tries sincerely to tell the story of the losers. But that is not easy. Their number is large and their records are seldom as complete and conveniently accessible as those of the winners. Whiggishness is the original sin of historians. Though they cannot escape it completely they can at least try their utmost to overcome it. Jenkins has done that and has produced a balanced, definitive study of lasting importance.

JOHN J. BEER
Department of History,
University of Delaware, Newark

Racial Attitudes

Ethnic, racial, and religious cleavages and conflicts are salient features of the world of the 1970's. *Towards the Elimination of Racism* is a timely contribution to the hard thinking needed for realistic analysis of these phenomena, objective analysis of which has been especially difficult and often vulnerable to attack owing to dogmatism, distortions, and persistent misinformation.

Unlike many current books dealing with ethnic relations, this volume deliberately does not focus upon the effects of racist beliefs and practices upon racial minorities. Instead, the editor has selected contributions that critically review research pertaining to the modification of "white racism." The first of the three groups of chapters summarizes several of the major theoretical approaches used in explanations of interracial attitudes and behavior. The second reviews a substantial accumulation of social psychological research concerning change in individuals' racial attitudes and in intergroup behavior. The third deals with the modification of institutional racism, that is, of those collective or systemic arrangements that produce racial discrimination or perpetuate disadvantage. Most of the chapters attempt to identify the principles that seem to account for success or failure of efforts to change intergroup attitudes and behavior of white persons in the United States.

An evident advantage of the chosen orientation is that it favors causal analysis rather than noncommittal description, thereby posing important issues that cannot be hidden in a thicket of "interesting" facts. On the other hand, the emphasis upon purposive efforts to change racial orientations occasionally seems to produce a tone of advocacy that distracts attention from the scientific issues. A tension between activistic and analytic interests seems implied when the editor thinks it appropriate to remark that scientific studies are not an adequate substitute for direct efforts to change the social system.

Although the orientation of most of the chapters is toward psychological rather than sociological studies, the editor suggests that "political, economic and legal action" to restructure societal arrangements is the most promising approach for eliminating racism. Even so, the social psychological approach is regarded as essential for correct diagnosis and effective social action, especially in view of the gaps between what is intended by and what results from legislation and judicial decisions.

The work identifies two foci of controversy in behavioral and social science research on racial relations in the United States. The first results from differing appraisals of how much of what kind of change has occurred in recent decades; for example, has the situation of black people improved at all, and if so, how much and in what ways? The second set of intensive debates concerns whether recent attempts to modify interracial behavior at the individual level have been more successful or less successful than those directed to the organizational or institutional level.

A third and prior controversial question is not explicitly dealt with, although it is raised by the very title of the work: What is "racism"? It is perhaps fortunate that most of the contributors did not attempt to guide their analyses by the definitions offered in the initial chapters. Katz makes racism synonymous with any categorical inequality, that is, "the unequal treatment of individuals because of their membership in a particular group." This remarkably broad characterization occurs in a context of frequent interchanges of terms—"racist prac-

tices," "discrimination," "inequality," and "practices and beliefs of racism." Even if the reader is able to sort out this collection of related but surely not identical concepts, she or he will hardly be helped by encountering in the very next chapter Chesler's characterization of racism as "whatever acts or institutional procedures help create or perpetuate sets of advantages or privileges for whites and exclusions or deprivations for minority groups." By these definitions racism is being practiced whenever white parents aid their children to get a good education, assist them in locating jobs, or allow them to inherit property. No doubt unequal advantages are involved in these practices, but how is clarity served by lumping them together with gross and explicit racial exclusion and denials of opportunity?

Other examples of conceptual problems are scattered through the text. To take only one other case, the editor at one point wonders whether during recent years interracial "attitudes and *behavior* [emphasis added] have actually changed, or whether what we are witnessing is simply an increase in their variability." But is not an increase in variability an actual change? And in any event I fail to understand the incertitude concerning overt behavior, for surely—though the macrochanges do not apply in every local or individual instance—we have abundant objective evidence of large changes in voting, office-holding, occupations, income, education, housing, and social participation.

