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*"He felt that life was changeable, fluid, active, and that is allowed it to be stereotyped in any way was death".*

From Oscar Wilde’s *The Importance of Being Earnest*.
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"He felt that life was changeful, fluid, active, and that to allow it to be **stereotyped** in any way was death".

From Oscar Wilde's *De Profundis*. 
It may not be out of place in a piece of psychological research to preface one's findings with a little rigorous self-examination. I must admit that the need for this self-probing was not prompted by any great desire on my part for thoroughness in procedure, but was forced upon me throughout the course of my work by people who were anxious to know why I chose this particular topic for investigation. One frank critic even went so far as to ask if I was a psychological subject at all. Another, with strong psycho-analytical convictions, tentatively attributed my interest to a deep-seated unconscious need within myself to adopt a prejudiced attitude toward other nations. Certainly, it is right and fitting that a research worker should run the gauntlet of such questions. He should be made to give some account of as much time, money, materials and energy expended. But his account need not be given nor its value assessed in terms of the immediate availability of his results for utilitarian or practical purposes. It should be sufficient answer if he can show that he has tackled a "trend" question in psychology.

In other scientific spheres the problems of the time were to pose themselves simultaneously to independent workers in widely separated parts of the world. Psychology is no exception to this rule.
It may not be out of place in a piece of psychological research to preface one's findings with a little rigorous self-examination. I must admit that the need for this self-probing was not prompted by any great desire on my part for thoroughness in procedure, but was forced upon me throughout the course of my work by people who were anxious to know why I chose this particular topic for investigation. One frank critic even went so far as to ask me if it was a psychological subject at all. Another, with strong psycho-analytical convictions, tentatively attributed my interest to a deep-seated unconscious need within myself to adopt a prejudiced attitude toward other nations. Certainly, it is right and fitting that a research worker should run the gauntlet of such questions. He should be made to give some account of so much time, money, materials and energy expended. But his account need not be given nor its value assessed in terms of the immediate availability of his results for utilitarian or practical purposes. It should be sufficient answer if he can show that he has tackled a "trend" question in psychology.

In other scientific spheres the problems of the time seem to pose themselves simultaneously to independent workers in widely separated parts of the world. Psychology is no exception to this rule.
It, too, has its problems of the day and hour, its prevailing "intellectual climates". What a research worker craves above all else is to acquire the almost infallible, and partly intuitive sense of the direction of current research, that is possessed in a high degree by the outstanding men of science. With a lavishness, comparable to that of Mother Nature, the seeds of research seem to be scattered far and wide, in all sorts of unlikely places. Although it would be sheer arrogance for me to claim that the seedling of research that I have tried so carefully to nurture will ever bring forth fruit of reasonable magnitude, I do not think it would be presumptuous to call it a true seed of research, born of the times, a living germ which is well worth attention.

My answer, therefore, to all those who would ask why this topic should be worth study is this. Psychological science, like any other, has its vanguard, its moving frontiers. It is attractive if somewhat audacious for a mere tyro in the field of research to wish to be in the van. This particular piece of investigation was undertaken, because of its seeming paramount importance, because in its modest way it tries to contribute to the understanding of man's social behaviour in the field of international relations. Workers in every part of the world are engaged in the study of this very problem. Each, in his /
his own way may add something of lasting importance to the vast sum of psychological knowledge. As my final justification I would quote Sorokin, who said, "Topics of research do not drop down from the heavens on a few exceptional souls; they lie in the trend of the times".

My objectives in this piece of research can best be expressed firstly in a general, and secondly in a specific form. In its general aspect this research project attempts to deal with the problem of the genesis of prejudice and its relation to the accepted Frustration-Aggression Theory. Specifically, it is limited to a study of one particular type of prejudice, namely the negative attitude known as Ethnic Prejudice in an unselected group of some 850 young people.

Scientific soundness demands at this stage a formulation of hypothesis. This is difficult to do in a clear-cut fashion, without a preliminary clearing of theoretical ground. Therefore, I shall reserve the statement of hypothesis for a later point in my argument, in the hope that increasing clarification and crystallization will come about in the course of time developing theory. Without some hypothesis, no orientation is possible in research, and for this reason I have kept in mind already existing theories of prejudice, and have kept a watch on my findings for any facts which would support or refute them.

The /
The theory which I have kept most steadily in view is that which states that the formation of prejudice comes about in answer to a definite mental need of the organism, and have amplified this with my own personal conviction that this need may be more sociogenic in its origin than we have been led to believe. In this connection I turn most gratefully for support to Wertheimer, who draws attention to a human need which is so often neglected in psychological studies of all kinds, namely the mental need for clarity or what we might call rational thinking, although Wertheimer in his brilliantly written posthumous volume prefers to call it 'productive thinking'.

Many psychologists who at present are chiefly devoting their energies to a study of popular thinking are tending to follow in the wake of Wertheimer, and to revise the older formulation of the normal thought processes as a mere blind tying of stereotyped labels to a collection of superficially related facts. It now seems that far too much emphasis was laid upon the passive and irrational aspects of man's social attitudes. At the present stage of inquiry much is made of the fact that there is constantly taking place in consciousness a process of assimilation of material to existing "frames of reference" the latter being succinctly defined by Krech and Crutchfield as "a term used to denote the functionally related factors."
factors (present and past) which operate at the moment to determine the particular properties of the psychological phenomenon, (such as perception, judgment and affectivity)". This would make allowance for an organised and rational pattern of prejudices.
II.

It is a commonplace too often repeated to be
underestimated how often that man's capacity for
understanding and harnessing the powers of nature
has far outstripped his capacity for understanding and
living amicably with his fellowmen. We live in an
age of ferment. Many believe that the fate of our
present civilization will be decided in the present
century. We who are living in it, are too close
to view it with impartiality. But, with a little

II. THE NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE BIOSOCIAL THEORY
OF PREJUDICE.

of how we consider the demographic specie
census. I think that such an observer would
be mainly impressed, not by the actual magnitude of
the changes which are taking place, but chiefly by the
rate of change on the exponential curve of progress,
within the last five decades. It is the overwhelming
speed of transformation in our physical world that
has taken us unawares and left us behind in a state
of bewilderment. The malaise which is all too
apparent in the present-day world would be diagnosed
as an acute case of maladjustment by some super-human
psychiatrist. "Adjustment to the world in some form
or other is the problem of every individual in the
world to-day."

But thinkers in every field are not without
their concerns for the cure of our obviously decadent
civilization.
II.

It is a commonplace too often repeated to be emphasised here again that man's capacity for understanding and harnessing the powers of nature has far outrun his capacity for understanding and living amicably with his fellowmen. We live in an age of ferment. Many believe that the fate of our present civilization will be decided in the present century. We, who are living in it, are too close to view it with impartiality. But, with a little imagination, we can put ourselves in the position of one who considers the present sub specie aeternitatis. I think that such an observer would be mainly impressed, not by the actual magnitude of the changes which increased mastery over matter has brought about in the world of men but chiefly by the rate of change or the exponential curve of progress, within the last five decades. It is the overwhelming speed of transformation in our physical world that has taken us unawares and left us behind in a state of bewilderment. The malaise which is all too apparent in the present-day world would be diagnosed as an acute case of maladjustment by some supra-human psychiatrist. "Adjustment to the world in some form or other is the problem of every individual in the world to-day".

But thinkers in every field are not without their nostrums for the cure of our obviously decadent civilization/
civilization. The most popular panacea seems to be the application of the scientific method to social thinking and social problems. We increasingly find the words Science and Society in juxtaposition in books, pamphlets, and articles. The achievements of science are undeniable, the scientist argues, therefore, the application of similar methods to the study of social phenomena is the only hope for man. Among the scientists, themselves, however, there are some who are very sceptical about the results of such application of the scientific method. Norbert Wiener, to quote one of these cynics, says in his remarkably well-written book on cybernetics, in reference to this very topic "I mention this matter because of the considerable, and I think, false hopes which some of my friends have built for the social efficacy of whatever new ways of thinking this book may contain. They are certain that our control over our material environment has far outgrown our control over our social environment and our understanding thereof. Therefore, they consider that the main task of the immediate future is to extend to the fields of anthropology, of sociology, of economics, the method of the natural sciences in the hope of achieving a like measure of success in the social fields. From believing this necessary they come to believe it possible. In this, I maintain they show an excessive optimism and a misunderstanding of the nature of all scientific achievement". I quote at this great length /
length, because it seems to me to be an important statement of the views of a whole group of present-day scientists and comes from one who is no narrow specialist, but from one with an almost Leibnizian breadth of mind.

The most laudable attempts to use scientific method in the social field have been made by the anthropologists and sociologists. In more recent years the services of psychologists have been enlisted in the study of man's social problems. Probably no psychologist will ever produce in psychology the analogue of the controlled experiment in general psychology. But for all this his methods need not be depreciated nor dubbed 'unscientific'. Fortified by a more elastic interpretation of what is and what is not scientific, such workers feel there is cause for optimism, and put great faith in the contribution that psychology has made to the understanding of man's unconscious mental processes and believe that such knowledge should be applied to the solution of social problems. No field of human activity seems too unimportant to be ignored. Art, literature, sculpture, and painting contribute their various analyses of the social problems of our day.

It seems that eventually the scientific method will be successfully applied in the social sciences. Everything, however, hinges upon our interpretation of/
of the word "scientific". This is a word which has broken loose from its moorings. It has become almost professionalized, monopolized by the scientists of physical matter. If we allow it to become debased in this way we can certainly never use it for any method applicable to social problems. Scientific method, properly defined is that method which is most appropriate for the material or medium in which the scientist works. In its truest sense, it has an almost ethical connotation, inasmuch that in his search after truth the scientist lays aside all personal considerations and strives faithfully to report the phenomena he has studied. Centuries have helped to evolve the best method for tackling the problems of the physical universe. This has come about more swiftly in the field of physical science than in any other because of man's loose coupling with the phenomena to be studied. Such isolation of scientist and subject matter is obviously difficult in the social field. The greatest hope would seem to lie in an adaptation of present scientific methods as they are found in the physical sciences, to enable us to deal adequately with the no less complex social sciences. That this is not an ill-founded hope can best be seen in the successful adaptations which have already been made in the physical sciences themselves. I am told that /
that in physics, processes which were previously conceived as static in nature, are now discovered to be dynamic, and almost as unpredictable in their future activity as many of man's social actions.

This principle of indeterminacy which has been almost exclusively considered the peculiar attribute of human behaviour, is now being regarded by many of our most eminent scientists as the chief principle behind the forces of the material world as well. If this theory is ever finally established to the satisfaction of conflicting schools of scientific thought it will have important consequences not only for philosophy but also for psychology. The latest trend in scientific thought is all towards the conception of the ultimate nature of the universe as mental. The finest expression of this opinion is probably that given by J.W.N. Sullivan in his book, the Limitations of Science. He puts it thus: "The most disconcerting characteristic of this region is that strict causality as a cardinal assumption in science does not seem to apply. In the motions of individual atoms and electrons there seems to be an element of free-will. Determinism has broken down and the Principle of Indeterminacy has taken its place. There is a great difference of opinion at present as to whether it is a merely temporary technical device. Einstein, Max Planck and others think /
think that strict causality will ultimately be restored in physics, while such men as Eddington and Schrödinger think that determinism must definitely be abandoned".

Whatever may be the outcome of this schism in scientific thought, it is encouraging for the psychologist who has felt himself bogged by the ubiquitous psychological problem of quantification, to find sympathetic points of contact with scientists exclusively concerned with material problems. Too many psychologists in their search for scientific accuracy have framed their problems to fit in with the old Newtonian concept of science. If this point of view is too crampingly inadequate in the realm of physics, how much more so is it likely to be in the realm of psychology. Sullivan goes on to develop his theme in the following words: "The present tendency is to reduce living organisms to mechanical systems. In view of what is happening in physics itself it does not seem likely that this effort will be successful. Particle Physics with simple location in space and time has definitely proved itself inadequate. It is very probable, as Whitehead maintains that the notion of particle will have to be replaced by the notion of organism. In order to avoid a break in continuity the notion of physics will have to be enriched and this enrichment will come from biology. We can look forward /
forward to further synthesis. The science of mind, at present, in such a rudimentary state will one day take control. In the service of this principle its concepts will be extended throughout the whole of nature. Only then will science reach the unity towards which it is aiming and the differences between the sciences of mind, life and matter in their present form will seem to be unreal.

It is greatly reassuring for any psychologist to find that, contrary to what is usually thought, the new trend in psychology towards the organismic approach is precisely the method which is in keeping with the newer attitude in scientific thinking in more purely physical fields, which are ordinarily more fertile in the production of new scientific concepts. The social psychologist, it would seem, therefore need no longer have any qualms about the so-called scientific nature of his investigations. From the pragmatic point of view, it will be enough if he adheres to P.W. Bridgman's extremely down-to-earth definition of the scientific method as he sees it. "The scientific method, as far as it is a method, is nothing more than doing one's damnedest with one's mind, no holds barred".

F.C. Bartlett once said "The great mystery of all conduct is social conduct. I have had to study it all my life but I cannot pretend to understand /
understand it. I may seem to know a man through and through and still I would not dare to say the first thing about what he will do in a group". With what heartiness do we not concur, when giving even the most superficial attention to that ever recurring "mystery" of man's social behaviour, the phenomenon of war on an international scale? The most important item and most urgent item for investigation on the agenda list of any social psychologist must be War and its related problems. That more and more psychologists are being drawn to the study of the youth of the world in the hope of getting at the root causes of wars, is evidenced by some of the contributions of notable psychologists in the symposium, entitled "Human Nature and Enduring Peace", edited by Gardner Murphy. After accounts by Dr. Goodwin Watson and Dr. Margaret Mead on what should be the immediate aim of American educators, the editor sums up in these words: "It follows from these analyses by Drs. Watson and Mead that one of the greatest and most neglected tasks of the post-war planner is the social and psychological study of teachers and children and youth as they are to-day. For though a new world architecture may be expertly set up within a year or two, it will crumble unless we add to our educational planning a continuing study of the attitudes, the readiness for war or peace, Fascism or democracy that are engendered in the experience of school and community".

The /
The politicians of the world, no less exercised about the problem of war have taken characteristic steps to bring about its solution or at least a temporary palliative. The fate of man's latest and probably frailest structure erected in the cause of peace, the United Nations Organization still hangs in the balance. It will only succeed if a psychological change takes place within the mind of every average citizen of the world. In popular speech, this change is tantamount to the abolition of "valley-mindedness", the state of mind of the man, whose psychological horizon coincides with the geographical boundaries of the particular part of the earth's surface with which he is familiar. The all-inclusive, specialized term used by the social psychologist is "ethnocentrism", which has an obverse side, covering many phenomena such as xenophobia, prejudice or scapegoating, and even pessimistic cynicism, apathy and inability to adjust to others.

In an effort to bring about this change in man's thinking, U.N.O. with admirable thoroughness has called upon the services of consulting scientists in some two dozen countries and has asked them to draw up an outline of research projects, which in their judgment are most in need of investigation on an international scale. The final recommendations which have emerged are worthy of our greatest respect, reflecting as they do the combined judgments of scholars representing some fifty institutes of
of research and higher learning in some three hundred
countries in the world.

These recommendations were divided into two
main groups.
A. The development of constructive human relations in
   childhood.
B. The psychological requirements for living in the
   United Nations.

Again and again, on reading these recommendations, one
is impressed by the emphasis which is laid upon
children and young people. Somewhat surprisingly in
such a report, there is even an amusing reference to
the deliberate inclusion of children in future
psychological studies. It runs: "There is a simple,
psychological reason why international bodies often
tend to overlook children. Delegates assemble in an
atmosphere of cameras, microphones, and bald heads.
Where are the children? In an adult world adults tend
to forget them. It has been suggested, half seriously,
that it would be well to arrange the entrances to the
General Assembly, to the Security Council, and Unesco
Headquarters, so that they might lead delegates twice
a day through a nursery school, play-yard... just as
a reminder".

Any social psychological study of Ethnic Prejudice
especially among young people, can never then be
regarded as superfluous or supernumerary, however
nugatory the results may appear to be. If for no other
reason /
reason than that it is in keeping with the type of research spirit that U.N.O. is trying to foster such attempts are always worth while. The results of such studies may by their accretion bring about a state of affairs in which ethnocentrism will be as much an anomaly in man's social world as the old geocentric view of the universe in his material world.

