have considerable validity.

Since the A-S scale, like the others, was intended not only to provide a *quantitative* measure of an ideology but also to aid in the *qualitative* description of that ideology (and of individual ideological patterns), its construc-

tion followed certain general rules. These rules had to do with (a) the formulation of individual items, and (b) the division of the total scale into subscales.

Since the scale should not, for practical reasons, include more than about fifty items (preferably fewer in later forms), each item should be maximally rich in ideas and there should be a minimum of duplication in wording or essential content of items. While the items are therefore often more complex than those of many other scales, this is not considered a fault. At the same time, they should be clear and unambiguous in meaning, so that agreement is ordinarily an expression of anti-Semitism, disagreement an expression of its opposite. It is important to avoid "double-barreled" items, that is, items with two parts such that a subject might agree with one part and disagree with the other, and thus not know how to respond.

Extreme prejudice of a violent and openly antidemocratic sort does not seem to be widespread in this country, especially in the middle class.¹ Since the present scale is intended to measure everyday, "garden variety" anti-Semitism, the items were formulated in such a way as to reflect the prevalent forms in which anti-Semitism now appears.

Most prejudice as one finds it in business, housing, and general social interaction is *pseudodemocratic* rather than *openly antidemocratic*; this distinction plays an important role in the analysis of anti-Semitic ideology which guided the construction of the scale and the formulation of items. An idea may be considered openly antidemocratic when it refers to active hatred, or to violence which has the direct aim of wiping out a minority group or of putting it in a permanently subordinate position. A pseudodemocratic idea, on the other hand, is one in which hostility toward a group is somewhat tempered and disguised by means of a compromise with democratic ideals. Pseudodemocratic statements about Jews are often introduced by qualifying phrases which deny hostility or which attempt to demonstrate the democratic attitude of the speaker, e.g., "It's not that I'm prejudiced, but. . ."; "Jews have their rights, but. . ."

This pseudodemocratic façade is probably relatively untouched by most of the current literature attacking prejudice as "race hatred," "un-American," "un-Christian intolerance," and the like. There is no hatred in the surface content of these attitudes and they have been squared with certain democratic values in such a way that the individual holding them apparently feels little if any sense of antidemocracy. And, of course, merely to label this way of thinking as un-American will not change it, first, because labeling is not enough, and second, because such thinking falls within one of the main streams of American social history and can be found to some extent in most sections of American life. It is necessary, rather, to understand its

¹ This is shown by various public opinion polls and reportorial studies although comprehensive and rigorously obtained data are lacking. It is also indicated by results from the present study.

external sources in American culture and tradition as well as the inner sources which make certain individuals particularly receptive to these cultural pressures.

It is probably an error to regard the pseudodemocratic compromise as a mere surface disguise used deliberately and skillfully by prejudiced people to camouflage their actual, conscious antidemocracy. The person whose approach to social problems is pseudodemocratic is actually different *now* from one whose approach is now openly antidemocratic. For various reasons—perhaps because he has internalized democratic values, perhaps out of conformity to present social standards—the pseudodemocrat does not now accept ideas of overt violence and active suppression. The concern with democratic values, and the resistance to antidemocratic ones, must be considered as psychologically and socially important facts in any attempt to understand prejudice, American variety. Undoubtedly very many people who are now pseudodemocratic are potentially antidemocratic, that is, are capable in a social crisis of supporting or committing acts of violence against minority groups. Nevertheless, it is important to understand the attempted compromise with democratic values: because it may reveal a democratic potential which might, if supported and strengthened, ultimately gain the upper hand; because it colors the whole fabric of pseudodemocratic social thinking; and, since this compromise reflects the prevalent forms of overt discrimination in this country—quotas, segregation, exclusion, denial of opportunities—to understand the former may help to combat the latter.

If patterns of ideology are conceived as falling on a dimension ranging from democratic to antidemocratic, then the pseudodemocratic ones probably stand somewhere between the center and the antidemocratic extreme. This is, of course, not a simple dimension: there are diverse approaches falling into each of these broad categories, and the dimension is not a simple quantitative one like length or weight. A change of certain trends in an individual may produce a qualitative reorganization and ideological change from one extreme of this dimension to the other. The task is to understand the total individual and, especially in the case of the pseudodemocrat, to gauge the psychological potential for both democracy and open antidemocracy.

Most of the items of the A-S scale have been formulated as pseudodemocratically as possible. This consideration was, in fact, one of the main reasons for the use of negative items only. The following rules have been followed in general: Each item should be made appealing and "easy to fall for" by avoiding or soft-pedaling or morally justifying ideas of violence and obvious antidemocracy. Much use is made of qualifying phrases such as "One trouble with Jewish . . ."; "There are a few exceptions, but . . ."; "It would be to the best interests of all if . . .," in order to avoid a categorical, aggressive condemnation. Items are worded so that the person can add at the end: "but I am not anti-Semitic." Seeming tentativeness is introduced by qualifications such as "it seems that," "probably," "in most cases." Finally, an attempt is made to

give each statement a familiar ring, to formulate it as it has been heard many times in everyday discussions.

To the extent that the above rules have been followed, pseudodemocratic subjects are likely to make scores on this scale as high, or nearly as high, as those of the antidemocratic ones. It will be the task of later techniques, both questionnaire-style and clinical, to provide further information concerning the distinctions between these two groups of subjects.

2. MAJOR SUBDIVISIONS OR AREAS: THE SUBSCALES

The general rules of item formulation just described refer primarily to the formal structure of items and can be applied to each item irrespective of the *content* of the ideas expressed in it. The content of the items was largely determined by the general conception of anti-Semitic ideology and the specific hypotheses discussed above. Several subscales were formed in order to insure systematic coverage of the various aspects conceived and in order to test certain hypotheses. The subscales cannot be thought of as dealing with *components* of anti-Semitism in any statistical sense; they are not based on statistical treatment of prior results, nor was any intensive correlational analysis of the present items made. The subscales are, rather, convenient ways of conceiving and grouping items.

The anti-Semitism scale contains five subscales dealing respectively with imagery (opinions) of Jews as personally *offensive* and as socially *threatening*; with *attitudes* concerning what should be done to or against Jews; and with the opposing views that Jews are *too seclusive* or *too intrusive* (assimilative). These subscales are probably not entirely independent either in a statistical sense or with respect to the actual content of the items; indeed, there is some question as to whether certain items may not equally well have been placed in a different subscale than the one to which they were assigned. Nevertheless, each subscale as a whole seems to deal with a fairly definite and definable phase of anti-Semitism. The subscales will now be discussed in order.

a. SUBSCALE "OFFENSIVE" (S_0). This subscale is presented in Table 1 (III). (The items are numbered as they appeared in the total scale, which was given in two parts, I and II, with twenty-six items in each part; thus, I-4 is Item 4, part I.) The items describe various "Jewish traits" which are offensive, unpleasant, and disturbing. Stereotypy is implicit in items ascribing faults to "Jews"—implicitly, "all" or "most" Jews—without recognition of individual differences. It is explicit in item I-13, which specifically states that "Jews are pretty much alike" and which indicates an image of "the Jews" as a stereotyped model of the entire group.

What are the characteristics of this stereotyped image? If the other items offer an adequate description, "the Jew" is extravagant, sensual, conceited, and overaggressive; but he is also "smelly," shabby, and unconcerned with his personal appearance. Jews are accused of being excessively Jewish, so to

TABLE I (III)
ANTI-SEMITISM SUBSCALE "OFFENSIVE"

- I-1. Jews seem to prefer the most luxurious, extravagant, and sensual way of living.
- I-4. A major fault of the Jews is their conceit, overbearing pride, and their idea that they are a chosen race.
- I-7. No matter how Americanized a Jew may seem to be, there is always something basically Jewish underneath, a loyalty to Jewry and a manner that is never totally changed.
- I-10. Districts containing many Jews always seem to be smelly, dirty, shabby, and unattractive.
- I-13. There are a few exceptions, but in general Jews are pretty much alike.
- I-16. The Jews should not pry so much into Christian activities and organizations nor seek so much recognition and prestige from Christians.
- II-1. The Jews should make sincere efforts to rid themselves of their conspicuous and irritating faults if they really want to stop being persecuted.
- II-4. There is something different and strange about Jews; one never knows what they are thinking or planning, nor what makes them tick.
- II-7. The trouble with letting Jews into a nice neighborhood is that they gradually give it a typical Jewish atmosphere.
- II-10. I can hardly imagine myself marrying a Jew.
- II-13. One general fault of Jews is their overaggressiveness, a strong tendency always to display their Jewish looks, manners, and breeding.
- II-16. Jews should be more concerned with their personal appearance, and not be so dirty and smelly and unkempt.

speak, but their attempts to assimilate into "Christian" activities are regarded as prying. Jewish faults are considered the main cause of anti-Semitism (Item II-1), which would be eliminated if the Jews made sincere efforts to improve. However, there is some doubt that Jews can ever quite manage to be fully Americanized (Item I-7). Item II-10, "I can hardly imagine myself marrying a Jew," is included here because it seems to refer more to an unpleasant image than to a clear-cut, hostile attitude. It represents a pseudodemocratic equivalent to Item I-15 in the "Attitude" subscale (see below). Are people consistent in their general agreement (or disagreement) with these items? This will be seen in the results presented below.

b. SUBSCALE "THREATENING" (S_T). These items, presented in Table 2 (III), describe the Jews as a dangerous, dominating, corrupting social group. They are asserted to have great power economically and politically, and to be unscrupulous and conniving in their dealings with Gentiles. They do not like hard work (Item II-11) but at the same time they lower the general standard of living by doing menial work and by living under low standards (Item I-14). In addition to being simultaneously rich and poor, powerful and parasitic, they are also at once capitalists and revolutionaries. In their lack of patriotism they are a threat to the nation, and in general they are a threat to civilization.

Apart from the enormous complexity of "the Jew" so described, there is something fantastic in the idea that a group so small numerically can be so

TABLE 2 (III)
ANTI-SEMITISM SUBSCALE "THREATENING"

- I-2. The Jews must be considered a bad influence on Christian culture and civilization.
- I-5. One trouble with Jewish businessmen is that they stick together and connive, so that a Gentile doesn't have a fair chance in competition.
- I-8. Jewish power and control in money matters is far out of proportion to the number of Jews in the total population.
- I-11. There are too many Jews in the various federal agencies and bureaus in Washington, and they have too much control over our national policies.
- I-14. Jews tend to lower the general standard of living by their willingness to do the most menial work and to live under standards that are far below average.
- II-2. War shows up the fact that the Jews are not patriotic or willing to make sacrifices for their country.
- II-5. Jews may have moral standards that they apply in their dealings with each other, but with Christians they are unscrupulous, ruthless, and undependable.
- II-8. The Jew's first loyalty is to Jewry rather than to his country.
- II-11. Jews seem to have an aversion to plain hard work; they tend to be a parasitic element in society by finding easy, nonproductive jobs.
- II-14. There seems to be some revolutionary streak in the Jewish make-up as shown by the fact that there are so many Jewish Communists and agitators.

powerful and so basic a social threat. This imagery in extreme cases seems to be an ideological expression of underlying paranoid trends; in *Mein Kampf*, for example, the Jews are regarded not only as "base and inferior" but also as having "germicidal potency" and "devilish cunning." However, most American anti-Semites are undoubtedly not psychotic or paranoid in the usual psychiatric sense. The personality trends related to this kind of imagery in Americans will be dealt with in later chapters.

c. SUBSCALE "ATTITUDES" (S_A). All the attitudes contained in this subscale (see Table 3(III)) are regarded as negative or hostile to the Jews as a group, and this hypothesis is generally borne out by the statistical results. These attitudes were intended to represent varying degrees of discrimination ranging from simple avoidance to suppression and attack, with intermediate actions of exclusion, quotas (partial exclusion), and segregation. In order to cover many forms of discrimination, a list of the major social areas in which it occurs was used in the formulation of items. These areas are: employment, residence (neighborhoods, apartment houses, hotels), education and professions, marriage, social organizations, politics, the nation. Item II-21 is a good example of pseudodemocracy: it assumes that the Jews are actually a threat (imagery: powerful, offensive, etc.) and suggests that the Jews solve "their own problem"—implicitly, that if they do not limit themselves voluntarily, the Gentiles may be forced to more drastic action. A person can agree to this, and many have, in the name of tolerance and democracy. It is, nevertheless, essentially an anti-Semitic idea: first, because as a matter of fact, it correlates well with the scale as a whole, and second, because it is based on hostile imagery, suppressive attitudes, and the assumption that anti-

