

CHAPTER IV

SOCIAL STATUS

In view of the widespread notion that intolerance can be explained by social and economic factors, a first task was to determine whether the men's social and economic history could account, either in whole or in part, for their ethnic intolerance. The most basic analysis of social factors concerned itself with whether or not significant differences in intolerance could be associated with different social and economic attributes. Those characteristics singled out for preliminary study were: age, education, religion, political affiliation, income, and social status.

The data as set forth below suggest that—subject to certain limitations—these factors cannot of themselves account for differences in the degree or nature of intolerance. With some few exceptions, other studies offer little assistance on this point. One of them, a carefully controlled survey poll on anti-Semitism which was conducted by Angus Campbell on a nationwide sample of 316 cases, tended toward the same conclusion.¹ It was found, for example, that when attitudes toward Jews were classified according to the various social and economic characteristics of those interviewed (age, sex, religion, education, and income), the relationships were for the most part slight, and in some cases negligible. While that study was based on a cross section of the nation's population, the present investigation had selected a relatively homogeneous group of veterans. This made possible a sharper testing of the findings mentioned above because it permitted certain important factors to be considered constant for the group.

AGE. To investigate a possible correlation between the subject's age and the degree of his anti-Semitism seemed pertinent, since ethnic intolerance is apparently absent in early childhood. Moreover, although elderly people are often intolerant, they rarely join violent mobs, perhaps because they are less volatile, or just less physically fit.

Recent German history has shown that the age groups between 16

¹Newcomb, T., and Hartley, E.: *Readings in Social Psychology*. New York, Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1947, pp. 518-27.

and 40 were those most ready to take part in violent anti-Semitic action. The *Fortune* opinion poll (February, 1946) indicated that both men and women in the age group of 35 to 49 tend to be slightly more anti-Semitic than those between 21 and 34. However, the Campbell study referred to above concluded that there was no consistent relationship between anti-Semitism and age.

Although the basis for selection in our sample limited the age-range it was still possible to divide the veterans into groups of younger and older men, and also into groups of three-year age intervals. When comparing the degree of anti-Semitic attitudes in the various age groups, no statistically significant difference appeared, although the older veterans tended to be slightly more anti-Semitic² (see Table 1(IV) below).

This table permits another observation: From the sample it appears that those born between 1910 and 1926 showed no significant difference with regard to anti-Semitism. Men born after 1918 went through their formative adolescent years in the 1930's when National Socialism and its program of anti-Semitic persecutions were widely discussed. Nevertheless, their attitudes toward the Jewish problem did not differ significantly from those of veterans who were born before 1920 and had therefore reached maturity before Hitler and his anti-Semitic policies made headlines. The implication seems to be that world events which have no direct impact on the individual do not significantly influence the development of his anti-Semitic attitudes.

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL. Whether a higher degree of general knowledge is positively correlated with tolerance is a question of great import. If it were so, then an educational program, such as the dissemination of correct information, would seem an adequate means of promoting tolerance. To date, opinion polls have not settled this problem, although it was found that for the nation as a whole, anti-Semitism seemed to be slightly related to educational level; those most educated were least anti-Semitic. A good case could be made for denying the existence of such a difference beyond mere verbalization, since those with more education may be expected to qualify their statements more carefully, while their underlying attitudes and behavior may be the same as that of persons who express themselves more bluntly and thus appear less tolerant. This may explain why veterans with at least some college education appeared slightly more tolerant, but not markedly or significantly so on the continuum (see Table 1(IV)).

² The Chi-square test was employed to determine the significance of various attributes. Throughout the text, where a *significant* difference is reported it is at least at the .01 confidence limit unless otherwise specifically mentioned.

TABLE 1(IV)

SOCIAL CORRELATES OF ANTI-SEMITISM

Age	Under 28	29-36		No.
	Years	Years		
	Percentage	Percentage		
Tolerant	44	34		61
Stereotyped	27	30		42
Outspoken & Intense	29	36		47
Number	94	56		150

Education	Did Not	Completed	Some College	No.
	Complete	High School	or More	
	High School	High School	Percentage	
	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	
Tolerant	35	39	51	61
Stereotyped	31	28	23	42
Outspoken & Intense	34	33	26	47
Number	65	46	39	150

Religion ^a	Catholic	Protestant	No Present	No.
			Religious	
			Denomination	
	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	
Tolerant	40	48	33	61
Stereotyped	28	25	33	41
Outspoken & Intense	32	27	33	46
Number	103	33	12	148

^a Two cases of Greek Orthodox not included.