I think that I might hazard the guess that all mature psychologists come to the point, sometime before they die when they admit that nothing psychological is really measurable in spite of some soothingly agreeable, and no doubt useful fictions existing in the sphere of intelligence testing. Another admission which advancing years would probably wring from even the most fervid of psychometricians is that a great deal of psychological experimentation destroys the very nature of the phenomena being considered. Wertheimer for this reason criticized most psychological studies for excluding that which was most 'vivid and real' in the living phenomena, that they somehow lost the very thing that really mattered. William Stern has a similar complaint when he says "The more exact an experiment is, that is, the more elementary and isolated the phenomenon and the more constant the conditions, the greater is its artificiality and the greater its distance from the study of the individual".

These two admissions at the start of any piece of psychological research are paralysing in the extreme.
Even if we succeed in stripping the psychological phenomenon, which interests us of all the extraneous circumstances surrounding it, and having extricated it from the web and woof of living reality, subject it to the one variable influence, which is crucial for our experiment can our results mean anything, if the conditions from which they emanated are purely factitious. Artifacts, as such spurious results are called, probably abound more in psychology than in any other science under the sun.

In what way can one hope to measure prejudice? In this investigation I have cut the Gordian knot by making no attempt to measure prejudice. I do not believe it possible. I have worked on the assumption that the best way to find out what people think is to ask them. Verbal expression, written or otherwise, is a form of behaviour, which is indeed worthy of study, possessing such overwhelming influence as it does in the society of to-day. As Aldous Huxley expressed it "The pen and the voice are at least as mighty as the sword; for the sword is wielded in obedience to the spoken or the written word". It is the overt verbal expression therefore of ethnic prejudice, which will be studied in this investigation. The nearest assessment to the quantitative assessment of prejudice will be the quantitative and qualitative analyses of the verbal expressions of the subjects.

No experimental situation was created. The subjects /
subjects were merely under the impression that a study of likes and dislikes was being carried out, and their co-operation was invited. They were requested to say exactly what they thought and felt, with the assurance that no one but the investigator would ever know who had written which particular responses. This all-too-simple set up leads to difficulties at later stages in the manipulation of data. It is usually found that stiffly controlled experimental set up yields data which almost classifies itself and dove-tails neatly into the pre-existing conceptual framework hand of the experimenter. On the other hand, the loosely arranged experimental or pseudo-experimental set up, produces a somewhat inchoate mass of data, sometimes defying analysis, but compensating for this by its undeniably greater psychological richness.

Throughout this study, I have sacrificed neat categorization with its easy transition into exact statistical computation for the incomparably richer psychological material, difficult to straitjacket into the usual statistical statement.

It is not our intention to measure prejudice, since there can be no measurement without a scale. However, since there is no scale which does not depend on the central tendencies and dispersion of the opinions of many people, we shall perhaps have a rough approximation to a measure by including in our /
our investigation as many subjects as possible. Moreover, there seems to be no compelling reason for the exclusion of data of a more introspective nature from the investigation which attempts to measure an attitude. That this outlook has been the accepted one in social psychology is emphasized by Krech and Crutchfield, and somewhat deplored. They express it in the following words. "There has been, on the whole, a traditional tendency to discount the "introspective" data as a basis for attitude and belief measurement, but there is not as this book repeatedly emphasizes any reason why techniques utilizing the data of immediate experience cannot be as reliable and as informative as other more objective techniques of measurement".

To anyone, fighting shy of committing himself to a clear-cut hypothesis, the postulational method of procedure comes as a great relief. Kantor is one of many research workers who believe it is the ideal way. To quote the relevant passage from one of his works: "Actually, the postulational procedure as a phase of the interpretative enterprise operates throughout the entire course of scientific investigation. It is not far-fetched to say that postulates are propositions which the worker sets up by way of systematizing his findings. In this sense, the interpretative level represents the worker's essential appreciation of this problem and results. In the ideal case scientific interpretation /
interpretation consists of the modifications of one's pre-suppositions during the course of one's inter-behaviour with the phenomena studied". So that to progress by a series of postulates is no less "scientific" than to demand from one's self a statement of hypothesis at the outset.

Since I am going to draw heavily upon the theory of homeostasis for the support of my first two postulates it may be fitting at this stage to indicate its importance for psychological theory. It was Charles Richet, the French physiologist, who, following in the tradition of Claud Bernard, in 1900 drew attention to the healthy variety of stability which is sought by all organisms. He wrote "The living being is stable. It must be so in order not to be destroyed, dissolved, or disintegrated by the colossal forces, often adverse which surround it. By an apparent contradiction, it maintains its stability, only if it is excitable and capable of modifying itself according to the external stimuli, and adjusting its response to the stimulation. In a sense it is stable because it is modifiable; the slight instability is the necessary condition for the true stability of the organism." This quotation might be taken in its entirety and inserted without causing any jar of inappropriateness in any modern text-book, dealing with the bio-social process of interaction /
interaction, going on all the time between the organism and environment.

When Cannon himself invented the special designation "homeostasis" to cover this process in a purely physiological sense, he had visions of its wider application in the future to other fields of human endeavour, especially the field of social organization. I quote the relevant section of his book: "It seemed not impossible that the means employed by the more highly evolved animals for preserving uniform and stable their internal economy (i.e. for preserving homeostasis) may present some general principles for the establishment, regulation and control of steady states, that would be suggestive for other kinds of organization. - even social and industrial - which suffer from distressing perturbations. Perhaps a comparative study would show that every complex organization must have more or less effective self-righting adjustment in order to prevent a check on its functions or a rapid disintegration of its parts when subjected to stress".

That view was expressed a long time ago by Cannon, but very recently the principle of homeostasis has been eagerly seized upon by psychologists as an explanatory principle which can be applied to more purely psychological processes. Encouraged by such precedents I venture to attribute the genesis of /
of prejudice to a failure in the homeostatic process of coming to terms psychologically with one's environment. By way of support it may be interesting to draw attention to some aspects of the application of the homeostatic principle in the field of psychological forces. There is a fine paragraph, very much to the point, written by Christian Weber in the Psychological Review of July 1949. "Why is it that of all consciously experienced goal-seeking the ideals of truth, beauty and love are set above others? Part of the reason for this is that they are really not ultimate goals at all but only directions in which behaviour can move. They allow progress but can never be attained or perfected. They provide for an ever-shifting equilibrium, like the moments of time itself, attained, only to be lost again. In short, ideals offer the best assurance of homeostatic balance perpetually falling short of attainment in the conscious sphere. The attainment of stable homeostasis is another name for dying. Cannon shows that the onset of old age is heralded by the increasing permanence of the homeostasis attained. The physical inertia of the corpse is the point where homeostasis leaves off and the principle of equilibrium begins to reign."

Without getting involved in the body-mind problem, we can agree with Christian Weber that "the organism /
organism and its mind, whether substantially different or not, alike dwell in an alien, external world, contacts with which are prevailing threats against or promises of survival. Hence, adaptation and emergency action are the common principles of biological and psychological science. It is in this sense that Cannon's physiological principle of homeostasis and the more physical and more recently promulgated concepts of servo-theory have been successfully applied to aspects of behaviour. Both concepts, however, homeostasis and servo-theory are so absolutely new in their application to mental processes that it may be a little premature to insist upon their relevance to the topic of prejudice. In psychological terms to be prejudiced, it seems to me is, to have died a little. It is characteristic of psychological ageing.

Perhaps a word or two needs to be said to justify my dragging in the principle of homeostasis like a deus ex machina to get out of a theoretical tight spot. It may not seem quite so wildly fanciful if we take a glance at the many extremely recent applications of this physiological principle of homeostasis and the more physical and more recently evolved concept of servo-theory or servo-mechanisms. 

Servo-theory is akin to the concept of homeostasis in that essentially it describes a process of

* See Note at the end of this section on Page following Page 87.
of returning to normal tempo and direction after deviation, but it may be found operating in purely physical systems. Interestingly enough, servo-theory is often found to be more adequate to explain certain behavioural processes in a more psychologically satisfying manner than the older concept and more widely understood concept of homeostasis. Nevertheless there is implicit, in both concepts the setting up of a balance, a balance between state of emergency and adaptation, of a dynamic type, responsive to change in environment by some internal adjustment.

We may list the many varied psychological processes which the theory of homeostasis has been made more or less successfully to explain.

(1) Colour vision, after-images of seen movement.
(2) Resistance to mental distraction and unfavourable temperature during work.
(3) Perceptual constancy phenomenon.
(4) Aspiration level.
(5) In the sphere of maladjustment.
(6) The instincts considered as autonomous drives in the nature of unconscious mechanisms.
(7) The view of homeostasis of being instinctive and directed towards the attainment of security in a complex environment. "It leads to conservative and orderly behaviour and preference for the familiar". (Cf. ethnocentrism). Regression is a way of attaining these stable states in the face of severe stress.
L. S. Kubie conceives instincts as demands made by the body on mental functions.

R. M. Lindner finds analogies between organic homeostasis and the behavior of psychopaths. The patient guards against disintegration due to inner tensions by an overflow of energy resulting in the familiar syndrome of hostility and destructive tendencies.

K. Van Vorst accepts this analysis and notes the individual ways of restoring homeostatic balance and attributes the consistently rebellious and predatory behavior of the psychopath to a weakening of restraining forces in the personality.

It would seem, therefore, that prejudice arises not in answer to a definite need of the organism, but rather on the failure of the interaction process arising from a need of the organism. This need is partly biogenic and partly sociogenic in its origin. It is biogenic in that there is a definite need within the organism for the satisfying tension that coming to terms with one's environment brings in its train. This healthy adaptation or adjustment brings about a feeling of satiation, akin to that which follows the satisfaction of any of the primary purely biological needs or specific drives as ordinarily described in psychology textbooks. Perhaps this drive or need might best be understood by a reference to Goldstein, who took a definite stand against the concept of specific drives.
(in his terminology 'the so-called specific drives') in his efforts to establish the simple general drive i.e. the drive for self-actualization. To quote: "If a human being is forced to live in a state of hunger for a long time, or if there are conditions in his body which produce a strong hunger feeling, so that he is urged to release this feeling, it disturbs the self-actualization of his whole personality. Then he appears as if under a hunger drive". Chacun fait son salut comme il peut. Each of us strives in every way he can to achieve the inner comfort or experience of equilibrium that is brought about by the successful fitting of the tension-producing element in the situation into his existing frames of reference. It is quite plausible that this feeling of inner satisfaction, which is subsequent upon the successful coming-to-terms with one's environment might well be that which accompanies the successful termination of one phase of the self-actualization process.

This need is also sociogenically determined in that the frames of reference at the disposal of each one of us are largely the products of social-cultural forces. Individuals are more or less adequately equipped to bring about the feeling of achieved satisfaction, the sense of inner balance created by homeostasis. In any process of biosocial interaction, aiming at the healthy homeostatic balance complexity must be met with complexity, simplicity with simplicity. It /
It requires complex frames of reference to deal adequately with complexity in the external situation. The inadequate frame of reference on encountering a complex external situation can only produce equilibrium, if the complexity of the situation is ignored or unrealised. As Christian Weber said that truth, beauty and love are ideals never attained likewise the true complexity of any situation is probably never fully coped with by any human being. It is probably in the sense which we give to the word "inadequate" that there lies any originality that this hypothesis may have. I would maintain that it is the "prejudiced" individual who finds himself most adequately equipped for achieving inner satisfaction of the unhealthy variety. For various reasons, perhaps lack of innate capacity, paucity or inferiority of frames of reference or at the other extreme perhaps every multiplicity and superiority of frames of reference, he attains the inner balance most easily and maintains it with similar facility. The bigoted ignoramus and the bigoted expert are alike in being prejudiced, in having pushed the homeostatic balance further than is desirable for healthy equilibrium. Many studies have been undertaken to show that the prejudiced is insecure. But it seems to me that in this there has been too glib an assumption that external insecurity, usually the result of socio-economic conditions is paralleled by a state of internal psychological /
psychological insecurity, manifesting itself in prejudiced attitudes. It is not at all improbable that external insecurity creates by way of compensation the optimal conditions for the production of a secure tightly structured framework within the organism. Similarly, in many studies dealing with the prejudiced so much stress has been laid upon the unconscious irrational forces which operate in the formation and maintenance of prejudices that we even find writers positing a definite need or craving for irrationality in man's make-up. Crawshay-Williams devotes the whole of his book to the thesis that follows. "There is in every adult a natural though unconscious tendency to think irrationally rather rationally". It is time that support were given to the opposite and as easily defended thesis that there is a definite, strong tendency in all human beings, whether of low-grade or high-grade intelligence to achieve clarity in all their thinking processes as far as in them lies. Wertheimer is the great exponent of this theory, developing it from his initial stand regarding the principle of Prägnanz in perception. He repeatedly asserts that the organisation of the field is as simple and clear as the conditions will allow. He even emphasises the importance of this principle in the special field of social psychology in these words - "Such issues play an enormous role in the personal, social, and political field." Often in political discussions, in political views, one realizes the /
the impact of the Pragnanz principle in the almost irresistible tendency, the strong desire to get a simple, decisive structurization of the field, to get clear-cut orientation, to act sensibly, not to be blind, not to act fortuitously. There is a thirst for true orientation". In another context, he says: "I hope that the reader will not misunderstand the philosophical meaning of this approach. When a picture is given here of the inner structural dynamics in the determination of process it does not mean that in this development man is merely passive. An attitude is implied on his part, a willingness to face problems straight, a readiness to follow up courageously and sincerely a desire for improvement, in contrast with arbitrary, wilful or slavish attitudes. This, I think, is one of the great attributes that constitute the dignity of man".

Moreover, the dichotomous distinction between rational thinking and irrational thinking seems to be just as deleterious in its effect upon psychological thinking as the distinction drawn by the older psychologists between thinking and feeling. Thinking which is prejudiced is described as irrational thinking, presumably because it does not exhibit the characteristics of a good sensible thought process, namely a true solution of the problem reached by logically correct operations, ending in a result which is proved correct, universally /
universally correct. This seems to be a non-
psychological way of regarding the thought process.
It is more logical than psychological. It is more
concerned with the means employed than in the end-
solution. Thinking, however, is not merely concerned
with means. The most important orienting factor in
any thought process is the end-solution. Irrational
thinking is an attempt at rational thinking which has
failed of its purpose. It ends in a poor gestalt
because the true structural significance of the means-
end relationship has not been adequately appreciated.
It is poor rational thinking. The important thing to
remember is that this evaluation is seldom made by the
so-called thinker himself. To him it is a gestalt
which is probably satisfying in the extreme. The
prejudiced are often the smuggest, most self-satisfied
of people.

Irrational thinking is not the opposite of
rational thinking. It is thinking which attempts
rationality and fails of its purpose. Someone aptly
described the psycho-analytical defence mechanism of
rationalization as an attempt to find the good reason
instead of the real one. But there is nothing abnormal
about this way of thinking. It is characteristic of
all of man's thought processes. The good reasons,
the ones which bring about the satisfying gestalt are the real ones for the thinker. That they would not be arrived at by any other impartial thinker in no way detracts from their essentially rational intention, namely the filling of the gap in the structurization of the problem-situation. If we may be pardoned for a lengthy quotation from Krech and Crutchfield we may obtain additional support from recent social-psychological research. "The meaning of the phenomena of "rationalization" has been much misunderstood. It has commonly been regarded as evidence of man's irrationality, whereas in truth it should rather be taken as evidence of just the opposite. If man showed no such strong tendencies towards rationalization - justification in terms of "reasons" - then we might be justified in calling him irrational. The existence of rationalization is one of the clearest demonstrations of the need for and striving after the only kind of logic that is available to the individual, - the logic of his own psychological world. The real significance of the phenomenon of rationalization is in what it indicates concerning the dynamic character of the basic cognitive and perceptual processes - the mutually adaptive and integrative adjustments of the various mental organizations to one another, beliefs, attitudes, needs, emotions and perceptions."
Working on my hypothesis I should find it well supported if prejudiced attitudes towards other nations were closely and even dynamically related to the frames of reference already formed within the minds of the subjects. What another nation means to the subjects psychologically will depend on how exactly it fits into this framework. I hope to show that the prejudiced are those who carry out more easily the process of filling the gap. Whereas other studies have tried to show that the socially underprivileged tend to be prejudiced because of the imbalance set up within them by feelings of insecurity, I wish to show that it is the psychologically secure, whose frames of reference have hardened into a final rigidity conducive to a static equilibrium, who are the prejudiced. It seems to me that it is not without reason that the common-sense view of the fair-minded or unprejudiced is that of a man with an open mind. I hope to show that, paradoxically enough the most prejudiced individual is the one with the greatest sense of inner security, and that the least prejudiced is the one who fundamentally has not achieved static equilibrium in the particular cognitive structure concerned, and who has maintained his relevant frames of reference in a greater state of fluidity or plasticity. This might account for the fact found/
found in ordinary experience that certain individuals may be bigoted, dogmatic, and prejudiced in certain areas of their thinking, while maintaining a sane, balanced outlook in others. No individual appears to be equally prejudiced in all areas.

