7-1-1941

American Jews and Anti-Semitism

Max Meenes

AMERICAN JEWS AND ANTI-SEMITISM

Max Meenes

Nearly ten years ago, 100 students at Princeton University were asked to select from a list of adjectives those that were most typically characteristic of Jews and they agreed quite generally upon the following: shrewd, mercenary, industrious, grasping, intelligent, ambitious, and sly.[1] There was somewhat less agreement on the designations: loyal to family ties, persistent, talkative, aggressive, and very religious. Less than two years ago, the same exercise[2] was assigned 100 Negro students at Virginia State College. With somewhat less agreement they characterized Jews as being progressive, shrewd, ambitious, grasping, industrious, very religious, intelligent, deceitful, brilliant, loyal to family ties. Thus, college students seem to show no hesitency in describing such a concept as "the Jew." What is more, a group of white students and a group of Negro students at different times and in different localities, show considerable agreement about such a conceptualized idea or stereotype. How does this come about? How is it related to actual face-to-face contacts and other experiences? How does it feel to be the butt of such prejudices? How are such attitudes to be understood?

Evidences of Anti-semitism

Our information about attitudes toward Jews in the United States comes from a variety of sources, many of them not reliable. Much of our knowledge, and the least dependable, comes from casual observation, experience and hearsay. More dependable information is obtained from surveys and investigations using questionnaires and interview techniques for studying attitudes.

From Casual Observation, Experience, and Hearsay

The vast outpourings of propaganda pamphlet material, books, newspaper stories and advertisements which suggest restrictions, magazine articles and radio utterances which consider Jewish matters, are convincing indications of the extent of the preoccupation of the American public with Jewish affairs. Such evidence has multiplied greatly in recent years, so that the importance which the so-called Jewish problem has assumed in the public eye does not require documentation. Organizations with avowed anti-Jewish programs are many and well publicized. Evidences of expressed attitude and behavior toward Jews are apparent in the form of economic, educational, and social restrictions. There are many ways in which Jews are made to feel more or less unacceptable.

Hatred of Jews in the United States has been fanned since the World War as never before. There is much evidence of anti-Jewish prejudice in colleges and professional schools which is reflected in enrollment restrictions, exclusion from fraternities, and partial

---

[1] D. Katz and K. Braly, "Racial Stereotypes of One Hundred College Students," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 28:285, 1933.
[2] J. A. Bayton, "The Racial Stereotypes of Negro College Students," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 36:98, 1941.

or complete exclusion from various extracurricular organizations.[3] Jews encounter difficulties in the professions, especially in teaching, engineering, and medicine. With respect to clerical work in New York, Broun and Britt say: "Of course, I can't prove it by precise statistics, but it is my impression that the number of companies going in for 'Christians only' increased very radically during the period of depression when there was a large oversupply of office workers."[4] As a device for exclusion of Jews, employers frequently inquire into the religion of the applicant, ask applicants who reply to advertisements to state religion, and request employment agencies not to send Jews. "Discrimination against Jews in New York spreads all over the city, reaches like a dark cloud into the narrowest and most remote streets, to the largest and smallest lines of employment. It is practiced deliberately, and also unconsciously, by those who dislike Jews and by those who don't care but who yield to a supposed demand of the public. It is of vast proportions and is by no means decreasing."[5] Since 1931 when this was written, practices of exclusion from employment, from social clubs and resorts, and indeed all forms of antisemitic prejudice, have increased still more as a result of propaganda from abroad which has encouraged greater overt expression of already existent attitudes.

FROM SURVEYS

In Middletown it was observed in 1925 that there was an increase in anti-Jewish sentiment with the growth in number of Jewish-owned retail stores and the incarnation of the Klan.[6] Jews were accepted socially but not without qualification. By 1935 the Jews of Middletown were "quietly on the defensive."[7] In the survey taken in that year much social discrimination was observed. "The issue is tinder ready for kindling if and as Middletown wants a bonfire to burn a scapegoat."[8] A comparison of these two studies of Middletown ten years apart, shows the existence of anti-Semitism in a representative middle Western city and presents further evidence of increasing anti-Semitism with the passing of time.

