

## Error Without Trial



# Current Research on Antisemitism

Edited by  
Herbert A. Strauss and Werner Bergmann

Volume 2

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York  
1988

# Error Without Trial

Psychological Research on Antisemitism

Edited by  
Werner Bergmann

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York  
1988

Published with the support of the  
Technische Universität Berlin,  
Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung.

Printed on acid-free paper (ageing-resistant – pH 7, neutral)

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

Error without trial.

(Current research on antisemitism; v. 2)

Includes bibliographical references.

1. Antisemitism – Psychological aspects. I. Bergmann,  
Werner, 1950– . II. Series.

DS145.E63 1987 305.8 87-32986

ISBN 0-89925-355-5 (U.S.: alk. paper)

*CIP-Kurztitelaufnahme der Deutschen Bibliothek*

**Current research on antisemitism**/ed. by  
Herbert A. Strauss and Werner Bergmann. –  
Berlin; New York : de Gruyter

NE: Strauss, Herbert A. [Hrsg.]

Vol. 2. Error without trial. – 1988

**Error without trial:** psycholog. research on  
antisemitism / ed. by Werner Bergmann. –  
Berlin; New York : de Gruyter, 1988.

(Current research on antisemitism; Vol. 2)

ISBN 3-11-010775-9

NE: Bergmann, Werner [Hrsg.]

© 1987 by Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin 30.

Printed in Germany

All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this book  
may be reproduced in any form – by photoprint, microfilm or any other means – nor trans-  
mitted nor translated into a machine language without written permission from the publisher.

Typesetting: Dörlemann-Satz, Lemförde – Printing: Hildebrand, Berlin

Binding: Lüderitz & Bauer, Berlin

## Foreword

This series, "Current Research on Antisemitism," organized and edited by the Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung at the Technical University of Berlin, is aimed at improving our understanding of a scourge of mankind that has grown vicious in our century. "Modern antisemitism," most historians agree, began sometime during the 1880's. The main characteristics that set it apart from older forms of "anti-Judaism" were the rise of ultra-nationalist and racist thought; the development of antisemitic social movements and political parties; and the turn against the constitutional equality of Jews. The modern forms were seen to rest on centuries, if not millenia, of religion – based discrimination, defamation, and persecution suffered by the Jewish minority in the Christian world. Ever since Christianity and Judaism – its parent religion – separated and began to compete, ever since Christian thought and faith had affirmed their separate identities from Jewish thought and practice, ever since permissive Roman Imperial usages had collided with the often crude "adversos Judaeos" tradition articulated by the church fathers – the teachings of the Christian churches had given a special and ambivalent place to Jews and Judaism. Jews were assigned a unique place in the *Heilsgeschichte* of Christendom: their ultimate conversion to the true faith would provide the ultimate test of the validity and superiority of Christianity. Yet the alleged involvement of Jews in the death of the Christ and the collective guilt incurred thereby demanded that, until the last judgement would introduce new realities, Jews were to exist in a demeaned and lowly state as punishment for their deed. Christian anti-Judaism was carried on as a religious and cultural norm; it became a self-fulfilling social and political prophecy, the basic paradigm within which secular motives for prejudice and hatred at times acquired increased irrationality and viciousness. Ironically, even thinkers of the Enlightenment in France and England used traditional Christian defamations of Jews and their religion to attack Christianity. There is good reason to agree with those historians who see strong continuities between what was now called Christian "anti-Judaism" and modern "antisemitism." Still, the most destructive effects wrought by antisemitism, although occurring in a nominally Christian country and carried out by baptized Christians, were planned in an anti-Christian and racist context.

With the rise of the nation-state in Central Europe, and the crisis of liberal nationalism turning imperialist, Jews began to be blamed for the alleged ills of liberalism. Antisemitism fused with a broad range of political ideas and interests. Emancipated Jewries were identified with “modernizing” trends in Western and Central continental Europe by old conservative and new extremist nationalist forces. In Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, similar economic and socio-political influences united with rising national independence movements within the traditional empires (Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman empires and Czarist Russia) to exaggerate sharply traditional religious and “middle-man minority” tensions. Thus, when World War I broke out, the basic racist and ultra-nationalist ideas and alignments had been rehearsed, as “modern antisemitism” gave way to the “new antisemitism” of the interwar period, most pointedly in Central Europe in the wake of the dislocations attendant upon the lost war. Antisemitism served to project responsibility on local Jews, or a phantom “world Jewry,” for the political and economic crises of the late 1920s and early 1930s. The Nazi seizure of power in Germany and their subsequent invasions and conquests of “space” for “racial superiority” brought ultimate horror and destruction to European Jewries. The government of one of the most civilized nation-states of Europe executed the most pernicious policy of persecution and extermination the world has seen so far. And although antisemitism has been recognized as one motive in the policies and opinions of other nations of the period as well, it did not match the final brutalities inflicted on the Jews by the Hitler regime.

Since the end of World War II, hatreds and prejudice have survived even as the horror of the Holocaust entered the consciousness of Western civilization. However, articulated attitudes of hatred and prejudice against Jews declined, especially among the young. Except among unreformed Nazis surviving as marginal men in Germany and Austria, antisemitism has turned latent due to its total unacceptability in politics, public life, or cultural institutions. In recent history, it has surfaced when politicians in Germany and Austria were caught with heretofore unrevealed involvements in the Nazi past, or when intended or unintended slurs were mobilized for political ends. In place of prejudice against Jews taking center stage, the arrival of new ethnic, religious, or “racial” minorities in Western Europe led to new patterns of stereotypes and prejudice against foreign workers, seekers of asylum, or immigrants from the now independent former possessions of Western European countries. They have created new challenges for social action as well as for research and theory in European social science. In the USA, changes in the status of Blacks and

other minorities, and immigrants from Third World countries, have woven new patterns into the rise and decline of discrimination and prejudice. And in the Third World itself, numerous tensions akin to those discussed in Western research have emerged, since decolonization has effected an entirely new pattern of national state formations based on tribal ethnicities. These ethnic conflicts have often led to tragically violent confrontations and to genocidal exterminations involving millions of human beings. At about the same period, a new world-wide phenomenon developed among communist and Third World countries. There a foreign-policy form of stereotyped hostility to Jews – anti-Zionism – emerged and revived, in turn, older antisemitic stereotypes, especially in communist-controlled Eastern European propaganda systems.

Thus the Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung, the first of its kind in Europe, faced a complex variety of phenomena subsumed under the imprecise terms “antisemitism” and “anti-Judaism.” It also confronted a research situation characterized by the co-existence of multiple strands of theory and empirical research concerning antisemitism and its scholarly *Unterbau*, the historical and social science disciplines dealing with prejudice, conflict, group tensions, minorities, and ethnicity. As a result, the Zentrum opted for approaches to the study of antisemitism that would prepare the way for basic theory and empirical research and for historic studies of more than local significance. This opting for basic and interdisciplinary research implies several assumptions. Antisemitism cannot be studied historically without being placed in the larger contexts of the economic, social, political, religious, and cultural histories of the discriminated-against group as well as its discriminators. Negative stereotypes cannot be studied without reference to the many positive forms of interaction and economic, cultural, religious, etc. relations that have formed positive mutual images at least since the beginning of Jewish emancipation in the middle of the eighteenth century. Antisemitism cannot be understood unless the *genera proxima* of its several forms are clearly conceptualized in the languages of several social sciences, above all in sociology and psychology. Thus, research on antisemitism requires not only historical and structural analyses of majority and minority, but the consideration of the full range of theories and empirical studies dealing with group relations in all their complexity.

This series, then, “Current Research on Antisemitism,” has been planned to account for the state of international scholarly knowledge of antisemitism in the relevant disciplines. It assembles in five volumes what each volume editor considers the most valid or recent contribution to the

*particular* problems of antisemitism, as well as to basic research in theory and empirical studies on general mechanisms and processes in such fields as group relations, prejudice, conflict, attitudes and behavior, to name just a few. Each volume consists of articles grouped in systematic chapters of the editor's choosing, and of introductions to each chapter by the editor, drawing the frequently divergent approaches and results of the several researchers into as coherent and concise a synthesis as possible.

Volume I deals with sociological research in its historical as well as systematic dimensions. It is edited by Helen Fein of the Institute for the Study of Genocide in New York. Volume II (the present volume) offers a path through the multidimensional contributions made by the several subdisciplines of psychology to antisemitism and prejudice. It is edited by Werner Bergmann of the Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung, Technische Universität Berlin. Volume III assembles studies of modern antisemitism along systematic (typological), geographic, and chronological lines, and aims at setting guideposts for a comparative history of antisemitism in Europe and the USA. It is edited by Herbert A. Strauss of the Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung, Technische Universität Berlin. Volume IV reviews the intellectual and religious history of modern antisemitism as revealed by the history of religion and philosophy, political theory, the critique of ideologies, the sociology of knowledge, and related disciplines. Volume V is based on the fact that the mass murder of Jews in World War II is being recognized by scholars as an event so unique that it has transformed the context within which antisemitism and prejudice can be studied. This last volume will review what the various disciplines have contributed to the complex processes that led to the genocide of the Jews and to the immediate and long-range implications of the multi-level traumata that resulted from it.

The editors of this series owe gratitude above all to the volume editors (excepting, of course, themselves) for whom working on their volumes was, to a large extent, a matter of dedication and responsibility. They thank the Technische Universität Berlin for adding an allocation for the publication of this series to the Publication Fund of the Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung and thus making its appearance possible.

And they thank Walter de Gruyter Verlag, Berlin, for the courtesy and efficiency with which they have chaperoned this series, part of the program of the Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung, to its realization.

Berlin, October 1987

Herbert A. Strauss  
Werner Bergmann



## Contents

Foreword .....	V
WERNER BERGMANN	
Introduction .....	1
Part I: Psychoanalysis and Personality Theory	
WERNER BERGMANN	
Approaches to Antisemitism Based on Psychodynamics and Personality Theory .....	9
RUDOLPH M. LOEWENSTEIN	
Anti-Semites in Psychoanalysis .....	35
MORTIMER OSTOW	
A Contribution to the Study of Antisemitism .....	52
LEONARD BERKOWITZ	
Anti-Semitism and the Displacement of Aggression .....	77
DONALD WEATHERLEY	
Anti-Semitism and the Expression of Fantasy Aggression .....	87
DONALD WEATHERLEY	
Maternal Response to Childhood Aggression and Subsequent Anti-Semitism .....	94
ELSE FRENKEL-BRUNSWIK AND R. NEVITT SANFORD	
Some Personality Factors in Anti-Semitism .....	98
MOSHE ANISFELD, STANLEY R. MUNOZ, AND WALLACE E. LAMBERT	
The Structure and Dynamics of the Ethnic Attitudes of Jewish Adolescents .....	119
JOHN J. RAY	
Is Antisemitism a Cognitive Simplification? Some Observations on Australian Neo-Nazis .....	129

## Part II: Group Theory and Ethnic Relations

WERNER BERGMANN	
Group Theory and Ethnic Relations . . . . .	139
AARON ANTONOVSKY	
Toward a Refinement of the "Marginal Man" Concept . . . . .	162
GERHART SAENGER AND HARRY MANUEL SHULMAN	
Some Factors Determining Intercultural Behavior and Attitudes of Members of Different Ethnic Groups in Mixed Neighborhoods . . . . .	172
NANCY C. MORSE AND FLOYD H. ALLPORT	
The Causation of Anti-Semitism: An Investigation of Seven Hypotheses . . . . .	186
LEON FESTINGER	
Experiments in Group Belongingness . . . . .	225
ROBERT E. GOODNOW AND RENATO TAGIURI	
Religious Ethnocentrism and Its Recognition Among Adolescent Boys . . . . .	232
JOAN HELLER ROLLINS	
Reference Identification of Youth of Differing Ethnicity . . . . .	240
FRED B. SILBERSTEIN AND MELVIN SEEMAN	
Social Mobility and Prejudice . . . . .	258

## Part III: Attitude Theory and Prejudice

WERNER BERGMANN	
Attitude Theory and Prejudice . . . . .	271
MARVIN KARLINS, THOMAS L. COFFMAN, AND GARY WALTERS	
On the Fading of Social Stereotypes: Studies in Three Generations of College Students . . . . .	302
WALTER R. HEINZ AND STEVEN R. GEISER	
A Cognitive Theory of Antisemitism in the Context of Religious Ideology . . . . .	331
FRANÇOIS HOUTART AND GENEVIÈVE LEMERCINIER	
Catechesis and Anti-Semitism. A Research Work into the Transmission of Religious Codes . . . . .	356

JOHN J. LA GAIPA	
Stereotypes and Perceived Ethnic-Role Specialization . . . . .	373
ARNOLD UPMEYER	
Ethnic Identification . . . . .	382
H. H. REMMERS AND WENDELL F. WOOD	
Changes in Attitudes toward Germans, Japanese, Jews, and Nazis	400
KENNETH L. DION AND BRIAN M. EARN	
The Phenomenology of Being a Target of Prejudice . . . . .	409
WILBUR B. BROOKOVER AND JOHN B. HOLLAND	
An Inquiry into the Meaning of Minority Group Attitude Expressions . . . . .	420
RONALD TADAO TSUKASHIMA AND DARREL MONTERO	
The Contact Hypothesis: Social and Economic Contact and Generational Changes in the Study of Black Anti-Semitism . . . . .	430
HILDE WEISS	
On the Significance of Personal Contact to Jews . . . . .	449

#### Part IV: Methods in Psychological Research on Antisemitism

WERNER BERGMANN	
Methods in Psychological Research on Antisemitism . . . . .	455
DANIEL J. LEVINSON AND R. NEVITT SANFORD	
A Scale for the Measurement of Anti-Semitism . . . . .	467
HARRY C. TRIANDIS AND LEIGH MINTURN TRIANDIS	
Race, Social Class, Religion, and Nationality as Determinants of Social Distance . . . . .	501

#### Part V: Combating Prejudice

WERNER BERGMANN	
Combating Prejudice . . . . .	519
WOLFGANG HOCHHEIMER	
Lessening of Prejudice Through Education and Prevention of Antisemitism . . . . .	527

DAVID A. SHIMAN

Activity 15: Generalizing and Stereotyping ..... 537

Activity 26: Attitudes toward Other Groups ..... 540

HENRI TAJFEL

The Formation of Cognitive and Affective Attitudes ..... 542

WERNER BERGMANN

## Introduction\*

Psychological concern with ethnic prejudice and particularly with anti-semitism has been influenced primarily by two factors: the particular situation of and developments in group relations between majorities and minorities, and the development of psychological theory. One could reconstruct the history of social psychological theory using the history of attempts to define "prejudice."<sup>1</sup>

Academic research on ethnic prejudice and intergroup hostility first began in the 1920's, possibly in reaction to the brutality of World War I, as Gavin I. Langmuir has suggested.<sup>2</sup> In the field of cultural anthropology, the concept of ethnocentrism, or xenophobia, was developed, which postulates seemingly natural hostility toward and rejection of out-groups. In sociology, the first instruments for the measurement of social distance between groups were developed,<sup>3</sup> and empirical analyses of group stereotypes were undertaken. Until the outbreak of World War II, antisemitism played little or no part in these analyses. Instead, researchers focused their attention primarily on racial prejudice toward the Black population in the United States. As Phyllis A. Katz showed in her survey "Historical Trends in Research on Prejudice,"<sup>4</sup> psychological research between 1920 and 1940 was concerned almost exclusively with the direct and indirect measurement of attitudes (24 papers); little or no theoretical research on prejudice was done during this period (three papers in 20 years).