What cannot be emphasised enough is that prejudiced thinking is not sui generis, but shows the same dynamic characteristics of all man's thinking processes. For final support we need only quote further from Krech and Crutchfield. "From the psychological point of view man is not quite the irrational being he is often made out to be by the cynic and the propagandist. That he is not is supported by the great extent to which man's beliefs resist change, by the extent to which his beliefs change meaningfully, and by the deep-rooted need for clarification which makes an active search for facts one of the outstanding features of man's mental life. In other words, this rationality of man's cognitive processes is seen in his distortion and selection of facts to make them appear reasonable just as well as in his more adjustive and objectively successful thinking. To illustrate this we might examine the significance of "logic-tight" compartments characteristic of some mental processes, rationalization, superstition, delusions, prejudices and stereotypes".

The /
The basic importance of perception processes in the field of social psychology has been amply illustrated in theoretical and experimental studies of all kinds, but not quite so much attention has been given to the immeasurably more important processes of cognition. Of course, in these studies the influence of the cognitive processes has usually made itself felt and has been taken into account as an important factor determining perception. F.C. Bartlett in his work on "Remembering" illustrated the effect of organizational factors operating over a period of time. These functional factors revealed themselves as levelling or sharpening tendencies, largely determined by the cultural frames of reference of his subjects. These factors also produce similar effects in immediate perception. More stress requires to be laid, however, upon the process of cognitive organization itself. Cognitive organization is admittedly an important functional determinant in perception, therefore, it should occupy a pre-eminent position in any study dealing with man's perception of his fellow-men. In simple language, what we see or feel, depends to a great extent on what we already know, and what we already know depends on the kind of life we have led and where and psychologists how we have led it. Future will perhaps devote more attention to the problem "To what extent is our personal perception influenced by our personal cognitive structures and also by our personal systems of cognitive organizations?"
I should like to show that it appears that the cognitive structure of the prejudiced must be better integrated (though not necessarily better differentiated) more isolated and more rigid than that of the unprejudiced. Moreover, it would seem that cognitive organization is in its ease and rapidity a function of the cognitive structure itself, a relatively simple structure leading to a greater facility of the organizational process, with consequent swifter attainment of the end-state of satisfaction which terminates the thought-process involved. It cannot be too greatly stressed that the simplicity to which I refer is not to be confused with paucity of psychological concepts. The ignorant and the expert in any field may be equally bigoted and prejudiced. If it is pardonable to wrest a line of poetry from its context and twist it into a new significance, we may quote from Browning: "On earth the broken arc, in Heaven the perfect round". It may be that the simplicity of the expert is born of perfection or near-perfection. But the perfect round is also found on earth -- the full gestalt of nothingness or completion.

It is my purpose in this investigation to study international awareness from the cognitive standpoint. In an endeavour to arrive at a finer appreciation /
appreciation of inter-individual and intra-individual variations, I shall strive to combine the statistical and dynamic approaches. Traditionally, social psychological investigations usually follow the now almost classic mass-statistical methods. In many quantitative studies depth-psychological methods are usually neglected as not being amenable to such manipulation. But might not an amalgam of the two approaches, bringing in the methods and concepts of the newer dynamic theories of personality and productive thinking, help to make such mass-information as we can obtain more meaningful psychologically?

Someone once divided all psychological phenomena into three distinct groups. (1) Universal; (2) Idiosyncratic or non-cultural; (3) Cultural. I should like to adapt for my own purposes this three-fold division. One useful way of regarding an individual's cognitive structures is as products of the process of socialization. In those frames of reference coming under the first category the influence of the prevailing culture would be nil. Into the second group would fall those cognitive structures which had arisen mainly as the result of the unique personal milieu or psychological life-space of the individual. Under group three would come the cognitive structures which may be regarded as the norm for the particular /
particular group concerned. Cognitive structures which are universal are difficult to imagine but probably do exist. They would probably arise in connection with man's most primal need, namely the need to come to terms with the universe and such fundamental changes of life and death as might be necessary for inner security. They would arise in answer to problems which are posed to man in general, stripped of all biological, geographical and cultural variations. Obviously, such cognitive structures do not concern us here.

The next two divisions, namely idiosyncratic and cultural, however, are very much to the point in this study. It is only by studying fairly large numbers of people that we can become aware of what might be called the prevailing cognitive structures of the group. Likewise it is only by using large numbers that we are able to use these as a background for the clearer delineation of the idiosyncratic or atypical. It is at this point that the newer dynamic approach to personality study is important, more especially when these atypical individuals exhibit in an extreme degree the psychological phenomenon which is being studied.

It is my intention in this study to rate the verbal manifestation of ethnic prejudice in a fairly large group of young people and thus to establish a tentative /
tentative cultural norm for such prejudice and to note the range of its distribution. The extremes, those with the very high and the very low prejudice scores are those whose cognitive structures in the field of international awareness will come under the closest scrutiny, in an endeavour to establish the soundness of our hypothesis. These extremes the "Highs and the "Lows" are also very interesting. As much intensive study will be carried out as is possible in the circumstances. We shall ask ourselves the question "Does the highly prejudiced have what we have decided to call an "idiosyncratic" or "atypical" cognitive structure? or does he have one which we might conveniently call "cultural"? Secondly, we shall ask "Does the highly prejudiced exhibit any type of insecurity, either external or internal? To answer the latter we shall have recourse to such projective techniques as are deemed advisable. Since we shall have occasion throughout this study to refer to the norms and what is normal it may be pertinent at this point to define our conception of the normal. Morgan mentions three types of possible definitions of abnormality. They are (1) the normative, (2) the pathological, and (3) the statistical. Owing to the nature of our data we must content ourselves with a statistico-relative concept/
concept of normality. We are assuming in this investigation that the normal is not very far away from the fictitious individual who occupies the modal point in our distribution. Psychologists who take a different view of prejudice in all its manifestations would prefer other concepts, probably the normative or even the pathological. Some psychologists even define prejudice as "the paranoia of the normal".

While we are clearing up small points of definition, this might be a good place at which to make clear the distinction which we have implicitly drawn in an earlier context between "culture" and "milieu". Just as the physical world can have two kinds of reality, so may also the non-physical world, or the "superorganic" as it has been called by sociologists, since the time of Herbert Spencer. Just as some selective process determines how the geographical environment will be translated into the behavioural or psychological environment of the individual, a person's milieu is really his psychological life-space. It is the organized residue of all he has extracted from all the social and cultural forces which have ever impinged upon him. Although it is for ever undergoing a process of change and re-organization it is best represented statically at any moment in time by the nature and organization /
organization of his cognitive structures. Other psychologists have expressed what is essentially the same point of view in other words. "The clearest, most uniform and most consistent view of an individual personality appears to be embodied in what the world means to the person .... We seek the private world of the individual; we wish to know in what private world he lives and how he sees the everyday situations which other people see in other ways". In other terms "The psychologist who is interested in describing the political attitudes of, say, the small business man, must determine for the members of that class the cognitive contents of their political world. To get a good description of a man's cognitive world is difficult. Nevertheless, this task is an essential objective for the social psychologist. (Emphasis mine).

Obviously, the role of past experience in the development of cognitive structures is of paramount importance, and this may be seen by some as a point of view that is incompatible with our preferred theory of the process of cognition which has obvious Gestalt leanings. Again, I turn to Wertheimer for support, when he says: "There are still psychologists who, in a basic misunderstanding, think that gestalt theory tends to underestimate the role of past experience. Gestalt theory tends to differentiate between and-summation aggregates, on the one hand, and gestalten structures /
structures on the other, both in sub-wholes and in the total field and to develop appropriate scientific tools for investigating the latter.

The crucial question is not whether past experience but what kind of past experience plays a role—blind connections or structural grasp with resulting sensible transposing; also how material gains from past experience come in, whether by external recall, or on the basis of structural requirements, of material functional fitness”.

Social psychology is greatly indebted to the fruitful genius and highly original concepts of Kurt Lewin. He can be regarded as largely responsible for a new orientation in the field of social psychology, ending to bring about a better fusion of individualistic and social emphasis; a more balanced, view of the combined operation of the personal and social determinants of conduct. Some of his experimentally derived concepts, such as the Zeigarnik effect, the level of aspiration, differentiation, detour, escape from the field, time perspective, cognitive structure, levels of reality, barrier, satiation, life space, marginal affiliation, group decision etc. have had an influence upon social psychological thought which promises to be permanent. Lewin may be said to have ushered in the fourth phase of social psychological thought. The three preceding phases in/
in the development of social psychology as a distinct discipline may be regarded as (1) the simplicist era existing prior to 1910, when writers evolved their own explanatory theory of social behaviour, mainly by a process of pure ratiocination, unhampered by empiricistic support or verification. In almost all cases, one narrowly conceived mental mechanism was assumed to be the root of all social behaviour. Great ingenuity was often shown in the way in which such theories were made to account for the most diverse types of phenomena. In this group fall such writers as Hobbes, Comte, Mill, Spencer, Bagehot, Tarde, Le Bon, Ross, McDougall and others.

This was followed by what is sometimes known as the individualistic era. In it we find McDougall with his all-embracing theory of instincts to explain social as well as individual conduct and his concept of the group mind. In this period is also found a radically different approach to social behaviour, bearing the distinctive stamp of the psycho-analytic school of Freud and his followers.

About two decades ago began what might be called the culture-pattern era, when there arose a school of psychological thought which placed the greatest emphasis upon the situation, either immediate or remote in determining conduct. Such concepts as status role, caste and pattern were given re-definition, and fresh allocation within the body of social psychological doctrine.
Then the Lewinian influence made itself felt with a new aspect of the situation stressed. Neither the cultural stimuli alone, nor past experience alone were the all-important determinants to be isolated for study. For the first time the nexus of forces operating between the individual and his situation is seen as a field or system of tensions with areas of greater or less stress, the resolution of which provides the goal towards which the individual's behaviour is directed.

The fourth phase which has recently emerged, after receiving the full impact of Köhler, Lewin and Tolman, seems to have as its outstanding characteristic a more comprehensive view of social behaviour as the resultant of a process of tension-reduction between the individual and the situation, plus added skill in the handling of variables, sociological and otherwise, and the application of experimentally derived concepts to full-bodied group-phenomena. An investigation such as we have undertaken here is difficult to bring into line with this particular trend in modern social psychology.

A full-bodied life situation yielding opportunities for the study of ethnic prejudice would be one involving race discrimination or an international war situation, which are two possible objective manifestations of prejudiced attitudes. Race discrimination, in all its /
its common forms, always seems to involve a question of colour. This aspect of ethnic prejudice has received a great deal of study and research. To judge from the great number of theories put forward to explain it, it is much more easily reduced to psychological terms than the more difficult to define form, which is international prejudice.

Modern warfare as we have known it within the present century has not involved the pitting of black against white. Colour has not been the vital issue. It has been a matter of nation against nation. For a psychologist no area of human behaviour could possibly be of deeper concern than the field of human activity showing what men are willing to die for. At one time in history, men made martyrs of themselves to uphold their religious beliefs. At other periods they have done the same for the advancement of science, in the face of all obstacles to progress. Yet, in this century, ordinary peaceable people are willing to take part in a kind of savagery, on a scale unequalled in previous history for something, which many of them would have the greatest difficulty in defining. The world to-day is an arena of warring ideologies. I know that in using this word I am making use of one which is somewhat eschewed by psychologists, but this has been due mainly to the tardiness of psychologists in applying their knowledge to social and even political /
political problems. Their restraint has perhaps been due to the uncertainty surrounding the definition of the word. The dictionary gives as its definition "the science of ideas (also) visionary speculation or (2) ideas at the basis of some economic or political theory or system". In actual fact, however, the word has a much wider range of usefulness. In its extended use we find that it is used to include the basic ideas (or rather the assumptions underlying any system of ideas, political, economic, religious, philosophical or scientific). Perhaps because it has been so often used in this broad, vague sense that psychologists tend to avoid using it. Yet even the man in the street realizes that an ideology, at least in the domain of politics represents something which is essentially psychological in nature and what is of greater importance that it possesses amazing potentialities as a mover of men's conduct. The ideal text-book on social psychology, when it is written, will, I am almost certain, devote some of its chapters to the discussion of the psychological nature of ideologies. The following quotation, although not chosen from a psychologist, shows a great deal of psychological penetration and has much bearing on the method of investigation I have chosen. "How are we to discover and analyse the structure of the /
the ideology of an individual? Broadly speaking, by studying his behaviour, but more particularly, by studying that part of his behaviour which largely arises from or manifests his conscious intentions (this aspect of human behaviour tends to be excluded from the field of psychology - a science which rather confines itself to the study of the more automatic or involuntary aspects of behaviour). Although intentional or voluntary behaviour may include such forms as locomotion, movements of the muscles etc. it is to the form of speech - or more properly the spoken or written utterance of the thought - that we must turn for the study of the most direct expression of an individual's conscious intentions. In other words, in order to study the ideology of a person, we must mainly study what he says and also the manner in which it is said, also we must make a comparative study of the utterances of this person with the utterances of others". In this study, the words 'cognitive structure' will correspond very closely to this layman's use of the word 'ideology'.

The interbehaviour of nations is functionally dependent upon the prevailing cognitive structures of the people within them. In most societies, there seems to be two influences operating to determine whether it shall be mainly co-operative or competitive
in nature. These are its structure and its ideals, or ideologies to use the word which is more in keeping with the spirit of the times. The study of structure is best left to the sociologist or anthropologist but ideologies concern the psychologist. In social psychology, far more important than the study of structures is the study of the group valuations, 'the definition of situations' as Thomas calls it. To me, it seems that the most important definition of all would be the prevailing idea of what is worth going to war about. Religion is no longer the live issue it once was. Economic considerations even do not have the weight that many people attribute to them. As yet, we have not found class pitted against class on a world scale. The only area of human conflict which is electrically charged with tension at the present time, at least on a world scale is the field of international politics. For an ideal which most people could not formulate in words millions of men have already died and very probably will die in the future. The social disease of anti-semitism is a cancer in our modern civilization which is pernicious in the extreme but cannot even approach in its potential peril the impelling force found in the psychological impetus given to mass-behaviour by the attitudes of international prejudice. Thouless in his introduction to Lowy's book on prejudice, called 'Co-operation, Toleration and
and Prejudice' says something extremely apposite in the following words: "It is indeed easy to criticize anti-semitism as a typical prejudice for the purpose of illustration of a discussion on prejudice. But it must not be forgotten that this is not the prejudice most likely to endanger world peace in the immediate future. In this respect, prejudices against the Germans and against Communists are much more dangerous and there is some risk that these prejudices may grow up unchecked while we are concentrating our attention on the undermining of anti-semitism. Because these prejudices are more immediately dangerous, having more serious present-day practical implications, they are more difficult to discuss factually. Had Thouless pursued the topic, no doubt, he would have added 'and almost impossible to investigate psychologically'.

Psychology and all appertaining thereto is subject to the same mechanism of prejudice as any other field of human endeavour. An impasse is created, when the existence of prejudice impedes the investigation of prejudice.

Kimball Young in his Handbook of Social Psychology defines prejudice as a composite of stereotypes, myths and legends in which a group label is used to classify characterize and define an individual or group considered as a totality. In further definitions of stereotypes /
stereotypes he indicates their importance for the individual's conception of reality. "Social-cultural reality" he says "is largely determined by irrational beliefs, culturized fantasies, and all the psychological baggage which makes up stereotype, myth, and legend. This is nowhere better illustrated than in the case of prejudice".

Other writers stress the affective element. "The term prejudice is often used to indicate negative reaction to any object, animate or inanimate. Thus we say of a man that he is prejudiced against popular music, against spinach, against cats. So used, prejudice means only dislike. As indicative of negative identification of a person-to-person order, however, prejudice means something far more complex than dislike".

In other definitions, the nature of the psychological disturbance involved assumes much larger proportions. For example, prejudice is one symptom of psychological stress - whether generated by present situations or by past memories. The person practising or actively receiving prejudice is expressing an emotional disturbance.

It is not easy to distinguish the effects of prejudice from those of other psychologically difficult experiences. Instances of racial and religious prejudices are interwoven with the other incidents and constitute an added number of hostilities.