In another city, Burlington, Vermont, where Jews constitute about three per cent of the population, an investigator reports[9] that in some sections of the city it is impossible for a Jew to buy property or to rent a home. Jews meet with discrimination in seeking employment, especially in the banks, and chain stores. "Even the nursery school in the community refuses admission to a child solely because she is Jewish."[10]

The American Jewish Congress has made extensive studies of discrimination in employment against Jews in the United States. One of their reports,[11] issued in 1938, states that such discrimination is increasing. A study of advertisements for employment appearing in New York newspapers from

[3] Heywood Broun and George Britt, *Christians Only*. New York: Vanguard Press, 1931, p. 333.
[4] *Ibid.*, 193.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 220.

[6] R. J. and H. M. Lynd, *Middletown*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1929, p. 479.
[7] R. J. and H. M. Lynd, *Middletown in Transition*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1937, p. 462.
[8] *Ibid.*, 462-3.
[9] Elin L. Anderson, *We Americans*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938, p. 286.
[10] *Ibid.*, 262.
[11] J. X. Cohen, *Toward Fair Play for Jewish Workers*. New York: American Jewish Congress, 1938, p. 47.

1918-1938 showed that discriminatory specifications increased in periods of depression and increased enormously in recent years coincidentally with the rise of Naziism. A survey of 90 leading employment agencies in New York City revealed that about half those interviewed said that discrimination against Jews was on the increase.[12]

From Social Distance, Stereotype and Questionnaire Studies

As early as 1925, Bogardus set up an *a priori* measure of social distance to obtain expressions of attitudes toward groups. In such scales subjects are asked whether they would admit Jews to close kinship by marriage, whether they would exclude them from their country, etc. In a typical study of this kind,[13] 269 white middle-class subjects expressed much less favorable attitude toward Jews than to Irish, Germans and Swedes. Another study[14] utilized as subjects 163 Jewish children and 30 non-Jewish children aged about 11. The total rankings of the Jewish children agreed highly with the non-Jewish, yielding a coefficient of correlation of .87.

The use of studies to obtain "racial" stereotypes is illustrated by the work of Katz and Braly, and of Bayton, cited in the opening paragraph of this paper. An extensive study of the stereotypes of a large number of St. Louis school children aged 9 to 16 years, was made by Meltzer[15] in 1934 and again in 1938. He found stereotypy of attitudes, but less than is usually reported in studies of college students. Some 1,320 children were asked to give reasons for their attitudes and they gave a total of 10,748 reasons indicating liking of 21 nationalities, 10,741 reasons indicating indifference, and 4,125 dislike reasons. Only about one-fifth of the total statements given by the children indicated dislike; about two-fifths indicated indifference, and 56 per cent of these were "not acquainted, don't know much about them." The high percentage of "don't know" statements may be taken as an indication that these stereotypes have not yet become completely rigid. There was a little more uncertainty and less stereotypy in 1938 than in 1934, probably a reflection of changed world conditions.

Guilford, using the method of paired comparisons, asked approximately 1,000 students at seven different universities to indicate their national preferences.[16] The subjects were asked to underline the one in each pair they would prefer to admit as fellow citizens of this country. Fifteen nationality groups were paired, and a rank order of preference for each group was obtained. Guilford found that the "Jew" was rated well below the average of the nationality preferences in all of these seven widely separated universities, with the exception of New York University, where 71 per cent of the subjects were Jews. There the "Jew" was rated second only to the "English." Guilford reported a "very great unanimity of opinion among all the thousand students excepting those of New York University."[17] The intercorrelations which are a measure of

[12] J. X. Cohen, *op. cit.*, 9.
[13] E. Monjar, "Racial Distance Reactions," *Sociology and Social Research*, 21:559-64, 1937.
[14] R. Zeligs and G. Hendrickson, "Racial Attitudes of Two Hundred Sixth-Grade Children," *Sociology and Social Research*, 18:26-36, 1933.
[15] H. Meltzer, "Children's Thinking about Nations and Races," *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 58:181-199, 1941.

[16] J. P. Guilford, "Racial Preferences of a Thousand American University Students," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 2:179-204, 1931.
[17] *Ibid.*, 183.

the unanimity of these attitudes range from .975 to .991 for all colleges except New York University, and even for the latter, the correlations are of the extraordinarily high order of .843 to .894. The striking agreement among college students in all parts of the United States shown in such studies is an indication of how universal and of how much agreement there is with respect to such attitudes. Jewish subjects at New York University, like the Negro subjects at Virginia State College[18] agree with the "racial" attitudes commonly held by college students with the exception of the rating of the stereotype of the group with which they identify. In rating that group they deviate from the college norm, giving it a higher rating than it receives from the great majority of college students.