---

\* Translated from the German by Susan Steiner.

<sup>1</sup> Bernd Six, "Vorurteil," in E. Lippert and R. Wakenhut (eds.), *Handwörterbuch der Politischen Psychologie*, Opladen 1983, pp. 326-335, p. 326.

<sup>2</sup> Gavin I. Langmuir, "Prolegomena to Any Present Analysis of Hostility Against Jews," *Social Science Information* 15, 1976, pp. 689-727.

<sup>3</sup> Emory S. Bogardus, "Measuring Social Distances," *Journal of Applied Sociology* 9, 1925, pp. 299-308.

<sup>4</sup> Phyllis A. Katz, "Introduction," in Phyllis A. Katz (ed.), *Towards the Elimination of Racism*, New York, Toronto 1976, p. 8.

In the late 1930's, dramatic changes took place, both on a general historical level and within the history of the social sciences. The persecution of German Jews and an increase of antisemitic propaganda in the United States quickly led to academic concern with antisemitic prejudice. These macro-historic changes and the new turn in social science were inaugurated by the many émigré German and Austrian psychoanalysts, psychologists, and social scientists, who adopted a more theoretical and psychoanalytically-oriented approach.

The *Studies in Prejudice* were a prime example of this. The turn toward theory, dominated in the 1940's and early 1950's by a personality-theory view of antisemitism,<sup>5</sup> had already been anticipated in the theoretical synthesis of John Dollard *et al.*,<sup>6</sup> who – in their “frustration-aggression theory” – brought together existing anthropological and sociological explanations of “intergroup hostility” with Freud's psychodynamic insights. This approach received no particular attention in the psychological discussion on antisemitism, however, and was not taken up until the late 1950's, when research on aggression expanded and the concept of the “authoritarian personality” faded.

The 1940's, therefore, witnessed an increase in theoretical studies on prejudice<sup>7</sup> which concentrated, in tune with the times, on the antisemitic aspect of prejudice. A survey of sociological and social-psychological studies on minorities in the United States shows that studies on the Jewish group reached a peak in the 1940's and (early) 1950's. While in the 1920's and 1930's only 3 and 4 papers, respectively, were published on Jews, the number rose to 9 in the 1940's, remained fairly high in the 1950's (7), and sank to 3 and 2, respectively, in the following two decades.<sup>8</sup>

This typical focus of research dealing with prejudice and minorities on “crisis situations,” “highly racist societies” and “personality types,” leads, as Graham C. Kinloch correctly observed,<sup>9</sup> to a distorted view, because psychopathological and sociopathological phenomena are pushed into the foreground, disregarding “normal” forms of prejudice and discrimination.

<sup>5</sup> For individual-level explanations of prejudice see Richard D. Ashmore and Francis K. Del Boca, “Psychological Approaches to Understanding Intergroup Conflict,” in Phyllis A. Katz (ed.), *Towards the Elimination of Racism*, New York, Toronto 1976, pp. 73–123.

<sup>6</sup> John Dollard, Leonard W. Doob, Neal E. Miller, O. H. Mowrer, and Robert R. Sears, *Frustration and Aggression*, New Haven 1939.

<sup>7</sup> 27 publications between 1941–1950, cf. Katz, *op. cit.*

<sup>8</sup> Abraham D. Lavender and John M. Forsyth, “The Sociological Study of Minority Groups as Reflected by Leading Sociological Journals,” *Ethnicity* 3, 1976, pp. 388–398.

<sup>9</sup> Graham C. Kinloch, *The Dynamics of Race Relations*, New York 1974, p. 27.

After World War II, Jews were no longer in immediate danger. This fact, coupled with a change of paradigm within psychology, led to another shift in the late 1950's and 1960's: social psychologists in the United States turned away from using dynamic psychological approaches in the analysis of antisemitism. Instead, they concentrated on the pressing issue of discrimination and prejudice against the Black minority.<sup>10</sup> In addition, other minorities besides Blacks and Jews (Hispanics, Indians, etc.) increasingly received attention. In Germany, on the other hand, depth analysis experienced a "late flowering" due to the return of émigré scientists and the Auschwitz trial. American research on minorities applied group psychology to research on prejudice toward members of out-groups. Phyllis A. Katz<sup>11</sup> saw the 1950's as a productive period, and above all, a period charged with the optimistic feeling that prejudice could be erased. The number of studies on "attitude change" rose from 4 in the 1940's to 14 between 1951 and 1960. This optimism, however, was short-lived. In the early 1960's, a general downward trend in research on prejudice could be observed.<sup>12</sup>

During this time, the group-psychological orientation within social psychology brought about an increasing influence of sociological research designs on prejudice and minorities. Purely psychological and especially psychopathological patterns of explanation (attitudes, frustration, authoritarian personality) were dropped and social-structural models were increasingly adopted in which social mobility and problems of power and group conflict took center stage. It is scarcely surprising, therefore, that the comprehensive studies of antisemitism of the 1960's such as those by Glock, Stark, Quinley, *et al.*<sup>13</sup> were sociologically oriented. Exclusively psychological research on antisemitism became rare; it was no longer possible to speak of a continuous tradition of such research.

The rise of cognitive theory within social psychology in the 1970's has not changed this, although it has led to a re-evaluation and re-definition of the concepts of attitude and prejudice, in that the patterns of data-processing (categorization) and the cognitive function of prejudice – as an acquired pattern of interpreting social reality – have been given priority.<sup>14</sup> The lack of attention paid to antisemitic prejudice in psychological research very

---

<sup>10</sup> Langmuir, *op. cit.*, p. 700.

<sup>11</sup> Katz, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

<sup>12</sup> Ashmore and Del Boca, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

<sup>13</sup> Charles Y. Glock and Rodney Stark, *Christian Beliefs and Antisemitism*, New York, London 1966.

<sup>14</sup> Six, *op. cit.*

probably is related to the fact that open antisemitism has pretty much ceased to exist in the Western world. Numerous sociological studies have shown that antisemitism today exists as repressed, latent prejudice and is therefore very difficult to expose through empirical research designs.<sup>15</sup> In contrast, other minorities in the United States and in Europe very definitely suffer from open discrimination and ethnic prejudice. As a result, research in the United States now concentrates on "prejudice against blacks," in Europe on "prejudice against foreigners," especially immigrant workers. Here, however, "societal-level explanations" such as "ethnicity," "racism," "minority relations," migration, and market models also dominate today. Social problems have increased academic interest in research on prejudice – which had, as we have seen, diminished during the 1960's and 1970's within sociology<sup>16</sup> and psychology.<sup>17</sup> Social-psychological and sociological research on antisemitism could and should gain new momentum as a result. Of primary importance is a synthesis of psychological and sociological theories, each of which up to now has operated on its own analytic level.<sup>18</sup> In addition, links within history ought to be sought. Not only must the "general lack of theory," "theoretical particularism" and "emphasis on static typology" be overcome, as Graham C. Kinloch has rightly demanded, but above all the "presentcentric and ethnocentric" character of research on prejudice.<sup>19</sup> As the careful empirical and theoretical analyses of Austrian sociologists have shown, precise historical analyses of the psychic and social aspects of each form of antisemitism are important. They have been neglected up till now. The Nazi past, the Holocaust, and the founding of the State of Israel have created a new, latent antisemitism, at least in Europe. This new antisemitism may have other functions, psychodynamically as well as socially, and a different base than the antisemitism which existed prior to World War II.<sup>20</sup>

The fact that currently no continuous work is being done on antisemitic prejudice in psychology cannot fail to affect the choice and the arrange-

<sup>15</sup> Alphons Silbermann and Herbert A. Sallen, "Latenter Antisemitismus in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland," *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 28, 1976, pp. 706–723. Bernd Marin, "Ein historisch neuartiger 'Antisemitismus ohne Antisemiten'?", *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 5, 1979, pp. 545–569; Werner Bergmann und Rainer Erb, "Kommunikationslatenz, Moral und öffentliche Meinung," *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 38, 1986, pp. 223–246.

<sup>16</sup> Lavender and Forsyth, *op. cit.*, Table 2.

<sup>17</sup> Katz, *op. cit.*, Table 1.

<sup>18</sup> Kinloch, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

<sup>19</sup> Langmuir, *op. cit.*, p. 703; Kinloch, *op. cit.*, p. 25: "low historical awareness."

<sup>20</sup> Marin, *op. cit.*



ment of the essays published in this volume. If it were to limit itself to the most recent research, it would neglect whole areas in which nothing new has been done for a long time. It would also be impossible to present enough new material. Because of this, the book centers on the three major traditions in psychological theory within which research on antisemitism has been done up to now: psychodynamic-psychoanalytic theory of personality, group psychology, and cognitive psychology, arranged chronologically. Some published research on each theory is included, representing its most influential period. For psychoanalysis, for example, work from the 1940's has been reprinted, for group psychology, from the 1950's; there has been little major development in these areas since then. We have included some new material as it has appeared.

From the foregoing, it should be clear that including published research on antisemitism does not exhaust psychological research on prejudice. Therefore, each group of essays is preceded by an extensive introduction sketching the general theoretical framework and tradition to which the studies included here (and the many which could not be included) belong. Thus, comprehensive research on prejudice is integrated with the specific subject of this volume.



Part I  
Psychoanalysis and Personality Theory



WERNER BERGMANN

## Approaches to Antisemitism Based on Psychodynamics and Personality Theory\*

Theories of prejudice based on psychodynamic and psychological models of personality are “individual-level explanations.” They attribute prejudice to particular personality traits.<sup>1</sup> Such primarily psychoanalytically informed theories have in common that they attribute prejudice to an internal psychic conflict or mechanism. The display of prejudice, indeed, even a disposition toward prejudicial attitudes, is interpreted in terms of an underlying personality conflict between ego, id, and super-ego which the individual tries to shift from himself onto other individuals or groups by means of the defense mechanisms of projection and the displacement of aggression. In the following, I will discuss three separate “symptom theories” of prejudice: psychoanalysis proper, frustration-aggression theory, and the theory of the authoritarian personality.

### 1. Psychoanalysis

In the works of Sigmund Freud, we find – in sketchy outline only – a number of early attempts to explain antisemitism. It is seen variously as hostility toward strangers, ethnocentrism, intolerance of even small differences, jealousy of the chosen people, castration anxiety, sibling rivalry, or in terms of a displacement theory which holds that hatred of Jews is used as a substitute for the forbidden hatred of Christianity i.e., self-hatred.<sup>2</sup>

---

\* Translated from the German by Susan Steiner.

<sup>1</sup> Richard D. Ashmore and Francis K. Del Boca, “Psychological Approaches to Understanding Intergroup Conflict,” in Phyllis A. Katz (ed.), *Towards the Elimination of Racism*, New York, Toronto 1976, pp. 73–123, p. 74.

<sup>2</sup> Sigmund Freud, *Der Mann Moses und die monotheistische Religion: Drei Abhandlungen (1939 [1934–38])*, Gesammelte Werke Bd. 16, London 1950, p. 197 or English edition: *Moses and Monotheism*, Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud (24 Volumes), Vol. 23, London 1953–1974, p. 91.

Freud's first explorations were taken up and further developed by later psychoanalysts.