RELIGION. Religious denomination showed no significant relation to degree of anti-Semitism (Table 1(IV)). Nor did any significant association between religious extraction—if this term may be used—and degree of anti-Semitism emerge when the religious denomination of the veterans' parents were also examined (see Appendix, Table 4(A)). Finally, it was

noted that veterans in whose homes two religious denominations contended for dominance showed no higher degree of anti-Semitism.

The relatively high percentage of Catholics among the group studied was a function of the sampling procedure which emphasized lower income groups. In the city studied, these groups are predominantly Catholics. (Negroes were not interviewed, and thus could not increase the percentage of Protestants in the sample, although they are overwhelmingly a Protestant group in Chicago.)

Since professed religious denomination is probably not a valid basis for analyzing the association of religious conviction with interethnic attitudes, a number of projective questions were employed, most of which dealt with soldiers' religious behavior in the army.

Among other questions dealing with army experiences, the men were asked: "How did the fellows feel about religion?" This opened a discussion of religion during which additional questions probed religious practices, such as church attendance in the army and in civilian life.

TABLE 2(IV)
"HOW DID THE FELLOWS FEEL ABOUT RELIGION?"

	Tolerant		Stereotyped		Outspoken and Intense		Total	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Religion was important in army	26	43	15	36	11	23	52	35
Most soldiers followed their own habits	22	36	19	45	28	60	69	46
Most soldiers didn't go to church	7	11	5	12	7	15	19	13
Don't know and Other	6	10	3	7	1	2	10	6
Total	61		42		47		150	

Veterans who answered the central question by stressing the acceptance and importance of religion in the army were *significantly* more tolerant than the rest of the sample (see Table 2(IV) above). It was assumed that the subjects were obviously projecting their own feelings about the importance of religion in the army and not basing their answers on carefully

observed behavior in others. Those who replied that "no one in the army was really religious" were equally distributed as to anti-Semitism. Intolerance, however, was concentrated in the group whose answers indicated their indifference to religion by statements to the effect that "most soldiers followed their own habits" or "everybody has his own opinions."

Thus it appears that men whose religious attitudes were characterized by vague and ambiguous statements about nonspecific "little differences" and "everybody having his own opinions" were those who were most intolerant.

That this correlation between stable religious beliefs, either positive or negative, and tolerance was of long standing appears to be a plausible hypothesis. Responses to the question, "Do you think your attitude toward religion was changed in any way by army life," appear to support this contention (see Appendix, Table 5(A)). Intolerant veterans claimed to have been strengthened in their religious conviction by the army experience *significantly* more often than the tolerant men.

The conclusion seems to be that while permanent religious attitudes correlated positively with tolerance, vascillation on this score was accompanied by a higher degree of anti-Semitism.

POLITICAL AFFILIATION. Just as religion (or religious conviction) in itself bore no relation to tolerance, but only the stability of such convictions, so political affiliation in itself seemed without bearing on the question. The lack of differences between the party affiliations of tolerant veterans and outspokenly anti-Semitic veterans confirms the often reported observation that political affiliation for the rank and file, in the United States, does not depend on party program. Only 50 per cent of the men had clear enough political convictions to call themselves either Democrats or Republicans. Of the tolerant veterans roughly 30 per cent were Republicans, while the percentage of outspoken anti-Semities among the Republicans was almost the same (26 per cent). Comparable percentages of tolerant veterans (69 per cent) and intolerant veterans (74 per cent) claimed to be Democrats.

FAMILY COMPOSITION. In addition to religious and political attitudes those of intolerance are also moulded under family influence. Therefore, an effort was made to determine whether family composition (as distinguished from family attitudes) was associated with intolerance. Gross comparisons of family composition failed to produce any correlates with anti-Semitism. The percentage of divorce among the men's families (about 10 per cent) indicated that the group as a whole was one in which

family disorganization was not high. There were too few cases of divorce among the veterans themselves to determine whether this factor exercised any influence on tolerance.