TABLE 3 (III)
ANTI-SEMITISM SUBSCALE "ATTITUDES"

- I-3. In order to maintain a nice residential neighborhood it is best to prevent Jews from living in it.
- I-6. Colleges should adopt a quota system by which they limit the number of Jews in fields which have too many Jews now.
- I-9. A step toward solving the Jewish problem would be to prevent Jews from getting into superior, profitable positions in society, for a while at least.
- I-12. The Jewish problem is so general and deep that one often doubts that democratic methods can ever solve it.
- I-15. It is wrong for Jews and Gentiles to intermarry.
- I-18. It is best that Jews should have their own fraternities and sororities, since they have their own particular interests and activities which they can best engage in together, just as Christians get along best in all-Christian fraternities.
- I-21. It is sometimes all right to ban Jews from certain apartment houses.
- I-24. Anyone who employs many people should be careful not to hire a large percentage of Jews.
- II-3. It would hurt the business of a large concern if it had too many Jewish employees.
- II-6. The best way to eliminate the Communist menace in this country is to control the Jewish element which guides it.
- II-9. In order to handle the Jewish problem, Gentiles must meet fire with fire and use the same ruthless tactics with the Jews that the Jews use with the Gentiles.
- II-12. It is not wise for a Christian to be seen too much with Jews, as he might be taken for a Jew, or be looked down upon by his Christian friends.
- II-15. One of the first steps to be taken in cleaning up the movies and generally improving the situation in Hollywood is to put an end to Jewish domination there.
- II-18. Most hotels should deny admittance to Jews, as a general rule.
- II-21. Jewish leaders should encourage Jews to be more inconspicuous, to keep out of professions and activities already overcrowded with Jews, and to keep out of the public notice.
- II-24. It would be to the best interests of all if the Jews would form their own nation and keep more to themselves.

Semitism is merely a rational reaction of Gentiles to the intrinsic badness of Jews.

d and e. SUBSCALES "SECLUSIVE" (S_8) AND "INTRUSIVE" (S_1). It is often stated that the cause of anti-Semitism lies in the fact that "Jews are different," and it has often been suggested that assimilation is the only solution to "the Jewish problem." Indeed, many Jews have taken the same point of view, attempting in every way possible to take over the prevalent culture of their local American community, and becoming anxious over all signs of "foreign Jewishness" in their family and friends. This is not the place to discuss the problem of the adjustment of Jews and other minorities to American culture. The question raised here concerns instead the psychology of anti-Semites: Is Jewish assimilation what they really want? If Jews behaved in a thoroughly conforming manner, would this satisfy the anti-Semites? One

indication that these questions will receive negative answers lies in the fact that highly assimilated Jews usually meet the same sort of discrimination that others do. Another sign in the same direction is the stereotypy so common in anti-Semitism. To the extent that a person is reacting to his self-created label or image of "the Jew" rather than to the *particular Jewish individual* with whom he is dealing, it matters but little what the Jew in question is like. The sign "no Jews wanted" is entirely insensitive to the virtues or faults of the specific individual applying for a job.

TABLE 4 (III)
ANTI-SEMITISM SUBSCALES "SECLUSIVE *vs.* INTRUSIVE"
A. "Seclusive"

- I-5. One trouble with Jewish businessmen is that they stick together and connive, so that a Gentile doesn't have a fair chance in competition.
- I-17. Much resentment against Jews stems from their tending to keep apart and to exclude Gentiles from Jewish social life.
- I-20. The Jews should give up their un-Christian religion with all its strange customs (kosher diet, special holidays, etc.) and participate actively and sincerely in the Christian religion.
- I-23. Jews tend to remain a foreign element in American society, to preserve their old social standards and to resist the American way of life.
- II-13. One general fault of Jews is their overaggressiveness, a strong tendency always to display their Jewish looks, manners, and breeding.
- II-17. The Jewish districts in most cities are results of the clannishness and stick-togetherness of Jews.
- II-20. Jewish millionaires may do a certain amount to help their own people, but little of their money goes into worthwhile American causes.
- II-23. The Jews keep too much to themselves, instead of taking the proper interest in community problems and good government.

B. "Intrusive"

- I-11. There are too many Jews in the various federal agencies and bureaus in Washington, and they have too much control over our national policies.
- I-16. The Jews should not pry so much into Christian activities and organizations nor seek so much recognition and prestige from Christians.
- I-19. One thing that has hindered the Jews in establishing their own nation is the fact that they really have no culture of their own; instead, they tend to copy the things that are important to the native citizens of whatever country they are in.
- I-25. Jews go too far in hiding their Jewishness, especially such extremes as changing their names, straightening noses, and imitating Christian manners and customs.
- II-3. It would hurt the business of a large concern if it had too many Jewish employees.
- II-7. The trouble with letting Jews into a nice neighborhood is that they gradually give it a typical Jewish atmosphere.
- II-19. The true Christian can never forgive the Jews for their crucifixion of Christ.
- II-25. When Jews create large funds for educational or scientific research (Rosenwald, Heller, etc.), it is mainly due to a desire for fame and public notice rather than a really sincere scientific interest.

In an attempt to quantify attitudes regarding assimilation, two subscales representing opposing sides on this issue were included in the A-S scale (Table 4(III)). Subscale "Seclusive" (S_8) takes the stand that Jews are too foreign and unassimilated; it accuses them of being clannish, of keeping apart, and of not being sufficiently concerned with other groups and other ways. The implication of these items is that Jews ought to assimilate more, that they could solve the problem of anti-Semitism themselves by entering more actively into American life and by conforming more closely with American conventions and standards. (Two of these items were also included in other subscales, Item I-5 being also in S_T , and II-13 in S_0).

Subscale "Intrusive" (S_I), on the other hand, accuses the Jews of over-assimilation and overparticipation. When Jews seem to be conforming in social behavior they are actually just "imitating" and "hiding their Jewishness" (Item I-25). Their attempts to join organizations are based on prestige-seeking and the desire to pry (Item I-16). Their admission into the government or into neighborhoods only leads to attempts by them at control and domination of non-Jews (Items I-11, II-7). Their seeming philanthropy is based on selfish motives (Item II-25). And finally, they lack a culture of their own and must therefore copy or "sponge on" the culture of the country in which they live (Item I-19). The implication of these items, in direct contrast to those in the "Seclusive" subscale, is that Jews ought to keep more to themselves and to develop a culture, preferably even a nation, of their own. (Four of these items were also included in other subscales, Item I-11 being also in S_T , I-16 and II-7 in S_0 , and II-3 in S_A .)

f. "NEUTRAL" ITEMS NOT IN A SUBSCALE (TABLE 5(III)). Four items in the A-S scale were not included in any of the five subscales. This illustrates

TABLE 5 (III)

"NEUTRAL" ITEMS IN THE ANTI-SEMITISM SCALE

- I-22. One big trouble with Jews is that they are never contented, but always try for the best jobs and the most money.
- I-26. There is little doubt that Jewish pressure is largely responsible for the U. S. getting into the war with Germany.
- II-22. There is little hope of correcting the racial defects of the Jews, since these defects are simply in their blood.
- II-26. On the whole, the Jews have probably contributed less to American life than any other group.

the fact that the subscales represent "components" of anti-Semitism only in a general prestatistical sense. A correlational analysis of the scale would very probably indicate components containing these four items, since they deal with significant aspects of anti-Semitic ideology and since they correlate well with the total scale.

Item II-22 is worth noting in particular; it takes a hereditarian-racist stand concerning the "defects" of the Jews and, like all hereditarian approaches, is pessimistic regarding improvement of group relations along democratic

lines. To the person who feels that Jews have special and basic faults which cannot be changed, all talk about ending discrimination, about improving Jewish-Gentile relations, and about "what Jews can do to help themselves" is meaningless and irrelevant. The fact that many people who take this "Jewish immutability" viewpoint also tend to tell the Jews how they must change is another sign of the illogicality of anti-Semitism. This idea of the insolubility of the problem is also expressed in Items I-7 and I-12.

3. THE TOTAL ANTI-SEMITISM (A-S) SCALE

The total anti-Semitism scale consists of fifty-two items and comprises all the items in the five subscales as well as the four neutral items discussed above. Both parts of the scale are present in Table 6(III), with instructions to subjects, just as it was administered.

TABLE 6 (III)
THE TOTAL ANTI-SEMITISM SCALE
Public Opinion Questionnaire A

This is an investigation of general public opinion concerning Jewish people. The following are statements with which some people agree and others disagree. Please mark each one in the left margin, according to the amount of your agreement or disagreement, by using the following scale:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| +1: slight support, agreement | -1: slight opposition, disagreement |
| +2: moderate support, " | -2: moderate opposition, " |
| +3: strong support, " | -3: strong opposition, " |
- _____ 1. Jews seem to prefer the most luxurious, extravagant, and sensual way of living.
 - _____ 2. The Jews must be considered a bad influence on Christian culture and civilization.
 - _____ 3. In order to maintain a nice residential neighborhood it is best to prevent Jews from living in it.
 - _____ 4. A major fault of the Jews is their conceit, overbearing pride, and their idea that they are a chosen race.
 - _____ 5. One trouble with Jewish businessmen is that they stick together and connive, so that a Gentile doesn't have a fair chance in competition.
 - _____ 6. Colleges should adopt a quota system by which they limit the number of Jews in fields which have too many Jews now.
 - _____ 7. No matter how Americanized a Jew may seem to be, there is always something basically Jewish underneath, a loyalty to Jewry and a manner that is never totally changed.
 - _____ 8. Jewish power and control in money matters is far out of proportion to the number of Jews in the total population.
 - _____ 9. A step toward solving the Jewish problem would be to prevent Jews from getting into superior, profitable positions in society, for a while at least.
 - _____ 10. Districts containing many Jews always seem to be smelly, dirty, shabby, and unattractive.
 - _____ 11. There are too many Jews in the various federal agencies and bureaus in Washington, and they have too much control over our national policies.

- _____12. The Jewish problem is so general and deep that one often doubts that democratic methods can ever solve it.
- _____13. There are a few exceptions, but in general Jews are pretty much alike.
- _____14. Jews tend to lower the general standard of living by their willingness to do the most menial work and to live under standards that are far below average.
- _____15. It is wrong for Jews and Gentiles to intermarry.
- _____16. The Jews should not pry so much into Christian activities and organizations nor seek so much recognition and prestige from Christians.
- _____17. Much resentment against Jews stems from their tending to keep apart and to exclude Gentiles from Jewish social life.
- _____18. It is best that Jews should have their own fraternities and sororities, since they have their own particular interests and activities which they can best engage in together, just as Christians get along best in all-Christian fraternities.
- _____19. One thing that has hindered the Jews from establishing their own nation is the fact that they really have no culture of their own; instead, they tend to copy the things that are important to the native citizens of whatever country they are in.
- _____20. The Jews should give up their un-Christian religion with all its strange customs (kosher diet, special holidays, etc.) and participate actively and sincerely in the Christian religion.
- _____21. It is sometimes all right to ban Jews from certain apartment houses.
- _____22. One big trouble with Jews is that they are never contented, but always try for the best jobs and the most money.
- _____23. Jews tend to remain a foreign element in American society, to preserve their old social standards and to resist the American way of life.
- _____24. Anyone who employs many people should be careful not to hire a large percentage of Jews.
- _____25. Jews go too far in hiding their Jewishness, especially such extremes as changing their names, straightening noses, and imitating Christian manners and customs.
- _____26. There is little doubt that Jewish pressure is largely responsible for the U. S. getting into the war with Germany.