Having thus found fault with central definitions, I must hasten to commend the work as a whole. The incisive analysis by Chesler of types of ideological elements in theories of racism is a gem of relevance and clarity. But commendations would become invidious quickly, for nearly every chapter gives a review of research from which is extracted a residue of well-attested findings and hypotheses. Some examples may suggest the richness.

1) Under a remarkably diverse range of other circumstances, the sheer fact of negative intergroup interdependence (for example, competition) is sufficient to produce collective prejudice.

2) Given an ingroup-outgroup distinction, direct competition and rivalry generate hostility and negative attitudes and behavior toward the outgroup, which subsequently become normative.

3) Given ingroup support of prejudice and discrimination, the negative behaviors are rendered especially likely by segregation, by socialization that reinforces them, by high levels of frustration, by

authoritarian personality structures, and by signals of threat.

4) The most acceptable general conclusion concerning education and mass propaganda is that these approaches have not been shown to have any consequential short-term effects upon racial attitudes.

5) Both tokenism and reverse discrimination exist. But the reverse discrimination often is limited to low-cost concessions (trivial behaviors or limited numbers of minority individuals) and thus becomes a kind of tokenism; that is, small incremental changes then are used to block more substantive changes.

6) Relatively large and enduring changes in racial attitudes can be brought about by inducing a perception of inconsistency between an individual's positive self-concept and his or her racial attitudes and behavior.

7) When properly supportive conditions can be arranged, interracial interaction reduces prejudice. The major conditions needed for favorable outcomes are: positive interdependence in attaining superordinate goals, equal status, favorable social climate (norms), intimacy, rewarding outcomes.

8) Somewhat more surprisingly, nonaffective training can change prejudice: alterations in cognitive organization, increases in self-insight or self-respect, and training in cognitive complexity all have been successful in reducing prejudice (for well-educated persons).

9) Detailed content analyses show that mass media and school textbooks in the past overwhelmingly presented highly ethnocentric and distorted images of blacks. Such selectivity and distortion still occur, although they are much lessened in the most recent years.

10) Prejudice is learned in the same way other beliefs, values, and preferences are learned. There are enormous variations across societies in the specific objects of prejudice, but great consistency over time within each society in the patterns of prejudice.

11) There is a distinctive and stable American pattern of "social distance" attitudes that puts English, white Americans, and Canadians at the center and Turks, Chinese, Koreans, and (India) Indians most distant from it. (The pattern has not changed greatly in 40 years. It is accepted by blacks and Jews, except that each of these groups, in good American fashion, puts themselves at the center, or top.)

12) Recent experiments show that simply dividing individuals into groups with identifying labels can produce systematic discrimination against the "out-group"—in the absence of intergroup competition or other conditions known to instigate hostility.

13) Massive evidence supports the general conclusion that the combination of socialization and conformity to group norms explains a large proportion of the variance in prejudice against outgroups.

14) After a quarter-century of criticisms and additional research, theories of "authoritarian personality" and frustration-aggression have emerged in chastened and more modest formulations: frustration alone accounts for little, but in the suitable normative setting it accentuates the acting out of prejudice in discriminatory or hostile behavior; authoritarianism is a complex cluster of processes and predispositions that helps to explain some (especially "right wing") prejudice.

As these examples perhaps suggest, numerous nonobvious findings make *Towards the Elimination of Racism* a gold mine of essential information. Naturally enough, the research reviews also expose many crucial gaps and stubborn puzzles, and raise new challenges.

For example, there is surprisingly little clear evidence bearing on the "obvious" presumption that parents affect the racial attitudes of their children. If they do, how? The absence of longitudinal studies is conspicuous. Thus, as Katz points out in chapter 7, much high-sounding political rhetorical about reducing the "racism that cripples all children" has not been followed by research resources or research efforts appropriate to the problem. Very little research on modification of racial attitudes among children has been done during the past 30 years (there has been a grand total of eight studies—six of them with high school students).