Development of Anti-Semitic Attitudes

Meltzer computed the order of preference of children in the fifth grade for 21 nationality groups and found it to be: "American, Englishman, Irishman, Frenchman, South American, Scotchman, Mexican, Italian, Swede, Spaniard, Russian, German, Armenian, Jew, Pole, Chinese, Greek, Negro, Turk, Japanese, Hindu—and this order of preference remains with surprising constancy the order given by children from the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades."[19] He concludes: "The general emotional atmosphere and climate of opinion in the United States does tend to nurture what may be called an American nationality preference pattern, which, wittingly or unwittingly, serves as a frame of reference for children's expressed order of preference for different nations or races."[20]

Summary

It is clear from the evidence cited that anti-Semitic attitudes are found in all parts of the United States. They take the form of economic discrimination and social rejection. Attitudes toward national and "racial" groups are universal in our culture. College students, school children, and adults appear to accept such group stereotypes. People who identify themselves with a minority group have a more favorable stereotype of that group than is common to other Americans, but share the same attitudes toward all other groups that are commonly held in our culture. Even when a person suffers from prejudice directed against the group with which he is identified, he accepts group distinctions and discriminations, and gives evidence of a partial belief in the current American stereotype toward his group. Virginia State students agreed with Princeton students on seven out of ten adjectives considered descriptive of "Negroes."[21] Jewish college students, Negro college students, college students in general, show a very high degree of agreement in "racial" stereotypes. It is therefore clear that these group attitudes are an integral part of American culture. They are to be found in school children and apparently become more rigid with age. These attitudes are influenced by national sentiment and change somewhat with a change in public sentiment, e.g.,

---

[18] Bayton, op. cit.
[19] H. Meltzer, "The Development of Children's Nationality Preferences, Concepts, and Attitudes," Journal of Psychology, 11:346, 1941.

[20] Ibid., 348.
[21] Bayton, op. cit., 100.

toward Germany. Nevertheless, over a period of years, and in all parts of the nation, these stereotypes have retained a high degree of constancy and uniformity. They have little or no relation to personal experience, for subjects repeatedly describe clear-cut stereotypes of such groups as Turks, Hindus, etc., even though they lack personal contact with any member of such groups. These prejudices toward minority groups form part of the cultural pattern of a nation made up of minority groups.

INFORMATION ABOUT JEWS

In addition to much rumor and opinion based on hearsay and colored by prejudice, there is some information about Jews that comes from studies comparing groups of Jews with non-Jews in the American population. Jewish groups have been found to rank as high as non-Jewish in intelligence test performance.[22] The results of temperament studies are somewhat equivocal. Using personality inventories, Sward and Friedman found that the mean scores of Jewish adult subjects differed from the non-Jewish in the direction of greater neurotic tendency and inferiority.[23] On the basis of an item analysis of the results of the Bernreuter inventory, Sward claims that his Jewish group shows more social dependence, submissiveness, drive, anxiety states and mood change.[24] On the other hand, Brown found no statistically reliable difference in stability and maturity between a group of Jew-

ish and non-Jewish boys except that the former are significantly higher in school adjustments.[25] In an earlier comparison, Brown reported no relation between "race" and emotional adjustment, but did find a positive relation between socio-economic level and emotional stability.[26] Malzberg[27] reports that functional psychoses are relatively more prevalent among Jewish insane. Shevach compared Jewish with non-Jewish children and adults on a variety of tests of perseveration; Jewish subjects showed a greater perseveration on some of the tests and less on others. There was no evidence of a racial determinant.[28]

In recent years a number of careful studies of the economic status of Jewish groups, population distribution, vocational groupings of Jews in America, etc., have made their appearance. More reliable information about Jews in the American economy is gradually becoming available.[29] Studies that compare Jewish with non-Jewish groups are open to criticism because of the great likelihood of sampling errors and uncontrolled variables. What is even more serious, the differences reported are frequently by implication considered to be due to a "racial" or other alleged inherent quality of Jewishness. The concept "Jew" is not defined, race is not proved but

[22] Otto Klineberg, Race Differences, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1935, p. 167.
[23] K. Sward and M. B. Friedman, "Jewish Temperament," Journal of Applied Psychology, 19:70-84, 1935.
[24] K. Sward, "Patterns of Jewish Temperament," Journal of Applied Psychology, 19:410-425, 1935.