THE TOTAL ANTI-SEMITISM SCALE
Public Opinion Questionnaire S

This is an investigation of general public opinion concerning Jewish people. The following are statements with which some people agree and others disagree. Please mark each one in the left margin, according to the amount of your agreement or disagreement, by using the following scale:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| +1: slight support, agreement | -1: slight opposition, disagreement |
| +2: moderate support, “ | -2: moderate opposition, “ |
| +3: strong support, “ | -3: strong opposition, “ |

- _____ 1. The Jews should make sincere efforts to rid themselves of their conspicuous and irritating faults, if they really want to stop being persecuted.
- _____ 2. War shows up the fact that the Jews are not patriotic or willing to make sacrifices for their country.
- _____ 3. It would hurt the business of a large concern if it had too many Jewish employees.

- _____ 4. There is something different and strange about Jews; one never knows what they are thinking or planning, nor what makes them tick.
- _____ 5. Jews may have moral standards that they apply in their dealings with each other, but with Christians they are unscrupulous, ruthless, and undependable.
- _____ 6. The best way to eliminate the Communist menace in this country is to control the Jewish element which guides it.
- _____ 7. The trouble with letting Jews into a nice neighborhood is that they gradually give it a typical Jewish atmosphere.
- _____ 8. The Jew's first loyalty is to Jewry rather than to his country.
- _____ 9. In order to handle the Jewish problem, Gentiles must meet fire with fire and use the same ruthless tactics with the Jews that the Jews use with the Gentiles.
- _____ 10. I can hardly imagine myself marrying a Jew.
- _____ 11. Jews seem to have an aversion to plain hard work; they tend to be a parasitic element in society by finding easy, nonproductive jobs.
- _____ 12. It is not wise for a Christian to be seen too much with Jews, as he might be taken for a Jew, or be looked down upon by his Christian friends.
- _____ 13. One general fault of Jews is their overaggressiveness, a strong tendency always to display their Jewish looks, manners, and breeding.
- _____ 14. There seems to be some revolutionary streak in the Jewish make-up as shown by the fact that there are so many Jewish Communists and agitators.
- _____ 15. One of the first steps to be taken in cleaning up the movies and generally improving the situation in Hollywood is to put an end to Jewish domination there.
- _____ 16. Jews should be more concerned with their personal appearance, and not be so dirty and smelly and unkempt.
- _____ 17. The Jewish districts in most cities are results of the clannishness and stick-togetherness of Jews.
- _____ 18. Most hotels should deny admittance to Jews, as a general rule.
- _____ 19. The true Christian can never forgive the Jews for their crucifixion of Christ.
- _____ 20. Jewish millionaires may do a certain amount to help their own people, but little of their money goes into worthwhile American causes.
- _____ 21. Jewish leaders should encourage Jews to be more inconspicuous, to keep out of professions and activities already overcrowded with Jews, and to keep out of the public notice.
- _____ 22. There is little hope of correcting the racial defects of the Jews, since these defects are simply in their blood.
- _____ 23. The Jews keep too much to themselves, instead of taking the proper interest in community problems and good government.
- _____ 24. It would be to the best interests of all if the Jews would form their own nation and keep more to themselves.
- _____ 25. When Jews create large funds for educational or scientific research (Rosenwald, Heller, etc.) it is mainly due to a desire for fame and public notice rather than a really sincere scientific interest.
- _____ 26. On the whole, the Jews have probably contributed less to American life than any other group.

The scale is intended to measure the individual's readiness to support or oppose anti-Semitic ideology as a whole. This ideology consists, according to the conception on which the scale was based, of *stereotyped negative opinions describing the Jews as threatening, immoral, and categorically different from non-Jews, and of hostile attitudes urging various forms of restriction, exclusion, and suppression as a means of solving "the Jewish problem."* Anti-Semitism is conceived, then, as a general way of thinking about Jews and Jewish-Gentile relations.

Can one legitimately speak of a readiness in the individual to accept anti-Semitic ideology *as a whole*? More concretely, can it be expected that people will respond relatively consistently to such varied scale items? These are questions which must be answered empirically. The content and generality of anti-Semitic ideology, and the adequacy with which it is measured by the present scale are indicated below by a statistical analysis of scale results. The validity of the scale will be indicated by correlations of the scale with measures of other, theoretically related, variables, and by analysis of the responses of the two subjects discussed in Chapter II.

C. RESULTS: STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SCALE

The procedure used for all scales in the present research was to allow six choices of response for each item: slight, moderate, or strong agreement, and the same degrees of disagreement, with no middle or neutral category. Each subject indicated the degree of his agreement by marking +1, +2, or +3, disagreement by -1, -2, or -3.

It seemed likely that three degrees of agreement or disagreement could easily be distinguished by the subjects, and that three degrees gave them the best chance to record clearly felt differences in strength of agreement or disagreement. Certainly the data indicate that all six response categories were used. The "don't know" category has been a source of difficulty and controversy in many fields of psychological research (121). In techniques which permit its use, it tends to be the most frequent choice. Without it, the subject must take a stand one way or the other, although the categories of slight agreement and slight disagreement permit him to be nearly neutral. If a subject is unable to decide, he can, of course, omit the item; but there were never more than 2 to 3 per cent omissions among subjects taking the questionnaire, and never more than 1 per cent of the group to which it was administered failed to fill it out adequately. Furthermore, the frequency with which the "moderate" and "strong" categories were used indicates that the items were relatively unambiguous.

The responses were converted into scores by a uniform scoring system. Since higher scores were intended to express increasing anti-Semitism, all responses were scored as follows:

-3 = 1 point	+1 = 5 points
-2 = 2 points	+2 = 6 points
-1 = 3 points	+3 = 7 points

It will be noted that the scoring skips from 3 to 5 points between -1 and $+1$. Four points represented the hypothetical neutral response, and was assigned when the item was omitted. It probably makes little difference statistically that this scheme was used rather than a six-point one in which $+1$ would receive 4 points. This scheme was used mainly because there seemed to be a greater psychological gap between -1 and $+1$ responses than between any other two adjacent responses. It was also convenient in marking the omissions.

A person's scale score is simply the sum of his scores on the single items. For the 52 items the scores can range between 52 points (1 point on each item, indicating strong opposition to anti-Semitism) and 364 points (7 points on each item, strong anti-Semitism). When the scale score is divided by 52 we obtain the mean score per item; thus, a total score of 78 can also be stated as a score per item of 1.5.

The initial results obtained with the A-S scale have been published elsewhere (71). The present discussion will deal with the second administration of the scale; on this occasion the questionnaire administered contained, in addition to the A-S scale, most of the other techniques which were used in subsequent stages of the research. The questionnaire was administered in April, 1944, to a class in Introductory Psychology at the University of California. It was given as a routine class activity in two parts, separated by an interval of one week; Part I (Questionnaire A) of the A-S scale was given in the first session, Part II (Questionnaire S) in the second. The class was designed for nonmajors in psychology and was rather heterogeneous with respect to major subject and year in school.

In view of a possible sex difference, the questionnaires of men and women were separated for statistical purposes. Due to wartime conditions, however, there were fewer than thirty men in the group, so that no statistics on men were computed. The data presented here are based on the questionnaires of the 144 women subjects, including nineteen members of major minorities: Jews, Negroes, Chinese, and foreign-born. In all subsequent groups the statistical analysis was limited to the questionnaires of native-born, white, non-Jewish Americans.

1. RELIABILITY

The reliability and related statistical properties of the A-S scale and its subscales are presented in Table 7(III). The total-scale reliability of .92 meets rigorous statistical standards, especially in view of the fact that Part II was administered a week after Part I. (The reliability of the scale on the

TABLE 7 (III)
RELIABILITY OF THE ANTI-SEMITISM SCALE AND ITS SUBSCALES

Property	Total Scale	Part I	Part II	S ₀	S _T	Subscale ^a		S _S	S _I
						S _A	S _B		
Reliability ^b	.92	.94	.91	.84	.89	.89	.71	.84	
Number of items	52	26	26	12	10	16	8	8	
Mean (total) ^c	2.70	2.74	2.66	3.08	2.59	2.47	3.28	2.55	
Mean (odd half)	2.74	2.94	2.86	3.52	2.84	2.48	3.00	2.60	
Mean (even half)	2.66	2.54	2.46	2.65	2.34	2.46	3.55	2.50	
S.D. (total) ^c	1.11	1.21	1.12	1.33	1.23	1.18	1.26	1.24	
S.D. (odd half)	1.21	1.31	1.19	1.55	1.34	1.21	1.35	1.30	
S.D. (even half)	1.12	1.15	1.15	1.30	1.32	1.25	1.45	1.35	
Range ^c	1.0-5.5	1.0-5.7	1.0-5.8	1.0-6.5	1.0-5.7	1.0-5.8	1.0-6.3	1.0-5.9	

^aThe subscales are abbreviated as follows: subscale "Offensive" (S₀), "Threatening" (S_T), "Attitudes" (S_A), "Seclusive" (S_S), "Intrusive" (S_I)

^bThe reliability of the total scale was obtained by correlating scores on Part I (the half administered first) with scores on Part II (in second half of questionnaire). All other reliabilities are based on correlations between the odd items and the even items. The correlations were corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula to give the reliability values in the table.

^cThe values of the means, S.D.'s and ranges are given in terms of mean score per item. If multiplied by the number of items in the scale or subscale in question, they are converted into values representing mean per total score or subscale.

first group studied, as previously published, was .98.) The two parts were equated in terms of the subscales, so that an equal number of items from each subscale appeared in each part. Parts I and II are also roughly equivalent in terms of mean and standard deviation. In view of the high correlation between Parts I and II, as well as their equivalence and their high reliabilities (.94 and .91), it would appear that either of them alone provides as good a quantitative measure as does the total scale.

It will be noted that the over-all mean is relatively low (140.2 as compared with a theoretical neutral point of 208) and that the obtained range includes extremely low scores but does not include the highest possible scores. The item analysis, as will be seen below, suggests the reason for this: despite our attempt to limit the scale to pseudodemocratic statements numerous items were still too openly or crudely prejudiced and had extremely low means (below 3.0). The present group of students was, however, less anti-Semitic on the average than the one studied earlier, the latter having a mean of 158 and a range of 52-303. The distribution of scores in both cases was fairly symmetrical but platykurtic, with very little clustering of scores around the mean.

The reliabilities of the total scale and of the two parts are almost matched by the high reliabilities of the subscales. Reliabilities of .8 to .9 are very satisfactory even for scales three or four times their length.

With regard to reliability, equivalence of halves, and form of distribution, then, it seems safe to conclude that the A-S scale (as well as the subscales) provides an adequate measuring instrument. It ranks the subjects with a relatively small error of measurement along a continuum or dimension. That this dimension may be called general anti-Semitism must still be demonstrated by the data on item analysis and validity which follow. No claim is made that the dimension is "pure" or homogeneous. To the extent that the scale is valid, it provides a measure of anti-Semitism in most of its generality and complexity. More specifically, it may be claimed that the higher an individual's score, the greater his acceptance of anti-Semitic propaganda and the greater his disposition to engage in anti-Semitic accusations and programs of one form or another.

2. INTERCORRELATIONS OF THE SUBSCALES

The above reliability data indicate that people are relatively consistent in their responses to the A-S scale and to the individual subscales dealing with relatively specific kinds of imagery and attitudes. Correlations among the subscales are shown in Table 8(III).

Intercorrelations of .74 to .85 are of considerable significance. The fact that they involve subscales dealing with so great a variety of opinions and attitudes is an important source of support for the hypothesis that anti-

TABLE 8 (III)

INTERCORRELATIONS^a OF THE A-S SUBSCALES

Subscale	"Threatening"	"Attitudes"	"Seclusive"	Total A-S
"Offensive"	.85	.83	.75	.92
"Threatening"		.84		.93
"Attitudes"			.74	.94
"Intrusive"			.74	

^aThese are the raw correlation coefficients. If they were corrected for attenuation to give the maximal value theoretically obtainable (with perfectly reliable instruments), they would all be well over .90.

Semitism is a general frame of mind, a way of viewing Jews and Jewish-Gentile interaction. Imagery of Jews as personally offensive and as socially threatening, attitudes of restriction, exclusion and the like, the view that Jews are too assimilative and yet too clannish—these seem to be various facets of a broad ideological pattern. An individual's stand with regard to one of these issues tends to be very similar in direction and degree to his stand with regard to the others.