In view of the extraordinary variety of circumstances under which school desegregation has occurred, it is not very surprising that the outcomes constitute a mixed bag—especially since methods of measuring or evaluating outcomes have been extremely diverse and since the inputs likewise have been varied and complex. In the more rigorous work in which classroom structures and incentive systems have been manipulated, significant increases in cross-race friendships have been demonstrated. Specific factors shown to be effective in some research include familiarity, positive interdependence for rewards, practice in role playing and empathy, and deliberate reinforcement.

Some but not all of the chapters attempt to take into account simultaneously individual personality factors and the interlocking processes of social systems. When this difficult double focus is successfully maintained, as in the chapter by Rothbart, we are brought to see that resistance to change of racially discriminatory patterns can be understood only by taking into account not only *what* discrimination *by* whom and *against* whom but also *for* whom. Much discrimination is done "not with the fist but with the elbow"—it is not so much directed against a victim as undertaken for someone's advantage or security. This apparently simple insight is indispensable for valid societal diagnosis and hence for workable social policies.

Throughout the various chapters are strong signals of caution against premature closure or overgeneralization of empirical findings. As sophisticated methodological studies multiply—dealing with evaluation apprehension, social-desirability effects, and other subtle sources of possible distortion—highly ingenious indirect approaches have been invented.

Many findings show the existence of complex interactions among variables. When people give up a belief in racial inferiority they may replace it with perceived racial threat or symbolic racism. Again, there is evidence of a "liberal distance function"—the perceived magnitude of social injustice increases with the distance between the observer and the locus of injustice. Underestimation by whites of discrimination against blacks is affected by this belief that bad things don't happen *here* and is accentuated by the prevalent "invisibility of injustice." Dirty work tends to be concealed; behaviors violating norms of fairness tend to be directed toward the powerless and to occur outside the zones of observation of most middle-class whites—who also avoid active search for unpleasant facts. And people who believe in a just world tend, in our society, to believe also in individual responsibility.

The net result of these factors operating upon whites who have sentiments of equality and justice is that attitudes favoring social equality and integration typically are held with low intensity. The reforms that are acceptable, then, are those that do not cost much and that do not require major changes in values and beliefs.

The complexities continue to be revealed. Under what conditions does guilt over harm-doing lead to altruistic behavior—or, in contrast, to derogation of the victim? (Persons who are *both* prejudiced and high in sympathy for others seem especially likely to strongly denigrate those they victimize.) What are the effects of school desegregation upon the

self-esteem of black and white children? Common sense may suggest that when desegregation is peaceful black children will have higher self-esteem than when they are exposed to whites' hostility in a school where turmoil and conflict accompany desegregation. But a study in this volume shows that black children in an abrasive and "anxiety-arousing" situation of conflict showed the higher self-regard—apparently an outcome in part of the high level of morale and group support among black parents and within a unified black community (Meketon, cited on p. 262).

One can only echo with enthusiasm the recommendation in the chapter by Ashmore and DelBoca that research on prejudice (and discrimination) must specify the social context in which individuals exist and must treat prejudice not as an isolated variable to be explained by a single antecedent but as an interacting and interconnected aspect of an individual's self-system and group affiliations.

In view of the great importance assigned by several contributors to law and political action both for maintaining and for changing racial and ethnic relations, it is appropriate that this volume contains an exemplary review of federal laws and regulations relevant to racial discrimination. Its author provides (p. 437) a definitive quotation with which to close this review:

It may not always be possible to "legislate morality," but it is clear that the law may take a leading role in pointing the way for the development of our morality. Accordingly, those involved in the continuing struggle for equal rights in this country must not overlook the powerful ally they have when "the law" is on their side.

ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR.
Department of Sociology, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York

Interpreting the Results of a Social Experiment

The Israeli kibbutz espoused equality for women as one of its founding principles over 50 years ago. Yet, contemporary kibbutz life departs from this ideal enough to cause grave concern to kibbutz leaders and planners. *Women in the Kibbutz* presents a carefully researched, richly detailed account of the problem but a simplistic, misleading, and controversial interpretation of its causes. The book seems designed to leave readers with the impression, unfortunate and probably erroneous, that if the kibbutz cannot create equality and equity between the sexes no society can.

Though declaring that the results "startled" them—a coy statement, coming from a well-known biological determinist like the first author—Lionel Tiger and Joseph Shepher feel driven by their data to an "inescapable" conclusion: "Some powerful pervasive force or forces intervene between the intentions of kibbutz ideology and the reality of kibbutz social structure." They call these forces biological and attribute the failure of kibbutzim to achieve full sexual equality to a "relative intractability of sex roles despite major social change."

Men and women in kibbutzim, they argue, live as if in two separate communities, and there seems to have been an increase in sex-typing and role differentiation over time. Women, their time freed by collective child care, can theoretically "work" anywhere in a kibbutz, but they are concentrated in service, provision of food and clothing, and education, while men are clustered in production, management, and kibbutz politics. Men hold a very high proportion of kibbutz offices, and women attend community meetings less often and rarely talk when present. As the importance of the nuclear family unit has grown and the collective commitment of the revolutionary founding period has declined, egalitarianism in sex roles has diminished, a point first made by Yonina Talmon and a phenomenon consistent with experiences in Russia, China, and American intentional communities (*1*). Moreover, Tiger and Shepher's attitudinal data show that women appear to like things the new way. Kibbutz women report dissatisfaction not because of reversion to a traditional sexual division of labor but because they do not have *enough* "femininity" and familism. Yet, such results should be kept in perspective. The kibbutzim have made great advances in sex role equalization, in part as a function of self-conscious communal and egalitarian values.

Tiger and Shepher have proceeded with research rigor and caution, if with limited theoretical imagination. Their book presents a vast quantity of carefully collected and analyzed historical and survey data, differentiated by type and age of kibbutz and supplemented with interviews and observations. It is on the level of concept and interpretation that *Women in the Kibbutz* has major flaws. Tiger and Shepher do consider (and reject the importance of) circumstances that may have intervened to make the kibbutz a less than perfect social laboratory: its existence within a larger society and the influence of large numbers of worldwide visitors. And in their claims for the role of biological forces in kibbutz life they postulate them only as propensities, not as strict determinants. But they fail to see that their conclusion that the seeming intractability of sex roles is biologically based is far from "inescapable." The kibbutz was never a perfect test of nurture versus nature as the root of sexual inequality. Given the conditions that prevailed at the outset of this social experiment, the current place of women in the kibbutz can be explained on purely social grounds.

Tiger and Shepher fail to accord its full significance to one very striking fact they report: There were 20 to 50 percent more men than women in kibbutzim until Israeli statehood (circa 1910 to 1948). In some early kibbutzim, there were as few as one or two women among a dozen men. Such low representation makes it seem probable that women never interacted with men on an equal footing and that their concerns were not built into the evolving social structure of the kibbutz. Recent laboratory research and field observations have shown that there are special sets of interactional dynamics around "token" women or "tokens" of any kind—people with a salient ascribed characteristic who constitute distinct numerical minorities in a group (*2*). It is much more likely that the proportionately scarce will fall into stereotyped roles and at critical moments be reminded of their "difference." It is unlikely that they will become important leaders, although they might play necessary service roles. And it is very likely that the assumed attributes and actual tasks of those in the numerical majority will be assigned more social value.

Such "dynamics of tokenism" emerge in Tiger and Shepher's account. The women of the early kibbutzim were assigned sex-stereotyped roles even over their protests. While women sometimes did "men's" work, men never took on the residual and ideologically less important service tasks traditionally assigned to women, for it was considered unacceptable for men to care for young children. What the pioneers' cultures of origin defined as men's work retained higher social value.

Would the roles of the sexes today be different if the numbers of women and