The history of research in psychoanalysis shows very clearly that it was triggered by Nazi anti-Jewish policies, including the Holocaust. Many psychoanalysts had been forced to emigrate from Germany and Austria. There was no psychoanalytic research on antisemitism until well into the 1930's – F. Bernstein's book *Der Antisemitismus als Gruppenerscheinung*, which appeared in 1925, owed more to group psychology than to psychoanalysis. However, literature responding to Freud's hypotheses in *Der Mann Moses und die monotheistische Religion*, written in the late 30's, increased dramatically after 1940. Rudolph M. Loewenstein started work on his *Psychoanalysis of Antisemitism* in France in 1941. In the United States, work on the series *Studies in Prejudice*, in which antisemitism and psychoanalysis are linked and their major significance is shown, began in the 1940's.<sup>3</sup> In 1946, an anthology containing important psychoanalytic work was published under the title *Anti-Semitism. A Social Disease* (edited by Ernst Simmel).<sup>4</sup> This brief glimpse shows clearly that psychoanalytic research on antisemitism was carried out primarily by the Jewish émigrés Adorno, Berliner, Bettelheim, Fenichel, Frenkel-Brunswick, Jahoda, Horkheimer, Simmel, Loewenthal, and others. With the exception of the continuing discussion of the study *The Authoritarian Personality*, (which, however, is primarily concerned with questions of methodology; cf. I. 3 and Part IV), the psychoanalytic approach to antisemitism lost ground in the United States during the 1950's. To some extent, psychoanalysis was supplanted by, or absorbed into, frustration-aggression theory. In addition, group psychology and sociological explanations also received more recognition. This may in part be due to the return of some émigré authors to Europe (Adorno and Horkheimer to Germany, Jahoda to England); there, the psychoanalytic interpretation of antisemitism flourished well into the 1960's.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> It involves Theodor W. Adorno, Else Frenkel-Brunswick, Daniel J. Levinson and R. Nevitt Sanford, *The Authoritarian Personality*, New York 1950; Bruno Bettelheim and Morris Janowitz, *Dynamics of Prejudice*, New York 1950; Nathan W. Ackerman and Marie Jahoda, *Anti-Semitism and Emotional Disorder*, New York 1950; Leo Loewenthal and Norbert Guterman, *Prophets of Deceit*, New York 1949; Paul W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction*, New York 1949.

<sup>4</sup> Ernst Simmel (ed.), *Anti-Semitism. A Social Disease*, New York 1946.

<sup>5</sup> IV. Conference of the German Society for Psychotherapy and Depth Psychology, Wiesbaden 1962; also the work of Adorno, Horkheimer, Mitscherlich, Brocher, Keilson, among others.

Today, new work on antisemitism has become rare. The essays which occasionally appear<sup>6</sup> do not add up to intensive and coherent research. Still, antisemitism and the Holocaust were major topics of discussion at the recent World Congress of Psychoanalysts in Hamburg (1985), giving rise to the hope that research in this area might gain new impetus.

Although the various psychoanalytic interpretations of antisemitism differ greatly, they do agree that antisemitism is the result of neurotic resolution of conflict, meaning that problems which actually originate elsewhere are compulsively transformed into antisemitism.<sup>7</sup> The differences between the several theories arise above all from different localization of areas of conflict. These include internal psychic conflict, constitutional potential for aggression, oedipal ambivalence combined with castration anxiety, experiences of social crises and loss of status, economic or religious competition or, even, the history of mankind (Freud). But although the conflicts are attributed to different sources, the basic psychodynamic mechanism remains similar in all approaches. It is assumed that "normal" psychodynamic relations between super-ego, ego, and id take on pathological forms in the antisemitic personality, because they reveal a *weak ego* which is capable neither of successfully integrating the demands of the super-ego, nor of dealing with the id. Therefore, we can distinguish between two forms of intrapersonal conflict and thus two patterns for interpreting antisemitism.

The first holds that the conflict between ego and super-ego, i. e. between the super-ego's external representatives (father, God) leads to oedipal conflict and is characterized by ambivalence. The fear of being destroyed, the disappointments and pain experienced through the conflict with the father, are transformed into hatred and aggression directed at his authority. These feelings, however, must frequently be repressed or transferred, either because the source of the fear is too powerful and threatens reprisal, or, alternately, because the subject experiences the ambivalent emotions of affection and rejection. These inhibited aggressions, then, tend to be di-

---

<sup>6</sup> Stanley Rosenman, "Psychoanalytic Reflections on Anti-Semitism," *Journal of Psychology and Judaism* 1, 1977, pp. 3-23; Mortimer Ostow, "A Contribution to the Study of Anti-Semitism," *Israel Journal of Psychiatry and Related Sciences* 20, 1983, pp. 95-118, reprinted in this volume.

<sup>7</sup> Christel Hopf, *Traditionen des Antisemitismus – Versuch einer soziologischen Interpretation*, Habil. Vortrag, Berlin 1983, p. 16; Sidney Crown, "Some Personality Correlates of War-Mindedness and Anti-Semitism," *Journal of Social Psychology* 31, 1950, p. 131-143 also Ackerman and Jahoda, *op. cit.* who take the opposing view: anti-semitism has no direct relation to a particular psychopathology; see also Christopher Bagley and K. Gajendra Verma, *Racial Prejudice, the Individual, and Society*, Westmead, Farnborough 1979, p. 81.

rected, through the defence mechanism of "displacement," at powerless persons or groups from whom no sanctions need be feared. The well-known "scapegoat theory" serves to explain why Jews, as a foreign and powerless group, are often the victims of affective release. The identification of Judaism as a "paternal religion" may be a further reason for this object choice.

The second conflict arises between id and ego through the ego's attempt to fend off libidinous and aggressive drives. The weak ego bars its id-impulses from becoming conscious and denies their existence, considering them "dirty." It then projects them onto others, who correspondingly appear diabolic, dirty, and sensual.

Thus, prejudice clearly has an "ego defense function" in psychoanalytic theory. Depending on the kind of personality conflict postulated, two models of personality and two types of antisemitic stereotypes may be differentiated.

Firstly, unresolved conflicts stemming from ambivalence result in a personality structure which rejects the demands of the super-ego<sup>8</sup> and therefore cannot neutralize and rationally release aggression. This personality structure corresponds to a stereotype which holds Jews to be intelligent, gifted, overpowering, aggressive, forward and "clannish."

In contrast, ego-id conflicts may result in a personality structure controlled by a harsh and conventional super-ego that resists all instinctual demands. Projected onto Jews, these then appear sensual, dirty, inferior, treacherous, etc.<sup>9</sup> A bipolar structure is typical of antisemitic stereotypes. The Jew is both communist and capitalist, cosmopolite and Zionist, rich and impoverished, brilliant and stupid, lazy and industrious, etc.<sup>10</sup> Clinical evidence shows two predominant fixations: fear of being destroyed and fear of sexuality.

Psychoanalytic research on antisemitism can be divided into two schools. The first, clinically oriented school, analyses antisemitism in the individual psychodynamic system. Its approach is based on analytic case histories.

<sup>8</sup> Erik Erikson, "Hitler's Imagery and German Youth," *Psychiatry* 5, 1942, pp. 475-493.

<sup>9</sup> Fabian Schupper, "Dynamische Motive des Antisemitismus," *Jahrbuch der Psychoanalyse* 2, 1962, p. 10; Rudolph M. Loewenstein, *Psychoanalyse des Antisemitismus*, Frankfurt a. M. 1968, p. 29 (English edition: *Christians and Jews: A Psychoanalytic Study*, New York 1952). For Rosenman, *op. cit.*, the Jew can even incorporate all three: "harsh superego, cool and rational ego, and lusting, greedy id."

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13; cf. the one-dimensional stereotype of the Negro, which is essentially an id-stereotype; see also Thomas F. Pettigrew, *Racially Separate or Together?*, New York 1971, p. 179.



The second school, which takes a historical and mass psychological approach, applies psychoanalytic categories to the historical development and the cultural and social-structural background of antisemitism. This method is descriptive and speculative, in that the psychodynamic concepts used for individuals are applied to groups, societies, or entire cultures.

Orthodox psychoanalysis assumes complete intra-psychic determinism, which means that prejudice appears as the result of psychic conflicts, whose genesis can be found in early childhood problems of identity development. Otto Fenichel<sup>11</sup> assumed that every human being tries to repress aggressive and sexual drives because they seem dangerous and dirty. The antisemitic personality projects these repressed drives onto Jews, who appear to be "ideal targets of projection" because they are – analogous to the subject's own unconscious – the archaic strangers and "others" par excellence. According to Fenichel, the antisemite hates in the Jew his own rebellious drives and those figures of authority which demand their repression.<sup>12</sup> Here, id and super-ego conflicts are interwoven. Fears of the reawakening of repressed drives and the victim's "revenge" are added to the negative projections. In order to explain the rise of antisemitism as a mass phenomenon, Fenichel had to broaden the narrow psychodynamic framework to include as additional conditions intense discontent of the masses and the existence of a Jewish minority which is felt to be alien.<sup>13</sup> Fabian Schupper<sup>14</sup> analyzed a compulsive neurotic and arrived at a conclusion similar to Fenichel's: demands of the super-ego as well as id strivings are projected onto Jews. This defense activity derives from an unresolved oedipal conflict, which he saw as closely connected to castration anxiety.<sup>15</sup> Fenichel has also suggested a connection between castration anxiety and the circumcision of Jews<sup>16</sup>. This has been challenged by psychoanalysts such as Bruno Bettelheim and Ernst Fraenkel as well as Irving E. Alexander and Sheldon Blackman<sup>17</sup> in empirical studies.

Rudolph M. Loewenstein, who examined antisemitism in relation to the genesis of neuroses, interpreted it as the result of unresolved ambivalence

---

<sup>11</sup> Otto Fenichel, "Elements of Psychoanalytic Theory of Anti-Semitism," in Ernst Simmel (ed.), *Anti-Semitism. A Social Disease*, New York 1946, pp. 11–32.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 20.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 30.

<sup>14</sup> Schupper, *op. cit.*, pp. 3–24.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 23.

<sup>16</sup> Fenichel, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

<sup>17</sup> Irving E. Alexander and Sheldon Blackman, "Castration, Circumcision, and Anti-Semitism," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 54/55, 1957, pp. 143–144.

and oedipal conflicts.<sup>18</sup> Analytic practice has shown that during the treatment of neuroses, the analyst is frequently the target of antisemitic hostility with both sexual and aggressive components. This means that incestuous desires repressed in the oedipal conflict are projected or displaced onto Jews, corresponding to the repressed desire to murder the father. Tobias Brocher spoke of the externalisation of guilt feelings,<sup>19</sup> and Hans Keilson called the Jews the representatives of the "inner enemy."<sup>20</sup> According to Keilson, hatred of Jews is a case of negative transference analogous to the analyst-patient situation. In both cases, we are dealing with the problems of aggression, ambivalence, projection, guilt, and guilty conscience.<sup>21</sup> The antisemite wants to destroy in the Jew what he hates in himself and feels powerless to change. For most psychoanalysts (Freud; Berliner, 1946; Loewenstein, 1952; Keilson, 1964; Loebowitz-Lennard, 1946), the primary reason for the choice of Jews as "scapegoats" lies in the particular ambivalence of Jewish-Christian relations. This is understood to some extent as sibling rivalry<sup>22</sup> or as a relationship of historic descent.<sup>23</sup> Two conflicts derive from the relationship of descent. On the one hand, Christians see Jews as "Christ-killers" and thus displace their aggressive tendencies onto them. Some slight ambivalence remains, however, because Christ himself was a Jew.<sup>24</sup> On the other hand, the historical relationship between Jews and Christians can be seen as following the pattern of the oedipal son-father conflict, with the Jews playing the part of "parents."<sup>25</sup> Henry Loebowitz-Lennard recognized the same factors in antisemitism which are responsible for the arousal of painful feelings in the child and the resulting hostility toward the father as the person responsible for this pain.<sup>26</sup> The monotheistic paternal religion leads to an unconscious hostility toward its major representatives, the Jews. In times of social, economic, or political crisis, this can turn into open aggression.<sup>27</sup> Bela Grunberger<sup>28</sup> also saw a connection between Judaism as a "paternal religion" with the

---

<sup>18</sup> Loewenstein, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

<sup>19</sup> Tobias Brocher, "Zum Vorurteil des Antisemitismus," *Tribüne* 5, 1966, p. 2126.

<sup>20</sup> Hans Keilson, "Vorurteil und Haß," *Die Zeit* 37, 18. 9. 1964, p. 13.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13.

<sup>22</sup> Freud, *op. cit.*, p. 197 (Standard Edition, Vol. 23, p. 91).

<sup>23</sup> Loewenstein, *op. cit.*; Henry Loebowitz-Lennard, "A Psychoanalytic Contribution to the Problem of Antisemitism," *The Psychoanalytic Review* 32, 1945, pp. 359-361.

<sup>24</sup> Loewenstein, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

<sup>25</sup> Ostow, *op. cit.*.

<sup>26</sup> Loebowitz-Lennard, *op. cit.*, p. 361.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>28</sup> Bela Grunberger, "Der Antisemit und der Ödipuskomplex," *Psyche* 5, 1962, pp. 255-272, p. 266.

expression of the oedipal conflict and consequent feelings of guilt. Here the Jew appears simultaneously as the powerful and as the castrated – and thus vulnerable – father. Grunberger considered antisemitism to result from an early failure to resolve the oedipal conflict, resulting in a “narcissistic injury” which in turn leads to a disturbance in ego formation (system of conditionings) and to a regressive and non-integrated ego. The superego is therefore at odds with the rest of the “normal” personality.<sup>29</sup> The narcissistic injury is projected onto Jews, either individually or collectively, for example, after a war has been lost (such as World War One). Thus, the ambivalence of the oedipal conflict with the father is resolved by splitting the father image into the evil father – the Jew –, and the good father, leader, or country; the narcissistic integrity of the ego is secured. Correspondingly, the antisemite has no feelings of guilt toward persecuted Jews, as Nathan W. Ackermann and Marie Jahoda have noted.<sup>30</sup> The authors explain this phenomenon not in terms of intrapsychic splitting, however, but rather in terms of an underdeveloped and suppressed consciousness. This is but one component of the “emotional disorder” the authors found to be emotional predispositions for antisemitism in their evaluation of 27 case histories. Generalized, non-specific anxiety, a confused self-image that vacillates between feelings of inferiority and superiority, unsatisfactory social relationships, a striving for conformity, fear of the deviant and the inability to build satisfactory object relationships are further dispositions. Ackermann and Jahoda see the psychodynamic genesis of this “emotional disorder” above all in a disturbed family situation: in the parents’ troubled marriage and rejection of the child, and in an intense and not-fully-resolved oedipal conflict. Antisemitism in this view has an “ego defense function;” it appears as an important, if irrational, defense, an attempt to restore the “crippled self.” Stanley Rosenman also claims that unsatisfactory social relationships, an unstable identity, and low self-esteem limit the possibilities of developing the individual’s competence.<sup>31</sup> The individual feels victimized and, given the chance, will “take revenge” on other, weaker individuals or groups for his suffering. By making the others “victims,” he wins back some of the lost omnipotence and, at the same time, gains recognition in his own group. For a number of reasons, Jews have been and still are suitable for the role of victim, as there are scarcely any characteristics, be they worthy of contempt or of respect, that

---

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 261.