Most theories of prejudice which have been put forward to date do recognize the main one important fact/
fact that prejudice arises in answer to some need of the individual. Those theories which limit themselves to a purely motivational analysis, however, do not seem to be able to account satisfactorily for all the facts. The more enlightened approach to the analysis of prejudice has brought forth elucidation by clearly showing that prejudice not only does something for the individual in the way of need-fulfilment but also something to the person. Although it may have arisen in the service of emotional experience and needs it has repercussions in the form of guilt feelings, conflicts, aggressive or defence reactions.

The needs that prejudice has been alleged to serve may be regarded as an inventory of all the needs of man. Different writers show predilections for different needs and build their theories around them. The mere listing of a few here will help to show the close tie existing between the particular need-fulfilment mentioned and the accompanying biosocial process of interaction. The manifold diversity of the forms of prejudice is a kind of 'endemic' phenomenon intimately related to the social matrix within which it is embedded.

(1) Prejudice may act in the service of the peculiar need of pathological systems, involving free-floating aggression, sadistic and paranoiac tendencies.

(2) It may operate in the service of the frustration-aggression sequence as we have already seen.
(3) It may act in the service of culturally disapproved needs, which may thus obtain a kind of vicarious satisfaction.

(4) It may operate in the service of culturally disapproved means.

(5) It may operate in the service of meaning in ambiguous crisis situations.

(6) It may operate to release repressed tensions. The work of the Frenkel-Brunswik group, which has made a most exhaustive study of prejudice, especially anti-semitism is along these lines.

(7) Prejudice may act in the service of self-regard and social conformity. In this case the specific need would appear to be induced by the person's conception of himself and also by the perception of the connection between himself and various groups.

Prejudice patterns, in short, would seem to operate at all levels of human behaviour from the trivial social situation in which prejudice may be a 'social entrance ticket' to the dangerous behaviour of the near-psychotic. A theory designed to cover such diverse phenomena must be couched in terms of something basic and primal in mental functioning. If I am criticized for favouring a theory which is too vaguely defined and too wide in its application it is only because all the others which have been put forward do not seem comprehensive enough to cover all the facts.
Dr. Lowy, in his book "Co-operation, Toleration and Prejudice" actually describes prejudice as being "pathological", a kind of "paranoia". In his own words, this is prejudice. "Prejudice signifies a bias coupled with an aggressive attitude for which an inadequate reason is given. Bias alone without the element of aggressive resentment and without a quasi-delusional stereotyped, concept, is something different. Obviously, there is no exact dividing line between sentiments, belief and references on the one hand and gross bias on the other. In general, people apply the word prejudice to all these phenomena, that is when they do not agree with them and the person professing or showing such attitudes appears to be uncompromising about it. The writer wishes, however, to restrict the notion prejudice in this work to the resentful quasi-delusional stereotyped mass - phenomena, as well as to the particular attitudes of individuals. The less capable such a bias is of leading to irrational resentment, the more remote it is from what the writer prefers to call 'prejudice'.

These are just a few examples of the type of definitions found in current works on the phenomena of prejudice. No less varied than the definitions of prejudice are the so-called theories of prejudice, at least of the ethnic type. The three chief theories /
Theories seem to be (1) The theory of the well-earned reputation. This theory explains itself by its title. The greatest criticism which has been levelled against it is, that though the prejudice is aroused by the group's reputation, the theorists are wrong in claiming that it is well-deserved. (2) The Scapegoat or Frustration-Aggression Theory. According to this theory, group prejudice is a reaction to external stimulation. A process of frustration-aggression has previously been generated within the individual or group. By a process of displacement, involving rationalization, projection and stereotyping, hostility is removed from the original cause of frustration and is directed against some minority or defenceless group or individual.

These two theories are typical of the two camps into which all such definitions seem to divide themselves. Broadly, we can distinguish two tendencies within them, namely, to locate the starting point of the process internally or externally. For convenience, we can call them "Stimulus" theories and "Drive" theories. Stimulus theories like the well-earned reputation theory imply that the prejudice reaction is almost totally determined by the nature of the stimulus, i.e. the objective characteristics of the minority or group. "Drive" theories stress the compulsive nature of aggressive tendencies within the individual.
individuals seem to have a certain amount of free-floating aggression, which they feel impelled to anchor somewhere. Chance factors seem to determine the particular anchorage selected.

Dissatisfied with these "monistic" theories, some writers recommend a Convergence Theory of Prejudice, which is dualistic in the sense that it takes into account both the internal factors within the individual and the objective characteristics of the stimulus or object of his reactions. This view is more in keeping with the interactionism which is favoured by modern psychological doctrine, but essentially it neither adds to, nor subtracts from what was already known. One cannot help feeling that both types of theory do little more than skim the surface of the phenomena involved.

The problem of defining anything is a knotty one. If someone asked me "What is a chocolate cake?" I should most probably set about describing the nature and quantity of the ingredients required. I should say exactly how they should be blended, handled and treated. Every step in the process would be carefully reported. In the end, I should expect my questioner to know what a chocolate cake was. This seems to be getting away from matters psychological, but it has great bearing on this matter of definition. When I repeat a recipe for Chocolate Cake, I am giving an /
an "operational definition" of Chocolate Cake. If you like, it is the **dynamic** approach to the problem. However, if someone insisted upon my defining the essential of Chocolate Cake, that is to give a substantive definition of it, I should be helpless. What someone should produce is a really good "operational definition" of prejudice. It would come about if psychologists would apply to thinking in their own field the lessons which they have learned from the study of thinking in general. A little more "process thinking" instead of the fatally easy, because familiar "substantive thinking". And yet, in this matter, the homely culinary art is more 'scientific' than we usually imagine. In the physical world, I doubt if men yet can give more than an operational definition of electricity. Why should we try to do more in psychology? Let us leave to the philosophers the task of defining entelechies and such imponderables. So, instead of trying to say what prejudice is let us confine ourselves to describing what is going on when prejudice is at work.

To take an example from ordinary everyday experience, it is amazing how often one hears on people's lips the words used as an opening phrase, "I may be prejudiced, but ......." You may have said it to-day or yesterday or last week, but you have certainly said it at some time in your life. It is odd /
odd how ready one is to admit it. It is so unlike the unwillingness to confess that one has no sense of humour. Somehow, I feel that it has something to do with the fact that the existence of even prejudice implies some kind of thought process. Nothing is more complimentary or self-laudatory than the notion, delusional or otherwise, that we have carried to a successful conclusion any piece of ratiocination.

To be prejudiced about any topic, subject, individual, or group means to have closed the relevant cognitive structures to any further intrusion from that particular area. Other cognitive structures may be in a similar state of isolation from possible modification or may be in a greater or lesser state of lability. A state of lability in any area creates vectors of tension between it and any pertinent material, psychological or physical with which it may be thrown into contact. The partial releasing of this tension by the automatic process of homeostasis is experienced as satisfying by the healthy organism. Automatically also, there will be over a period of time, a continual process serving to reduce lability and the ease with which adjustment can be made. The experience of instruction, in fact the experience of aging itself serves to bring about rigidity in ever-increasing areas of our cognitive structures. Older people /
people and experts are notoriously dogmatic in certain areas of thinking of human concern. They are usually more self-satisfied, too.

This type of definition would cover all types of prejudice but can it account for the so-called irrational element, the highly emotional component of group prejudice, the passionate hatred? Many people experience this type of prejudice against Jews and Negroes. The basic feeling in this type of experience is anxiety. I use the word anxiety advisedly and not fear, as the distinction which Goldstein draws between the two is worth preserving. As surely as we experience anxiety at the loss or threatened loss of bodily support, just as surely do we fear to lose our mental terra firma, and to experience as a result a sort of psychological emptiness. Unlike fear, anxiety may have no assignable cause in the external world. The emotional foundation of prejudice in its extreme and yet common form is the anxiety produced by the interruption of the equalization process in the mind of the prejudiced thinker. There has been an invasion of the achieved structurization of the prejudiced areas of his mind. It means that chaos or near-chaos has been created where formerly there had been order of a kind. His inner security has been
been threatened. A threat to existence, to life itself is being experienced. There is a high degree of "ego-involvement" in all this. There is always the need for self-actualization, a coming to terms with one's environment, the process of equalization going on between the organism and the environment. Overt prejudice indicates a break in this process. The individual has lost his frame of reference. He is like a ship without a rudder. The slow and insidious corrosion caused by the slow process of life and education in its widest sense we usually manage to survive without the acute sense of disorientation which certain rude shocks can give.

Violent anti-semitic and anti-negro prejudice is nearly always produced by some sudden impact or contact, either psychological or physical in nature with aspects of the Jewish or Negro group which the prejudiced cannot admit (or permit to enter) within his already existing cognitive structures and at the same time maintain a sufficient state of psychological balance within. The cognitive structures related to the prejudiced person's ego has been simultaneously invaded. This is the cognitive structure which all of us need to keep as intact as possible for inner psychological balance. As a matter of experience, we all know that we are more prejudiced about ourselves than any other person or subject under the sun. The more ego-involvement of an unpleasant nature accompanying /
accompanying the incursion of fresh material into cognitive structures the more the overt experience is likely to be toned with feeling of a negative kind, from mild resentment passing through all degrees to utter hatred.

The Negro and the Jew admittedly are the object of the scapegoating mechanism in many societies. But violent anti-Negro attitudes and anti-semitism nearly always arise in face-to-face contact situations. For my own convenience in this study I shall draw a distinction between two forms of prejudice of the ethnic type: (1) Latent prejudice in which the cognitive structure relating to some objective reality is in a particularly rigid state, but is still maintaining its equilibrium. The state is not emotionally toned to any high degree, since there is not a very high degree of ego-involvement, and (2) Active prejudice which is characterized by the highly emotionalized attitudes described often as racial hatred or as resentment. There has been a simultaneous disruption of two types of cognitive structures, and a subsequent state of disequilibrium has been produced. The cognitive structures involved are the ego-structure and the particular structure related to the objective stimulus. This type of prejudice is often manifested in face-to-face contact situations and shows a high degree of ego-involvement. It must be obvious, of course/
course, from this that the first type of potential or latent prejudice, as we have agreed to call it, can very easily merge into (one is almost tempted to say regress to) the second type. It seems that this is what actually happens in an international war situation. It is often found that certain apparently harmless, and unemotional people become almost rabid in their hatred of the enemy. The threat of war and all the dangers accompanying it has produced the anxiety reaction normally following upon the assault upon the ego-structure and has charged with emotional quality the pre-existing latent form of the prejudiced attitudes. Psychologically speaking, true prejudice is of the latent type. After its emergence in expressive behaviour of a highly emotional nature it is no longer pure prejudice.

Although it is the violent externalization of prejudiced attitudes which strikes the eye and terrifies the mind, it is the root which is of psychological interest. Allport once made a study of what he called some "roots of prejudice". But it seems to me, that viewed from the functional standpoint, prejudice itself is the radix to which must be traced many violent manifestations of resentment, persecution, hatred and intolerance of many kinds.

A /
A tremendous advantage accrues from the
distinction we have drawn between latent prejudice
and active prejudice. By separating the two forms,
pure and alloyed as it were, we can see the functional
mechanism at work, the root behind the manifold,
fully-developed forms which active prejudice may
assume. It is very seldom that the etymologically
pure definition of a word coincides with its
psychological application, but prejudice, analytically
considered, would seem to be one of those rare words.
It is indeed praedjudicia - - a pre-judging. We are
all inevitably prejudiced to some extent in our
thinking. In fact, it has been said that education
is a process of instilling prejudices into the young.
Although, most teachers are unaware of this, it is
indeed very true. Someone may, in the future,
undertake the herculean, one might more accurately
say Augean task of making a systematic analysis of
school history books, as, stand, present in an effort to
understand prejudice.

We have thus more severely delimited the field
of our study. We are not concerned here with the
overt behaviour in situations involving race
discrimination, or international hatred, but rather
with the underlying cognitive structures, likely in
certain contingencies to lead to such behaviour.

To /
To borrow a term from Goldstein, active prejudice would seem to be a disordered or 'catastrophic' state of the organism. The process of self-actualization has been violently blocked. The stimuli in the environment which have precipitated this condition may also be described in Goldstein's terminology as examples of inadequate stimuli. A quotation at this point might be highly relevant.

"Normally, the organism responds only to those stimuli which are "adequate", that is relevant to its nature. Normal equalization is possible, and the organism is in a state of ordered behaviour, only so long as it is not affected by inadequate stimuli, and only in this ordered state is it possible to carry on the performance that corresponds to its nature. Therefore, to live in a milieu which allows for ordered behaviour, which allows specially for normal equalization, is requisite for the organism's living at all. The proper milieu for the organism is not the entire environment, but only that part with which it can come to terms, in such a way that normal equalization is possible. Each organism has its own characteristic milieu. Only a certain segment of all that surrounds it constitutes its world. We call this milieu the adequate milieu, that is the milieu that is appropriate to the nature of the organism. Contact with does not alter the organism in such a way that it becomes unable to realize /
realize its own nature. The stimuli arising from it we call adequate stimuli". Again, to quote further: "The organism does not react to all the stimuli which are inadequate to it. Such stimuli can become effective only if they are strong and force themselves upon the organism, and then it is driven into the catastrophic situation, not only because it is unable to react adequately, but also because it is so shocked and disturbed in its functioning, that for a longer or shorter period, it is unable to react at all. This brings it into the danger of not being able to carry on even those performances which are essential for its existence and in this sense we may consider catastrophic behaviour as a threat to the existence of the organism".

It is at this point that my tentative theory comes closest to the psycho-analytical account of ethnic prejudice. That it has close affinities with certain psycho-pathological states is quite apparent. That this state is necessarily that of paranoia is by no means obvious. Dr. Lowy who seems to be the chief or at any rate the most articulate exponent of this theory draws the likeness between the prejudiced individual and the psychotic in very clear terms. "Paranoia, he says, "is a very interesting type of psychosis. The patient /
patient suffers from a delusional system, the content of which is in different varieties; that he is an extraordinary individual, who is being envied or interfered with; persecuted or even physically harmed, by a known or by a mysterious person or persons; in most cases, this suspicion refers to a whole organized body, in possession of extraordinary and even superhuman powers and resources as they pursue this aim of persecution. If the delusional belief stresses chiefly the experience of being persecuted we speak of paranoia persectoria...

There is no doubt that the persecution felt by the paranoiac originates within the mind, and signifies an inner enemy. It indicates some disturbance within his own mind which makes him feel uneasy and as if threatened. Through externalization of this inner enemy the mental disharmony is changed into the interfering external world, i.e. the persecuting persons and their numerous torturing instruments, possible and impossible". It is probably better to continue with the quotation than to resort to paraphrase with its possible risk of distortion.

Continuing, he says, "The vague awareness of this deepest disharmony stimulates various kinds of neurotic counter-measures, i.e. attempts at coping with their dysbalance. One mode of doing so is the extensive /
extensive employment of externalization, as described above". What follows now is of the greatest importance for his theory of ethnic prejudice. "And if there is also an accentuated inclination for producing hatred, then this aggressiveness together with the process of externalization (projection) leads him to attack, to despise, and hate others, that is to cherish prejudice". (Emphasis mine). He then consolidates his position by drawing upon the support of famous psychiatrists, and somewhat dogmatically accepts their ex cathedra statements as the final word on the subject. In conclusion, he remarks, "The upshot of what has been said so far on the process of externalization and on its employment in creating prejudice for abreacting hatred is that a neurotic emotional urge (parapathic process) is at work in both cases, in the general process of projection and in that of cherishing prejudice and political or racial hatred. This is to-day the accepted scientific theory on this matter. Bleuler, the greatest psychiatrist of his age, following Kraepelin aptly remarked that the first condition for producing psychotic delusions is a peculiar mental need in the individual for having these in the face of it unpleasant delusions. But just the same applies, as we have seen with regard to externalization and /
and prejudicial hatred. The prejudiced individual needs for his mental process those others on to whom he projects his inner disharmony. He could not live without the existence of his existing or imagined adversaries, near or remote."