The correlations of .92 to .94 between each of the three major subscales and the total anti-Semitism scale are high enough so that knowing an individual's score on any one subscale permits one to predict with considerable accuracy his score on the total A-S scale. In short, while almost every subject varies somewhat in his responses to the individual items (as will be shown below), almost every subject demonstrates a general degree of support or rejection of anti-Semitism which is relatively consistent from one type of accusation or attitude to another. This is not to say that all the ideas contained in the scale are of equal importance emotionally to each anti-Semite. It is more probable—and this view is supported by the interviews—that for each high scorer there are a few central opinions (imagery of Jews as cunning, power-seeking, sensual, etc.) and attitudes of primary importance; but these "pet" ideas seem to provide a basis or general readiness for the acceptance of almost any anti-Semitic idea. The fact that this generality is not complete suggests that various patterns of anti-Semitic ideology may exist and might profitably be studied (as variations within the general framework described here).

The correlation of .74 between subscales "Seclusive" and "Intrusive" reveals a deep contradiction in anti-Semitic ideology. As a matter of simple logic, it is impossible for most Jews to be both extremely seclusive and aloof and at the same time too intrusive and prying. This categorical, self-contradictory rejection of an entire group is, however, more than a matter of

faulty logic. Viewed psychologically, these results suggest a deep-lying irrational hostility directed against a stereotyped image to which individual Jews correspond only partially if at all.

The illogical manner in which the hostility operates is illustrated by a comparison of related items from these two subscales. Thus, "Seclusive" Item II-20 states that rich Jews help "their own people" but not "American causes." However, "Intrusive" Item II-25 takes care of any exceptions: Jews donate money not out of generosity but rather out of desire for prestige and fame. Similarly, either Jews do not take enough interest in community and government (Seclusive), or when they do, they have too much control over national politics (Intrusive). Anti-Semitic hostility leads, then, either to a denial of demonstrable facts (Jewish philanthropy, smallness of number, etc.) or to an interpretation of them which finds the Jews at fault.

The same self-contradictions and the same implications are evident in the high correlation (.74) between subscales "Seclusive" and "Attitudes." It is indeed paradoxical to accuse the Jews of being clannish and aloof, and at the same time to urge that they be segregated and restricted. It would seem, then, that a general hostility and readiness to accept negative imagery are an essential part of the psychological functioning of anti-Semitic individuals, who can regard a great variety of specific accusations, often mutually contradictory, as valid.

The reliabilities and subscale intercorrelations, taken together, permit several conclusions regarding the nature and inner sources of anti-Semitism. It is a general way of thinking in which hostile attitudes and negative opinions toward Jews predominate. Several patterns of imagery brought out by the subscales seem to be partial facets of a single broad ideological framework. While these ideas are relatively common today, it would appear that those individuals (the high scorers) who take them over most easily are different in their psychological functioning from those who do not. One major characteristic of anti-Semites is a relatively blind hostility which is reflected in the stereotypy, self-contradiction, and destructiveness of their thinking about Jews.

3. INTERNAL CONSISTENCY: STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE INDIVIDUAL ITEMS

A critical reader of the A-S scale may feel that certain items are unsatisfactory in one way or another: that they do not measure what the others measure, that everyone agrees with the ideas expressed, that certain items are too ridiculous to be supported by anyone, and so on. He may like a few items particularly and wonder how successful they were. Or he may be concerned with shortening and improving the scale and want a statistical basis for item selection and improvement. For these and other reasons a statistical analysis of the items has considerable value.

The problem can be posed in statistical terms as follows. If an item is good, in terms of the total scale, then item scores ought to correlate well with total scale scores. Since few high scorers agree with all items, and since some low scorers agree with several items, a statistical technique is necessary to determine the closeness of the relationship between item score and scale score. The most extensive technique for item analysis is the computing of *correlations* between item scores and scale scores, especially if some sort of factor analysis is planned. The Likert "Discriminatory Power" technique, although statistically more limited, has a great time-saving advantage. Furthermore, Murphy and Likert (84), obtaining both Discriminatory Powers and item-total scale correlations for a single scale, found a correlation of .91 between these two measures of item value. In other words, the order of goodness of the items, as determined by the Discriminatory Power technique, is practically the same as the order determined by the correlation technique. The Likert technique was therefore used in the present study.

The Discriminatory Power (D. P.) of each item is obtained by the following procedure. Subjects whose total scores fall in the highest 25 per cent of the distribution are considered high scorers, while those whose scores fall in the lowest 25 per cent of the distribution are considered the low scorers.

The means of the high scorers is obtained for each item and found to vary from item to item. Similarly for the low scorers. If an item measures anti-Semitism well, then anti-Semites (high scorers), as determined by the total scale score, will make higher scores on it than will those who are opposed to anti-Semitism (low scorers). The greater the difference between the item mean for the high scorers and that for the low scorers, the greater the Discriminatory Power of that item, and the better the measure of anti-Semitism it gives. A positive D. P. indicates that the item is anti-Semitic, in the sense that anti-Semites as determined by the total scale agree with the item to a greater degree than do unprejudiced subjects. If an item has a negative D. P., it has apparently been scored in reverse, since low scorers agree with it more than high scorers do. All items in the present scale have positive D. P.'s.

The data on the item analysis of the A-S scale are presented in Table 9 (III). Each item is identified by a key phrase, and the letters O, T, A, S, and I refer to the subscales Offensive, Threatening, Attitudes, Seclusive, and Intrusive respectively.

The most important data on each item are the group mean and the D. P. The group mean reflects the general group tendency toward agreement or disagreement. A mean near 4.0 indicates that the group was pretty evenly divided pro and con on the issue. Group means between 3.0 and 5.0 are likely to involve scores covering well the entire range from 1 to 7. Means below 3.0 indicate a strong group tendency toward disagreement,

THE AUTHORITARIAN PERSONALITY

TABLE 9 (III)

ANTI-SEMITISM SCALE: ITEM MEANS AND DISCRIMINATORY POWERS
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA WOMEN

Part I

No.	Item	Mean		D.P.	Mean for Total Group
		H.Q.	L.Q.		
1.	(O: luxurious)	4.44	2.03	2.41	3.11
2.	(T: bad influence)	2.75	1.11	1.64	1.85
3.	(A: keep Jews out)	4.25	1.03	3.22	2.30
4.	(O: conceit)	4.50	1.30	3.20	2.71
5.	(S,T: businessmen)	5.86	1.38	4.48	3.45
6.	(A: quota)	2.89	1.00	1.89	1.67
7.	(O: basically Jewish)	5.78	1.99	3.79	3.59
8.	(T: power and control)	5.33	2.30	3.03	3.80
9.	(A: suppress Jews)	3.61	1.05	2.56	1.84
10.	(O: dirty districts)	2.94	1.24	1.70	1.98
11.	(I,T: Washington)	4.55	1.24	3.31	2.56
12.	(A: democratic methods)	4.75	1.13	3.62	2.76
13.	(O: all alike)	5.50	1.67	3.83	3.64
14.	(T: low living standards)	3.00	1.24	1.76	2.05
15.	(A: wrong to intermarry)	4.19	1.19	3.00	2.57
16.	(I,O: prying)	3.89	1.03	2.86	2.24
17.	(S: Jews exclude Gentiles)	4.22	2.11	2.11	3.53
18.	(A: fraternities)	5.89	2.13	3.76	3.84
19.	(I: no culture)	4.86	1.73	3.13	3.19
20.	(S: give up religion)	3.03	1.30	1.73	2.66
21.	(A: apartment houses)	4.47	1.30	3.17	2.52
22.	(N: never contented)	5.42	1.22	4.20	3.17
23.	(S: foreign element)	4.28	1.38	2.90	2.88
24.	(A: don't hire Jews)	5.30	1.19	4.11	2.84
25.	(I: hide Jewishness)	4.33	1.62	2.71	2.87
26.	(N: war with Germany)	2.86	1.05	1.81	1.69
Mean:		4.34	1.42	2.92	2.74

ANTI-SEMITISM SCALE: ITEM MEANS AND DISCRIMINATORY POWERS
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA WOMEN

Part II

No.	Item	Mean		D. P.	Mean for Total Group
		H. Q.	L. Q.		
1.	(O: own fault)	5.89	2.51	3.38	4.31
2.	(T: unpatriotic)	2.97	1.05	1.92	1.75
3.	(I,A: too many employees)	4.89	1.30	3.59	2.95
4.	(O: different and strange)	4.17	1.19	2.98	2.23
5.	(T: unscrupulous)	4.47	1.16	3.31	2.45
6.	(A: Communists)	3.39	1.05	2.34	2.08
7.	(I,O: typical atmosphere)	5.28	1.32	3.96	3.23
8.	(T: first loyalty)	5.05	1.81	3.24	3.10
9.	(A: Gentiles ruthless)	3.22	1.00	2.22	1.84
10.	(O: marry a Jew)	6.58	2.30	4.28	4.22
11.	(T: parasitic)	4.36	1.27	3.09	2.19
12.	(A: avoid Jews)	3.89	1.13	2.76	2.09
13.	(S,O: overaggression)	4.97	1.73	3.24	3.44
14.	(T: revolutionary)	4.28	1.35	2.93	2.69
15.	(A: Hollywood)	3.94	1.13	2.81	2.47
16.	(O: dirty)	3.78	1.24	2.54	2.30
17.	(S: clannish)	5.78	2.32	3.46	4.57
18.	(A: hotels)	2.22	1.05	1.17	1.46
19.	(I: crucifixion)	2.69	1.08	1.61	1.66
20.	(S: millionnaires)	3.97	1.32	2.65	2.44
21.	(A: Jewish leaders)	4.64	1.62	3.02	3.07
22.	(N: racial defects)	3.86	1.08	2.78	2.40
23.	(S: Jews keep apart)	4.03	1.94	2.09	3.21
24.	(A: form own nation)	4.78	1.70	3.08	3.23
25.	(I: Rosenwald)	2.89	1.16	1.73	1.74
26.	(N: contributed least)	2.89	1.19	1.70	1.97
Mean:		4.19	1.42	2.77	2.66
Means for total scale:		4.27	1.42	2.85	2.70

Number: Total group = 144; H. Q. = 36; L. Q. = 37.

Range of total scores: Total group: 52-286; H. Q. : 183-286; L. Q. : 52-89.

with few scores of 6 or 7 (+2 and +3 responses). And group means of over 5.0, conversely, indicate relatively uniform agreement.

The Discriminatory Power, on the other hand, is a measure of the variability of the high and low scorers around the group mean, and of their average difference in response. How large must a D. P. be in order to indicate almost no overlap between highs and lows? This depends on the form of the distribution and the size of the group mean. An item with a group mean of 2.0, a low quartile mean of 1.0, a high quartile mean of 3.0, and a D. P. of 2.0, is undoubtedly very discriminating; the low scorers responded unanimously with -3, and the high scorers probably varied but little around the -1 response. In general, the more extreme the group mean (especially below 3.0 or above 5.0) the lower the D. P. can be and still adequately separate the low from the high scorers. From a broader point of view, however, the best items should have means nearer to 4.0; when the item mean is above 5.0 or below 3.0, the item should be reworded so that fewer people or more people, respectively, will agree.²

For items with group means in the approximate range 3.0 to 5.0, Discriminatory Powers may be evaluated according to the following general standards: a D. P. of over 4.0 is very high and indicates almost uniform agreement by the high scorers, disagreement by the low scorers, with almost no overlap. D. P.'s of 3.0-4.0 are very satisfactory and indicate a clear-cut difference between high and low scorers. D. P.'s of 2.0-3.0, while statistically significant, indicate greater variability in the responses of low and high scorers and a fair amount of overlap. A D. P. between 1.0 and 2.0 involves considerable agreement by the low scorers and disagreement by the high scorers, but it still indicates a statistically significant difference between the low mean and the high mean.³ As the D. P. decreases below 1.0, the possibility of significance decreases rapidly.

With these considerations in mind we can examine the data in Table 9. In general the Discriminatory Powers are quite satisfactory, averaging 2.85 for the entire group.⁴ For the 52 items, 5 D. P.'s are over 4.0, 21 are between

² A minimum item mean of 2.5 ought probably to be set for this group, since various studies have shown college students to be less prejudiced than the general population. For other groups studied in the present research, many item means were as much as a point higher.