[25] F. Brown, "A Note on the Stability and Maturity of Jewish and non-Jewish Boys," Journal of Social Psychology, 12:171-175, 1940.
[26] F. Brown, "A Comparative Study of the Influence of Race and Locale upon Emotional Stability of Children," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 49:325-342, 1936.
[27] B. Malzburg, "New Data Relative to Incidence of Mental Disease among Jews," Mental Hygiene, 20:280-291, 1936.
[28] B. J. Shevach, "A Note on Racial Differences in Perseveration," Journal of Psychology, 5:271-279, 1938.
[29] Such studies are now appearing regularly in Jewish Social Studies, e.g., M. M. Fagen, "the Status of Jewish Lawyers in New York City," Jewish Social Studies, 1:73-104, 1939.

remains a superstition.[30] The transmission by inheritance of temperament and even of intelligence is not proved. But above all, it must not be forgotten that a "Jew" is also rich or poor, and like everyone else, is influenced by cultural, social, vocational and educational experiences. Economic status, social group influences, age, sex, schooling, occupation and personal determinants influence attitudes and also have an effect on temperament, personality, and intelligence.

EFFECTS OF ANTI-SEMITISM ON JEWS

Consciousness of group membership and group distinction appears as early as age four or five.[31] This awareness of distinction may lead to the development of inferiority feelings and consequent overcompensation.[32] Race consciousness results in the development of group prejudices so that members of minority groups adopt the same attitudes toward other minorities as are current in the general culture, although attitudes toward the minority with which they identify are somewhat deviant from the common stereotype of that group.[33]

The rejection of Jews by non-Jews probably reinforces segregation and strengthens special education in Jewish cultural traditions. It probably does not, however, diminish the desire of Jews to participate in general cultural activities. This defensive strengthening of Jewish group life against barriers to free assimilation makes of Jews incomplete participants in the national culture, keeps Jews marginal men.[34] In ghetto times, the barrier existed against Jews as a group, and the individual Jew could find some feeling of security within the group. "Now as a result of the disintegration of the group, he is much more exposed to pressure as an individual."[35] There is thus a tendency for the individual, when rebuffed, to fall back upon the group and so the group is strengthened and group counsciousness increases. But the conflict and the psychic tension in the individual persists. Difficulties of adjustment multiply.

Anti-Semitism in Germany has consisted of economic oppression, interruption of professional relations and a rupture of social intercourse with non-Jews. The one common result of such sudden oppression was the appearance of tremendous insecurity. This produced frequent regression tendencies, retreat to the past. Additional prevalent effects were negative attitudes toward new work which was usually lower in the social scale than the previous occupation, schizoid reactions, excitability, a need for affection at any price. In some cases there resulted a successful compensation with development of greater versatility and initiative.[36]

Being a member of a minority group which is not fully accepted by the

[30] J. Barzun, Race, A Study in Modern Superstition, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1937, p. 353.
[31] B. Lasker, Race Attitudes in Children, New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1929, pp. 33-39; R. E. Horowitz, "Racial Aspects of Self-Identification in Nursery School Children," Journal of Psychology, 7:91-99, 1939; K. B. and M. K. Clark, "The Development of Consciousness of Self and the Emergence of Racial Identification in Negro Preschool Children," Journal of Social Psychology, 10: 591-599, 1939.
[32] A. A. Roback, "Have the Jews an Inferiority Complex?" B'nai Brith Magazine, 39:339, 1925.
[33] Guilford, op. cit.; Bayton, op. cit.

[34] E. V. Stonequist, The Marginal Man: A Study in Personality and Culture Conflict. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937.
[35] K. Lewin, "Psycho-Sociological Problems of a Minority Group," Character and Personality, 3:182, 1935.
[36] G. H. Singer, "The Influence of Sudden Oppression on a Racial Minority," Journal of Social Psychology, 10:127-145, 1939.

prevailing social group sets up conflict in the members of the minority. Such conflict leads to restlessness, and over-emphasis in one direction or another. The restlessness, uncertainties, over-reactions, withdrawals of Jews, are the result of the tension set up in certain social environments. "Jewishness" has nothing to do with it. These personality manifestations are absent among Jews in other surroundings.[37]