<sup>30</sup> Ackerman and Jahoda, *op. cit.*

<sup>31</sup> Rosenman, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

have not been attributed to them.<sup>32</sup> For Hans Ornstein,<sup>33</sup> fear and a feeling of inferiority, together with hate and envy, are the major emotional motives for the pathological complex of antisemitism which can be ascertained on an individual and on a collective level. In addition to these emotional aspects, such cognitive and cognitive-affective aspects as prejudice and fixation must also be considered.<sup>34</sup> In Ornstein's work, however, a clear psychoanalytical orientation is no longer recognizable.

The body of work discussed above concentrates on clearly antisemitic individuals. These pathological cases are, however, quantitatively relatively unimportant and are rarely to be found in psychoanalytic therapy. Mortimer Ostow analyzed the relationships of not explicitly antisemitic persons to Jews, using three clinical cases and three examples from psychoanalytic literature. He found a marked ambivalence in which antisemitic and philosemitic tendencies are merged: "In each instance, we see attraction to Jews complemented by rejection."<sup>35</sup> Ostow saw the major reason for the change from philosemitism to antisemitism in tendencies toward separatism and rejection on the part of the Jewish group. This rejection, and the displacement of oedipal conflicts onto Jews lead to a regression into infantile xenophobic forms of reaction.<sup>36</sup> He distinguished the following phases: the subject transfers conflicts with parents and family onto the stranger, who is then the object of ambivalent feelings. Feelings of guilt toward his own group lead to the centripetal tendency to reunite and, correspondingly, to resolution of the philosemitic-antisemitic ambivalence in favor of complete rejection of Jews.<sup>37</sup> The antisemitic tendencies of non-pathological antisemitic personalities, therefore, prove to be the negative side of an ambivalent attitude toward Jews.<sup>38</sup>

Individual psychodynamic analysis of antisemitism can be applied to "collectives" in two ways: firstly, one can include the historical structures and traditional patterns of interpretation which might be responsible for the negative transference reactions of fear of being destroyed and sexual fears, and secondly, the individual neurosis can be expanded and interpreted as a collective one.

---

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13.

<sup>33</sup> Hans Ornstein, *Der antijüdische Komplex. Versuch einer Analyse*, Zürich 1949.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13.

<sup>35</sup> Ostow, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 108.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 113.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 104.

Beginning with Freud, historically-oriented psychoanalytic research has been mainly concerned with religious tensions between Judaism and Christianity. Judaism, as the "father religion," is seen to lead to identification of the Jew with the father who is simultaneously loved and hated.<sup>39</sup> Jews are representatives of repressed drives and at the same time representatives of the father (super-ego); thus, Christian culture regards them with mingled hate and fear, contempt and attraction.<sup>40</sup> According to Freud, the hatred of the Jews results from the Jews' refusal to accept the guilt for the killing of God the Father and of Moses, another "father" and the creator of monotheism. Whereas the Christians admit to these murders and expiate their guilt through the sacrifice of Christ and through baptism, the Jews refuse to recognize their guilt and accept baptism. Christianity, as a religion of the son, is fighting against the old paternal religion of Judaism.<sup>41</sup> Other authors, such as Erik Erikson and Henry Loebowitz-Lennard, see the source of antisemitism in the identification of Jews with the punishing father/super-ego. According to Erikson, the attraction of National Socialism lay in the fact that it offered a solution to the problem of rebellion against the father.<sup>42</sup> To the extent that religion and culture are generally viewed as drive-repressive in psychoanalytic theory, Judaism (super-ego) is regarded as a substitute victim for an attitude which is essentially anti-cultural and anti-Christian.<sup>43</sup> Antisemitism is then viewed as regressive and opposed to civilization.<sup>44</sup> Maurice Samuel<sup>45</sup> argues along these lines. In his view, antisemitism is "Christophobia." Hatred of Christ, who is seen as a symbol of such cultural values as peace, equality, brotherhood, etc., is displaced onto Jews because Christ was a Jew. From this perspective, the extermination of Jewry can be seen as "deicide."<sup>46</sup>

Other psychoanalysts have tried to solve the problem of collective antisemitism by transferring the individual-psychological concept of neurosis onto collectives, i. e. by postulating a *social neurosis*.<sup>47</sup> According to

<sup>39</sup> Bernhard Berliner, "On Some Religious Motives of Anti-Semitism," in Ernst Simmel (ed.), *Anti-Semitism. A Social Disease*, New York 1946, p. 79.

<sup>40</sup> Loewenstein, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

<sup>41</sup> Freud, *op. cit.*, p. 194 f.

<sup>42</sup> Erikson, *op. cit.*

<sup>43</sup> Freud, *op. cit.*, p. 194-197.

<sup>44</sup> Ernst Simmel, "Antisemitism and Mass-Psychopathology," in E. Simmel (ed.), *Anti-Semitism. A Social Disease*, New York 1946, pp. 33-78.

<sup>45</sup> Maurice Samuel, *The Great Hatred*, New York 1940.

<sup>46</sup> Rosenman, *op. cit.*, p.21.

<sup>47</sup> Red Bain, "Man is the Measure," *Sociometry* 6, 1943, pp. 460-464; Gregory Zillboorg, "Psychopathology of Social Prejudice," *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 16, 1947, pp. 303-324, p. 304. Both express strong criticism of this identification of clinical pathology with social evil.

Loewenstein, the symptoms of acute collective antisemitism are to a large extent identical with those of individual antisemitism.<sup>48</sup> In organized masses, identification with the leader takes place and he is 'given' the function of the super-ego. Brocher spoke of "collective regression."<sup>49</sup> Aggressive tensions are reduced and projected onto an alien group.<sup>50</sup> Certain parallels to neurotics can be drawn: in both cases, the real conflicts are not solved, but are diverted through released aggressions onto pseudo-problems.<sup>51</sup> Red Bain considered antisemitism to be a form of social-pathological behavior that can take on neurotic or psychotic forms, depending on whether rigid, compulsive, and maladjusted behavior creates feelings of guilt leading to repetition and reinforcement of this behavior, or whether understanding of one's behavior is lacking altogether.<sup>52</sup> "When some such personality segment is common to a great many people in a given community, we may speak properly of a social neurosis or psychosis."<sup>53</sup> Ernst Simmel rejected the view that antisemitism is a mass neurosis because neurotic individuals can never form a group<sup>54</sup> and because the average antisemite has a relatively "normal" and well-adjusted personality. Antisemitism can better be viewed as a mass psychosis, since it is characterized by a delusional denial of reality and uncontrolled destructive aggression.<sup>55</sup> In situations of crisis, a break with reality takes place. The individual antisemite is not a deviant. He loses autonomy by joining a group. As in Loewenstein's and Brocher's argumentation, regression is of major importance here. The antisemite regresses for short periods of time rather than continuously, as the psychotic does, and this contributes to the emergence of group-specific mass psychosis. His membership in the group protects him from individual regression and psychosis: "The flight into mass psychosis is not only a flight from reality but also from individual insanity."<sup>56</sup> This temporary regression offers the possibility of unsanctioned aggression toward minorities. For Martin Wagh<sup>57</sup> too, regression and historical situations of crisis are crucial to explaining collective anti-

---

<sup>48</sup> Loewenstein, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

<sup>49</sup> Brocher, *op. cit.*, p. 2121.

<sup>50</sup> Loewenstein, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 46.

<sup>52</sup> Bain, *op. cit.*, p. 461.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>54</sup> Simmel, *op. cit.*, p. 493.

<sup>55</sup> Simmel, *op. cit.*

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>57</sup> Martin Wagh, "Psychoanalytische Betrachtungen zur Dynamik und Genese des Vorurteils, des Antisemitismus und des Nazismus," *Psyche* 5, 1962, pp. 273-284.

semitism. Wangh saw the psycho-genesis of the escalation of antisemitism into National Socialism in the anxiety-producing crisis situation of the early 1930's, when an entire generation reacted with regression because they had already been exposed to a similar situation in early childhood (1917–1920). This early situation was intensified by the wartime absence of the father and the resulting anxiety of the mother.<sup>58</sup> Mass psychoses formed a defence against the individual psychoses threatening to emerge at that time.<sup>59</sup> In general, then, psychoanalysis portrays antisemitism as the result of disturbed ego development<sup>60</sup> leading to a partial denial of reality. Prejudice can be used either individually or collectively to ward off unconscious anxieties; as a defense reaction it is comparable to neurotic and psychotic defense mechanisms.<sup>61</sup> This psychodynamic localization has led to interpretations of antisemitism which concentrate exclusively on affective aspects. This trend, in turn, has been criticized by Christel Hopf.<sup>62</sup>

In general, the psychoanalytic theory of prejudice has increasingly come under attack. Bagley, Verma *et al.* (1979) consider psychoanalytic theories of prejudice to be, for the most part, “naive and disappointing,”<sup>63</sup> and Ashmore and Del Boca (1976) were unable to find clear confirmation of either the projection or the displacement theory in their empirical research.<sup>64</sup> Above all, the confusion of individual and collective levels has been criticized.<sup>65</sup> Critics believed further that a connection between prejudice and personality structure which completely ignores social and cultural norms could not be established or was overrated.<sup>66</sup>

With the exception of the late reception and interest in psychoanalytic research on antisemitism in Germany in the early 1960's – for example, at the 4th Congress of the German Society for Psychotherapy and Depth Psychology in Wiesbaden in 1962 –, there has been little continuous development of psychoanalytic theory on antisemitism since the late 1940's. If one does not blame the specific psychoanalytic view of theory for this failure, two alternative reasons seem possible. The first of these is that little attention was paid to antisemitism in the 1950's and even less in the

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 279.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 283.

<sup>60</sup> Brocher, *op. cit.*, p. 2132.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>62</sup> Hopf, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

<sup>63</sup> Bagley and Verma, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

<sup>64</sup> Ashmore and Del Boca, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

<sup>65</sup> Zilboorg, *op. cit.*, p. 304.

<sup>66</sup> Christopher Orpen, “The Effect of Cultural Factors on the Relationship Between Prejudice and Personality,” *Journal of Psychology* 78, 1971, pp. 73–79, p. 73.

1960's because of the increasing distance to the Holocaust and also because of increasing racial tensions in the United States. The second possible reason is that psychoanalytic elements have made their way into other theories and continued to "work" from within these theories.<sup>67</sup> This is obviously true of the two theories that were most influential in the 1950's and 1960's: Dollard *et al.*'s frustration-aggression theory (1939) and research on the "authoritarian personality" by Adorno *et al.* (1950).

## 2. Frustration-Aggression Theory

In their book *Frustration and Aggression*, a work of seminal importance for research in this area, Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer, and Sears<sup>68</sup> integrated depth psychology not only with experimental (learning) psychology of the Hull school, but also with studies in social psychology and cultural anthropology. Psychoanalytically, their theory originated in Freud's conception of "aggression as a reaction to aversion" and in Alfred Adler's idea of "aggression as a reaction to unfulfilled needs."<sup>69</sup>

Until about 1915, Freud had considered aggression to be a component of the sexual drive. Later (after 1920) he saw it as a consequence of the death instinct.<sup>70</sup> The authors of the "Yale Group" did not proceed on this theory of instincts but instead used learning theory.<sup>71</sup>

The classic frustration-aggression hypothesis as put forth by Dollard *et al.* consists essentially of four assumptions. First, there is a causal connection between frustration and aggression. Secondly, this connection can be determined quantitatively. Thirdly and fourthly, the theory involves catharsis and displacement.<sup>72</sup> From the claim of a causal relationship, it fol-

<sup>67</sup> Bagley and Verma, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

<sup>68</sup> John Dollard, Leonhard W. Doob, Neal E. Miller, O. H. Mowrer, and Robert R. Sears, *Frustration and Aggression*, New Haven 1939.

<sup>69</sup> Hans-Joachim Kornadt, "Die Entwicklung der Frustrations- und der Aggressionsforschung," in H. J. Kornadt (ed.), *Aggression und Frustration als psychologisches Problem*, Darmstadt 1981, pp. 3-59, p. 6 ff.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>71</sup> For a criticism of the psychoanalytic and behaviorist conception of aggression, see Leonard Berkowitz, "Some Aspects of Observed Aggression," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 2, 1965, pp. 359-369; *ibid.*, "The Contagion of Violence. An S-R Medialional Analysis of Some Effects of Observed Aggression," in W. J. Arnold and M. M. Page (eds.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, Lincoln 1970; Amélie Schmidt-Mummendey, "Vorstellungen und Erklärungsversuche zum aggressiven Verhalten," in Amélie Schmidt-Mummendey and Hans-Dieter Schmidt (eds.), *Aggressives Verhalten*, München 1975, pp. 14-20.