Intolerant men were just as likely to be single as married. The size of the veteran's own family, as well as that of his parents, was unrelated to anti-Semitism. Moreover, the fact that he came from a large family, with three or more children, exercised no influence on his degree of intolerance toward the Jew; neither did it make any difference whether he was the only child or had one sibling.

As another index of family integration, the relative permanence of residence was considered since frequent moving interferes with the stability of interpersonal relationships. However, when the length of family residence in the current dwelling unit was related to the degree of intolerance, no significant difference was noted. The spread among the sample in this respect ranged from 43 per cent, who had been dwelling in their homes for less than one year, to 32 per cent, who had lived in theirs for longer than ten years.

The question of family disruption was also studied as a possible factor in the development of intolerance. Nor did the absence of any relationship between gross indices of family organization and anti-Semitism settle the issue. It merely meant that the answer was not to be found in the formal state of the family, and that further investigation of the impact of the family on the individual was indicated (see Chapter VII).

NATIVITY OF PARENTS. In past years, it has been a popular belief that anti-Semitism, as well as many other interethnic hostilities, found its roots in the struggles of European life, and that it was transplanted to the United States by relatively uneducated immigrants. This was one of the many ways in which man safeguarded his own self esteem by blaming undesirable attitudes on an outgroup. If this assumption had been true, the "Americanization" of immigrant groups would have been the most effective method for improving interethnic relations.

Since it is true that anti-Semitism took a much more violent form in some European countries than it ever did in the United States, it seemed relevant to learn how the sons of native-born parents differed in questions of tolerance from the sons of foreign-born parents. It was found that the degree of ethnic intolerance proved unrelated to the nativity of the veterans' parents; in the metropolis studied, the sons of immigrants were no more intolerant than those of native-born parents (see Appendix Table 6(A)).

However, it was observed that whereas it made little difference whether both parents were foreign- or native-born, an increase in the degree of anti-Semitism was observed in cases where only one parent was foreign-born, although the difference was not great enough to be statistically significant. Only a tentative explanation of this phenomenon may be suggested, namely that a union of native-born and foreign-born parents may have made for less family cohesion, which may in turn have increased the son's insecurity and led him to seek aggressive outlets for his frustrations and/or to adopt more outspoken attitudes.

Similarly, those subjects who had one native- and one foreign-born parent tended to be somewhat more intolerant toward the Negroes. Thus the tendency toward greater intolerance among children with one foreign-born parent could not be ascribed to patterns formed in Europe (where anti-Semitism was rampant), since these parents came from Central and Eastern Europe, where discrimination against Negroes was virtually unknown. (See Appendix Table 13(A).)

READING AND LISTENING HABITS. Attitudes expressing themselves in social interaction are no longer shaped by the family and the church alone. While the family still moulds the basic personality, and while, consciously or unconsciously, most fundamental values are derived from the religious and moral teachings of childhood, how the personality expresses itself in action and how moral convictions are implemented in everyday living is now strongly influenced by propaganda. Although the bulk of empirical observations and the limited number of controlled experiments on this subject indicate that mass communications tend to be less important than basic personality and environmental factors in modifying attitudes, the German example certainly demonstrated that once slumbering hostility is aroused by environmental factors it can easily be directed against a specific goal. Though mass communication does not as yet seem to influence basic attitudes such as aggression, isolation, and feelings of competence or incompetence, it certainly influences the manner in which they are expressed, and channelizes their expression.

Undoubtedly, mass communications perform a significant role of buttressing and providing elaboration for existing attitudes. The impact of these defense processes is difficult to assess, but the individual's selectivity reveals itself in the way he chooses, from the variety of available communications, those whose symbols are most readily incorporated into his existing frame of reference. In this sense, therefore, the

reading and listening habits of the individual are significant social characteristics which help to maintain his current beliefs, and limit all attempts at modification which are contrary to their tendencies. In an analysis of intolerance, these social characteristics have special significance. First, various sources of mass communications present different amounts of material designed to maintain existing prejudices.³ Secondly, various media of mass communication give different "news slants" to the general social and political process. Therefore the veteran's reading and listening habits were investigated rather to determine how his selectivity reflected on his tolerance than to find whether ethnic attitudes reflect the impact of chosen types of communication.