³ While standard deviations have not been obtained for all items, it can be shown that (with group $N = 100$ to 150) the standard error of the difference between the means for low and high scorers is almost never above .50, seldom below .25. In terms of the critical ratio, then, a D.P. of over 1.0 is statistically significant, that is, the means are different though the distributions are partially overlapping.

⁴ While correlations between items or between each item and the total scale have not been computed for this group, later data on similar scales suggest that the average inter-item correlation is about .4, while between each item and the sum of the remaining items the average correlation is about .6. (See Chapter IV.)

3.0 and 3.9, and 15 are between 2.0 and 2.9. Only 11 D. P.'s are between 1.0 and 1.9, the lowest being 1.2.

All of the D. P.'s are therefore above a minimum standard of acceptability. The 26 items with D. P.'s of over 3.0 are statistically very satisfactory. Why were the other items less adequate? The answer is indicated by the group means on these items. Of the 11 items with D. P.'s of less than 2.0, 10 have means below 2.1. Conversely, almost all of the items with means of over 3.0 have D. P.'s of over 3.0. The mean for the low quartile is very low (below 2.0) on almost every item. The mean of the high quartile, on the other hand, varies greatly from item to item. *The items with low D. P.'s were, in almost every case, statements with which the high quartile tended predominantly to disagree.* This result seems to be due partly to a lack of pseudodemocratic coloring in these items, partly to their obvious illogicality or lack of truth, and partly to a lack of extreme anti-Semites among these subjects. Thus, the mean of the high quartile on all 52 items averages 4.3 and varies from 2.2 to 6.6. For the 10 items with the highest D. P.'s, however, the high quartile means average well over 5.0.

The dependability of the item means and D. P.'s is indicated by a comparison of the present group with the group of college students previously tested and reported on. The latter group responded to the entire scale (and other questionnaire material) at one sitting; the reliability was .98 and the subscale intercorrelations were also slightly higher than in the present group. The group mean per item was 3.0 as compared with 2.7 for the present group, and the average D. P. was 3.4 as compared with 2.85 here. The main difference between the two groups seems to lie in the greater number of high scorers in the first group tested. The over-all mean of the low quartile was almost identical for the two groups: 1.39 then, 1.42 now. But the high quartile averaged 4.80 then as compared to 4.27 now. In noncollege groups a larger number of high scorers, and larger D. P.'s, have been found (see pp. 76, 140). Despite the over-all scale differences between the two groups, however, the adequacy of the individual items was very similar. Thus, the rank-order correlation between the D. P.'s was .78, while the item means correlated .92. In short, the most discriminating items for one group were also the best for the other group, and similarly for the poor items. The general conclusions about item means and discriminabilities to be drawn from the present group, then, are generally true for the previous group as well.

Table 9(III) reveals that the best items pertain to a variety of topics. *Stereotypy* in anti-Semitic imagery is shown in the tendency to overgeneralize Jewish faults, and in the fact that Item I-13 ("Jews are all alike") is one of the most discriminating, with a D. P. of 3.83. The idea of Jews as a *political threat* (radicalism: Items II-6, -14) was much less prevalent than the idea of Jews as an *economic threat* (wealth and power: Items I-5, -8, -22,

II-5, -11) or as a *moral threat* (immorality: Items I-1, II-1, -7, -13). Accusations on *religious* grounds were seldom supported,⁵ as shown by the low group means and D. P.'s on Items I-20 and II-19. A variety of *discriminatory attitudes* (exclusion, restriction, suppression: most items in the "Attitude" subscale) found considerable support and were very discriminating.

The importance of careful formulation of items is shown by a comparison of good with poor items. The most discriminating items are usually the most pseudodemocratic ones according to criteria discussed above (Section B, 1). Consider, for example, the two items dealing with intermarriage. Item II-10 ("I can hardly imagine myself marrying a Jew") has a group mean of 4.2 and a D. P. of 4.3, with a high quartile mean of 6.6 (almost all +2 and +3 responses). On the other hand, Item I-15 ("It is wrong for Jews and Gentiles to intermarry") has a group mean of only 2.6, a D. P. of 3.0, and a high quartile mean of 4.2. The higher mean and discriminability of the former item are probably due to its greater indirectness and distance from crude anti-Semitism. By what criterion is this item anti-Semitic? The criterion is the fact that it correlates well with the total scale, that is, it differentiates very well between subjects who score high and subjects who score low on the total scale. (The fact that the correlation is not perfect indicates that response to any single item is not a clear-cut sign of anti-Semitism nor of its opposite; the criterion must be the total scale score).

Similar reasoning applies to items dealing with housing restrictions. The following items had very low group means (1.5 to 2.5): Item II-18 (consistent exclusion from hotels), I-3 (exclusion from neighborhoods), I-21 (occasional exclusion from apartment houses). Item II-7 (Jews give a neighborhood a "typical Jewish atmosphere"), which is more indirect and pseudo-democratic, had a higher mean (3.2) and D. P. (4.0). It would appear that many individuals who are not now willing actively to support anti-Semitic programs have nevertheless a negative imagery and an underlying hostility that constitute a definite potentiality for such action. Even the more open and crude items on housing had significant D. P.'s, and the high quartile means of 4.3 and over (except on II-18), seem to indicate only weak resistance to these ideas.

The same considerations hold for the items dealing with occupations. Items which urge explicit policies of suppression and restriction of Jews (I-6, -9, II-9, -15) tend to have low means. But items which emphasize gen-

⁵ It is frequently held that Sunday School training is a major cause of anti-Semitism, which is then regarded as a form of "religious prejudice." In this group, at least, rejection on religious grounds was infrequent. From the generality and irrationality of anti-Semitic ideology, it is clear that many diverse accusations are almost always involved, and that there are many sources for the underlying hostility which makes a given individual receptive to anti-Semitism. For a discussion of the role of religion in prejudice see Chapters VI and XVIII.

eralized Jewish faults and which introduce subtly discriminatory practices tend to have higher means; thus, Jewish businessmen are regarded as unfair and conniving (Item I-5), and they have too much financial power (I-8). While active suppression is not so desirable (low mean on I-9), it is unwise for an employer to hire many Jews (higher mean on I-24, II-3). The simplest solution—one that eliminates the need for suppression—would be for Jews to form their own nation (II-24).

The pessimism of the high scorers regarding the solution to this problem is brought out by a number of items. On the one hand, they take the view that anti-Semitism has been entirely or primarily brought by the Jews on themselves and that any solution of the problem is a matter of Jewish responsibility (Items II-1, II-21). Non-Jews are simply the victims of Jewish faults; if Jews would improve, become as good as "other people," anti-Semitism would be eliminated. On the other hand, the Jews seem to be incorrigible, and any apparent change only masks the Jewishness beneath (Items I-7, -13, II-4, -8, -22). The contradiction is therefore complete: anti-Semitism is due to Jewish faults, but the Jews are unable to improve; the Jews should make sincere efforts to change, but their "basic Jewishness" is unchangeable. For the antidemocratic anti-Semite the only answer is open and direct suppression; for the pseudodemocrat it is subtle exclusion and "resigned tolerance" toward a bad state of affairs. The pseudodemocrats seem to betray a sense of threat and some antidemocratic potential by their doubts that democratic methods can solve the problem (Item I-12).

D. THE SHORT FORM OF THE A-S SCALE

It was a regular policy of the present research to contract the proven techniques in order to introduce new ones measuring additional trends of theoretical importance. In line with this policy, and in view of the high reliability and internal consistency of the original 52-item A-S scale, a short form of ten items was used in the first revision of the questionnaire.

The short form is presented in Table 10(III). The ten items were selected from the original fifty-two on the basis of both statistical and theoretical considerations. Since statistical adequacy (Discriminatory Power) was a necessary—but not sufficient—condition for inclusion, the new items were selected from the fifteen or twenty which had been most discriminating on the two administrations of the long form. Among these, selection was determined by the following qualitative considerations. Each item should be as rich in meaning as possible. There should be a minimum of duplication of meaning or content among items. They should cover most of the subscales and most of the areas of accusation and discrimination. These desiderata have not been realized entirely; there were other items that seemed to merit inclusion, and for certain

TABLE 10 (III)
THE TEN-ITEM A-S SCALE (Form 78)

<i>Old No.</i>	<i>New No.^a</i>	
I-24	11.	Anyone who employs many people should be careful not to hire a large percentage of Jews.
I-5	16.	One trouble with Jewish businessmen is that they stick together and connive, so that a Gentile doesn't have a fair chance in competition.
II-17	21.	The Jewish districts in most cities are results of the clannishness and stick-togetherness of Jews.
II-1	26.	Persecution of the Jews would be largely eliminated if the Jews would make really sincere efforts to rid themselves of their harmful and offensive faults.
II-21	33.	Jewish leaders should encourage Jews to be more inconspicuous, to keep out of professions and activities already overcrowded with Jews and to keep out of the public notice.
II-10	40.	I can hardly imagine myself marrying a Jew.
II-7	49.	The trouble with letting Jews into a nice neighborhood is that they gradually give it a typical Jewish atmosphere.
I-7	62.	No matter how Americanized a Jew may seem to be, there is always something different and strange, something basically Jewish underneath.
I-13	69.	There may be a few exceptions, but, in general, Jews are pretty much alike.
I-11	72.	There are too many Jews in the various federal agencies and bureaus in Washington, and they have too much control over our national policies.

^a "New number" refers to the numbering of the items in Form 78.

"Old number" refers to numbering in the long form discussed previously. Slight revisions will be noted in the wording of several items.

purposes they would probably be superior. The high internal consistency of the long form indicates that several statistically adequate short forms might be constructed. Nevertheless, the present form was expected to provide an adequate tool for most purposes of measurement. The slight revisions in the wording of some items were intended to make them simpler and clearer in meaning. The manner of presentation of this form was different from that previously used. Whereas previously each scale had been presented "all of a piece," on a page or pages of its own, in this and all successive forms of the questionnaire the various scales were presented interspersed with each other, so that no single scale was particularly prominent or focal, and adjacent items dealt with widely varying topics.⁶

The new questionnaire, identified as Form 78 (on the basis of its having

⁶ The other scales in this form, to be discussed in the chapters that follow, deal with general prejudice (Negroes, other minorities, patriotism), with politico-economic liberalism and conservatism, and with potentially antidemocratic personality trends. There were 78 items in all. This form of the questionnaire, like all the other forms, contained in addition other questions dealing with group memberships, personality, and so on.

78 scale items), was administered in the spring of 1945 to the following groups. Two of the groups comprise undergraduate students at the University of California: the full membership, save for absentees, of the introductory Public Speaking class. Here, as in all groups, men and women were separated in the statistical treatment and analysis was limited to native-born, white, non-Jewish Americans. The first two groups, then, are the Public Speaking Women ($N = 140$) and the Public Speaking Men ($N = 52$). The third group comprised forty women, the entire feminine membership of an Extension Division class in Psychology at the University of California. Most subjects of this group were in their thirties and late twenties, and hence were somewhat older on the average than those of our college sample. The fourth group, Professional Women ($N = 63$), is actually a combination of three smaller groups: (a) Twenty-four public health nurses, the entire nursing staff of a nearby health department (the director of this department was generally liberal in his outlook and had tried to select younger nurses with more advanced ideas about public health); (b) public school teachers; and (c) social workers, who were reached through the mails. In the latter two cases, only about 20 per cent of those appealed to sent in their questionnaires, and this sampling technique was not tried again.

The reliability data for the short A-S scale are presented in Table 11 (III). Reliabilities of .89-.94 are extremely satisfactory, especially for a 10-item scale, and they are similar to those obtained on the long form.⁷ The means of 3.3 to 3.4 for University and Extension Class students are substantially the same as the mean of 3.55 on these ten items for the previous class taking the long form of the scale. However, the mean of 2.6 for the Professional Women is significantly lower than the others (above the 1 per cent level statistically). This difference may be due partly to sampling errors; the teachers and social workers responded voluntarily by mail, and the tendency to cooperate in filling out a questionnaire dealing with prejudice and with personal feelings is probably correlated with lack of prejudice.⁸ The slightly greater reliability (.94) of the scale for this group may reflect a greater ideological consistency in older age groups.