<sup>72</sup> Regina Koeck, "Grenzen von Falsifikation und Exhaustion - der Fall der Frustrations-/Aggressionstheorie," *Psychologische Beiträge* 19, 1977, pp. 391-419, p. 393.



lows that frustration always leads to some form of aggression, that there is no such thing as spontaneous aggression without some previous frustration. It follows from the second assumption that the degree of aggression is directly proportional to the degree of frustration. The catharsis hypothesis contains the assumption of a hydraulic model: each aggressive act releases pressure which has built up through frustration. If the possibility of release is blocked at one point, a displacement of aggression takes place, either by choosing other objects (extrapunitive), by direction of aggression against oneself (intrapunitive), or by secondary forms of reaction.<sup>73</sup>

Subsequent research has served to modify and specify the hypotheses described above. Even the definition of aggressive behavior, be it in terms of the results (infliction of damage) or in terms of the intended behavior (hostile aggression vs. instrumental aggression), is so controversial that the term "aggression" appears to refer to functionally different types of behavior. For this reason, it has often been suggested that the general definition be changed to concrete functional descriptions of behavior. Moreover, the deterministic claim of a connection as well as a linear quantitative relation between frustration and aggression had to be reduced to an "inducement hypothesis."<sup>74</sup> The catharsis hypothesis also had to be refined, since aggressive acts may reduce aggression or aggravate it (positive reinforcement). Whereas the ethological theory of aggression (Konrad Lorenz and others) emphasizes the drive-reducing effect of aggressive behavior, research into learning theory stresses the contrary effect of positive reinforcement as long as the aggression is not sanctioned.<sup>75</sup> The displacement hypothesis has also been modified along the lines of the social learning theory.<sup>76</sup> This means that the choice of "scapegoats" and the behavior displayed toward them is determined by a social learning process (imitation learning) and not by the quantity of excitation and corresponding quantity of reactive discrimination.<sup>77</sup> Contemporary research moves between the extremes of psychologically-based behavioristic aggression theory and the social learn-

---

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>74</sup> Neal E. Miller (with collaboration of R. R. Sears, O. H. Mowrer, L. W. Doob and J. Dollard), "The Frustration-Aggression Hypothesis," *Psychological Review* 48, 1941, pp. 337-342.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. critically: Hans-Dietrich Dann, "Müssen Aggressionen ausgelebt werden?," in Amélie Schmidt-Mummendey and Hans-Dieter Schmidt (eds.), *Aggressives Verhalten. Ergebnisse der psychologischen Forschung*, München 1975, pp. 63-90, p. 81. He considers the catharsis hypothesis a theoretical construction which is not absolutely necessary.

<sup>76</sup> Albert Bandura, *Aggression. A Social Learning Analysis*, Englewood Cliffs 1973.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. the mediating position taken by H. Selg, *Zur Aggression verdammt? Psychologische Ansätze einer Friedensforschung*, Stuttgart 1971; Koeck, *op. cit.*, p. 407.

ing theory of aggression. Empirical studies have uncovered many factors of aggressive behavior, ranging from hereditary genetic components (proven in animals) and personality factors (custom, reactive pattern, experience, inhibition) to situational (cultural) variables.<sup>78</sup>

Research centering around frustration-aggression theory replaced psychoanalytic models of antisemitism in the late 1950's and early 1960's. Around this time, a small body of work was published which concerned itself with the link between frustration/aggression and antisemitic prejudice. But beyond this, the F/A theory has influenced nearly all psychological and sociological theories of prejudice and conflict. It can be seen as a basic theory, and can be expected to remain as important in the future as it has been in the past for research on antisemitism.

As early as 1948, Arnold Rose applied the frustration-aggression theory to the study of Jews as scapegoats. The Jew appears as a symbol of urban culture in the United States. Urban life is admired but also feared and hated, resulting in a frustrating mental conflict symbolically associated with Jews: "Frustration may be conceived of as supplying the energy, the motive force, for prejudice: symbolic association directs it against certain suitable groups."<sup>79</sup> Rose used the theory of displacement, which is of great importance in the psychoanalytic discussion of antisemitism. Leonard Berkowitz, one of the most important contributors to frustration-aggression theory in the 1960's and 1970's, explored the question of the displacement of aggression onto the Jewish minority.<sup>80</sup> He empirically tested the prevailing "scapegoat theory of prejudice" which had previously been questioned by Gardner Lindzey on the basis of empirical research.<sup>81</sup> Until then, displacement theory had primarily examined the influence of external stimulus factors on the displacement of aggression (degree of similarity between frustrator and substitute object). Now Berkowitz, working on antisemitism, tried to determine the influence of the subject itself (personal prejudice). By dividing two groups of strongly and weakly antisemitic persons,

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Berkowitz, *op. cit.*, 1970; for sanctions cf. Albert Bandura and Richard H. Walters, *Social Learning and Personality Development*, New York 1963; for a general view cf. H. Kaufmann, "Definitions and Methodology in the Study of Aggression," *Psychological Bulletin* 64, 1965, pp. 351-364.

<sup>79</sup> Arnold M. Rose, "Anti-Semitism's Root in City-Hatred," *Commentary* 6, 1948, pp. 374-378, p. 378.

<sup>80</sup> Leonard Berkowitz, "Anti-Semitism and the Displacement of Aggression," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 59, 1959, pp. 181-187, reprinted in this volume.

<sup>81</sup> Gardner Lindzey, "An Experimental Examination of the Scapegoat Theory of Prejudice," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 45, 1950, pp. 296-309; *ibid.*, "Differences Between the High and Low in Prejudice and Their Implication for a Theory of Prejudice," *Journal of Personality* 19, 1950/51, pp. 16-39.

respectively, in half and exposing one of each of the subgroups to frustration in order to create aggression, he was able to prove the strong influence of personal prejudice on the displacement of aggression: strongly antisemitic persons showed a stronger tendency toward the displacement of aggression than did weakly antisemitic persons.<sup>82</sup> In contrast to several studies<sup>83</sup> indicating a correlation between strong prejudice toward Jews or other minorities and a high level of "frustration susceptibility, aggression and overt disturbance,"<sup>84</sup> Lindzey contended that there was no difference between strongly and less strongly prejudiced persons in the tendency to displace aggression. For this reason, he rejected the "scapegoat theory" as an all-encompassing explanation. Bohdan Zawadzki (1948) criticized the narrowness of the "scapegoat theory" on the grounds that it only considers the subjective side in the choice of a target for displacement, calling it "a pure 'drive' theory"<sup>85</sup> that omitted the objective qualities inherent in the object. In his view, the interactive character of choosing an object for displacing aggression was not properly taken into consideration. This legitimate objection received little attention, however: the small amount of work done on antisemitism continued to concentrate on the side of the subject. In a later essay, Berkowitz<sup>86</sup> showed that prejudiced persons, when forming judgments under conditions of stress, tended to react to such stress by broadening and blurring the categories used, so that the displacement of aggression onto other objects was made easier. A. Buss assumed that frustration causes a non-specific lowering of the aggression threshold toward all objects,<sup>87</sup> which does not, however, answer the question of the choice of particular targets of aggression. Donald Weatherly also empirically tested the selectivity of displacement. Using a "fantasy test"<sup>88</sup> he was able to show that strongly antisemitic persons have a stronger tend-

<sup>82</sup> Berkowitz, *op. cit.*, 1959, p. 186.

<sup>83</sup> Gordon W. Allport and Bernard M. Kramer, "Some Roots of Prejudice," *Journal of Psychology* 22, 1946, pp. 9-39; Harrison G. Gough, "Studies in Social Intolerance: I. Some Psychological and Sociological Correlates of Anti-Semitism," *Journal of Social Psychology* 33, 1951, pp. 237-246; Emory L. Cowen, Judah Landes, and Donald E. Schaet, "The Effects of Mild Frustration on the Expression of Prejudiced Attitudes," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 58, 1958, pp. 33-38.

<sup>84</sup> Lindzey, *op. cit.*, 1950/51, p. 39.

<sup>85</sup> Bohdan Zawadzki, "Limitations on the Scapegoat Theory of Prejudice," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 43, 1948, pp. 127-141, p. 132.

<sup>86</sup> Leonard Berkowitz, "Anti-Semitism, Judgemental Processes, and Displacement of Hostility," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 62, 1961, pp. 210-215.

<sup>87</sup> Arnold Buss, *The Psychology of Aggression*, New York 1961.

<sup>88</sup> Donald Weatherly, "Anti-Semitism and the Expression of Fantasy Aggression," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 62, 1961, pp. 454-457, p. 454, reprinted in this volume.

ency to choose Jews as substitute objects than do weakly antisemitic persons. In contrast to Lindzey, therefore, Weatherly attributed great importance to existing personal prejudice in the selection process. In a second empirical study on antisemitism in 1963, Weatherly<sup>89</sup> took up the question of the rise of ethnic prejudice in connection with early childhood experiences. Discussion of this issue had already played an important part in *The Authoritarian Personality*.<sup>90</sup> The results show that a relatively strict maternal discipline of the child's aggressive behavior is connected with a high degree of antisemitism. Certain methods of child rearing thus seem to increase readiness to displace aggression.<sup>91</sup>

On the whole, the frustration-aggression theory was used to empirically show a large number of personal, situational, and target-group-specific factors determining the choice of "scapegoat." They include: 1) the expectation of sanctions associated with aggression against the substitute object;<sup>92</sup> 2) the number and quality of "similar" features between the frustrator and the substitute object; 3) an acquired negative attitude; for example, a prejudice which renders aggressive behavior toward the rejected person or group easier;<sup>93</sup> 4) the type of threat which gives rise to "frustration:" a threat to an individual, or a "shared threat;" and finally; 5) the personality of the frustrated person, his authoritarianism, ethnocentrism,<sup>94</sup> and general "hostile disposition."<sup>95</sup>

In actual fact, in researching antisemitism, the various social science disciplines have always limited themselves to a few of these factors. Psychological research, for example, has concentrated primarily on personality traits and inner conflicts, while sociologists have been concerned with situative and normative factors. A synthesis has seldom been attempted. There are, however, some exceptions. Carl Iver Hovland and Robert R. Sears, for example, examined the correlation between economic crises and

<sup>89</sup> "Maternal Response to Childhood Aggression and Subsequent Anti-Semitism," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 66, 1963, pp. 183-185, reprinted in this volume.

<sup>90</sup> Adorno *et al.*, *op. cit.*

<sup>91</sup> Weatherly, *op. cit.*, 1963, p. 185; cf. for confirmation Robert R. Sears, Eleanor Maccoby, and H. Levin, *Patterns of Child Rearing*, Evanston 1957.

<sup>92</sup> For example "potential ingroup censure," cf. Edward and Marcia Donnerstein, "Variables in Interracial Aggression: Potential Ingroup Censure," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 27, 1973, pp. 143-150.

<sup>93</sup> Kaufmann, *op. cit.*; for an opposing view see Robert W. Genter and Stuart P. Taylor, "Physical Aggression as a Function of Racial Prejudice and the Race of the Target," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 27, 1973, pp. 207-210.

<sup>94</sup> Berkowitz, *op. cit.*, 1959, p. 186.

<sup>95</sup> Genter and Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 210.

cases of lynching,<sup>96</sup> and Dollard *et al.*<sup>97</sup> presented the rise of National Socialism as the result of the manifold frustrations which the Germans suffered. However, later psychologists did not adopt this comprehensive initial approach to the frustration-aggression theory. Unless one considers learning-theory, the frustration-aggression theory cannot adequately explain why particular groups are targeted for displaced aggression.<sup>98</sup> Equally, personality characteristics cannot explain the choice of target groups, nor has a satisfactory description of the factor "similarity" been achieved to date.<sup>99</sup> Therefore, only "visibility" and "defenselessness" are left as factors in selections. I agree with Herbert A. Sallen's criticism that the "scapegoat theories of ethnocentrism" cannot account for the fact "that prejudice is not an abnormal phenomenon but that it generally belongs to the accepted and self-evident norms of an interacting community, i. e. that it is part of the expected conformity . . ."<sup>100</sup> The frustration-aggression theory over-emphasizes the affective components and the pathological aspects of prejudice; cognitive dimensions are not taken into adequate consideration. It is, after all, a theory of motivation.<sup>101</sup> And as such, it continues, together with psychoanalysis, to influence research, as in the case of the *California Studies*.

### 3. Studies on the "Authoritarian Personality"

In 1944, the American Jewish Committee founded a "Department of Scientific Research." It was to concern itself primarily with antisemitic prejudice. Soon, however, it expanded its program to include research on ethnocentrism, fascism, and conservatism.<sup>102</sup> It even planned to develop a comprehensive philosophy of the human condition in modern society.<sup>103</sup> The core of its program, however, was clearly the historical framework of the Holocaust, National Socialism, and re-education plans for the post-war period.

<sup>96</sup> Carl Iver Hovland and Robert R. Sears, "Minor Studies of Aggression: VI. Correlation of Lynchings with Economic Indices," *Journal of Psychology* 9, 1940, pp. 301-310.

<sup>97</sup> Dollard *et al.*, *op. cit.*, 1939.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. the criticism expressed by Zawadzki, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

<sup>99</sup> Hans Werbik, "Die Frustrations-Aggressions-Hypothese," in Amélie Schmidt-Mummen-dey and Hans-Dieter Schmidt (eds.), *Aggressive Verhalten*, München 1975, pp. 91-125, p. 116.

<sup>100</sup> Herbert A. Sallen, *Zum Antisemitismus in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, Frankfurt a. M. 1977, p. 93.

<sup>101</sup> Kornadt, *op. cit.*

<sup>102</sup> J. P. Kirscht and R. L. Dillehay, *Dimensions of Authoritarianism: A Review of Research and Theory*, Lexington 1967, p. 4.

<sup>103</sup> Adorno *et al.*, *op. cit.*, p.X.

Despite the fact that most scholars involved were psychoanalytically oriented, the approach taken – personality theory – was essentially practical and educational, as the following quotation shows: “Our aim is not merely to describe prejudice but to explain it in order to aid in its eradication.”<sup>104</sup> Ironically, the authors’ theoretical approach rendered the realization of their goal almost impossible. How can deeply ingrained attitudes, acquired in the socialization process in early childhood and necessary for ego stability, be changed at some later point through education unless, of course, that education is psychotherapy?<sup>105</sup> Research guided by the concept of authoritarianism involved the hypothesis “that the political, economic, and social convictions of an individual often form a broad and coherent pattern, as if bound together by a mentality or ‘spirit,’ and that this pattern is an expression of deep-lying trends in his personality.”<sup>106</sup> This hypothesis contains the three basic working assumptions of the study. Firstly, a person will exhibit the same pattern of behavior, attitudes, and values toward differing objects, for example, minorities. Ethnocentrism, antisemitism, conservatism etc. are seen as variations of one basic attitudinal syndrome.<sup>107</sup> Secondly, attitudes in such areas are based on a few basic personality characteristics,<sup>108</sup> so that character types can be compared and contrasted using psychoanalytic models, for example, authoritarian vs. tolerant characters. Thirdly, personality structures such as these originate in early childhood situations in the family.