One of the effects of oppression is to heighten group solidarity. The group then becomes more important and attempts to organize to fight the enemies from without. This has led to the organization of anti-defamation leagues and a great flood of defensive literature. Unfortunately such efforts seem to accentuate the difficulties by keeping the issues alive. They tend to support the false idea that the issue is "Jews vs. non-Jews."[38] In general, such measures are attempts to fight irrational, emotional attitudes by rational, logical methods. "We must stop being concerned so much with meeting this or that particular attack, putting poultices on boils as they break out."[39] Yet such feverish organization for defense, an attempt to refute allegations about Jews with factual data, is an obvious effect of anti-Semitic attack. The failure of the world to listen to reason and to respect the facts, but to maintain its prejudices in spite of scholarly refutations, only increases the sense of futility in Jews. "The view widely prevalent in Jewish and non-Jewish circles that by acting in this way or that the Jews might have been able to avert anti-Semitism is based

on an illusion. For it is not the Jews who are hated, but an imaginary image of them, which is confounded with the reality, and the Jews' actual 'faults' play a very unimportant part in the matter."[40]

CAUSES OF ANTI-SEMITISM

A discussion of causes at this point can only be tentative and exploratory. There are too many gaps in our knowledge and much of our information rests upon shaky foundations. All that we know of Jews and of anti-Semitism is based upon hearsay, personal testimony, history, statistical and attitude studies. There are as yet few if any studies that show the relation between attitude and behavior in specific situations, although many hostile acts presupposing the existence of antagonistic attitudes have been reported. Attitudes may remain latent for long periods until circumstances make for their reactivation.

Since we are concerned with attitudes it is not necessary to discuss inheritance as a possible cause. Investigators of genesis and development of attitudes are convinced of the importance of social factors in their determination. "The problem of colored populations, of immigration, and miscegenation, of anti-Semitism and national hatreds are not problems about a natural fact called race: they are problems of social life, of economic status, of educational policy, and of political organization."[41] Yet, as Donald Young says:

Not a single individual in the United States is permitted by his own beliefs and by the

---

[37] Lewin, op. cit.
[38] R. C. Rothschild, "Are American Jews Falling into the Nazi Trap?" Contemporary Jewish Record, 3:9-17, 1940.
[39] Ibid., 15.

[40] Hugo Valentin, Anti-Semitism: Historically and Critically Examined, New York: Viking Press, 1936, p. 305.
[41] Barzun, op. cit., p. 276.

controlling attitudes of his group to regard his fellows as individuals rather than as members of some class or caste based on racial or national ancestry, and characterized thereby. . . . These attitudes affect beliefs in inborn qualities, limit employment, fix the place of residence, influence forms of recreation, and go so far as to prescribe varieties of social relationships.[42]

The basic causes of anti-Semitism are clearly group differentiation, group consciousness, group conflict, and cultural attitudes. Three forms of anti-Semitism, all interrelated, may be considered: social, economic, political.[43] Social anti-Semitism has a long history and is manifested in social discriminatons and socal distance. It has its basis in stereotypy and prejudiced attitudes prevalent in the culture, and these are in turn acquired by cultural transmission. Economic anti-Semitism flares up violently in the search for scapegoats during periods of economic crisis. Improved economic conditions reduce such group conflicts. The high "visibility" of Jews, make it easy to divert the aggression of the economically dissatisfied toward the Jew as a scapegoat. Political anti-Semitism arises from propaganda which derives its effectiveness from the presence of social anti-Semitism and economic distress.

Psychoanalysts and psychologists attempt to explain anti-Semitism as a process of displacement of hate. Gibson looks upon anti-Semitism as a form of hostility created by pent-up anger which results from thwarting. This hatred is directed toward the stereotype of the Jew through propaganda.[44] Aggression is the result of

frustration and "German persecution of the Jews, in short, is aggression that has been displaced from the agents really responsible for the frustration."[45]

WHAT CAN BE DONE

An intelligent program for the removal of anti-Semitism must be based upon a thorough understanding of the phenomenon and its causes. But even with our present partial knowledge it is possible to consider some measures to this end. No panaceas will, of course, be offered, but some indications of the directions to be taken to overcome prejudice will be presented.

In so far as economic conditions increase hostility toward Jews, an improvement in economic welfare may to some extent alleviate this hostility. Propaganda depends for its effectiveness upon economic stringency and upon already existent attitudes and will lose some of its effectiveness upon the removal of these supports. Perhaps also people can be taught to identify propaganda and develop some degree of immunity. Counter-propaganda that aims to lower the prestige of the anti-Semitic propagandist may also reduce the effectiveness of propaganda. However, defense against propaganda may sustain anti-Semitism by keeping the issue alive.