The Discriminatory Power method of item analysis was again carried out, and the results are presented in Table 12 (III). The average D. P. of 3.68 is very satisfactory and indicates that on most items there were very few low-quartile members who agreed, few high-quartile members who disagreed.

⁷ The fact that these reliabilities are similar to those obtained on the long form argues against the hypothesis that the high reliability of the latter was due to a "set" for all-negative items.

⁸ This hypothesis is supported by questionnaire and clinical material on personality trends (opposition to "prying" and to "being analyzed" in the prejudiced subjects). Also, fewer high-scoring than low-scoring subjects in the groups tested were willing to be interviewed.

TABLE 11 (III)

RELIABILITY OF THE A-S SCALE (FORM 78)

Property ^c	Gr. A ^a	Gr. B ^a	Gr. C ^a	Gr. D ^a	Over-all ^b
Reliability	.89	.93	.90	.94	.92
Mean (total)	3.33	3.36	3.40	2.57	3.16
Mean (odd half)	2.98	3.30	3.20	2.34	2.96
Mean (even half)	3.66	3.42	3.63	2.83	3.38
S.D. (total)	1.43	1.48	1.36	1.37	1.41
S.D. (odd half)	1.42	1.51	1.38	1.27	1.40
S.D. (even half)	1.62	1.56	1.48	1.58	1.56
Range	1.0-7.0	1.1-6.3	1.2-6.1	1.0-6.2	1.0-7.0

^aThe four groups on which these data are based are: *Group A*, U. C. Public Speaking Class Women (N = 140); *Group B*, U. C. Public Speaking Class Men (N = 52); *Group C*, U. C. Adult Extension Class Women (N = 40); *Group D*, Professional Women (nurses, teachers, social workers, N = 63).

^bIn obtaining the over-all means, the individual group means were not weighted by N.

^cThe values of the means, Standard Deviations, and ranges are given in terms of mean/person/item. If multiplied by 10 (the number of items), they are translated into values representing total scale score per person.

The best items deal with such varied topics as conniving businessmen, Jews being all alike, intermarriage, exclusion from neighborhoods.

How much influence did the form of presentation of the items have on their individual means and D. P.'s? Does it matter whether the items are presented in a solid block, as in the first form, or randomly dispersed through a longer series of extremely varied items, as in Form 78? Evidence bearing on this question was obtained by comparing the results on these ten items for the two types of presentation. The mean for the Psychology Class women on these ten items (first form, excluding the remaining forty-two items) was 3.55, as compared with 3.32 for the Public Speaking Class women, the most comparable group taking Form 78, and the average D. P.'s were 3.76 and 3.68 respectively. The differences are not statistically significant. Furthermore, the rank-order correlations between the individual item means for these two groups was .62, while the D. P.'s correlated .90. These correlations seem even more significant when one considers that the wording of some items was changed, and that the two groups were not systematically equated. The results on the first form were also compared with the over-all averages for all four groups taking Form 78. The individual item means correlated .88,

TABLE 12 (III)

ITEM MEANS AND DISCRIMINATORY POWERS^a

A-S SCALE - FORM 78

No.	Item	Group A		Group B		Group C		Group D		Over-all ^b		
		Mean	D.P.	Mean	D.P.	Mean	D.P.	Mean	D.P.	Mean	D.P.	Rank
11.	(Hire Jews)	2.76	4.25	3.10	3.69	3.40	4.13	1.71	2.36	2.74	3.61	(6)
16.	(Businessmen)	3.79	4.58	3.62	4.10	3.58	4.35	2.63	4.35	3.40	4.34	(1)
21.	(Jewish districts)	3.46	2.97	3.81	3.17	3.92	3.35	2.86	2.00	3.51	2.87	(9)
26.	(Get rid of faults)	3.41	3.20	3.42	3.96	3.92	3.83	3.16	4.58	3.48	3.89	(5)
33.	(Jewish leaders)	2.29	2.28	2.96	3.09	2.12	1.25	2.10	2.86	2.37	2.37	(10)
40.	(Marry a Jew)	4.44	4.60	3.92	4.67	4.42	4.09	3.04	3.77	3.96	4.28	(3)
49.	(Nice neighborhood)	3.03	3.57	3.31	4.35	3.15	3.88	2.29	4.70	2.94	4.12	(4)
62.	(Basically Jewish)	3.54	3.85	3.31	3.29	3.60	2.76	2.94	4.12	3.35	3.50	(7)
69.	(All alike)	3.44	4.02	3.19	4.20	3.22	4.24	2.73	4.76	3.14	4.30	(2)
72.	(Federal agencies)	3.07	3.49	2.81	3.50	2.60	2.63	2.27	4.30	2.69	3.48	(8)
	Mean/person/item	3.32	3.68	3.35	3.80	3.39	3.45	2.57	3.78	3.16	3.68	

^aThe four groups on which these data are based are: Group A, U. C. Public Speaking Class Women (N = 140); Group B, U. C. Public Speaking Class Men (N = 52); Group C, U. C. Adult Extension Class Women (N = 40); Group D, Professional Women (nurses, teachers, social workers, (N = 63).

^bIn obtaining the over-all means, the individual group means were not weighted by N.

and the D. P.'s correlated .80. It would therefore appear that the relative discriminability (D. P.) and level of acceptability (mean) of the items is due mainly to the nature of the items themselves rather than to their form of presentation in the questionnaire.

Although no correlations were computed among the four groups taking Form 78, the great variability of the over-all means and D. P.'s indicates considerable consistency of item mean and D. P. from group to group. The best items for one group tend to be the best for other groups, and similarly for the worst items. This consistency in rank order of means and D. P.'s holds even for the Professional Women, despite the fact that the absolute values of the item means were considerably lower for this group than for the others.

Further evidence on these issues is given by results obtained in September, 1945, from a group of 153 students, preponderantly women, at George Washington University, Washington, D. C.⁹ The ten A-S items were presented in a solid block, on a sheet containing no other scales, the instructions duplicating those given for the long form of the scale. The obtained reliability was .91, a value almost identical with those for the other groups. The group mean per item was 4.52 and the average D. P. was 4.02. The mean is significantly different (above the 1 per cent level) from the University of California means, and suggests, as have other independent studies, that significant sectional differences in anti-Semitism exist (the Far West being, apparently, less prejudiced than the East). While the Washington students obtain consistently higher scores, the item means show a rank-order correlation of .84 between the Washington group and the average of the four California groups, indicating a marked similarity in the relative acceptability of the items. This group also gives evidence that extremely high scorers do exist, and that the restricted range of the groups taking Form 78 is due mainly to a lack of extremely anti-Semitic members. The individual scores in the Washington group covered the entire range of possible scores, 10-70, with a mean per item of 6.27 for the high quartile, 2.25 for the low quartile.

The Discriminatory Powers for the Washington group correlated .54 with the average D. P.'s for the four California groups. The smallness of this value, in contrast to that for the item means, is due primarily to a change in the rank of item 72, which asserts that "there are too many Jews in Washington agencies." The D. P. for this item had a rank of 8 in the California groups, but a rank of 2 for the Washington group (the D. P. being 4.5). While the rank of the mean on this item was identical in the two groups (9 in both cases), the difference between low and high scorers was relatively much greater in Washington than in California. Living in Washington should provide, one might expect, a reality basis on which to respond to this

⁹ We wish to thank Dr. G. H. Smith, then teaching at George Washington University, for his cooperation. These results were not incorporated in the main body of data because this group was not given the remaining sections of the questionnaire.

item and thus minimize the differences between otherwise low and high scorers. This does not seem to be the case. It would seem, rather, that how an individual assimilates and interprets social reality is to a large extent determined by his pre-existing ideology. Living in Washington appears to have mainly a polarizing rather than a homogenizing effect, especially on the "Jews in government" issue.

From the above discussion the following conclusions may tentatively be drawn.

a. The item means and D. P.'s are not appreciably changed by changes in the form of presentation (from 52 consecutive anti-Semitic items to 10 consecutive anti-Semitic items to ten items randomly interspersed among a series totalling 78 in all).

b. While over-all mean and average D. P. vary considerably from group to group, relative discriminability and level of acceptability of each item (rank D. P. and mean) tend to remain fairly constant, with the exception of certain sectional differences (as in Item 72, regarding Washington agencies). That is, certain items tend consistently to have relatively high D. P.'s, others to have low D. P.'s, and similarly for the item means.

c. The item means and particularly the D. P.'s were statistically very satisfactory. For eight of the ten items the D. P.'s averaged 3.5 to 4.3 (these values would be even higher were the Washington group included), and even the lowest average D. P.'s of 2.4 and 2.9 are adequate.

d. The most discriminating items deal with Jewish businessmen, stereotyped imagery, marriage, exclusion from neighborhoods, and Jewish responsibility for anti-Semitism. It is interesting that items stating the most frequently heard accusations and the more openly antagonistic attitudes usually had lower means and D. P.'s.

e. In view of its high reliability and internal consistency, the short form of the A-S scale can be used for most research purposes in place of the original, longer form.

E. VALIDATION BY CASE STUDIES: THE RESPONSES OF MACK AND LARRY ON THE A-S SCALE

One meaning of the concept of validity as applied to a psychological test is that the test, which involves only a small sample of the individual's responses, tells us something that is generally true of that individual as judged by an intensive study of him. The A-S scale may be said to have validity of this kind to the degree that the subjects, in their responses to the scale, reveal the same tendencies which come out in their interviews. It will be worth while, therefore, to compare the responses of Mack and Larry to the A-S scale with what they have to say about Jews when they are invited to speak spontaneously.

In Table 13(III) are shown the scores of Mack and Larry, the group mean and the D. P. for each of the ten items in the short form of the A-S

TABLE 13 (III)

RESPONSES OF MACK AND LARRY ON THE A-S SCALE

<u>Item</u>	<u>Mack</u>	<u>Larry</u>	<u>Group^a Mean</u>	<u>Group^a D.P.</u>
11. (Hire Jews)	3	1	2.74	3.61
16. (Businessmen)	6	1	3.40	4.34
21. (Jewish districts)	5	1	3.51	2.87
26. (Get rid of faults)	6	1	3.48	3.89
33. (Jewish leaders)	3	1	2.37	2.37
40. (Marry a Jew)	7	3	3.96	4.28
49. (Nice neighborhood)	5	1	2.94	4.12
62. (Basically Jewish)	5	1	3.35	3.50
69. (All alike)	3	1	3.14	4.30
72. (Federal agencies)	3	1	2.69	3.48
Over-all mean	4.6	1.2	3.16	3.68

^aThe group means and D.P.'s are based on all four groups taking Form 78.

scale (Form 78). Mack's mean score, 4.6, is definitely, but not extremely far, above the over-all group mean of 3.16. He was just barely inside the high quartile for the group of Public Speaking Men of which he was a member. This is in keeping with the moderation which characterized the whole ideological section of his interview, and it forms part of the basis for the statement, in Chapter II, that he is a relatively mild case. His anti-Semitism is fairly general, in that he agrees with six of the ten statements and scores above the group mean on all but one of them; but a study of the responses to individual items reveals a clear pattern, one that can be distinguished from other patterns of anti-Semitism. In disagreeing slightly, and thereby scoring close to the group mean, in the case of Items 11 (Hire Jews), 33 (Jewish leaders), and 72 (Federal agencies), he is saying that he would have no serious objection if Jews should participate more fully in American life, that this indeed is what they ought to do. The main trouble, as seen in the positive responses to Items 16 (Businessmen) and 21 (Jewish districts), is that they would rather stick together and accumulate wealth and power for their own group. Although persecution would be largely eliminated if they should rid themselves of their faults (Item 26), they cannot really become "Americanized" (Item 62) and would still have to be kept at some distance personally and socially (Items 40 and 49).