Specifically, the men were asked which newspapers they read regularly, and which were their favorite radio programs and magazines. Statistically, the findings were negative. No significant relations between intolerance and the favoring of one newspaper, type of magazine, or radio program could be established. The replies indicated that almost as many men declared their favorite newspaper to be one of the two New Deal papers in town, the *Chicago Sun* and the *Chicago Times*, as preferred the opposing *Chicago Tribune* or the local Hearst paper. The rest, a small minority, preferred the middle-of-the-road *Daily News*. It may be added that the Hearst paper and the *Daily News* were the only papers preferred more by outspoken and intense anti-Semites than by tolerant men, while for both the *Chicago Tribune* and the New Deal papers the reverse was true. The numbers in each case were too small to permit conclusions, particularly since the difference was not statistically significant.

SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS. To determine the relationship between the varying degrees of anti-Semitism and socioeconomic status, four different status criteria were employed: (1) amount of *income* of the subject at the time of the interview; (2) type of *job* held by the veteran, ranked according to the Alba Edwards socioeconomic classification;⁴ (3) type of *job* held by the subject's *father*; and (4) the indirect measure of the veteran's *rank* at the time of his *discharge* from the army. Anticipating the discussion of these criteria it may be said here that none of these factors seemed associated with intolerance among the members of the sample since none

³ Berelson, Bernard, and Salter, Patricia: "Majority and Minority Americans: An Analysis of Magazine Fiction," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Summer, 1946, present a statistical analysis of the frequency with which ethnic stereotypes are contained in magazine fiction.

⁴ Edwards, Alba: *A Social-Economic Grouping of Gainful Workers of the United States*, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1938, p. 2.

of them were significantly different for the tolerant, the stereotyped, or the outspoken anti-Semite. (Table 3(IV).)

TABLE 3(IV)
SOCIOECONOMIC CORRELATES OF ANTI-SEMITISM

Current Salary	Up to \$2,500	\$2,500 to \$3,000	\$3,000 and Over	Not Applicable	No.
	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	
Tolerant	39	39	43	45	61
Stereotyped	33	24	18	35	42
Outspoken and Intense	28	37	39	20	47
Number	59	43	28	20	150

Socioeconomic Status	Unskilled and Semi-skilled	Top Four Groups ^a	No.
	Percentage	Percentage	
Tolerant	38	42	61
Stereotyped	33	24	42
Outspoken and Intense	29	34	47
Number	80	70	150

Rank in Army	Privates and Corporals	Sergeants	No.
	Percentage	Percentage	
Tolerant	38	42	61
Stereotyped	26	31	42
Outspoken and Intense	36	27	47
Number	80	70	150

^a Includes students on G. I. Bill of Rights and veterans engaged in on-the-job training.

Salary distribution among the veterans was skewed by the underrepresentation of high incomes which was due, of course, to age differentials and the absence of former officer personnel. For the same reason,

as far as type of job held was concerned, the professional and managerial groups were not proportionally represented. Nevertheless, a detailed breakdown by degree of anti-Semitism, amount of salary earned, and type of job held failed to reveal any group in which outspoken anti-Semitism was significantly concentrated. The lack of a relation between type of job held by the veteran and anti-Semitism was particularly noteworthy in the case of clerks and kindred worker categories where it was presumed that anti-Semitism might be concentrated. Some studies have stressed that anti-Semitism is prevalent among the lower middle classes, or the upper classes, while workers are supposedly less contaminated. This study seems to indicate that for this sample socioeconomic status as such is not correlated with intolerance. (See Appendix Tables No. 7(A) and 8(A) for more detailed breakdown of income, socioeconomic status, and intolerance.)

Because status causation of anti-Semitism has been so frequently accepted, and because the veterans' status in civilian life was still so new, another gauge of status was also investigated, namely, rank at discharge. In this case too, there was no difference to be found between the degree of intolerance among privates, and the lower versus the higher ranks of noncommissioned officers.