I quote these excerpts in full, because Dr. Lowy speaks in clear terms for a great body of thinkers on this subject. As far as objective description of the prejudiced state of mind is concerned I am almost in entire agreement with him, especially in regard to (1) inner dysbalance; (2) definite urge or need to have the particular delusional beliefs, whatever they may be; (3) the aggressive emotional element; (4) externalization. What the theory should and does not answer can be expressed in the following questions. What, if anything, determines the nature of these delusional beliefs? What determines the target of the externalization process? What is the content of these beliefs? Why should one psychotic find his enemies among, say, the ancient Egyptians or Mesopotamians, Medes or Persians, and another among present-day Germans? What process has been knocked off its balance to create this inner disequilibrium? Depth psychology in this case does not go deep enough. What is important is that the delusional beliefs of even the psychotic are dependent upon the cognitive structures /
structures already existing within his mind. Each of us could, if possessed of sufficient self-knowledge and insight, forecast with a fair degree of accuracy, what imaginary enemies he would choose if he ever became psychotic. Certainly the ignorant labourer would never regard the chief of his seven devils the archfiend Mephistopheles and consider himself as Faust, unless he had cognitive structures relating to old demonology or the legends of Dr. Faustus. Likewise, the simple charwoman is not likely in a psychotic state to see herself as Cassandra or the ill-fated Eurydice. The aggressive element, although duly noted has not been accounted for. Whence this passionate so-called irrational element? A theory of prejudice to be even fairly accurate must at least try to answer these questions.

The best approach to a theory of prejudice would be the eclectic exploration and exploitation of various theories put forward to explain not only prejudice but other psychological phenomena. The most valuable contribution, it seems to me, is supplied by Goldstein's psychological doctrine, especially the following concepts:

(1) the drive for self-actualization.

(2) /
(2) the need to come to grips with one's environment or milieu.

(3) the necessity for maintaining the equalization process, particularly when inadequate stimuli force disruption upon us.

(4) his emphasis upon the catastrophic state brought about by the disruption, the emotional element being caused by the threat to life itself.

(5) his clear statement, that in all catastrophic states of the organism there would appear to be a regression, a return to earlier, more primitive levels of functioning. Goldstein in his clinical work was only too familiar with the increasing concretization of behaviour in psycho-pathological states. The use of force and violence as seen in the state of extreme ethnic prejudice could then be explained as a state of active prejudice in which the organism is resorting to an earlier mode of adaptation.

The organismic view can account most adequately for the broad substratum of prejudice which is closely related to the biogenic needs of the individual. In the final analysis, we find ourselves in the study of prejudice at the bedrock need, which might be said to be the origin of all the other needs, namely the need to live, the need for mere continuation of existence.
All individual psychologists and an ever-increasing number of social psychologists recognize the importance of such ultimate needs, although they tend to consult their own tests in naming them. Various descriptive terms, such as basic needs or drives, primary needs, non-derived needs etc. may be used. The fault of which many psychologists are guilty, however, is that of oversimplification. They sometimes tend to conclude that, because these needs have been artificially isolated for purposes of study in an irreducible form, the mental processes accompanying them must likewise exhibit only the most elementary type of organization. The cognitive element is largely ignored. Cognitive processes and organization are going on from the very start (and perhaps beforehand) of the human organism's existence as a separate individual.

The basic needs in their discrete forms manifest themselves when the organism is subjected to some particular deficit in some way inimical to its continued existence. More and more attention is being drawn in psychological works to the purposive nature of human and animal behaviour. What is sometimes neglected, however, is Tolman's insistence that "purposiveness and cognitiveness go together". There is a need, which for want of a better term, we can call mental to come to terms with one's environment, a need for clarity, a need to "understand". Choice of terminology /
terminology, again, is usually congruent with one's general psychological outlook. If the all-inclusive outlook of Goldstein appeals to us this mental need may be regarded as the conceptual accompaniment of all the other needs. If we prefer the list of drives given by a writer like Tolman, we could regard this need or drive as a peculiarly mental one, closely allied to the exploratory and aesthetic drives, which he includes in his lists, in contradistinction to the more strictly biological needs.

Deprivation of any basic need, that is deprivation at the physiological level, leads to disordered states and finally to the extinction of the organism. Deprivation at the conceptual level, that is the peculiarly human level, is equally disastrous, the psychotic states representing the last stages of such deprivation of the organism need.

The problem of motivation is central to any study of behaviour, social or individual. If any one regards Goldstein's theory as too all-embracing, it is interesting to note that Morgan assumes a similar position, only he expresses himself in physiological terms. Morgan's term, which one might regard as corresponding to Goldstein's "self-actualization" is the term "central motive state" which is his all-inclusive term for the neural integrative activity.

This /
This c.m.s. has three properties or behavioural aspects.

(1) the initiation of general activity.

(2) the evocation of specific behaviour.

(3) a readiness to perceive and react to stimulus situations in particular ways. This last aspect Morgan considers the most important. "In many ways, however, the priming aspect of the c.m.s. is the most important feature for the psychologist. It is this which makes motivated behaviour appear so purposive for it is the set to perceive and react in certain ways which defines the goal."

Probably the c.m.s. of Morgan is the nearest approach we shall get to the description of the physiological correlates of the need for self-actualization. This parallelism is more striking in the passage where he says that "The c.m.s. appears to be partly self-perpetuating". That is to say there is some reverberatory activity in the neurons involved in the c.m.s. such that neural activity, once it has been initiated tends to continue. Some of the reverberation, maintaining the c.m.s., may be a purely central affair accounted for in terms of recurrent neural circuits; some of it, on the other hand, may be caused by circular reflex activity, i.e. the /
the c.m.s. may lead to gastric constrictions, to changes in the sexual organs or the like, and these in turn send in afferent stimulations which build up the c.m.s.

A valuable amplification of Goldstein's position would be given by an adequate account of the genetic development of the ego. Goldstein would no doubt include this within the word 'self' in his term 'self-actualization'. The ego is the part of the self which has already been actualized. It is one side of the balancing or equalizing process. Although it can never be conceived as being static, for purposes of study, it is well represented by the individual's cognitive structures relating to the ego. In the individual's psychological make-up, the ego-structure (which we may call it for short) seems to occupy a nodal point, with which all other cognitive structures are more or less closely related. All the foregoing is merely insistence upon the fact that in any study of motivation and especially of social motivation all aspects of mental life must be included. As Sherif says in his Outline of Psychology "All in all, cognition and motivation and action are not discrete functions operating in separate compartments. They are functionally, inseparably interrelated in the psychological product of any given moment".

What /
What I am mainly trying to do here is to emphasize the cognitive factors, which tend rather to be neglected in favour of motivational factors. Cognitive factors, certainly, had the first innings in the early study of psychology, and received full representation in the work of such men as Wundt and Titchener and others. Recently, the swing of the pendulum has tended to be away from the acknowledged study of cognitive (i.e. perceptual plus symbolic processes). I say acknowledged because much of the recent study has been unwittingly focussed upon cognitive elements. It has often been a matter of amazement to me, how the so-called 'depth psychologists' could imagine they were plumbing the depths of an individual's mind, when in reality they were merely salvaging the flotsam and jetsam which came to the surface in the form of free association, slips of the tongue, dream fragments, etc., all phenomena which are predominantly cognitive in character. The cognitive factors therefore have really obtruded themselves upon the notice of psychologists all along the line, but have not been, at least in recent years, openly acknowledged as factors of the utmost importance as component parts in any psychological behaviour, normal or abnormal, especially if it is 'molar' and not 'molecular' behaviour which is under review. In this point /
point of view, we have the support of Sherif:
"Talking of the difficulty of isolating motivational
factors in the study of behaviour, he says: "Unless
we are working on the physiological level (i.e.
dealing directly with hormone factors, various
depletions etc.) there is no way of dealing with
motives than to take differential findings of various
psychological phenomena as their indexes. This is
in fact what "depth" psychologists (e.g. psycho-analysts)
are constantly doing. In spite of their scorn of
surface data, they are constantly using tiny bits of
surface phenomena, various kinds of slips, selective
forgetting, pre-occupation with certain symbols, etc.)
as indexes of the dramatic depth-phenomena, complexes,
libido, infantile sexuality, etc."

In the course of my study, it has been borne in
upon me that there is no adequate, extant theory of
prejudice. Most theories give an account of one type
of prejudice, usually ethnic and ignore all the others.
Köhler in his Dynamics in Psychology gives an
invaluable hint to any one who is interested in
psychological research. He considers first scientific
research in fields other than psychology. The
scientific mind takes an ordinary everyday occurrence
and views it functionally. For example, we all know
from every day experience that if we drop an apple it
falls /
falls to the ground. If we do the same with any other object the same happens. So we speak of falling and imagine that this explains the situation completely. Viewed from the functional standpoint of the scientist the 'falling' aspect is secondary to the operation of the force of gravity, which really explains the situation. The scientist views the falling in an unfamiliar light. When the scientist by his efforts isolated the principle and found it at work in all these everyday experiences, then he was viewing the situation functionally.

It seems clear that we need a similar approach in the study of prejudice. Everyone knows what prejudice is. We see it daily in ourselves and in others. We know when it has been at work, just as clearly as we see the apple dropping from the tree. What is requiring to be brought out into the open is the principle or force at work, that corresponds to the pull of gravity. Only when we have done this have we given a functional explanation of prejudice.

All my dark gropings, therefore, in the field of research have had one chief goal in view, namely to arrive at a comprehensive functionally orientated definition of prejudice. Prejudice cannot be viewed statically. It is a function of the mind, rather than a state of mind. It operates at the conceptual level /
level. Any theory of prejudice, to be adequate, must define it so operationally that we can see how the term can be applied in familiar everyday experience to such diverse areas of human activity as the eating of food, the use of objects and articles, certain kinds of people, certain thought systems and ideas, and in short anything on which we can pass judgment.

Common sense applies the word in these various situations because they are in reality homologous. Unfortunately the word 'prejudice' has itself taken on some of the emotional colouring of the impassioned states with which it is sometimes associated. At times, in its overt form prejudice is predominantly affective in nature. Because this is its commonest active manifestation, we must not be blinded to the fact that it can operate with the affective element reduced to a minimal influence, when the prejudice is what I have, for convenience, called 'latent'.

Another point which requires stressing is that the affective element is highly imbued with 'ego-feeling'. For this reason, in any account of prejudice, an important place must be accorded to the psychological contributions which have been made in the study of ego-involvement and the genetic development of the ego. Moreover, it may be trying to achieve the impossible, but what obtrudes itself upon anyone who gives a thought to /
to the topic of prejudice, is the need, first of all, for a theory of prejudice, which will cover under one explanatory principle the various forms which prejudice is known to assume, and in the second place, to bridge the gap between the neo-Gestalt writers of the Sherif school of thought and the body of classical psycho-analytical doctrine. Some 'symbiotic' arrangement of the best contributions of both schools of thought seems desirable. I have, therefore, gathered together various contributory strands of psychological theory, which by way of recapitulation I shall enumerate here. By combining these, a more lucid statement of the mechanism of prejudice may be obtained. These are:

(1) Goldstein's organismic approach to the biosocial interaction processes, especially because of the support lent to it by findings from psycho-pathology. This is the closest link which I can find between the holistic approach and the tenets of the psycho-analytical school, largely based upon studies of abnormal psychology.

(2) Wertheimer's emphasis upon the principle of Prägnanz in all thinking processes, and above all in the never-ending process of biosocial interaction.

(3) The concept of 'frames of reference' of the Sherif school, particularly for its renewed emphasis upon /
upon cognitive elements in the biosocial process.

(4) To account for the ineluctable affective element in prejudiced states, we cannot do better than adopt the findings of Sherif and others in their studies of ego-involvement.

(5) Lastly, for a well-grounded psycho-physical background it is satisfying to find to hand such an adequate account of the neural accompaniments of motivation as is found in Morgan's description of the 'central motive state'. All psychological facts are said to have brain correlates so that when the full dynamics of prejudice are understood, perhaps some such explanation as Morgan offers will be found adequate to cover certain aspects of it. By combining all these strands, and by keeping in mind that prejudice may remain entirely latent, we may hope to give a more adequate account of prejudice in all its forms.

If I am criticized for having weighed down this prolixation to the study of prejudice with an undue amount of theorizing, I may perhaps justify myself by claiming that some such interpretative background is implicit in any hypothesis and can only serve the purpose of giving additional point to our empirical findings. Perhaps, we can now regard ourselves as being a little nearer to having extricated /
extricated the fundamental scientific principle operating under the phenomena of prejudice.

Just as the study of gravity might have been initiated by the fall of a cricket ball as well as of an apple, so also for the study of prejudice it would be really immaterial, that is psychologically, whether we studied prejudiced attitudes towards snoek, Picasso, existentialism or Walt Disney. However, prejudices range themselves along a continuum with the relatively innocuous at one pole and those which are as dangerous as dynamite at the other. Of the dangerous variety, some are dangerous to their owners and others dangerous to the contemporaries of their owners.

The social psychologist is chiefly interested in man among men. Just as the physician must leave the healthy and attend to the sick, so the social psychologist must devote his main attention to the ills of society or social living. Frictionless group living must be a secondary consideration. Group tensions of the undesirable variety clamour for first attention, especially when these may assume the gigantic proportions of an international conflict situation. The exigencies of the times break in upon the academic serenity of the social psychologist, and divert his mind from serener lucubrations.

Such /
Such problems may seem to some psychologists to be completely outside the scope of psychology proper. They may seem to be the exclusive concern of the politicians of the world. In other spheres the barrier between pure science and applied science is being gradually rendered less impenetrable. There is more need for this type of mutual adjustment in the field of psychology to-day than in any other field of intellectual activity. There is a positive demand even among the most ordinary people to-day for any help that psychological knowledge can give. Contrary to all the other evolutionary processes going on in the world man's evolution seems to be decreative. All the others are passing from complexity to ever simpler forms. Man's development, on the other hand, is against the general stream of the evolutionary current. He is passing on to ever more baffling complexity. Men, even the very ordinary ones, are aware of this. Max Scheler, the German philosopher, expressed in the following words the chief problems of the times. "In the thousand years of human history, ours is the first era, in which man has become a problem to himself, in which he no longer knows what he is and at the same time knows that he does not know it." It is reasonable, therefore, that people should turn to the science which deals with specifically human problems, namely psychology. In the third Yearbook of the Society for the Psychological /
Psychological Study of Social Issues, Human Nature and Enduring Peace, a kindred question is posed and answered in unequivocal terms. "Is not psychology too effete and technical, too abstruse and involved, to make any positive difference when vast economic and political forces are at work?" "No. A psychology worthy of the name is closely integrated with economics and politics. Indeed our primary task (i.e. as psychologists) is to view the economic and political forces as human behaviour forces, and to describe them in psychological terms applicable to fundamental human conduct. No niceties of technique, to fine points or academic trivialities are involved. It is the massive issues, the great landmarks of human behaviour to which attention will be given".

In his book, "Drives Toward War", E.C. Tolman quotes an interesting thesis of Drucker's, namely that since the beginning of Christianity Western Europe has been dominated by a series of some four myths as to the Nature of Man. Each of these myths has embodied the particular ideals of its era. In chronological order, they were (1) Spiritual Man of the pre-renaissance times; (2) Intellectual Man of the Renaissance period; (3) Economic Man of the period of industrial expansion; (4) Heroic Man of the present day ——— the age of dictatorships. Tolman takes it upon himself to indicate /
indicate the fourth phase which he sees emerging now. The new myth, he tells us, is that of the Psychologically Adjusted Man. It would seem that Tolman is being truly prophetic, if the half-inarticulate longings and strivings of vast numbers of people are indicative of the birthpangs of a new myth.

I have indulged in this somewhat lengthy preamble in order to state in clear terms at the outset my own theoretical position. Earlier I expressed the hope that in the course of argument the formulation of hypothesis would develop of itself and take more concrete shape. It may now be expressed in the following terms.

The hypothesis underlying the following four statements requires a synthesis of psychological contributions derived from varied schools of thought. This is in keeping with the eclectic approach which seemed so eminently desirable at the outset.

(1) My thesis is that social-cultural forces play a preponderant role in the formation of international prejudices.

(2) This role can best be investigated by an analysis of the highly-individualized quintessence of the social-cultural matrix which we have decided to call "milieu".

(3) Psychologically, milieu is best revealed by scrutinizing /
scrutinizing the cognitive structures of the individual, and in particular his cognitive awareness of the particular topic under survey.

(4) A biosocial interpretation requires the inclusion of as many personality data and sociological variables as is deemed necessary.

It would be idle to continue with my own speculations as to what constitutes an adequate theory of prejudice without trying to see in what respects it runs parallel or diverges from classical Frustration-Aggression theory, which to-day seems to be the only theory which has received any large body of acceptance. The difficulty I find, in subscribing to the F-A theory is that I see no inevitable causal connection between the existence of frustration and its emergence into aggression. Individuals react differently to frustration. Many psychologists are beginning to realize firstly, that frustration is not necessarily bad for the individual, and secondly that it does not invariably lead to aggression. That it may and the majority of cases does lead to aggressive adaptation would be readily admitted by most people.