This is almost exactly what Mack tells us in his interview. It is the main

point that he tries to make. "They accent the clannish and the material. . . . If a Jew fails in business, he's helped to get started again. . . . They would be liked and accepted if they would be willing to mix. . . . The Jews won't intermingle. . . . I certainly wouldn't (marry a Jew). . . . I would date that girl in Public Speaking, but she doesn't emphasize her Jewishness. She was accepted by the whole class. I would marry her if she had thrown off her Jewishness, but I wouldn't be able to associate with her class."

It is interesting that Item 40 (Marry a Jew) is the one about which Mack feels most strongly and on which he deviates most markedly from the group mean. It would appear that he feels safe in saying, in the interview, that he would marry the Jewish girl "if she had thrown off her Jewishness," because he does not really believe that she ever can do this; there would always be "something basically Jewish underneath" (Item 62).

The item on which Mack obtains a score that is slightly below the group mean is 69 (All alike). Here there is a real discrepancy between scale and interview. The analysis of the interview seemed to show that stereotypy was an outstanding characteristic of this subject's thinking, and yet when it comes to the item which pertains most directly to this characteristic, he fails to agree. This is not because the item is a poor one, for its D. P. was next to the highest obtained with this short form of the A-S scale; nor do there appear to be any special features of Mack's stereotypy that would render Item 69 inapplicable. Perhaps it is too much to expect that scale and interview will agree in every particular; these instruments are not that precise, or perhaps most subjects are not that consistent.

It may be noted that Mack, in the interview, where he is allowed free scope, brings into his discussion of the Jews certain ideas, e.g., Jewish "weakness," that are not touched upon in any of the ten statements which comprise the A-S scale. This outcome would have been considerably less likely, it seems, if he had responded to the 52 items of the original A-S scale. It is claimed for the short form of the scale that for most research purposes it can be substituted for the long form. In Mack's case there appears to be no reason for dissatisfaction with the measure of the degree of his anti-Semitism which the short form yields; concerning the content of his anti-Semitic ideology it is noteworthy that the pattern which appears in his responses to the scale corresponds to what is central and seemingly most important in his spontaneous discussion. That the ten-item scale should at the same time reveal the more incidental and individualistic features of a subject's ideology concerning Jews would be too much to ask.

Larry's responses to the A-S scale are true to form. He obtains the lowest possible score on every item except 40 (Marry a Jew), and even here he disagrees slightly. When it was stated in Chapter II that Larry was not an extreme example of low-scoring men, the reference was to what was known of him from all the diagnostic devices employed in the research. He made it

clear enough in his interview that he was strongly opposed to prejudice against minority groups, and had he not come out with an extremely low score on the A-S scale we would have had cause for serious doubt of its validity. That he did not obtain the lowest possible score on Item 40 is evidence that he did not respond to the A-S items in an automatic way. It seems that at this point his impulse toward complete social interaction with Jews collided with his conventionalism, a trait which we have seen to be well developed in him, and he could not in honesty go beyond slight disagreement with the item.

In general, the responses of these two subjects on the A-S scale are consistent with what they say about Jews in their interviews. This consistency appears not only in the degree of anti-Semitism expressed but in the content of the subjects' thinking about Jews. To the extent that these results may be generalized, the A-S scale is a valid index of ideology concerning Jews.

F. DISCUSSION: THE STRUCTURE OF ANTI-SEMITIC IDEOLOGY

Perhaps the first conclusion to be drawn from the results presented above is that anti-Semitism is best conceived psychologically not as a specific aversion but as an ideology, a general way of thinking about Jews and Jewish-Gentile interaction. This is demonstrated by the high reliability of a scale dealing with so varied a set of ideas, by the reliabilities and intercorrelations of the subscales, and by the high internal consistency of the scale as revealed by the item Discriminatory Powers. The statistical results indicate that a quantitative measure of total anti-Semitic ideology has been obtained. Any individual can be assigned, with a relatively small margin of error, a rank along a dimension ranging from strong support of anti-Semitic ideology at one (high) extreme, to strong opposition at the other (low) extreme. The meaning of middle scores on this dimension is ambiguous, since they may represent indifference, ignorance, or an ambivalent combination of partial support and partial rejection of anti-Semitism. It is noteworthy, however, that individuals making middle scores on one subscale tend to make middle scores on the other subscales as well. Despite item-by-item variability, individuals tend to be highly consistent in their responses to the several subscales.

The fact that an individual's stand on one set of items is similar to his stand on all others does not necessarily imply that all anti-Semitic ideas are of equal psychological importance to each individual. The spontaneous discussions of anti-Semites, whether in an interview or in everyday social life, suggest that for each individual there are certain "nuclear ideas"—imagery of Jews as conniving, or sexual, or radical, and the like, and corresponding primary attitudes—which have primary emotional significance. However,

these central ideas apparently make the individual receptive to a great variety of other ideas. That is, once the central or nuclear ideas are formed, they tend to "pull in" numerous other opinions and attitudes and thus to form a broad ideological system. This system provides a rationale for any specific idea within it and a basis for meeting and assimilating new social conditions.

This conception of anti-Semitism aids in the understanding of the present results. It also offers an explanation of why an anti-Semitic rumor that is entirely new in its specific details (for example, the wartime accusations that only Jews could get tires or draft exemptions or officer status) is easily believed by anti-Semites: because of a receptivity to negative imagery generally and by means of an ideological system within which the new idea is easily assimilated.

This conception of the *inclusiveness* of anti-Semitic ideology stands in sharp contrast to numerous theories which conceive of anti-Semitism in terms of certain specific accusations or motives. The notion of anti-Semitism as a form of "racial" prejudice, for example, seems to be based on the idea that the main accusations against Jews involve their "racially inherited" traits (faults). Another common view, that anti-Semitism is a form of "religious" prejudice, is based on the explicit or implicit assumption that religious differences, and thus accusations on religious grounds, are the central issues in anti-Semitism. A third "specificistic" view is that anti-Semitism is based primarily on distortions of facts which some individuals have mistakenly accepted as true; for example, that Jews are unusually rich, dishonest, radical, and so on. This last theory has led to numerous attempts to fight anti-Semitism by giving the "true facts"—attempts which are distinguished for their lack of success. What this theory has overlooked is the *receptivity* of many individuals to any hostile imagery of Jews, and the emotional *resistance* of these individuals to a less hostile and less stereotyped way of thinking. Finally, anti-Semitism is sometimes explained in terms of financial motives and accusations: many people, it is asserted, oppose the Jews on the simple grounds of economic competition and financial self-interest. This theory ignores the other accusations (of power seeking, immorality, and the like) which are made with equal or greater emotional intensity. It also fails to explain why anti-Semites so often violate their own material self-interest in maintaining their prejudices. None of these conceptions of anti-Semitism has adequately grasped its generality, its psychological complexity, and its function in the emotional life of the individual. Nor can they suggest why many individuals oppose anti-Semitism despite their having economic situations, religious backgrounds, sources of information, and so on, which are similar to those of anti-Semites. What is required, in our opinion, is a psychological approach which seeks to grasp both anti-Semitic ideology and *anti-anti-Semitic* ideology in their full complexity and scope, and which then attempts to discover

the various sources of each viewpoint in the psychological development and social background of the individuals holding it.¹⁰

Before discussing the major ideas comprising anti-Semitic ideology, a few words regarding the scale and the scale data are necessary. It is believed that most of the major facets of everyday American anti-Semitism have been represented in the scale, though no claim is made that it contains all the anti-Semitic ideas currently in vogue. The scale data provide an empirical basis for the following discussion in the sense: (a) that each of the ideas to be discussed is supported by most anti-Semites (subjects who fall within the highest 25 per cent of scorers on the scale), opposed by most *anti*-anti-Semites, the differences being statistically significant; and (b) that each anti-Semite supports most of these ideas, while each low scorer opposes most of them. Thus, one can speak of a broad framework of anti-Semitic ideology which is held in its entirety by relatively few individuals but which is supported in varying degrees by many more.

What, then, are the major opinions, values, and attitudes comprising anti-Semitic ideology, how are they organized or systematized, and how is this system different from other, non-anti-Semitic points of view?

One striking characteristic of the imagery in anti-Semitic ideology is its *stereotypy*, which takes several forms. There is, first, a tendency to over-generalize single traits, to subscribe to statements beginning "Jews are . . ." or "The Jews do not . . ." Second, there is a stereotyped negative image of the group as a whole, as if "to know one is to know all," since they are all alike. Third, examination of the specific characteristics comprising the imagery reveals a basic contradiction in that no single individual or group as a whole could have all these characteristics.

Another aspect of stereotypy which is implied by the scale items and brought out more directly in the interviews may be termed "stereotypy of interpersonal relationships and experiences." It involves an inability to experience Jews as individuals. Rather, each Jew is seen and reacted to as a sort of sample specimen of the stereotyped, reified image of the group. This form of stereotypy is expressed very clearly in Mack's discussion of Jews (see Chapter II); while no statistics are available, the other interviews as well as everyday conversations indicate that his approach is not uncommon.

This limitation in the experience of individuals has certain implications

¹⁰ It may again be emphasized that the present approach is a psychological one. The sociologist, at least during this stage in the development of social science, tends to proceed along other, perhaps parallel, lines. Thus, a psychological approach in terms of purely religious or purely economic *motives* is inadequate. However, a sociological approach in terms of religious or politico-economic *structures* and their relation to anti-Semitism as a sociocultural trend is, in our opinion, both valid and of great significance. What must be opposed, as we see it, is the tendency mechanically to subsume psychology under sociology and to confuse basic economic or religious social forces with superficial economic or religious motives in the individual. Sociological forces are considered in Chapters XVI, XVII, XVIII, XIX.

for the theory that contact with "good Jews" lessens anti-Semitism. The effectiveness of social contact would seem to depend in large part on the individual's *capacity for individuated experience*. This capacity is certainly not hereditarily determined, but it may often be difficult to change in adults. When it is lacking, new social experiences are likely to lead, not to new learning and development, but merely to the mechanical reinforcement of established imagery.

Further analysis of stereotypy and other characteristics of anti-Semitic thinking, as well as concrete examples from the interview material, are presented in Chapter XVI.

These considerations raise several questions which are dealt with in later sections of this research. Do anti-Semites express the same stereotypy of thought and experience in relation to other groups and issues, that is, are stereotypy and rigidity aspects of their general psychological functioning? Why is it so important for anti-Semites to reject Jews on any and all grounds? Are the contradictions and oversimplifications primarily surface signs of a deeper-lying anxiety and hostility? If so, what are the personality trends involved, and how are they different from those found in non-anti-Semites?

Let us consider the deeper psychological meaning of the stereotyped negative imagery of Jews. While the specific surface opinions cover a great variety of topics, there seem nevertheless to be certain unifying ideas or themes underlying the opinions and giving them coherence and structure. Perhaps most central is the idea that Jews are *threatening*. Certainly this idea is present, explicitly or implicitly, in almost all the scale items. It is expressed in the subscale "Offensive," where Jews are described as a *moral threat*, that is, as violators of important standards and values. These values include: cleanliness, neatness, and conformity; also opposition to sensuality, extravagance, prying, social aggressiveness, exhibitionism. The imagery of Jews as value-violators makes them not only offensive but also very disturbing. The anxiety becomes almost explicit in item II-4: "There is something different and strange about Jews . . ."

These values are, of course, not limited to anti-Semites. Indeed, many of them are among the currently prevailing conventional middle-class values—and most Americans are *psychologically* middle class. It may be that anti-Semites and non-anti-Semites differ regarding certain values such as sensuality or conformity. However, it is likely that many unprejudiced individuals have substantially the same values as the anti-Semites do. Why, then, do these values become the basis for anti-Semitic accusations in one group but not in the other? One hypothesis would be that the non-anti-Semites are more flexible in their support of these values, less disturbed by value-violators and less inclined to stereotypy and overgeneralization.