The conclusion as to socioeconomic status and its relation to anti-Semitism bears comparison with the situation in pre-Hitler Germany. Contrary to widely held notions, anti-Semitism there was by no means restricted to the petty bourgeoisie, but was widespread among sectors of all classes, including the working class.⁵

SOCIAL MOBILITY. The picture so far presented begins to change when the static concept of status is replaced by the dynamic concept of social mobility. Social scientists define social mobility as upward or downward change in the social position of an individual over a period of time, or as compared with the position of his family. If the effect of social mobility on anti-Semitism is studied, rapid change in status becomes more significant. Slow changes need not lead to aggressive behavior nor will a change of society as a whole produce such feelings. If societal change embraces all members of society, appropriate societal cushioning will usually protect the individual. In the case of individual changes in status, a slow

⁵ It should be pointed out again that this sample permits no generalizations about the top social strata. The *Fortune* survey of February, 1946, it is true, indicates increased anti-Semitism on the upper income level, but there are no statistical studies to support the point. However, some impressionistic observations support this contention, although anti-Semitism in the "upper classes" may be somewhat different in causation and content.

rate of change will allow him time for adjustment and also permit him to direct slowly accumulating frustrations into socially acceptable channels. Sudden frustrations promote the tendency to react to deterioration of status through discharge in hostility. This was exemplified in the rapid succession of inflation and deflation in pre-Hitler Germany and the attendant increase in anti-Semitism. Therefore, a study of the consequences of relatively sudden status change seemed indicated.

Social mobility was viewed as a shift in the veteran's socioeconomic or occupational position from that of his immediate prewar position to that of his position at the time of the interview.⁶ Most men felt they were entitled to return to a position which was better than, or at least equal to, the one they had left on enlistment. They felt that their service to the country, the hardships they had experienced, and especially the loss of opportunity for regular advancement more than justified such expectations. Therefore, a current status lower than the one enjoyed before enlistment was not only an injury to their self-esteem, as loss in status always is, but was also viewed as an unjustified mistreatment by society, particularly in view of promises which they considered to have been made to them.

It was possible to gather precise data on the social mobility of 130 veterans. Temporarily unemployed veterans were not rated because their unemployment was almost always transitional and sometimes deliberate. Nine of the men, who were studying under the G. I. Bill of Rights or obtaining benefits through the on-the-job training program, were rated as upwardly mobile because they were expected to improve their status through increased skills or learning. Table 4(IV) indicates that a third of those for whom data were available were in the upward mobility group, one-seventh in the downward, while the remainder, slightly more than half, registered no change of status.

Aggressive attitudes, both spontaneous and elicited, were found to be most highly concentrated in the downwardly mobile group, while the pattern was *significantly* reversed for those who had advanced in social status since the period of their previous civilian employment. Those who had experienced no change presented a picture somewhat in the middle; among them the number of tolerant persons was almost equal to that of the men who held stereotyped anti-Semitic beliefs.

⁶ The men were asked about their occupational status before the war and at the time of the interview. These two data were compared with the Alba Edwards classification, described above. A shift upwards of one or more grades on this scale was held to constitute upward social mobility; while a reverse shift was classified as downward social mobility.

TABLE 4(IV)

ANTI-SEMITISM AND SOCIAL MOBILITY

	Downward Mobility		No Mobility		Upward Mobility		Total	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
Tolerant	2	11	25	37	22	50	49	38
Stereotyped	3	17	26	38	8	18	37	28
Outspoken and Intense	13	72	17	25	14	32	44	34
Total	18		68		44		130	

While the previously discussed social and economic characteristics, viewed, as it were, in a static context, proved relatively unrelated to anti-Semitism, they were *significantly* related to the expression of intolerance when viewed in the dynamic context of the individual's social mobility.⁷

The no-mobility group showed the highest concentration of stereotyped opinions—that is, they were “middle-of-the-roaders” in the intolerance continuum. (Over 70 per cent of the stereotyped anti-Semites were found in this middle category.) This datum tends to highlight the relation between mobility and intolerance.

It should be realized that the stereotyped and the outspoken anti-Semites held many attitudes in common about the Jew. The difference between the stereotyped and the outspoken anti-Semites appeared to be the greater tendency of the stereotyped anti-Semite to control his hostile feelings so that they expressed themselves only in unfavorable opinions rather than in demands for action. The demand for action, and action itself, threatened the *status quo* which this middle group seemed to wish to preserve. It can also be assumed that self-discipline with regard to social attitudes is a result of the willingness to accede to society's demands for conformity. It then seems understandable that the individual who reacts to downward social mobility as to the consequence of an act of injustice by society would experience a weakening of the desire or the ability to conform to society's demands. Such conformity, in a society

⁷ It might be argued that the relationship between anti-Semitism and mobility (as defined in this study) may have been the result of a third attribute: education. This however was not the case, for association of social mobility and tolerance remained present when educational level was held constant.

which deprives the individual, seems pointless to the person deprived.⁸ The stereotyped anti-Semite therefore becomes a potentially outspoken anti-Semite, given conditions which may weaken his self-discipline. One such condition is likely to be downward social mobility.