Tolman in his book "Drives Toward War" introduces two possible channels for the draining off of frustrated tendencies /
tendencies. Instead of one general drive, activating the organism he posits two broad categories. (1) Biological drives, and (2) Social Techniques. (The latter term, he uses in deliberate preference to derived needs or drives, since he maintains that these have been learned in the course of socialization. When either of these drives is frustrated aggression or submission may be the outcome. This is really the valuable part of Tolman's book. Since Tolman's theory has a broad basis in his studies of animal behaviour his account is not to be lightly dismissed, especially as it seems to have a solid fulcrum of support in ordinary everyday experience. Tolman makes a gratuitous attempt at novelty in the matter of nomenclature, but there seems to be no special advantage in discarding the all-inclusive general drive put forward by Goldstein. What is of inestimable value in Tolman's contribution is his insistence upon two facts which must never be overlooked in the study of the enlistment of basic drives in the prosecution of such obviously genicidal behaviour as international war. These two facts are (1) the tendency, probably a learned social technique, to group co-operation for completely non-aggressive purposes (self-abusive collective techniques) in order to facilitate the satisfaction of biological drives, and the really original contribution, which states that when this /
this social technique encounters what we might call secondary frustration, there emerges group-co-operation with aggression in view, if necessary to obtain similar satisfaction of biological drives. Of immeasurable value also is Tolman's clear statement of the fact that individual behaviour may resort to either self-assertive or self-abasive techniques in its attempt to achieve satisfaction of urgent needs.

Tolman, and in this most people would agree with him, finds that certain psychological dynamisms of psycho-analytical origin are of too great value to be thrown overboard in any account of drives leading to aggressive behaviour. He lists these as fixation, repression, reaction-formation, introjection, symbolization, displacement, identification (with parent or adult), identification with group, projection. For my own purposes these psychological dynamisms are best regarded as tricks of the mind or devices of the organism in its effort to maintain the equalization process, going on between the ego-driven organism and hard reality. Even the self-assertive and self-abasive techniques of Tolman are of the same nature essentially, although they are usually more externalized, overt and less subjective in nature. Tolman himself tends to give a new twist to the meaning of some of these accepted psychological mechanisms, but it seems that they /
they are much more useful in their accepted and orthodox psycho-analytical sense as a short-cut method of description.

If for no other reason than that he has brought out clearly into the light of day the limitations of the frustration-aggression theory, Tolman's work is to be highly rated. It represents a timely check to the unbridled assertions of some psychologists, who looked upon the theory as the ne plus ultra of psychological thought on this subject. The frustration-aggression sequence just does not give all the answers. It would mean a diagnosis of prejudice in purely motivational terms. This is simply not enough. As I have tried to stress elsewhere, a psychological analysis of prejudice demands that we take into account not only motivational factors but more purely symbolic, perceptual-cognitive as well as affective or emotional processes.

Higher units of analysis are essential for the understanding of the mechanism of prejudice. For a really exhaustive analysis we find ourselves faced with the need to understand the individual as completely as possible. The complete study of one individual rather than the culture as a whole might come nearer to yielding the solution of the problem of /
of prejudice. And yet, our diagnosis would be incomplete and somewhat meaningless if we remained detached from the social-cultural matrix. The best mode of attack would seem to be a multi-dimensional approach to the individual and his prejudices, supplemented by the study of his sociological context to understand what is sometimes called the environmental support for the pattern of percepts, beliefs, and attitudes that each one of us has woven into the very texture of his being.

Chiefly I regret not having encountered before this the two terms used by the above-mentioned writer, namely "teleostatic" and "teleodynamic". They would have greatly helped to clarify my discussion, and splendidly in themselves worthy of a wider currency in contemporary psychology.

Just one more quotation may be permissible, to reinforce my argument. "The dependency upon the environment on one hand and the desire to cope with its diversity and changing conditions on the other generates the background for human motivations. The mechanisms to achieve their goals are teleodynamic and teleostatic, as well as a combination of both. Together they try to find equilibrium with the different environmental forces and to maintain this. Such an achievement leads to the "peace of mind" which Marx hailed as the greatest good on earth."
NOTE.

My attention has just been drawn to two very interesting articles in the Journal of Psychology (July 1950, Vol. 30, 1st. Half.), which I regret were not published sooner, so that I might have incorporated their discussion within my thesis. However, I cannot refrain from mentioning a few of the writer's conclusions, since they are in such complete accordance with my own. The author, Eric Barrett, M.D. reviews the whole topic of cybernetics and its various implications. He considers the basic facts of the relationship between living matter and the environment. I now quote, "The mysterious constancy of these molecules, their power to maintain their high degree of order or energy or, in a different way of looking at it, their low state of entropy is, in the terminology of this paper, a teleostatic function. If we could understand its mechanism we would indeed have gained a deep insight into one of nature's greatest mysteries. This, however, is by no means the only relationship of life to its environment. We have now to consider the other kind of relationship, the teleodynamic functions of living matter.

In general, these are the functions by which the living organisms adjust themselves to their environment by which they are trying to cope with the diversities and unremitting changes in the forces and conditions of their surroundings. For the first condition and object of life, the maintenance or constancy, which we have just mentioned, these diversities and changes are disturbing, energy consuming, sometimes even incompatible with life."

Chiefly I regret not having encountered before this the two terms, used by the above-mentioned writer, namely "teleostatic" and "teleodynamic". They would have greatly helped to clarify my discussion, and are indeed in themselves worthy of a wider currency in contemporary psychology.

Just one more quotation may be pardonable, to reinforce my argument. "The dependency upon the environment on one hand and the desire to cope with its diversity and changing conditions on the other constitute the background for human motivations. The mechanisms to achieve their goals are teleodynamic and teleostatic, as well as a combination of both. Together they try to find equilibria with the different environmental forces and to maintain them. Such achievement leads to the "peace of mind" which Max Planck calls the "greatest good on earth."
I sometimes think that many a social psychologist could with great benefit to himself study the art of our newspaper cartoonists. With a few clever strokes these men can place on paper a figure which is immediately recognised and understood by millions of people all over the world. Between the artist and his readers seem to pass the words "You all know this type, of course". When a cartoonist picks off an individual he isolates and exaggerates the one feature which appears to him distinctive, unusual, original, striking. When he draws a type, however, he puts on paper the lowest common denominator of a whole class. Probably we receive the cartoonist's efforts with such delight because of this universal tendency in our own perception, particularly of the social variety.

Bartlett's "sharpening" and "levelling" tendencies are nowhere better illustrated than in any good cartoon. This reduction of all members of a group to a common level is known in psychology as stereotyping, and the symbolic form of the percept is known as a "stereotype", a term which is the brilliant and happy invention of a man, who studied the public as earnestly as any cartoonist, namely Walter Lippmann.

Earlier in this study, it was suggested that the
mind of the unprejudiced must be in a greater state of lability or flexibility than that of the unprejudiced. Interestingly enough, in his behaviouristically oriented study of semiotic "Signs, Language and Behaviour" Charles Morris introduces a passage, which seems to link up this part of my tentative theory with the place occupied by stereotypes in social psychology. Morris makes no mention of stereotypes as such, but from his theory and principles it would seem almost self-evident that his definition of a "pathic sign" in semiotic makes it practically synonymous with what is known as a stereotype in social psychology.

There is also an interesting parallel between what we have said about the catastrophic (almost pathological) effect produced by a disruption of the normal equalization process and Morris' designation of certain pathic events.

Morris expresses it thus. "Health", he says, "is a state of the organism, in which all the structures and activities are so harmoniously integrated and regulated that easy maintenance of the whole organization is continually insured, while injury or disturbance of the ideal state of functioning is the essence of all pathic events. ........ In these terms a sign process as one kind of event may be healthy /
healthy or pathic. Healthy or pathic signs must be distinguished from adequate or inadequate stimuli.

The signs of an individual are in general healthy in so far as they are subject to correction and improvement. They become pathic in so far as they are anomalously resistant to such correction and improvement.

Bearing in mind that the chief characteristics of the psychological concept of a "stereotype" is its almost perpetual resistance and unresponsiveness to fresh objective facts and Morris' description of a pathic sign as being resistant to correction and improvement, can we say that a "stereotype" is a "pathic sign"? If we were permitted this interchange of the two terms, it might help to consolidate the next step in the development of our theoretical position. Morris himself looks to the future to bring about an effective degree of co-operation between semiotic and social-psychological disciplines. At this stage, however, we may content ourselves with the detection of similarities between Morris' description of certain sign-processes and the creation of stereotypes within the individual. "For the most part" to continue quoting from Morris, "the signs of the organism are flexible, changing as the needs and abilities of the organism change and as the environment changes; in this way more reliable and adequate signs replace less reliable and /
and adequate signs. But under certain conditions this flexibility is lost and sign events become pathic events".

It is interesting to compare with this one of the most adequate definitions of a stereotype to be found in social-psychological literature. It is given by Krech and Crutchfield in their Theory and Problems of Social Psychology. It takes a dual form.

(1) It may refer to a tendency for a given belief to be widespread in a society. This is a sociological and statistical concept, and can be illustrated by the studies that count the number of people, who believe, for example, that blondes are less intellectual than brunettes, or that workers are more honest than capitalists.

(2) The concept may refer to a tendency for a belief to be over-simplified in content and unresponsive to objective facts. This is a psychological concept.

The study of pathic signs, therefore, would seem to be highly germane to the analysis of prejudiced attitudes especially in the incipient form of stereotypes. Linking this up with my own vaguely expressed theory of the greater lability and flexibility of the unprejudiced mind, it would seem that we now can accommodate stereotypes within our scheme as being sign processes characteristic of a pathic state in the organism, taking /
taking the form of exceptional rigidity and inflexibility of the cognitive structures, and thus blocking the normal equalization process of biosocial interaction.

All situations in which prejudice is operative are characterized by such pathic sign processes. There is the same resistance, cessation of interaction to which we have had occasion to refer previously. Stereotyping is only one particular example of this ossification, as it were, or production of rigidity in what should be a normally fluid, labile area. This seems to indicate that a stereotype is a cognitive structure possessing a more than ordinary degree of stability, rigidity, or internal consistency. Some body of perceptual facts, having more or less adequate reinforcement in "environmental supports" has been fitted into a highly individualized "frame of reference" with great facility and consequent satisfaction to the owner. This brings us to the all-important psychological process, the discussion of which cannot be postponed, namely, the process of social perception. Three fundamental topics demand full and adequate treatment in any developed doctrine of general or social psychology and these are perception, motivations, and learning. The essential inseparability of the two disciplines, general and social psychology, is evidenced by the constant process of mutually advantageous support rendered /
rendered by the findings in these two distinct branches of the science. Recently the term 'social perception' has come into vogue to denote the enormous influence upon perception, exerted by such social factors as membership of a group, or the influence of the mores or culture-pattern upon behaviour, in short any modification of the perceptual process which is traceable to social causes.

The chief distinctive feature of all psychological processes seems to be best covered by the use of the term "self-organizational tendency". If the primary need of the organism, the archetype of all the other needs into which it may ramify is for self-actualization, the process of organization would seem to be the peculiarly psychological precipitate of the need-fulfilment. The quality of our organizational processes is an index of the extent to which self-actualization has taken place. The richness and complexity of conceptual processes as these represent the highest level of such organization are thus the measure of the development of the personality as a whole.

Living at all levels involves a continual process of internalization of the outside world in a psychologically assimilable form. The first
step in this process can be artificially isolated for study as perception. In actual fact, perception is inextricably bound up with motivational, affective and cognitive processes. The initial experience of any situation is mediated primarily by the process of perception. We see, hear, touch, taste or feel the object. Organizational factors are at work from the first contact with the stimulus situation. Perceptual organization not only has a tendency to reduce the sense datum from a complex and unstructured form to a more readily assimilable simplicity and structuredness, but there is also at work a relational influence which places the new percept into a hierarchically organized system of related percepts. This latter system is known in social psychology as a "frame of reference".

I think it was Voltaire who once said that if God had not existed man would have had to invent Him. Somewhat akin to this alleged desperate need for divine authority is our need for an internal scheme of things. If we do not already have the requisite "frame of reference" we need must invent one. We create our own 'points de repère' or anchorage points. In our cognitive "maps" a psychological ordinate and abscissa are a psychological necessity. This has been shown experimentally beyond all refutation in the brilliantly conceived experimental studies of Dr. Sherif on the autokinetic phenomenon. Moreover, it has been shown experimentally /
experimentally that an already established 'frame of reference' produced in isolation may be altered by the possessor to bring about a greater conformity and similarity between it and the frames of reference of other individuals, who have been functioning as a group, and have consequently gone through the process of compromise and have arrived at fairly stable "social norms". Thus we see that the study of the psychology of social norms is basic to an understanding of the process of social perception. Three facts emerge. These facts produce three rubrics under which we might subsume, if so minded, the whole topic of social perception.

(1) The need for a stable frame of reference, and the ad hoc creation of one, if desperate.

(2) The tendency to bring our frames of reference into line with those of other individuals in our group. This might be termed the first law of social perception.

The bearing of all this on the study of prejudice is not difficult to detect. Some prejudiced areas of thinking or rigid cognitive structures will be held by individuals as a result of group membership. Prejudice against other nations is usually regarded as a group-induced phenomenon.
phenomenon. Group participation tends, therefore, to bring about conformity in the nature of cognitive organizations and stable group formations, as found in a permanent community might not only produce level conformity, but also remove possible occasions for alien influences to operate in a disintegrating fashion. In this way, stereotypes, the stock-in-trade of prejudice are born. When the stereotypes remain submerged in what we have distinguished as the latent form of prejudice, we may regard the state of the organism as pathic. When stereotypes lead to overt aggression in the form of active prejudice the state of the organism may be said to be catastrophic.

In coming to terms with our world (or perhaps worlds would be a more appropriate term) it would seem that there are two possible types of modus vivendi for producing equilibrium.

(1) To remain unprejudiced open-minded, to keep our frames of reference in a readily adjustable form, in constant interaction with the influx of fresh data from the objective world. This is the almost gyroscopic type of equilibrium that freedom from prejudice demands.

(2) To achieve a kind of stabilization by the cessation of the interaction process in certain areas of the mind. This false type of equilibrium creates distorted perception since fresh incoming sense data cannot be accommodated /
accommodated until stripped of their real complexity. This type of pseudo-equilibrium is characteristic of the prejudiced states with the concomitant phenomena of distorted perception.

The practical exigencies of life, however, are not always conducive to the first type of adaptation. Hamlet-like vacillation is apt to be the counterpart in external behaviour of this attitude of mind. As Bernard Shaw once expressed it "The open mind never acts; when we have done our utmost to arrive at a reasonable conclusion, we still, when we can reason and investigate no more, must close our minds for the moment with a snap, and act dogmatically on our conclusions. The man who waits to make an entirely reasonable will dies intestate." Stereotypes are a particularly hardy form of distorted perception. Individually, we all tend in perception and subsequent cognitive processes such as recall to simplify the matter as much as possible. The levelling process is at work within us all the time. In group contacts, a further levelling takes place to produce virtually the same simplified concept for all the members of the group. This happens in the acquisition of stereotypes. A stereotype is as it were the epitome of an epitome, as it originates in individual perception and is subsequently modified by all the developments peculiar to social perception.

Sherif's
Sherif's experiment on the alteration of the individual's frame of reference upon entry into a group with already established norms, or a consistent group frame of reference, may be taken as the paradigm of all kinds of stereotype formation. Thrown upon our own resources we are impelled to produce our own frame of reference. This will be determined by many factors but largely by the nature of our percepts. Our symbolic processes may be influenced by many media of communication. Our own milieu, that is our individual psychological environment depends upon what selection processes have been at work. Selective perception, determined most often by needs, but also as we have seen by social influences leads to selective cognition. That is why the full analysis of an individual's cognitive structures, if it were possible, would be one of the finest guises of his total personality structure. The residual deposit of selective cognition, we have decided to call milieu. Of course, this cyclical process is going on all the time. Needs determine perception, which in turn determines cognition, which at a later date determines perception and so on. A hyphenated term, therefore, would be of more use to us in this study. Perceptual-cognitive items are selected according to the influence of various factors upon the organism. Owing to this it comes about that several individuals /
individuals can be subjected to almost identical psychological influences and yet emerge with utterly different cognitive structures.