Since hostility toward Jews may be looked upon as a form of aggressiveness resulting from frustration, any form of social organization that reduces the number and severity of individual frustrations will reduce the amount of aggressiveness. But what

---

[42] Donald Young, *American Minority Peoples.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1932, p. 2.
[43] Rothschild, *op. cit.*, 9 ff.
[44] J. J. Gibson, "The Aryan Myth," *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 13:164-171, 1939.

[45] J. Dollard, L. W. Doob, N. E. Miller, O. H. Mowrer, R. R. Sears, *et. al.*, *Frustration and Aggression.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939, p. 155.

form of society will do this? A more immediate effect may come from measures which deflect aggression in other directions. Perhaps the redirection of aggressiveness toward social and political evils may help. In the long run, it would seem that a lessening of frustrations and a deflection of agressiveness in directions that make for less intergroup antagonisms will be beneficial.

Basically however, the problem depends upon the presence of distinctive groups, the development of group consciousness, the acquisition of group stereotypes, and the cultivation of tolerance. Young believes that *"group antagonisms seem to be inevitable when two peoples in contact with each other may be distinguished by differentiating characteristics, either inborn or cultural, and are actual or potential competitors."*[46] Anti-Semitism would disappear if Jews became so completely assimilated that they could not be distinguished from non-Jews. In other words there would be no Jewish problem if there were no Jews. But the obstacles to complete assimilation are many and are not easily overcome. Non-Jews set up barriers against complete Jewish absorption in the prevailing culture and many Jews oppose the submergence of the Jewish group.

Since individuals nurture group identification, and since group consciousness is one of the dominating mores in the United States, any device which will reduce the importance of group consciousness will bring about an abatement of group conflicts. Religious conflicts have led to wars in the past but with the growth of religious tolerance and the less dominant position of religious organizations in the modern state, such conflicts have diminished in intensity. When national and "racial" groups lose their importance by becoming subordinate to group formations along non-national lines, this form of conflict may be expected to disappear.

Group attitudes as reflected in stereotypes form the psychological basis for group discrimination. Such stereotypes, as has been shown, are universal, fairly uniform, and moderately rigid. They are, however, modifiable, by education or propaganda. The schools have done little to eradicate such stereotypes. College courses in race relations and even the arrangement of intergroup contacts have had little effect.[47] Segregation in schools and educational discriminations are not conducive to educational correction of this condition. A positive school program aimed at the destruction of group stereotypes would seem to be required. Our schools are part of our culture and stereotypy is integral in the cultural milieu. It is useless to talk of education as a panacea until it is known more clearly what specific educational measures will be effective.

Formal education, even if carefully designed to modify attitudes, is of little effect as long as the attitudes to be modified are socially prevalent. A drastic change in social values would seem to be called for. Attitudes appear to be acquired subtly and indirectly from impressions conveyed by adults. It would therefore seem necessary to change adults or to reorganize our culture in such a way as to evoke different attitudes before much progress may be expected. The outlook for this

---

[46] D. Young, *op. cit.*, p. 586, our italics.

[47] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

is not very encouraging.

Horowitz[48] has found different levels of tolerance in individuals which seem to be related to group prejudice. It appears also that introverts show greater tolerance than extroverts and that the more loquacious persons show less tolerance. The problem is in part, at least, that of increasing tolerance of individuals. Just how this may be achieved is not clearly known but further investigation may point the way. The level of tolerance must be raised if a higher degree of national unity is to be achieved.

How may increasing tolerance be attained? Direct educational procedures seem of dubious value, but indirect methods may be effective. In the schools, cooperative endeavors should be stressed increasingly, and all children should participate upon the basis of ability alone. Group formations must cut across "racial" lines. It must be tacitly assumed throughout the edu-

[48] Eugene L. Horowitz, unpublished study carried out under the auspices of the Pi Lambda Phi Foundation Gift to Columbia University, 1938-1939.

cational process that "racial" membership is of no consequence.

Programs to increase understanding of the cultural backgrounds of minority groups may result in greater respect and sympathy for the lesser known minorities. Sympathy, desirable as it may be, is not enough and it may result in too great emphasis on group distinctiveness. Tolerance is of course a long range program. In the meantime, intergroup frictions may be alleviated by governmental measures designed to reduce the fear of economic insecurity, and by political and legal actions directed against discrimination in public places.

A consideration for individual differences and a recognition of the intrinsic importance of the individual rather than his group memberships is the aim of a tolerant society. Each individual will find his place in such a society in accordance with his individual abilities. Tolerance is most likely to be achieved in a society that nourishes respect for the individual and permits of a wide range of individual differences.