Two methods were used to test these assumptions empirically: a survey of attitude patterns using standardized questionnaires [scales for the development of antisemitism (AS), fascism (F), ethnocentrism (E), and conservatism (PEC)],<sup>109</sup> and the analysis of personality structures using psychoanalytic case histories, depth interviews, and projective tests.<sup>110</sup>

Although the theoretical core of the concept of authoritarianism was psychoanalytic, concepts from the frustration-aggression and socialization theories were integrated into it in order to give weight to such social

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, foreword, IX.

<sup>105</sup> Sallen, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

<sup>106</sup> Adorno *et al.*, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. Ashmore and Del Boca, *op. cit.*, p. 81, who call it “ideology;” cf. Donald T. Campbell and Boyd R. McCandness, “Ethnocentrism, Xenophobia and Personality,” *Human Relations* 4, 1951, pp. 185–192.

<sup>108</sup> Else Frenkel-Brunswik and R. Nevitt Sanford, “The Anti-Semitic Personality: A Research Report,” in Ernst Simmel (ed.), *Anti-Semitism. A Social Disease*, New York 1946, p. 96.

<sup>109</sup> Adorno *et al.*, *op. cit.*

<sup>110</sup> Ackerman and Jahoda, *op. cit.*; Bettelheim and Janowitz, *op. cit.*

systems as the family and the economy. One must bear in mind, however, that this research project was exploratory and that it contained many *ad hoc* explanations; the researchers were not guided by a systematically developed theory.<sup>111</sup>

The point of departure was Freud's psychodynamic model of id, ego, and super-ego. As postulated by analytic theory on antisemitism, the antisemitic personality is characterized by a weak ego. This psychic underdevelopment has its roots in a disturbed early childhood socialization caused by parental rejection of the child<sup>112</sup> or by the authoritarian character of the parent-child relationship.<sup>113</sup> Such a situation prevents the integration of external norms into the ego, so that the ego exists in permanent conflict with id and super-ego. The results are a tendency toward conformism, a rigid structuring of one's environment, for example in the form of sharp ingroup/outgroup differentiation, low frustration tolerance, and a search for group support. Adorno and his colleagues named nine aspects of the attitude pattern of the "authoritarian personality:" 1) conventionality, 2) authoritarian submission, 3) authoritarian aggression, 4) anti-intraception, 5) superstition and stereotypy, 6) power and toughness, 7) destructiveness and cynicism, 8) projectivity, and 9) certain attitudes toward sex.<sup>114</sup> As in psychoanalysis and frustration-aggression theory, the theory of authoritarianism also postulates a displacement or projection mechanism by means of which latent aggressions and feelings of guilt are projected onto alien groups that do not adhere to the conventional morality of one's own group.<sup>115</sup> Because of their authoritarian fixation on strength and dominance, authoritarian persons choose relatively weak objects as targets of projection. In spite of their weakness, these objects are felt to be threatening because the sense of threat is fed by the persons' own intra-psychic conflicts and therefore needs no anchor in reality. In contrast to the model of externally produced frustration followed by displacement of aggression, endopsychic conflicts are projected outward in this model. Intra-psychic problems and needs, not economic, religious, or cultural conflicts, are decisive in creating prejudice and hatred toward minorities.<sup>116</sup>

<sup>111</sup> R. Nevitt Sanford, "The Approach to the Authoritarian Personality," in I. L. McCary (ed.), *Psychology of Personality*, New York 1956; Kirscht and Dillehay, *op. cit.*, pp. 5, 7.

<sup>112</sup> Ackerman and Jahoda, *op. cit.*

<sup>113</sup> Else Frenkel-Brunswik, "A Study of Prejudice in Children," *Human Relations* 1, 1948, pp. 295-306, cf. also Weatherly, *op. cit.*, 1963.

<sup>114</sup> Adorno *et al.*, *op. cit.*, p. 228.

<sup>115</sup> Gerald S. Lesser, "Extrapunitiveness and Ethnic Attitude," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 56, 1958, pp. 281-282.

<sup>116</sup> Adorno *et al.*, *op. cit.*, p. 8; Kirscht and Dillehay, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

Hilde Weiss explains this “retreat” from social and class-specific to endopsychic lines of conflict with the disappointment felt by the Marxists of the Frankfurt School that antisemitism and adherence to fascist beliefs cut across class lines.<sup>117</sup>

The “authoritarian personality” is certainly a hypothetical and intra-psychic construct, but neither its social factors, such as developments in the family structure and in the socialization process, nor its social consequences can be ignored. Although the „theory of the authoritarian personality” and the “critical theory of society” do not harmonize, it is important to see that external economic and political factors are considered to have a strong influence on the family and the character of authoritarian individuals. Even unconscious drives are considered socially determined.<sup>118</sup> The theory of the authoritarian personality is, in the final analysis, based on a Marxist theory of fascism and capitalism.

Although the study was strongly criticized soon after publication<sup>119</sup> – particularly on methodological grounds<sup>120</sup> – no study to date has had a stronger impact on the social psychology of prejudice and antisemitism. The chain of critical evaluation and research based on this study has remained unbroken up to the present. Its links are “numerous and amazingly heterogeneous.”<sup>121</sup> According to Kirscht and Dillehay, the three most important reasons for the study’s continuing influence are 1) the assumption of a basic psychic pattern which allows the most varied expressions of opinions to be placed in relation to prejudice; 2) a general frame of reference to explain the roots of prejudice; and 3) the development of a scale which can be used both in large-scale opinion polls and in small-group experiments.<sup>122</sup> In fact, all social-psychological research following the study has used one of the four scales to construct attitude syndromes described earlier (AS, F, E, and PEC scales, see Part IV).

<sup>117</sup> Hilde Weiss, *Antisemitische Vorurteile in Österreich*, Wien 1984, p. 15.

<sup>118</sup> Cf. critically: E. Cramer, “Zur empirischen Überprüfbarkeit kritischer Faschismustheorie,” *Angewandte Sozialforschung* 7, 1979, pp. 23–31; Weiss, *op. cit.*

<sup>119</sup> Above all in Richard Christie and Marie Jahoda (eds.), *Studies in the Scope and Method of “The Authoritarian Personality,”* Glencoe 1954.

<sup>120</sup> Lack of representativeness of the samples, inexact statistical analyses, lack of control of variables, failure to consider possible alternative explanations, etc., H. H. Hyman and P. B. Sheatsley, “The Authoritarian Personality – A Methodological Critique,” in Richard Christie and Marie Jahoda (eds.), *Studies in the Scope and Method of “The Authoritarian Personality,”* Glencoe 1954, pp. 50–122.

<sup>121</sup> Richard Christie and Peggy Cook, “A Guide to Published Literature Relating to the Authoritarian Personality Through 1956,” *Journal of Psychology* 45, 1958, pp. 171–199, p. 188.

<sup>122</sup> Kirscht and Dillehay *op. cit.*, p. 7.



There have been a number of attempts to classify the widely scattered and qualitatively extremely varied literature related to the study.<sup>123</sup> They may be classified into three main areas. Firstly, personality characteristics having to do with the authoritarianism syndrome are discussed and criticized. These are dogmatism, rigidity, psychopathologies (neuroses, psychoses), typical cognitive styles, etc. Secondly, other "belief systems" (to borrow a term from Milton Rokeach), such as political, religious, and ethnic attitudes and forms of conduct as well as general social or psychic phenomena such as alienation, *anomie*, social prejudice and stereotyping are shown to be equally correlated with authoritarianism.<sup>124</sup> Thirdly, authoritarianism is related to social factors (amount of education or training, occupation, class, religion, age, etc.), and to behavioral patterns and social groups (family, child-rearing, method of child-rearing, religious activity, social mobility, etc.). The follow-up studies tend to confirm or stress correlations between an authoritarian personality structure and stereotyped interpersonal perception<sup>125</sup>, authoritarian childrearing, psychic maladjustments, extreme right-wing political views, and social prejudice.<sup>126</sup> The link to cognitive factors such as rigidity<sup>127</sup> and tolerance of ambiguity<sup>128</sup> has remained controversial, as has the question of class-specific distribution of authoritarianism.<sup>129</sup> In general, critical evaluations tend to emphasize sociological aspects not adequately considered in the theory in that concepts such as *anomie* (Srole), subcultural differentiation (R. Christie), and role theory<sup>130</sup> are used instead of psychoanalytic explanations. Situational and cognitive aspects are also taken into account.<sup>131</sup>

<sup>123</sup> See Christie and Jahoda, *op. cit.*, 1958, p. 171, who list 230 titles which had been published up to 1958; Kirscht and Dillehay, *op. cit.*

<sup>124</sup> Milton Rokeach, *The Open and Closed Mind*, New York 1960; Leo Srole, "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Explanatory Study," *American Sociological Review* 21, 1956, pp. 709-716.

<sup>125</sup> Alvin Scodel and Paul Mussen, "Social Perceptions of Authoritarians and Non-Authoritarians," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 48, 1953, pp. 181-184.

<sup>126</sup> Christie and Jahoda, *op. cit.*, 1958, for a critical view: Kirscht and Dillehay, *op. cit.*, p. 35; John J. Ray, "Authoritarian Tolerance," *Journal of Psychology* 111, 1980, pp. 303-304.

<sup>127</sup> Douglas N. Jackson, Samuel J. Messick and Charles M. Solley, "How 'Rigid' is the 'Authoritarian'?", *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 54/55, 1957, pp. 137-142.

<sup>128</sup> Ray, *op. cit.*

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid.*; cf. the thesis of "working-class authoritarianism" by Seymour M. Lipset, *Political Man*, Garden City, New York 1960 (Chapter IV); Lewis Lipsitz, "Working-Class Authoritarianism: A Re-Evaluation," *American Sociological Review* 30, 1965, pp. 103-109; cf. also the research on mobility and stratification in part II.

<sup>130</sup> Don Stewart and Thomas Hoult, "A Social-Psychological Theory of the Authoritarian Personality," *American Journal of Sociology* 1959, pp. 274-279.

<sup>131</sup> Kirscht and Dillehay, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

The claim that the authoritarian personality structure is a causal factor in the creation of prejudice and intolerance toward alien groups generally has been of great consequence for research on antisemitism. Accordingly, antisemitic prejudice is seen as a case of general ethnocentrism. This may be one of the reasons why the originally major significance of antisemitism has been de-emphasized, even by the authors of *The Authoritarian Personality*.<sup>132</sup> The connection between authoritarianism and prejudice in general had already come into the foreground, when the “Negro question” became dominant in the United States in the 1960’s. Of the 230 authors listed by Christie and Cook in 1958, only four percent were concerned with antisemitism, not counting the “California Studies” and later studies by the same authors. After 1958, work based on the concerns of these authors became even rarer.

Else Frenkel-Brunswik and R. Nevitt Sanford published the first and basic study on the “antisemitic personality” as early as 1945.<sup>133</sup> They administered questionnaires asking 240 college students, for the most part women, about their antisemitic feelings and their social and political orientation. In addition, they tried to explore the subjects’ psychological backgrounds, using projective questions. Finally, longer interviews and projective tests (Thematic Apperception Test, Rorschach Test) were carried out with selected persons. The latter methods showed generally conservative attitudes and a tendency toward ethnocentrism in the antisemitic persons. These individuals, mostly of middle-class origin, had a narrow personality with a strict, conventional superego, to which they subordinated themselves completely. In the later and larger study, *The Authoritarian Personality*, the authoritarian personality was seen as the common denominator, – with ethnocentrism as one of its main characteristics – while antisemitism appears only as a variation on this theme. Gough examined this basic assumption of continuous “attitude clusters” in his *Studies of Social Intolerance* of 1951, in that he worked out the intercorrelations with the AS-scale by using a great number of scales of measurement. He postulated a number of personality characteristics and attitudes, some of which differed from the Frenkel-Brunswik/Sanford study: “a) lower intellectual level; b) disadvantaged economic background; c) less sociability and participation in school activities; d) inferior academic

<sup>132</sup> Erhard Bahr, “The Anti-Semitism Studies of the Frankfurt School: The Failure of Critical Theory,” *German Studies Review* 1, 1978, pp. 125–138, p. 129.

<sup>133</sup> “Some Personality Factors in Anti-Semitism,” *Journal of Psychology* 20, 1945, pp. 271–291.

performance; e) greater uneasiness and discomfort in social situations; f) greater tendency to complain of personal dissatisfactions, problems, and annoyances; g) narrowness of outlook in regard to national and international affairs; h) debunking attitude toward questions of political-social ideals and goals; i) antagonism toward many outgroups, . . . j) emphasis on nationalism, chauvinism, and conservatism; and k) feelings of victimization and exploitation.”<sup>134</sup> These findings on the socio-economic influences affecting antisemites, which differed from Frenkel-Brunswik/Sanford’s, later led to a prolonged controversy on the class-specific aspect of authoritarianism<sup>135</sup> and on the influence of social mobility (see Part II). The question of antisemitism was of importance only in studies on status and mobility. With the exception of Terry Prothro and John A. Jensen, who examined the great variations of F-scale values among persons of different cultural backgrounds in the southern United States<sup>136</sup> and pointed out that racial prejudice against Negroes may exist without concomitant antisemitic prejudice, but not vice versa, research on authoritarianism has treated the question of antisemitism only in terms of “authoritarianism as found in minorities.” Thus, antisemitism was traced among Jews, and in other cases, mutual prejudice was uncovered between Blacks and Jews. In a theoretical analysis, Irving Sarnoff<sup>137</sup> explained Jewish antisemitism as identification with the aggressor: the aggressor’s attitudes and arguments are adopted. Working in the psychoanalytic tradition, Sarnoff saw the antisemitism of the non-Jewish majority as projection. Identification with the father or the strong majority is the personality’s basic defense mechanism, particularly when rejection by the parents and feelings of inferiority were strong during childhood. A societal situation of humiliation or deprivation can strengthen this primary self-hate, which is then directed toward the individual’s own, weak, group.<sup>138</sup> Jerome Himmelhoch<sup>139</sup> con-

<sup>134</sup> Gough, *op. cit.*, p. 245.