Stereotypes, however, we have seen, tend to be a hard core of perceptual-cognitive items, common to large numbers of a group in relation to some individual, group or idea. It would be an interesting speculation for some theorizer with plenty of time at his disposal to uncover the areas of human thinking which are most amenable to stereotyping and which are most inviolable. It would be fascinating to discover whether these were areas of most vital concern to human beings or whether they largely concerned matters of indifferent interest. Be that as it may, stereotypes of members of other nations or groups seem almost fatally easy to acquire.

Adopting the viewpoint we have stated toward our own material the individual's milieu will be in general terms his awareness of other nations. Selective cognition may have resulted in a greater or lesser awareness of what other nations are. Their individual's experience in the form of travelling in other countries, reading books about other lands, races or nations, knowing or speaking another language, acquaintance with the literature, art or folklore of other countries may in any or all of these ways contribute to the enrichment of the relevant cognitive structures. We perceive only what we want to perceive /
perceive or what our individual or group living has led us to perceive. By the same token, we know what we want to know or what our individual or group living has led us to know.

Many psychologists maintain that there is a true verifiable basis for many of our stereotypes regarding classes of human beings. There must be certain uniform sense differentiae, they maintain, to form the nucleus of the stereotyped concept. Certain discriminanda, perhaps indefinable and intangible, what we might call "ethno psychic constants" have been experienced by large numbers of people and have given rise to the consensus of opinion. There must be more than a grain of truth in this, but the difficulty lies in determining just when the stereotype no longer fits any objective discriminanda. Stereotypes are mainly outworn concepts which may at some time have had some slender support in fact but have now lost almost entirely their once tenuous link with reality.

It is something of a blow to one's self-esteem, when one realizes just how many stereotypes one is carrying around, helplessly and uncritically as one's psychological baggage, in so many fields of human thought. It is a blow to us, for as much as we like to resemble the others in our group there is also a deep-rooted need to be different. This is nowhere better illustrated than in women's fashions. A garment is no longer the height of fashion/
fashion when everyone without important exception is wearing it, and yet it would be simply outrage if none were wearing it anywhere in the world. Perhaps it is the inviolacy need which is chiefly operative in this type of phenomenon. Somehow, somewhere, a certain distance must be maintained between ourselves and others. People who live cheek by jowl, sometimes have the most dominant urge to maintain social distance. Ordinary phrases in the language, such as 'one's betters', 'keeping at arm's length', 'putting someone in his place', 'waking up to or down upon' all witness to this common need. Even social distance is no longer possible. Some people take refuge in setting up a psychological distance. 'Aloof' and 'reserved' are terms used and understood by everyone. With all this in mind, it comes with a shock, when it breaks in upon us, how little distance there is between us psychologically, when we are all going about from day to day with almost identical little bundles of inadequate stereotypes. The most fastidious of us in this respect are living in what, to use a wildly fanciful term is a psychological slum.

Standardization of our physical environment in the form of uniform houses, clothes, appurtenances, gadgets etc. is gradually annihilating social distance. More than anywhere else this can be seen in the United States. It seems to be the natural accompaniment of democratic ways of living. Standardization of our psychological /
psychological environment in the form of tabloid Press, nationalized education, radio, films and other cultural media are helping to bring about a similar annihilation of psychological distance. It would not be such a wild guess if one estimated that there are probably more stereotypes per head of population on every topic under the sun than existed one hundred years ago. It may be that a stereotyped area in our minds is better than a blank one, but in many cases it would be difficult to choose the lesser of the two evils.

Since stereotype formation is closely allied to the establishment of social norms for the group, we really cannot sidestep the problem of group definition. People with a sociological bias in research very often assume that the sociological group or socio-economic status grouping of the individual, when once determined is the group with which the individual must stand in a psychological relationship. Many American social psychologists have found it useful to distinguish two kinds of groups in relation to the individual, (1) his membership group, and (2) his reference group. Demagogues and would-be politicians must have often encountered in concrete form this disturbing perversity in human beings. Many a political leader has found it a hopeless task to induce certain people to see that their true interest lies in making their membership group /
group and their reference group one and the same. Black-coated workers have often mis-identified their interests with those of the capitalists, although in actual fact they were part of the proletariat. The proletariat was their true membership group, but the upper class was their reference group. Psychologically one's reference group would seem to act more powerfully in the initiation and stabilization of social classes.

The distinction between "social classes" and "social strata" put forward by Centers represents a welcome improvement in the field. An important reference to this is to be found in the Spring International Social Sciences Bulletin: "Social class is another term which seems particularly prone to evoke verbalistic argument. Mr. Centers, for instance, in his recent study of class, comes to the conclusion that "classes are psycho-social groupings, something that is essentially subjective in character, dependent upon class consciousness..... whereas "social strata" as defined by such objective criteria as wealth or occupation are not necessarily classes"; and then takes exception to the work of W. Lloyd Warner and his associates in recent studies of American social status systems for committing "essentially the same error as those who have defined some particular set of social strata as classes". (International Social Science Bulletin. Spring 1950. Vol. 11. No. 1).
Sherif in his Outline of Social Psychology sums up a section, dealing with this topic, in the following terms: "But it is a fact of utmost importance that the change or maintenance of attitudes is to a large extent a function of the reference group to which the individual relates himself."

T.M. Newcomb in Personality and Social Change gives a good account of quite an extensive study of the change in students' attitudes when they become part of a new membership group (i.e. college community) with a well-defined psychological 'climate'. The trend of influence in this college was predominantly liberal. Many students found the official attitudes, especially political, which were prevalent in the college, at great variance with attitudes already established, and being maintained by other groups of which they were members (e.g. family, club, social set, clique, etc.). The net result of the study was that the greater the degree of identification existing between the student and his actual membership group (i.e. the college community) the greater was the change in attitude. Some students, however, could never quite break free from reference groups and in their cases the degree of change was less noticeable.

Therefore, in any study dealing with the linkage of stereotypes and groups it is well for us to try to remember that the allocation of any individual to his appropriate group is not quite the easy matter it seems. People do not /
not arrange themselves along the obvious sociological lines of division. In many cases an individual's membership group and reference group are identical. This is more likely to take place in a simple primitive community. In modern urban life an individual may belong to several membership groups but psychologically he may relate himself to any one of these groups and even to one in which he has no actual membership. It is the group to which he relates his standards, aspirations, ambitions, opinions that is of the greatest psychological importance.

Before we leave this topic, mention should be made of one interesting result, emerging from Newcomb's study. One's identification with a reference group, he found, need not be of a positive nature. Of students, who adopted a liberal attitude consonant with that prevailing in the college, some seemed to do so, because they had adopted the college group as their new reference group, and wanted more or less consciously to be like their fellow-students. Others, however, showed conformity more in a spirit of defiance of family restrictions, which they felt impelled to shed. In the latter case, the conformity arose not from adopting a new reference group, but from using the old reference group as a negative force.
Reference groups, therefore, can operate positively or negatively, depending upon whether they are used self-abasively to reinforce or attitudes or self-assertively as an influence to be opposed.

Prejudice, that is, group prejudice, is defined by Sherif as the negative attitude of members of one group toward another group and its members. Sherif thinks that "it is off the mark to treat the problem of group prejudice only in terms of the dynamics of individual frustration, jealousies, and enmities. Group prejudice is a product of group living. It manifests the characteristics of the phenomenon of 'distance' to which we have already referred. It is an established social norm, a standardized psychological product of the group. In many experimental studies it has been shown experimentally that there is no one-to-one relationship between group prejudice and contact with the group against which prejudice exists. Neither is there simple correlation between ignorance or lack of information and group prejudice. Prejudice in an individual is predominantly the product of group living. It is acquired by the individual along with his identifications, loyalties, aspirations, and opinions. In the final analysis, the reference group used by the individual operates either positively or negatively to make him a good member of the group with which he identifies himself.
The concepts of 'distance' and the 'annihilation of distance' produced by standardization of group norms are crucial for the explanation of many social-psychological phenomena. Combined with the theory of 'membership groups' and 'reference groups' and the principles of identification they go far towards the explanation of group prejudice.

The greatest experience of social solidarity seems to arise when the individual's membership and reference group are one and the same. With very few exceptions this actually takes place in national groupings. The individual who is a member of a particular nation, generally, accepts this nation as his reference group, in international matters. Processes of identification of long standing have caused him to identify himself with the nation as a whole. The more completely the identification with one's national group the more uncritically will the norms of the group be adopted in wholesale fashion. This shows the operation of some of the collective-abusive techniques, which he has learned to use in the service of elementary needs. In moments of stress, when the group is attacked or receives threat of attack, the alternative collective-assertive techniques may be brought into action. When in group solidarity is threatened the outgroup delineations rise up in unwonted clarity.

Social stratification seems to be one of the inevitable sequelae of social organization. Any organized group seems to evolve in time a class structure, implicitly /
implicitly or explicitly built upon a scale of value. Every society, even the most democratic seems to exhibit this evaluation of human beings in terms of some unwritten code. A certain amount of vertical mobility may be permissible in the members of certain social groups but the horizontal placing is apt to remain constant for most individuals throughout their lives. This represents their chief membership group in the community. The concept of status or class is closely bound up with the individual's ego-attitudes, and consequently ego-reference and ego-distance. Sherif constantly makes a great deal of this point. "The formation of attitudes towards various groups as prescribed by social norms regulating their relative positions in society is then one aspect of ego-development".

One characteristic, however, of modern civilization, is its organization of human beings into groups which are ever increasing in their sheer numerical force. The largest unit-group at the present time is the nation-state. There are signs that the nation state is tending to supersede all others in the psychological force which it possesses in the formation of identification, aspirations, loyalties, ambitions, and the power it exerts conceptually in the form of symbols. Most psychologists /
psychologists, I think, would attribute the tremendous force of patriotism (or ethnocentrism) to the indisputable fact that as far as the nation-group is concerned, it represents not only the membership group but also the reference group for most of its component individuals. We have seen, experimentally, what a powerful effect such a combination can produce in the maintenance and even change of attitudes. Add to this the weight of sheer numerical power in influencing men's attitudes. A problem which has not been studied experimentally but which would be worth investigating would be the extent to which the individual is able to withstand the force of public opinion (or 'the bandwagon effect' as it is called in the U.S.A.) and the strength of attitude maintenance. How well can the individual adhere to his reference group when all objective evidence clearly puts it into the minority. To stand within a membership group which is numerically very strong, and yet get one's bearings from a reference group of microscopic proportions is probably demanding too much from any individual. The sheer magnetic force of numbers must draw many would-be deviants into the vortex of conformity.

It is this power of attraction due to sheer weight of numbers, plus all the external symbols of force and unity that gives such cohesive strength to the national groups of to-day. What most pacifists are trying to do, although /
although they are not all aware of it in exact terms, is to bring about a change of ego-reference in the people of the world. To be a member of a nation-state and yet to look upon some world federation of such nation-states as one's reference group is the chief task of U.N.O. today. That a change of attitudes cannot be brought about suddenly by any number of fiats issuing from peace councils is gradually being realised by the people most intimately concerned.

As things stand at the moment, international affairs are being run on almost parochial lines with the exact coincidence of membership group and reference group units. Just as within the nation, loyalty to the nation-group and its use as a reference group is not incompatible with participation in varied membership groups, so something similar may be seen on a world scale, when national boundaries represent merely the boundaries of memberships, within the world-state reference group.

To some psychologists the study of attitudes is the alpha and omega of social psychology. This is quite understandable, because most of their definitions of attitude are so all-embracing that they are bound to cast a wide net over many fields of human behaviour. Sherif and Cantril give the following /
following omnibus definition of an attitude.

"An attitude is an established readiness which has a subject-object relationship of highly variable content which is learned (formed) which has affective properties with various degrees of motivational components, which may refer to whatever stimuli are encompassed in the subject-object relationship and which determines that an individual will react to the stimulus in a selective way. Once formed, an attitude serves as an anchorage to structure or modify subsequent experience or response". Ego-attitudes are defined in particular as being 'highly charged affective attitudes'. We could hardly ask for a more explicit definition than this of the term 'attitude'. The only criticism which might be made against it is that it does not take into account the various stages through which a pre-attitudinal state may pass on its way to becoming a fully-developed attitude. This definition of Sherif and Cantril's is entirely adequate for the description of a fully-developed attitude, and no doubt they had in mind the suggestion of finality in the word 'ready' when they composed it. But for many psychological studies, and for prejudice in particular, it is not this end-state which is of greatest interest, but what led up to it. An attitude in its final form is always part /
part of a clearly defined psychological context. With change of context, either natural or artificial, comes change of attitude. Many of us indubitably possess attitudes towards various matters in this fully developed form. But, on the other hand, we are all aware that in many areas of our thinking we remain somewhat submerged below the line, where a vague tendency to feel or think in a certain way emerges into a full-blown attitude. Most of us manage to get along from day to day without a "show-down" of our attitudes, either to ourselves or others on myriads of topics.

It would seem that attitudes manifest themselves in a subject-object situation rather than a "subject-object relationship". There is a connotation of realization, of actualization about the term 'attitude'. Before we can be said to have an attitude about anything a complex process of clarification has been going on in our minds. There is a definiteness about an attitude. It is always clearly 'pro' or 'anti'. It is incomprehensible apart from the total psychological field in existence at the time of expression. Attitudes are notoriously subject to change. They change according to the changes which take place in the total situation which called them forth.
forth. The more clearly defined the psychological field the more crystallized are our attitudes. But clearly defined psychological situations are apt to be the exception rather than the rule. Let us take the recent World War II. situation for example. The attitude of most people towards the enemy was held in the forefront of consciousness and were clearly defined, unmistakably 'pro' or 'anti'. What is psychologically interesting in such a situation is not that such and such a percentage of people were pro-German and another percentage were anti-German, but what pre-disposing causes rendered the one group favourable and the other group unfavourable when the total psychological situation was almost uniform for all. Some unknown factors pre-determined the fully-developed attitude of acceptance or rejection. For anyone interested in prejudice it is these pre-attitudinal states which are of the utmost importance. Like an iceberg which keeps by far the greater part of its mass concealed under water, the attitude (whether expressed overtly or not) in its fully-developed pro- or anti-form, is based upon a much more massive structure, consisting of the psychologically more interesting perceptual-cognitive structure of the individual.

One very important component element in this substructure /
substructure in attitude formation is what is known as belief. The relationship between belief and attitude is of necessity a very close one but the distinction between them is too important psychologically to be ignored. Krech and Crutchfield aptly describe a belief as "the cognitive embodiment of an attitude". From this it would seem that it is impossible to have an attitude without a related belief, but it is possible to have a belief without a specific related attitude. Belief formation is anterior to attitude formation. Its characteristic is its enduring quality, in contradistinction to the sudden emergence, variability and inconstancy of attitudes, which are called forth as component parts in a total psychological situation, which has brought the "subject-object relationship" from a mere pre-disposing condition to an actual pro- or anti-behaviour situation.

This enduring quality and complexity of the cognitive organization known as belief is fully brought out by Krech and Crutchfield. "A belief", they say, "is an enduring organization of perceptions and cognitions about some aspect of the individual's world". Elsewhere, they stress its development by describing it as an organization of an organization. It takes us one step further in the rising scale of complexity from the simplest organization of perceptual-cognitive elements/
elements to the complete organization of an attitude proper. To quote again from the same authority, "A belief is a structured complex totality of original perceptions and cognitions". This organization involves motivational and emotional processes as well as perceptual-cognitive elements. It is this "cognitive embodiment" quality in beliefs, which renders their analysis so essential in the study of the development of attitudes. In individuals it is this enduring structured organization, which acts like loaded dice in the toss-up between any pro- or anti-attitude. It would be indeed difficult in any psychological analysis, which must of necessity be artificial to isolate any pre-disposing cause more important in the formation of prejudice than the nature of our beliefs.

There is taking place at the present moment in the field of social psychological theory two distinct advances upon all earlier standpoints. These are the dislodgment of attitudes from their time-honoured position of supremacy and their re-allocation within the growing body of theory, and secondly, a new conception of the term 'attitude' itself, which incidentally brings it more into line with the distinction I have tried to draw between the pre-attitudinal states and attitudes proper. Two quotations from recent works will help to illustrate my points more /
more clearly. The following are two excerpts from the review, made by J.S. Bruner and M. Brewster Smith, of the recent book on Social Psychology, published by Krech and Crutchfield. In a highly favourable review, they welcome the new concept of attitude, in these words: "Through the application of motivational and cognitive principles the concept of attitude, traditionally so central in social psychology, has been placed in a context which is no longer remote from the main stream of psychological theory. For 'attitude' in this treatment becomes a grouping or 'packaging' of cognitive and motivational processes. The result is the first contemporary textbook in social psychology". The need for further definition, and one might almost say fission of the somewhat loose concept of attitude is best illustrated by a quotation from an article by E.K. Beller in the Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology of May, 1949. It runs: "On the basis of this analysis the following reconsideration of the concept of attitude is suggested. One can study two verbalizable components of a social attitude.