It may be assumed that the wish to "play safe," on the part of the non-mobile group, prevented it from taking those social and economic risks which, while offering the chance to rise in status, also entailed all the risk which changes imply, among them that of declining in status. It was particularly true for this group, to whom the G. I. Bill offered easily accessible chances to raise their educational (and, by implication, their social and economic) status. As noted above, the men who availed themselves of this opportunity were classified as upwardly mobile.

The same lack of desire to assume even temporary risks on the chance of bettering oneself also prevented these men from taking an extreme view of ethnic problems. Holding stereotyped opinions on the Jews was the accepted pattern for the group, while both great tolerance or violent anti-Semitism, they felt, might expose them to the criticism or the ridicule of their peers. Such tactics seemed risky and to be avoided.

The German example may again be mentioned in this connection. The socially and economically downward-moving lower middle class groups (frequently referred to as the "squeezed-out groups") were the followers of Hitler, while the "respectable," relatively secure, and static middle classes (those who had not yet experienced downward mobility) held apart from this extreme form of nationalism (and anti-Semitism). Before Hitler, they were the followers of the *Stahlhelm*, of the conservative parties who embraced "stereotyped" and social anti-Semitism without being outspokenly intolerant. All this changed with the advent of Hitler. Then anti-Semitism became not only respectable, but the social norm. Moreover, these middle classes which had formerly enjoyed relative security now themselves became part of the squeezed-out group, squeezed out first by the new ruling group of National Socialists and then by the war mobilization economy. At this point, most of them became intensely hostile to the Jews, both because they were again following the accepted and successful pattern and also because they needed more vio-

⁸ This is a process which can be observed in other situations in which the individual experiences frustrations. The typical nonconformist is the delinquent. With the exception of those cases in which delinquency is nothing but conformity to the mores of the delinquent's immediate environment, delinquency is almost always the consequence of the delinquent's conviction that he has not received his due, and has been cheated by those who to him represent society.

lent outlets for the hostility aroused by sudden and severe frustration.⁹

In view of the association between downward social mobility and intolerance, and upward social mobility and tolerance, the few cases (fourteen) who displayed both upward mobility and outspokenly intolerant attitudes warrant special attention. An analysis of the actual income gains associated with upward mobility reveals that these veterans who were both outspokenly anti-Semitic and upwardly mobile tended to be considerably more mobile than the others. Veterans with moderate increases in yearly income (up to \$1,000) were more frequently tolerant than intolerant. However, among those veterans whose salaries increased \$1,500 and more the number of outspoken anti-Semites equaled that of the tolerant veterans. This may tentatively be explained by the fact that sharp upward mobility is likely to be associated with marked aggressiveness in general. Sharp upward mobility implies changes in life patterns which produce great stress in the individuals involved. This was first observed by Durkheim in his study of suicides in Europe.¹⁰ The data at hand indicate that while slow upward mobility is closely associated with tolerance, rapid mobility either upward or downward, is positively related to interethnic hostility.

In conclusion, it may be said that these data support the theory that intolerance becomes a more serious problem to the degree that large groups become downwardly mobile at a rapid pace owing to changes in the structure of society. The data also seem to indicate that to understand intolerance it is less important to concentrate on the social and economic background of the individual than to investigate the nature of his social mobility. The question which must be answered for each individual is whether or not he is being forced downwards or prevented from fulfilling his expectations of upward social mobility.¹¹

⁹ One of the authors of this study made a series of observations on the manner in which this group dealt with their frustrating experiences following the rapid loss of secure status. The vast majority reacted as described above. A small minority became even more tolerant than they had been, and rejected Hitler severely. But they paid a great price in increased anxiety, an anxiety which those avoided who accepted Hitler and found a discharge for their hostility in aggression against Jews and other out-groups.

¹⁰ Durkheim, Emile: *Le Suicide*, F. Alcan, Paris, 1897.

¹¹ The same analysis was employed with respect to anti-Negro intolerance and revealed a pattern similar to that of anti-Semitism. For further discussion of this analysis, see Chapter VIII.