<sup>135</sup> Lipset, *op. cit.*, and Lipsitz, *op. cit.*, on “working-class authoritarianism.”

<sup>136</sup> Terry E. Prothro and John A. Jensen, “Group Differences in Ethnic Attitudes of Louisiana College Students,” *Sociology and Social Research* 34, 1950, pp. 252–258. See also Christopher Orpen, “The Effect of Cultural Factors on the Relationship Between Prejudice and Personality,” *Journal of Psychology* 78, 1971, pp. 73–79 for a confirmation of the relevance of cultural norms in place of personality characteristics.

<sup>137</sup> Irving Sarnoff, “Identification with the Aggressor: Some Personality Correlates of Antisemitism Among Jews,” *Journal of Personality* 20, 1952, pp. 199–218.

<sup>138</sup> Cf. Peter Loewenberg, “Antisemitismus und jüdischer Selbsthaß,” *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 5, 1979, pp. 455–475, p. 469; cf. Barry D. Adam, “Inferiorization and Self – Esteem,” *Social Psychology* 41, 1978 pp. 47–53 on the link between “inferiorization” and “self-esteem.”

firmed the connection established by Adorno *et al.* between the "authoritarian personality" and a general rejection of ethnic minorities among 140 Jewish students and some of their parents. The prejudiced persons investigated rejected their own Jewish group, although the values obtained for ethnocentrism were lower than the comparable values obtained for the white majority in the "California Studies." Himmelhoch considered these ethnocentric attitudes to be dependent on the degree of self-rejection, arguing that self-rejecting individuals are usually eager to settle on any scapegoat offered by society in order to keep their psychic balance through a combination of projection and displacement of hostilities. For authoritarian Jews, membership in a hated group is, of course, the central dilemma. Marian Radke-Yarrow and Bernard Lande<sup>140</sup> studied a group of sixty Jewish college students, using the F-scale, an Insecurity-Scale, parts of the "Thematic Apperception Test," and projective questions on the status of minorities, and found that persons who scored high on the F-scale were more strongly antisemitic and strove to avoid identification with their own group. However, they also found the opposite reaction – the "idealization" of one's own group. The authors interpreted both reactions as attempts to satisfy personal needs for conformity, aggression, subordination, etc. and at the same time keep the frustration of belonging to a weak minority to a minimum. Irwin D. Rinder<sup>141</sup> also noted polarities of over- and under-identification with one's own group in persons with high values on the F-scale. Joseph Adelson<sup>142</sup> too, found a distinction made by Jewish authoritarians between "good" and "bad" Jews. This dichotomization of one's own group allowed a defense against the negative judgement of the majority. The majority was likewise seen as divided into a good and a bad group, and antisemitism was attributed to the less educated lower classes. Thus, a certain identification with the aggressor had taken place; antisemitism seemed to some extent justified because of the "bad" Jews. From this perspective, the struggle against antisemitism must therefore aim at a change in behavior on the part of these "bad" Jews because there is the danger that the

<sup>139</sup> Jerome Himmelhoch, "Tolerance and Personality Needs: A Study of the Liberalization of Ethnic Attitudes Among Minority Group College Students," *American Sociological Review* 15, 1950, pp. 79–88.

<sup>140</sup> Marian Radke-Yarrow and Bernard Lande, "Personality Correlates of Differential Reactions to Minority Group-Belonging," *Journal of Social Psychology* 38, 1953, pp. 253–272.

<sup>141</sup> Irwin D. Rinder, "Polarities in Jewish Identification: The Personality of Ideological Extremity," in Marshall Sklare (ed.), *The Jews. Social Patterns of an American Group*, Glencoe 1958, pp. 493–502.

<sup>142</sup> Joseph Adelson, "A Study of Minority Group Authoritarianism," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 48, 1953, pp. 477–485.

majority might not differentiate between good and bad Jews. The localization of authoritarian personalities among the middle class members of the Reform wing of Judaism corresponds to the results that Adorno and his colleagues obtained in 1950. Moshe Anisfeld, Stanley R. Munoz, and Wallace E. Lambert<sup>143</sup> considered membership in minority or majority groups and negative attitudes toward parents and oneself to be less important for the development of ethnic attitudes. They studied 110 Jewish adolescents and isolated a negative and hostile attitude toward others as the significant variable connecting a negative attitude toward Jews and non-Jews and verbal attacks on nonconformists on the one hand, and negative attitudes toward parents and the self on the other hand. In this conception, group relationships and the sense of belonging diminish in importance beside the personal, individual psychic disposition of "manifest hostility."<sup>144</sup> Richard L. Simpson<sup>145</sup> examined Black-Jewish prejudice and found parallels between authoritarianism and a marked tendency to apply punishment and discipline as well as evidence of a "jungle philosophy" and religious conventionalism (in contrast to Adelson).

Although the connections between authoritarianism, fascism, and antisemitism were still broadly discussed in Germany in the 1960's, albeit less in psychological and empirical than in political and philosophical terms, research on antisemitism in terms of the theory of authoritarianism was no longer being done in the United States by that time.<sup>146</sup> Instead, studies carried out on antisemitism in the United States in the 60's, were sociologically oriented toward studying antisemitism in terms of social and cultural factors such as religion<sup>147</sup>, social mobility<sup>148</sup>, age, and education.<sup>149</sup> The tradition of connecting authoritarianism with research on antisemitism has been carried on since then only by a few researchers such as, for example, John J. Ray in Australia, who conceives of antisemitism as an acquired

<sup>143</sup> Moshe Anisfeld, Stanley R. Munoz and Wallace E. Lambert, "The Structure and Dynamics of the Ethnic Attitudes of Jewish Adolescents," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 66, 1963, pp. 31-36, reprinted in this volume.

<sup>144</sup> Anisfeld *et al.*, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

<sup>145</sup> Richard L. Simpson, "Negro-Jewish Prejudice: Authoritarianism and Some Social Variables as Correlates," *Social Problems* 7, 1959, pp. 138-146.

<sup>146</sup> For explicit rejection see Bruno Bettelheim and Morris Janowitz, *Social Change and Prejudice*, London 1964, p. 68.

<sup>147</sup> Charles Y. Glock and Rodney Stark, *Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism*, New York, London 1966.

<sup>148</sup> Bettelheim and Janowitz, *op. cit.*, 1964.

<sup>149</sup> Charles Y. Glock, Robert Wuthnow, Jane Allyn Piliavin, and Metta Spencer, *Adolescent Prejudice*, New York 1975.

mythology handed down from generation to generation and adopted by a suggested “fascist personality” type. According to Ray, this personality type is characterized by a lack of empathy for other people’s sufferings.<sup>150</sup>

---

<sup>150</sup> Reprinted in this volume.

RUDOLPH M. LOEWENSTEIN

### Anti-Semites in Psychoanalysis\*

Before we take up the problem from the angle of psychoanalytic observation on neurotic patients, let us remind the reader that psychoanalytic treatment of a neurosis consists in tracing the neurotic symptoms back to their unconscious psychological causes. The symptoms are the result of conflicts between various emotional tendencies and the forces which oppose them. They have their roots in early infancy, and among them by far the most important are those involving members of the family.

They are important because they are the first conflicts the child has to resolve in his first contact with society – through the family. It is through the family that he must learn to live in society with other human beings. The socializing process is accomplished by his gaining progressive control over the forces of his instincts – in other words, at the expense of the instincts. And the manner in which the child achieves this control will set the pattern for the type of solution he will apply in adult life to the emotional problems created by conflicts between his instinctual drives and the demands of the external world and of his own moral conscience. He will achieve this mastery through the use of psychological mechanisms which enable his ego to defend itself against the instinctual drives. Among these mechanisms the most important is repression. The purpose of repression is to hold in check unacceptable desires not only by preventing them from being translated into action but by banishing them from consciousness, and by repressing all thoughts, ideas or memories capable of arousing these desires. When the defense against these instincts breaks down, neurotic disturbances result. Disturbances also occur as a result of unsuitable or morbid solutions to the conflicts.

Needless to say, emotional conflict in childhood is not by any means the complete explanation for neurosis in adult life. The whole process of man's

---

\* From: Rudolph M. Loewenstein, *Christians and Jews. A Psychoanalytic Study*, International University Press Inc., New York 1952, pp. 26–52. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

psychological growth and development is a series of conflicts and attempts to adapt to a changing environment. Conflicts which had been dealt with at an early age recur and have to be resolved again on a different level during the psychophysiological changes of puberty. And again in adult life the demands of society confront the individual with an entirely different order of problems. But when a man continues to apply his infantile patterns of solution to his adult problems, either through perseveration of these patterns or through reactivation of anachronistic reactions, neuroses result. Among the sources of neuroses, the relative importance of factors deriving from childhood or puberty or adult life vary in every case.

Among the conflicts playing an important role in neuroses, two are most directly connected with our subject: ambivalence, and the oedipus complex. We know that in the human mind love and hate are very closely, one might almost say inseparably, related, and that generally feelings of love are accompanied by feelings of hate for the same person. This phenomenon is known as ambivalence. During childhood the two components of this ambivalence become gradually and progressively separated. The child tends to repress and render unconscious any tinge of hostility toward the persons he loves and to withdraw all affection from the persons he dislikes. Little by little he creates personages who are wholly black or wholly white – angels or devils, heroes or traitors. Generally this process is not confined to childhood but continues into adolescence and sometimes into adult life. However, in the normal course of emotional development, the intensity of the ambivalence decreases considerably with age.

The ambivalence of the emotions is oriented in given directions from childhood. The child passes through one stage of development, essential in the formation of a normal adult, which Freud has called the oedipus complex: the stage when the little boy experiences erotic feelings toward his mother and feelings of jealousy and hatred toward his father. These feelings are subjected to early repression and seem to disappear forever. The normal adult generally has no memory of them.

The repression of these erotic and hostile drives toward the parents, and the consequent passing of the oedipus complex, form the nucleus of what will later become the moral conscience of the adult. The repression of the drives which form the oedipus complex is a process common to all human beings. There is no society in existence, however primitive, that does not forbid incest and parricide under threat of dire punishment. However, the very fact that this taboo is so absolute and universal indicates that the forbidden desires exist and that the possibility of these acts remains. They have been reduced to unconsciousness and apparent im-



potence, but they nevertheless continue to exert an indirect influence on the human mind.

The impulses inherent in the oedipus complex are repressed in the child both through fear of punishment and by affection for the rival parent. But the work of repression goes much deeper than this. The child sets up forces within himself which fight the oedipal desires by means of an internalization of the parental taboos; he constructs parent images which represent for him the morality of human society. He then no longer needs pressure from without to resist the forbidden desires. He has formed what Freud called a "superego," the nucleus of his moral conscience.<sup>1</sup> In neuroses the defenses fail partially and the drives tend to overwhelm the ego.

Psychoanalytic treatment aims at inducing the patient to recall the deeds and events, desires and unconscious conflicts – now forgotten or banished from consciousness – which have caused his neurotic disturbance. By giving the patient freedom to express all his thoughts and feelings without any constraint, the psychoanalytic method gives access to the unconscious regions of the personality. The imprints left in childhood on the psychological development of a human being manifest themselves when reactions which originated in the past are found to persevere in later life and when there is a tendency to repeat these reactions.

Now, in the course of this reliving of the past, there is a re-enactment of the reactions of that period, but this time with the psychoanalyst as the object. Freud called this the "transference" to the psychoanalyst of feelings or emotional reactions which had originally been experienced toward people in the patient's entourage. During these transference reactions, erotic and aggressive tendencies are brought to light and also the ego forces which combat them. The ego defenses, in fact, play a very significant part in the course of the analysis. They form the basis of the unconscious resistance which the patient sets up against his treatment and his cure.

What light can psychoanalytic observation of patients throw on the origins and causes of anti-Semitism? The cases which are best known to us and which furnish particularly good opportunities for studying the problem, are those in which the patient exhibits only a latent or moderate degree of anti-Semitism when he comes for treatment. The interesting

---

<sup>1</sup> The id, the ego, and the superego, as defined by Freud, are the three parts which compose the psychic apparatus. They are conceived of as systems of psychic functions. Functions of the id center around the basic needs of man and their striving for gratification. Functions of the ego mediate between these strivings, the outside reality, and the moral demands around which center the functions of the superego.

thing about such cases is that during the course of the analysis these mildly anti-Semitic patients will suddenly reveal strong anti-Semitic prejudice. Psychoanalytic treatment, therefore, offers a good opportunity for a kind of experimental study on the incipient and developmental stages of anti-Semitism.

At some point in the course of analytic treatment almost all non-Jewish patients will manifest varying degrees of anti-Semitism. Almost invariably their reactions confirm Pinsker's observations that the Jew is regarded with a combination of fear and hate, and as a dangerous, mysterious, disturbing, and uncanny personage. These fear and hate reactions become directed toward the analyst in the process of transference. In other words, the patient transfers to the analyst the fear and hate feelings which date back to his childhood and which were originally directed toward his parents. And when the analyst is a Jew, these feelings are attributed to his Jewishness and take the form of transitory anti-Jewish reactions. During these anti-Semitic stages of analysis, the Jew who is hated and feared by the patient in the person of his analyst usually represents to him a deformed image of his father or even of himself.