Moreover, these values tend, as will be shown later, to be held very strongly by the high-scoring subjects, and they appear frequently in these individuals'

thinking about themselves, other people, and social issues generally. In view of the emotional support given these values, and the intensity with which supposed value-violators are rejected, it is reasonable to ask whether the surface opinions and attitudes are motivated by deeper emotional dispositions. It is possible, for example, that anti-Semites are unconsciously struggling to inhibit in themselves the same tendencies that they find so unbearable in Jews. Jews may be a convenient object on which they can project their unconscious desires and fears. It is difficult otherwise to explain why anti-Semites feel so threatened by violations of their moral values, and why they develop exaggerated, stereotyped imagery of the "morally impure" Jews as a threat to the "morally pure" Gentiles. It will be significant in this connection whether the categorical distinction between *value-violators* (ego-alien, morally threatening groups) and *value-supporters* (ego-syntonic, morally pure groups) appears generally in the thinking of these individuals regarding the various other ideological areas to be considered in the following chapters. To the extent that this and other themes underly and unify the entire social thinking of anti-Semites, their specific opinions and attitudes must be regarded in part as expressions of deeper-lying personality needs, anxieties, and conflicts.

The idea of Jews as a *social threat* is expressed directly in the subscale "Threatening," where they are described as having harmful effects in various areas of social life. This concern with supposed Jewish *power* is a recurrent theme in the sources from which our scale items were taken and in the later interviews of our subjects as well as in the A-S scale itself. In the case of the moral values mentioned above, it is implied that non-Jews are the opposite of Jews: clean, conforming, modest, and the like. It would seem that power, however, while threatening in Jews, is justified and even valued in non-Jews.¹¹ For example, the attitudes of segregation and exclusion are based on the assumption that Gentiles should be more powerful than Jews in order to enforce these policies. Why does the concern with power recur so often and in so many forms? Why is the Jewish group, which is actually small and relatively weak, regarded as so threatening, while the really powerful and dominating groups in the *status quo* are supported rather than feared? Is it actually the weakness of the Jews which is most disturbing to the anti-Semite? If the concern with power and the fear of weakness in the high scorers represent deeper personality trends, these trends should be revealed by the clinical techniques and they should be expressed in the other ideological areas.

The issues of Jewish group loyalty and Jewish assimilation, viewed psychologically, reveal several central themes in anti-Semitic ideology. At first glance the criticisms of Jews and the demands on them seem both simple and reasonable. The Jews are, it is asserted, too clannish: they either keep apart in a kind of snobbish seclusion, or, if they do enter community affairs

¹¹ Cf. the "usurper complex" described in Chapter XVII.

they stick together and take advantage of other people. Therefore, the Jews must overcome their pride and clannishness, and their attempts to control other groups. When they have thoroughly assimilated, when they have lost their foreign ways and their clannish, conniving methods of gaining money and power at the expense of others, they can be liked and accepted. Until they change, they can hardly be surprised to find themselves excluded or limited in certain ways. The essential demand is that the Jews liquidate themselves, that they lose entirely their cultural identity and adhere instead to the prevailing cultural ways. Related to this narrowness is a punitive rather than an understanding approach to value-violators; the Jews deserve whatever hardships they may sometimes undergo since they have brought it on themselves. In this vindictive approach there is no room for more complex explanation, no way of considering discrimination as primarily a cause rather than an effect of Jewish traits. There is an aversion to the idea that the basis for resolution of Jewish-Gentile conflict lies primarily in the total social organization—and therefore in the dominant groups in the society—and only secondarily in Jews themselves.

But this demand for assimilation is not as simple as it seems at first glance. Jews who attempt to assimilate are apparently even more suspect than the others. Accusations of “prying,” “power-seeking,” and “imitation” are made, and seemingly generous acts by Jews are attributed to hidden selfish motives (subscale “Intrusive”). There is no logical basis for urging on the one hand that Jews become like everyone else, and on the other hand, that Jews be limited and excluded in the most important areas of social life.

It need not be denied by non-anti-Semites that there are extremely clannish and power-seeking individuals in the Jewish as well as in the Gentile group. But why do the high scorers not oppose *all* individuals who seek power for themselves or their narrow groups and who would take advantage of others? It is a remarkable fact that most individuals who see clannishness, prying, and power-seeking as “Jewish traits” value the same things, under other names, in Gentiles. It is accepted as “human nature” that each individual will stand by his group, that “blood is thicker than water,” and that each group is therefore unified in its material interests. As long as there is any trace of a Jewish group, therefore, it is expected that each Jew will have primary loyalty to it. While this “clannishness” is deplored, the anti-Semites tend to hold in contempt anyone who lacks “loyalty and pride” in his group, and to put great value on these traits in their own groups.

The imagery described above seems to characterize the thinking of most anti-Semites. Individual differences in the pattern of *attitudes* (programs of action) supported depend primarily on the strength of adherence to democratic values. Openly antidemocratic individuals have a direct and clear-cut program: violent attack on the Jews leading to total liquidation or to permanent suppression and restriction. What to do is, however, a greater psycho-

logical problem for those who have the same imagery, but who at the same time want to support democratic values of equality, nonviolence, and the like.

The negative imagery of Jews, and the accompanying sense of threat, involve two main fears which form the basis for attitudes. There is, first, the fear of *contamination*: the fear that Jews may, if permitted intimate or intensive contact with Gentiles, have a corrupting or degenerating influence. Various forms of corruption may occur: moral, political, intellectual, sensual, and so on. Among the many ideas which have been attributed to "Jewish contamination" are free love, radicalism, atheism, moral relativism, modern trends in art and literature. Gentiles who support ideas such as these tend to be regarded as unwitting victims who have been psychologically contaminated in the same way that one may be organically infected by a disease. The notion that one Jew can "infect" many Gentiles is very useful in rationalizing many apparent contradictions. It permits one to attribute great influence to the Jews and thus to blame most social problems on them, despite their relatively very small number. It justifies one's hostile feelings and discriminatory actions. Furthermore, an idea or social movement can be called "Jewish" even when most of its supporters are Gentile, since the latter are regarded as merely dupes or victims of Jewish contamination. An individual who accepts this reasoning feels compelled, no matter how great his value for tolerance, to protect the Gentile group by restricting the activities of the Jewish group.

Viewed psychologically, this way of thinking raises several questions. Why is it necessary for anti-Semites to regard Jews as the source of all these ideas, that is, why do they regard these ideas as *imposed* on Gentile but *originating* in Jews? One hypothesis is that this represents an attempt on the part of the prejudiced individual to resolve an inner moral conflict by externalizing or projecting his own immoral tendencies; the inner conflict is replaced by a new conflict between groups: the stereotypically moral "we" and the stereotypically immoral "they." That the inner conflict persists unconsciously in full force is shown by emphasis on external immorality and by the fear that this immorality will corrupt all who are exposed to it. The investigation of this and other hypotheses is reported in later chapters.

In addition to the fear of contamination there is the *fear of being overwhelmed*. This anxiety is related to the imagery of Jews as prying and power-seeking. If Jews are given the opportunity of free participation in community affairs then, granted that they have these tendencies, they will form a small sectarian clique interested only in their own power and material interests. To gain these aims they will shrewdly use even the most ruthless and dishonest methods. There is thus great danger that the Gentile group will be persecuted, victimized, exploited—in short, overwhelmed.

It is difficult indeed, for a person with such hostile imagery and such anxiety, to have entirely democratic attitudes regarding Jewish-Gentile

interaction. Most pseudodemocratic attitudes represent attempts, conscious or unconscious, at compromise between the tendency to express the underlying hostility directly (aggressive attack) and the tendency to conform to democratic values (tolerance, equality). The demand for total Jewish assimilation represents one such compromise, since total assimilation is, so to speak, a nonviolent way of liquidating the Jews. If there were *no* Jews then at least one source of anxiety and one object of hostility would be removed. Unfortunately, partial assimilation (the phase in which some Jews attempt to assimilate while others do not) seems to be more disturbing to anti-Semites than none at all. As long as the anti-Semites have some sense of the presence of a Jewish group—and thus an image of “the Jew” which can be applied stereotypically to all individual Jews—those Jews who seem to be assimilating will be suspected of evil motives. It is an oft-repeated historical paradox that those who demand total assimilation do the most to prevent it, since their hostility and discrimination tend on the one hand to increase Jewish nationalism and pride, and on the other hand to provide external barriers repelling those Jews who attempt assimilation into the dominant group. Conversely, Jewish assimilation has proceeded most rapidly in those communities which have accepted them without totalitarian demands for submission and all-out assimilation.

A second way of nonviolently eliminating the Jews, and thus of solving the problem of interaction by simply not having any, is for them to “stay on their side of the fence and we stay on ours.” If they cannot be entirely absorbed—and, despite their demand for total assimilation, most anti-Semites seem to feel that the “basic Jewishness” is permanent—then they should be totally separate. The separation could be made complete if the Jews would “form a nation of their own and keep more to themselves” (Item II-24).¹²

Some individuals, including Jews, have supported the idea of separation (fraternal organizations, neighborhoods, and the like) on grounds of differences in interests and culture. There can be no objection, from a democratic point of view, to an organization devoted primarily to Jewish culture and conducted in the Yiddish language, nor to one concerned mainly with Chris-

¹² The idea of a Jewish nation, particularly the important issue of Jewish settlement in Palestine, has been supported by various ideological camps. Much support in America has come from open or pseudodemocratic anti-Semites who wish that all Jews would settle there and who are afraid that, if the doors of Palestine are closed, America would have to open its doors to the refugees.

Many non-anti-Semites have also supported the idea of a Jewish homeland, but not for reasons of separation and exclusion. The main democratic reasoning, in general, is that there should be a geographical-political unit in which Jewish culture can be the primary one, that this nation should be a part of the family of nations, and that all individuals should be free to settle in whatever nation they choose, without the demand for total assimilation or the threat of exclusion. Since the Jewish group contains the same diversity of ideologies and personalities as any other major grouping, it is not surprising that there is much disagreement on this issue among Jews. In the present discussion, however, the main concern is with non-Jews.

tian religion or any other cultural form. But consistency with democratic values does require that, once the primary aims and functions of the organization are laid down, membership be open to *any* individual who accepts its principles and meets its requirements. It is undemocratic to exclude any group as a whole, that is, to be unwilling to consider any applicant on the basis of his *individual* merits and faults. The exclusionism of some Jewish groups, while understandable as a defensive "pride" reaction, is no more justified than the equivalent policy in other groups. The total exclusion of one group by another, whether on ethnic, religious, social class, skin color, or other grounds, is necessarily based on stereotypy, hostility and anxiety, conscious or not. It is sometimes said that "a Jew (or Negro or Catholic) would not be comfortable here." This usually means that he would be exposed to some degree of prejudice, subtle or crude, and it is the others who would be uncomfortable.

Discrimination takes a variety of other forms, all designed to limit Jewish-Gentile interaction by restricting the full participation of Jews in community and national affairs. All forms of discrimination (exclusion, segregation, suppression, and so forth) against all groups have the double function of restricting intergroup contact and of maintaining the dominant social position of the group doing the discriminating.

There are many economic, political, religious, and other institutional forces involved in the subordination of various American groups. These broader social forces were, however, beyond the scope of this research. We were concerned, as stated in Chapter I, with the problem of the *consumption* of ideology by the individual: granted that various ideologies are present in the social environment, why is it that some individuals consume (assimilate, accept) the more undemocratic forms while others consume the more democratic forms? The general assumption made was that, granted the possibility of choice, an individual will be most receptive to that ideology which has most psychological meaning for him and the most significant function within his over-all adjustment. Accordingly, there was much concern with the psychological content of anti-Semitic ideology in an attempt to form hypotheses regarding the deeper psychological trends, if any, which underlie and motivate the surface opinions and attitudes.

Numerous trends underlying anti-Semitic ideology are suggested by the present scale results: stereotypy; rigid adherence to middle-class values; the tendency to regard one's own group as morally pure in contrast to the immoral outgroup; opposition to and exaggeration of prying and sensuality; extreme concern with dominance and power (fear of Jewish power and desire for Gentile power); fear of moral contamination; fear of being overwhelmed and victimized; the desire to erect social barriers in order to separate one group from another and to maintain the morality and the dominance of one's own group.

Can it be demonstrated that these personality trends are actually present in anti-Semitic individuals? In the chapters which follow, there are several lines of evidence bearing on this question: (a) If these trends are present, then they should also be found in various other ideological areas. (b) These trends should be expressed in nonideological forms as well, that is, in ways of thinking about people and life generally. (c) Intensive clinical study should reveal these and other trends directly, as well as their organization and function in the total personality, and their course of development.