It should be emphasized that this fearsome figure of the father corresponds only to one part of the patient's feelings toward his real father and usually to an unconscious part. In fact, it is the very patient who is conscious only of admiration and respect for his father who has repressed all his aggression toward him since childhood. We have already explained the importance of ambivalence. It tends to split the father image into two personalities, the "good" father and the "bad" father. In religion, the split is into God and the Devil and in art into Hero and Villain.

During analysis, when the transference is "negative" – i.e., dominated by hostile feelings once experienced toward the father – the Jewish doctor is regarded as the dangerous and sinister Jew. In this sense he can be said to represent to the patient the hated and feared father. Frequently, however, another person who represents authority and who can readily be identified with the analyst is substituted for the father.

I observed a striking example of this mechanism in a young Frenchman whom I analyzed in France in 1940–1941. He was in his twenties, was violently anti-German and apparently devoid of all anti-Semitic prejudice; in fact, anti-Semitism seemed to him typically *boche* and hence particularly detestable. In the course of his analysis he had a dream of a man in a German uniform but with Jewish features, with whom he had to fight to the death. He admitted shamefacedly that in his imagination he had confused me with the enemy who had become both *boche* and Jew. He

then recalled that during his scouting days he had been unfairly treated by a Jewish superior. At the time he had generalized his resentment into an attitude of distrust of all Jews. Later he had overcome this attitude but it revived momentarily during analysis when the question of rivalry with his younger brother aroused in him bitter feelings towards his father whom he reproached for preferring the younger son. Under cover of this transitory anti-Jewish reaction, he could express with impunity a resentment felt in childhood.

The mechanism of "displacement" which operates in transference is a common enough process in everyday life. Pent-up anger against a superior can safely be vented on an innocent inferior: an unhappy woman may "take it out" on her children, a resentful maid on her employer's dishes. In psychoanalysis, the analyst takes the rap for all the patient's accumulated aggressions of childhood, adolescence and even maturity.

Another defense mechanism against the instinctual drives is "projection." Projection, like displacement, plays a big role in normal life also, but it is to be seen with particular clearness in paranoia and related psychoses. Paranoiacs may believe, for example, that others have incited them to sexual acts which they have committed or have desired to commit. Firmly convinced of their own innocence, they blame others as their tempters or as the instigators of their thoughts and actions. The medieval monk who saw in every beautiful woman an incarnation of Satan was projecting his own suppressed desires.

During analysis, projection becomes a complex clinical mechanism. We have seen how repressed desires must be brought into the open in order to surmount them. Patients struggle against becoming conscious of these desires by attributing them to the analyst. At such moments the Jewish analyst may be regarded as a "dirty Jew," sensual and diabolical. Other patients have similar feelings toward the analyst when the analysis begins to free them from the infantile fixations which have occasioned their difficulties. In such stages the patient revives anti-Semitic prejudices long since discarded and apparently overcome. In all these cases the mechanism is the same. When the analysis threatens their pathogenic compromises, they begin to hate and fear the psychoanalyst.

When the patient feels threatened by his own inadmissible instinctual drives he may protest that it is the analyst's fault because with his dirty Jewish imagination he has put such thoughts into his head. This is in miniature a paranoid form of delusion very common among anti-Semites.

Sometimes the neurosis has been built up on passive tendencies repressed in childhood. Neurotics of the passive type often overcompensate for

their tendencies by identifying themselves with heroes or by imitating strong, virile characters. In such cases, when the neurosis breaks through in spite of all efforts at compensation, the analyst has to uncover the repressed passive tendencies to enable his patient to surmount them. Then there occurs a special type of fear reaction – fear that the analyst wants to weaken or emasculate them, or to change them into women. Curiously, in the minds of such patients during this phase, the Jewish analyst is conceived alternately as a mephistophelian personage or as an effeminate, emasculated man. The fact that the Jews are circumcised and so in a sense mutilated stirs up in them superstitious horror, thereby revealing their unconscious fear of being mutilated or castrated as a punishment for forbidden desires.

In some patients, the analyst can observe at first hand the sadistic satisfaction derived consciously or unconsciously from the idea of Jews being tortured and massacred. The structure of this type of satisfaction is very complex. Neurotics who suffer from an intense sense of guilt and who live in anticipation of punishment protect themselves by projecting their faults onto the Jewish analyst or onto Jews in general. They would like to see the Jews tortured and punished in order not to feel guilty themselves. To avoid punishment they would like to assume the punitive role themselves.<sup>2</sup> All such patients think and act at certain moments like fanatical anti-Semites. They make the Jews the scapegoat for their own repressed desires, both sadistic and masochistic.

The reactions of habitual anti-Semites have the same psychological structure as these transitory manifestations of anti-Semitism that occur during analysis.

Naturally, not all neurotics react in these ways, nor do all react with the same intensity during the course of analysis. What sorts of people, then, tend to have these strong reactions? One type is represented by the man who always tends to protect his self-esteem against any undesirable trait in himself by attributing that trait to others. All around him, in his family and among his acquaintances, he detects his own faults and inadmissible intentions. Men of questionable honesty, for example, are quick to accuse others of dishonesty or double dealing. These are the neurotics whose reactions are tinged with paranoid traits.

Another type which becomes an easy prey to anti-Semitism is represented by the man who tends to make a clear-cut separation between his aggressive feelings and his positive, affectionate, and amorous feelings. Such

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Robert C. Bak, "Masochism in Paranoia," *Psychoanalytical Quarterly* 15, 1946.

people are more prone than others to think in terms of the completely admirable or the utterly detestable, and to show marked ambivalence in all emotional relationships. They think in sweeping generalizations and stereotypes. Some of them alternate between love and hate toward the same person, according to whether their vanity is wounded or is flattered at the moment.

Probably the great majority of fanatical anti-Semites belongs to one of these two types, which are often combined. But in their ranks are also found individuals who have been profoundly disillusioned by personal or professional disappointments and failures which they blame on others. They are quick to pick on successful Jews as their scapegoat.

It is impossible to determine the relative importance of the respective factors of inner propensity, specific development or cultural influence in the conditioning of these reactions. Probably all three factors are involved concurrently.<sup>3</sup>

The factors which produce anti-Semitic reactions in analysis are, of course, also operative in the case of Jewish patients and of Gentile patients analyzed by Gentile doctors. In the Jewish patient, the same defense mechanisms come into play; he has the same tendency to generalize, but the threatening attributes of the analyst are not associated in his mind with his being a Jew. I have been told by Gentile analysts, however, that their patients sometimes experience anti-Semitic reactions towards them because psychoanalysis is considered a "Jewish" psychology, because its founder, Freud, was a Jew. In general, however, Jewish patients of Jewish analysts or Jewish patients analyzed by Gentiles make generalizations of a different order; they accuse their analysts of moral obliquities which they attribute to "all doctors" or "all psychoanalysts."

These differences arise from the fact that it is customary and traditional to react to Jews in the way we have just described as typical in certain stages of analysis. In western society, the traditional concept of the Jew as scapegoat is always available. In patients who are devoid of any conscious anti-Semitism, it is sometimes necessary to overcome considerable resistance in releasing anti-Jewish sentiments into consciousness. It is important, incidentally, not to confuse latent anti-Semitism with such normal

---

<sup>3</sup> A remarkable study of the correlation between anti-Semitism and other personality traits has been made by Else Frenkel-Brunswik and R. Nevitt Sanford, *The Anti-Semitic Personality: A Research Report*. Another extensive study is being prepared under the direction of Nathan Ackerman and Marie Jahoda, drawn from material collected by various psychoanalysts. We hope that these and other studies will bring about a better understanding of the interplay of the various factors involved.

transitory reactions as any man has from time to time towards an out-group.

Among the many patients who have assimilated this traditional concept of the Jew as scapegoat from their family and environment, there is one class which is particularly interesting. It was Freud's explanation of anti-Semitism in his book, *Moses and Monotheism*, which gave me an understanding of these patients. Christians regard Jews as the murderers of Christ. According to Freud, by loving and deifying Jesus the Christians feel relieved of the guilt feelings common to all mankind, which arise from death wishes against one's father. Jews who refuse to recognize Christ as God appear to Christians as unrepentant parricides.<sup>4</sup> Among Catholic and Protestant patients, I have noticed that there are various theories, on a conscious level, about the role of the Jews in the life and death of Christ. Some Christians have always been aware of the intimate relationship between Jesus and the Jews of his times. Some are conscious of a bond between the Jews of those distant times and those of the present day. Others recall that when they learned Bible history, they thought of the Jews solely as murderers of Christ. And among the latter, some have such a strong sense of the link between the past and present that they consider Jews of the present generation and of all future generations guilty of the death of Christ. There are, of course, very few people in Western Europe or America today who still hold these convictions. But they were commonly held in the Middle Ages, and even in our epoch they furnished the reason for the pogroms in Czarist Russia and in Poland.

The patients I have in mind in this connection are those whose reactions toward the analyst are extremely complex, and center around the relationship between Christ and the Jews. The contradictory reactions exhibited by these patients in the course of analysis are derived from conflicts of the so-called "latency period" – conflicts to which religious instruction gives particular shape.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Freud used the psychoanalytic method of reconstructing from observed data the forgotten past of an individual's life to approach the "forgotten" (prehistoric) past of humanity. In his book, *Moses and Monotheism*, he applied this method to the very subject with which we are dealing. This book, which contains many penetrating ideas about the nature of Christian anti-Jewish feeling, expands his earlier hypothesis of the father's murder by the primal horde. He applied this hypothesis to the relationship of the Jewish people to their leader, Moses, who, according to Freud, was killed by his followers. Guilt for this deed created in their descendants peculiar submission to God.

<sup>5</sup> During a discussion of the relationship between faith and the psychoanalysis of religious concepts, a believing Christian maintained that the two were perfectly compatible: "Man becomes aware of God through his human faculties, therefore his religious concepts are

To understand what happens in such instances we must go back to the psychological development of the child. The stage which follows the formation of the superego has been called by Freud the latency period. This is the stage in a child's life when the sexual drives are more or less in a state of quiescence. It lasts until the emergence of these drives in full force at puberty. During the latency of the sexual drives, and probably because of it, the child is able to proceed along the path of emotional and moral socialization, a process required of him at this age by his family and by society. The six-year old starts going to school and begins his moral and religious education. He may be considered to have reached the "age of reason" when his superego is formed, but even then his moral development is not complete, and his superego must continue to be built up and strengthened by moral training through the years that follow.

At first the moral requirements of the superego are narrow and rigid. Its gradual adaptation to the social and psychological situation of later life necessitates complicated elaborations on conscious and on unconscious levels. Thus the moral requirements and prestige of the parents will come to be partially replaced by those of teachers, or of social, political, and religious authorities. Admiration for the parents and a tendency to identify with them, especially with the father, yield to admiration and identification with heroes and, most important of all, to worship and faith in God.

Religious teaching is actually one of the most powerful means employed by society to effect the necessary elaboration and consolidation of the superego in the child. Through it, the moral principles representing the demands of the superego can be projected outward, thus becoming infinite and universal. The imperfect, real father is replaced by the perfect, universal God the Father.

Conflicts typical of the end of the latency period center around the need of the superego to hold in check the instinctual drives which tend to become turbulent before the onset of puberty. Among Christian children, initiation into religious life in their first communion intensifies this conflict between the instinctual drives and the moral forces by accentuating repression. A temporary asceticism and feelings of intense guilt may develop in them, with accompanying rebellious drives which may take the form of religious doubts or sacrilegious obsessions.

The religious instruction given to a Christian child, whether it results in neurotic symptoms or not, leaves a deep impression on the patterns of his

---

given human expression, and this human expression may properly become an object of scientific psychoanalytic study."

developing superego. It includes a study of Bible history, since the gospel stories supply prototypes for his moral formation. He is taught to renounce his aggressive instincts and his sexual temptations under threat of punishment in hell, and he is also taught to renounce them for love of Christ. He learns to love Christ and to identify with him. He is told that if he succeeds in repressing his bad instincts Christ will love him.

The Jews, who are described in the gospels as unbelievers and executioners of Christ, become in the imagination of the child so taught the symbols of these bad instincts, the incarnation of every wickedness the child has repressed in himself. On the other hand, since the Christian child identifies with the Son of God, God the Father whom the Jews recognize becomes associated in his mind with the Jews. The Jews are pictured in his mind as the "elders," the older generation – in other words, they become the transformed image of his own father. Thus, the ancient conflict between Christ and the Jews which took place nineteen hundred years ago reflects the child's own past conflicts with his father, and becomes the unconscious symbol of his oedipus complex.

It would perhaps be more correct to say that these religious problems have their psychological counterpart, since it is on a psychological level that the conflicts of the preceding oedipal period are revived in the latency period by religious teaching. The fact that the Jews represent to the Christian child both his own repressed instincts and his father, whom he fears and loves and hates at the same time, is the basis of one of the primary forms of ambivalence toward Jews; i.e., a mixture of hatred, fear, and attachment.

While believing the Jews guilty of Christ's death, Christians cannot help being aware of the close ties which unite the Jews to Christ. The Jews are of the same race as Christ; they saw him; they participated in his death and they witnessed his resurrection; so that in the Christian imagination Christ and the Jews have come to be associated more or less consciously.

Christians must also reckon with the fact that Jesus became the Redeemer only because he was crucified. However violently they may denounce the Jews, the fact remains that the Jews performed the act which alone made Christianity possible. Their role has therefore been odious but indispensable throughout the history of Christianity, since they have borne on their shoulders the curse for the death of Christ. On a spiritual level, the young Christian benefits by the crucifixion. On a psychological, unconscious, level the crucifixion represents to him the culmination of the unconscious death wishes of his oedipal period. The Jew is held responsible for the crime from which the Christian reaps moral and psychological