(1) the interiorized norm (an internal response) which reflects some source which impels the individual to react in a positive, negative, or neutral way toward the relevant value object and

(2) a behavioural disposition, which reflects other sources of /
of instigation (including incompatible interiorized norms) and which is more likely to be in accordance with the actual overt responses of the individual to the same value object. (Emphasis mine).

At the risk of being boring, I include one more quotation from the aforementioned review, to indicate that the type of study which we have here undertaken is in keeping with what will be the future trend in attitude investigation. "An attitude is defined and treated consistently as the enduring organization of motivational and cognitive processes in relation to some aspect of the psychological field. As such they treat its structural dimensions and something which was earlier lacking there is a good though elementary account of the functions which attitudes and beliefs serve in the economy of the individual's adjustment". In the discussion of the cultural and functional or psychological determinants of attitudes there is a richness of suggestion, which warrants the close examination of graduate students in search of thesis topics. For it is here, the reviewers agree with the authors, that the great advances in attitude theory are coming.

One's first impulse when studying attitudes of any description, positive or negative, is to attempt to construct a scale for their measurement. Many techniques have been specially devised to aid the psychologist in this /
this type of measurement, and he may model himself upon Thurstone and Chave, Likert, Guttman, Bogardus and others. Many of these are monuments to human ingenuity and the mathematical prowess of their inventors, but the 'vivid and real' that Wertheimer longed for in psychological investigation is very often forgotten in their application. The greatest defect in most attitude-measurement studies is a two-fold one. (1) Firstly, the scale enthusiasts often assume that terms are synonymous for all subjects taking the scale. It is valueless to compare statistically A's and B's attitudes to say, Germans, if upon presentation of the word "Germans" to consciousness, A conjures up a picture of sun-browned Jugendherberger with rucksacks, shorts and Tyrolean hats, and B a Hollywoodised version of Nazi gangsterdom. Such scales are valueless, unless they are preceded by a psychological analysis of the peculiar mental content of the individual, relevant to the topic, towards which attitudes are being investigated. Not only should this analysis come prior to the administration of any scale, but if it is omitted it means that we are ignoring a source of error, which no amount of statistical prestidigitation with its aura of scientific accuracy can remove, neutralize or nullify. (2) The second fault which is sometimes noticeable in the application /
application of scales is that the 'emergent' quality of attitudes is not always fully realized. An attitude emerges within a total psychological field. This holds for the written or verbal recording of an attitude in an interview or pencil-and-paper test situation. For many individuals the need has never before arisen to externalize verbally their 'interiorized norms' or latent attitudes. The same scale, given at a later date, presents a new situation within a new psychological field, and might accordingly call forth a different attitude. To make the attitude, which may be merely evanescent and tied to the specific situation, at least comprehensible we require to examine something more enduring, more inseparably linked with the personality structure of the individual. Two points, therefore, which we have to keep in mind in our attempts at attitude-investigation are best expressed in interrogative form.

What does the object mean psychologically to the individual? A preliminary analysis of mental content might be more valuable than most other procedures.

Is the expressed attitude merely brought forth by the psychological field existing at the moment of the test-situation, or is it characteristic of something more permanent?
In this study I intend to concentrate upon the analysis of certain beliefs as being the most rewarding procedure. If I were asked to associate each of the terms stereotype, belief and attitude with the psychological process with which it is most clearly connected, I should say that superficially speaking, a stereotype was predominantly perceptual, a belief predominantly cognitive, and an attitude predominantly motivational or affective. Probably the three terms are inextricably interrelated as are the three different processes in any psychological experience.

The great difficulty in defining prejudice arises because it partakes something of the nature of a belief and something of the nature of an attitude. In what I chose to describe as latent prejudice it is more akin to a belief, more purely cognitive in aspect. In the form I call active or salient prejudice it is much more akin to attitude with its pro- or anti-emotional tone, ready to bridge the gap between fundamental psychological processes and action.

I have shown the first of these aspects for investigation for two reasons. Firstly, on the grounds of expediency, since it is much easier to carry out in the somewhat artificial paper-and-pencil test situation. Secondly, because I consider it the more important aspect of /
of prejudice, and therefore not easily negligible when any choice has to be made.

Just what, then, we may ask ourselves, is the relation between prejudice and the stereotyped beliefs about other nations, which are being carried about by the young people of to-day. Stereotypes are toughly resistant to change. Those we acquire in youth are not easy to discard. The future belongs to the youth of the world. They will determine whether peaceful living or warfare is to be the solution of our international problems. Since a stereotyped belief, viewed from our angle, represents the measure of success which standardizing (or normalizing) psychological influences have had in producing nearly the same milieu for everyone, can we as a result of our investigation say that we are not only beginning to look almost exactly like our neighbours but are beginning to think almost exactly like them? How far has the process of psychological standardization (or to use the more common term 'socialization') influenced the young people we have selected for study, in the field of international awareness. Purely sociological data will only be related to our material only in so far as it helps in the understanding of the 'environmental supports' of the perceptual-cognitive material at our disposal.

Studies /
Studies of stereotyping, as it affects other nationalities, has been most extensively carried out in the U.S.A. Krech and Crutchfield sum up the results of such studies in the following terms. "People in America tend to have a remarkably high consistence and uniformity in their beliefs about other peoples of the world. Certain traits are widely believed to characterize given nationalities, and there is relatively little differentiation made among the people of a country. For large numbers of people in America, in fact, there is even less differentiation than this — all 'furriners' are alike, and usually bad. Evidence of the beliefs of people in other countries about the rest of the world is meager, but it seems certain that extreme 'stereotyping' is the rule. (Emphasis mine).
IV. THE NATURE AND FINDINGS OF THE INVESTIGATION.

The reasons for the following investigation have already been given, and I hope validated, but to complete our report, we must give the "who", "where", "when", "what" and "how" of things, as well as the "why".

THE SUBJECTS.

This is the first hurdle which the would-be researcher will probably encounter. People are seldom willing to be "guinea-pigs", but are even more recalcitrant when the investigator assumes the appearance of the hated "sniper" who wants to know what people think "en masse". Only one who has tried social investigation can ever know what adamant opposition can be met with in the endeavour to know what people think about anything. No veil of anonymity could ever be opaque enough to induce the mass of British people, at least, to state freely their opinions on subjects, connected even in the remotest degree with politics. The accuracy of the ballot-box has always seemed to me one of the anomalies of democratic society, but it is one of those traditions which are so well established that few people ever begin...
IV. THE NATURE AND FINDINGS OF THE INVESTIGATION.

THE NATURE OF THE INVESTIGATION.

The reasons for the following investigation have already been given, and I hope validated, but to complete our report, we must give the "who", "where", "when", "what" and "how" of things, as well as the "why".

THE SUBJECTS.

This is the first hurdle which the would-be research worker encounters and is usually a formidable one. People are seldom willing to be "guinea-pigs", but are even more recalcitrant when the investigator assumes the appearance of the hated "snooper" who wants to know what people think "en masse". Only one who has tried social investigation can ever know what adamant opposition can be met with in the endeavour to know what people think about anything. No veil of anonymity could ever be opaque enough to induce the mass, of British people, at least, to state freely their opinions on subjects, connected even in the remotest degree with politics. The secrecy of the ballot-box has always seemed to me one of the anomalies of democratic society, but it is one of those traditions which are so well established that few people ever begin /
begin to question their existence. For this reason, such an investigation as has been carried out here is almost unimaginable among certain sections of our adult population. Fortunately, for this investigation, it was adolescents and young subjects who were eminently desirable. Otherwise, the wall of opposition might have been too great for anyone to penetrate. The co-operation of just over eight hundred and fifty young people and adolescents was finally secured.

**PLACE AND TIME OF INVESTIGATION.**

Institutions, like schools and colleges, just naturally suggest themselves to the social investigator as likely hunting-grounds. Here the existing administration and organization of the institution often help to make the selection and classification of subjects much easier.

But it is precisely in those places where the likeliest subjects are found in the greatest concentration that one also encounters the most consolidated phalanx of opposition in the form of resentment at the threatened intrusion upon privacy. For this reason, all hope of reaching the young subjects in public schools had to be abandoned. This necessarily rendered useless any pre-arranged system /
system of sampling. Beggars cannot be choosers and "stratified sampling", one of the best means of introducing something resembling control into social research entails freedom of choice. I had to find subjects as best I might and trust to luck that the resulting sample would be a "random" one. Some institutions were, indeed, prevailed upon to grant some subjects, but no one can say what incalculable perhaps unconscious process of selection went on in the mind of the Headmaster or Superintendent. Most of the subjects were found in private day-schools and institutions of further education for boys and girls. Some girls' clubs also granted facilities for the investigation. With the exception of the girls' clubs, which were visited in the evenings, most of the subjects were dealt with in the course of the day, either individually, or in groups, which were kindly freed from the normal time-table of the institution to take part in the investigation. The period of investigation extended from November 1948 to July 1949.

**METHOD OF INVESTIGATION.**

The matter to be investigated had previously been defined as the cognitive awareness of other nations, with the /
the stress laid on those which arouse prejudice and attitudes of rejection in the minds of the subjects. The best manner of investigating this awareness and these attitudes had to be designed so that it could be carried out expeditiously and in such a way that the investigator, who by the very nature of his task is not always a persona grata should take up as little time and space as possible and also glean what he could in the way of personal and sociological data, to serve as a background for his results. The preliminary "try-out" or test-run although theoretically ideal is not always possible. One hour of each subject's time was made available. The investigator made the most of this by trying two approaches and discarding later the one which yielded least in the way of valuable information. The great reservoir of stereotyped beliefs had to be tapped in some way. One method was to give the subject very little time so that responses would be almost automatic, and presumably more stereotyped because ill-considered. The other way was to give the subjects more time for considered opinions to see if the resulting expressions of true belief might be more original and less a prey to stereotypy. The target seemed to resolve itself into a double one. By aiming at both stereotypy and true belief /
belief one might hope to strike one or at least something in between.

Each subject was given a little printed booklet, whose pretentious-sounding title, viz: "A Study of Intergroup Attitudes", it must be asseverated was intended to serve as a disguise rather than as a faithful description of either its purpose or contents. It has no doubt called forth a few snorts of contempt from those who do not realise its true purpose and have accepted it at its face value as an atrocious example of psychological jargon. But it is just as well when investigating prejudice not to call a spade a spade. So much for the somewhat absurd title.

Each subject was required to furnish as much personal data as possible under the following headings:

1. Name.
2. Age.
3. Address.
4. School or College. (Source).
5. Nationality.
6. Father's occupation. (This in preference to father's income, which would have been regarded as intrusion of privacy).
7. Attendance at Church or Sunday School.
8. Attendance of parents at Church.
9. Conversations about politics. (Do your parents discuss politics?) Probably a somewhat risky question.

10. Newspaper reading. (Do you ever read newspapers?)

11. Radio listening habits. (Do you listen to talks on the wireless?)

12. Interest in other countries. (Do you like films showing life in other countries?)

13. Interest in other countries. (Have you ever visited a foreign country?)

14. Interest in other countries. (What foreign country or countries have you the greatest desire to visit?)

15. The word "foreign" was purposely not defined for the subjects since it was considered possibly interesting to see what countries might be regarded as foreign.

15. Political convictions. (What Government party would you vote for if you could vote to-day?)

Strictly speaking, the phrase should have been "political party", but from my experience of teaching children and adolescents, I knew which phrase was more likely to elicit the information I required.

A tripartite investigational approach seemed to hold out the greatest promise of meaningful results, which would divide themselves into categories broadly classifiable as affective, cognitive and behavioural (or motoric).
Affective Responses.

The following list of nationalities and races was read out to the subjects at the rate of one item every five seconds. The subjects were required to underline any which suggested anything in the slightest degree unpleasant or distasteful.

1. Americans.  
2. English.  
4. German Jews.  
5. French.  
7. Dutchman.  
8. Germans.  
10. Irishmen.  
11. Russians.  
15. Poles.  
17. Spaniards.  
18. Scotsmen.  
20. Greeks.  
22. Italians.  
23. Filipinos.  
24. Hungarians.  
27. Danes.  
28. Turks.  
29. Czechoslovakians.  
30. Bulgarians.  
31. Finns.  
32. Arabs.  
33. Hindus.  
34. Negroes.  
35. Bohemians.  
36. Syrians.  
37. Armenians.  
38. Servians.  
40. Australians.  
41. Hawaiians.  
42. Swiss.  
43. South Americans.  
44. Albanians.  
45. Muslims.

The total of underlined items was calculated for each subject, and this total I have called Prejudice Score. A distribution was made of these Prejudice Scores and is shown in histogram form on Page 475, Table No. 17. From an acquaintance
with general social behaviour trends one would expect this to result in the well-known J-curve of conforming behaviour, and this is to a large extent true as can be seen from the shape of the histogram. However, the really vital information which this part of the investigation yielded lay in the revelation it gave of those nations or races which aroused prejudice on the largest scale. This was calculated by considering each of the races or nations in the list one by one and taking the number of underlinings accorded to it. In this way, what we might call the "prejudice-provoking" nations could be isolated, and graded. The result is shown on the diagram on Page 476 Fig. 18.

**COGNITIVE RESPONSES.**

The following twenty items were selected from the long list as being most worthy of the closest investigations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>(No.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Americans</td>
<td>(No. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>(No. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>(No. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>(No. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Germans</td>
<td>(No. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Canadians</td>
<td>(No. 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>(No.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>(No.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>(No.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Poles</td>
<td>(No.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Scotsmen</td>
<td>(No. 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>(No. 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>(No. 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>(No. 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Finns</td>
<td>(No. 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Arabs</td>
<td>(No. 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>(No. 33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Negroes</td>
<td>(No. 34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Australians</td>
<td>(No.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>(No. 45)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These twenty items were then used as stimuli, firstly with the intention of revealing stereotypy and secondly of exposing the true beliefs of the subjects. From even the most cursory inspection of the returned responses it could be noticed that there was a very close correspondence between stereotypes as thus examined and the beliefs of the subjects. The beliefs or sentence responses, being more informative, were, therefore, retained for scrutiny and the words or phrase responses discarded. The method of presentation was as follows:

(1) **STEREOTYPES.** The list of twenty items was read out at the rate of one item every ten seconds. The subjects were asked to write down on the space provided the first word or phrase which occurred to them when they thought of the personality, character, or appearance of members of the particular nation concerned.

(2) **TRUE BELIEFS.** More time was given in this section for the recording of responses. The subjects were allowed one minute for each /
each item. This time they were required to write one true sentence about each of the peoples mentioned. No constraint was imposed other than that the sentence should be interesting, if possible, and above all, should be believed to be true by the subject himself.

(3) **ETHNOCENTRISM.** It was considered desirable to gain, if possible, some information as to the extent and intensity of ethnocentrism. This was done by asking the subjects to write down in order of preference the names of all the races or nations which they liked. Six spaces were provided, with additional space for reasons, if, any, but subjects were free to add still more if they wished.

(4) **XENOPHOBIA.** In similar fashion, xenophobia was approached by asking the subjects to write down the names of the races or nations which they disliked. The same freedom as regards number of responses was granted.
This part of the investigation came nearest to measuring attitudes or behaviour tendencies. Eight degrees of social intimacy were arbitrarily chosen, ranging from No. 1 presumably the degree indicative of the closest intimacy to No. 8, the supposedly most remote. The attention of the subjects was not drawn to these intended gradations. It was hoped that any major error in the placing of these degrees would be made apparent by the results. Something of this nature did actually happen.
The degrees of social distance were drawn up as follows:

1. COUSIN. (or related by marriage)
2. LIVE IN THE SAME HOUSE.
3. SCHOOL CHUM (or chum).
4. MEMBER OF MY CLUB.
5. IN MY SCHOOL TEAM (or sports team).
6. SIT NEXT TO IN CLASS (or work next to).
7. ATTEND SAME SCHOOL (or work in same place).
8. LIVE IN MY COUNTRY.

The adaptations in brackets were re-phrasing of the degree of intimacy for those adolescents and young people who were old enough to have left school. The previously selected twenty items were again used in this part of the investigation. Three possible responses were open to the subjects. They were asked to state acceptance (by a X), rejection (by an O) or doubt (by a ?) of each of the twenty nations or races in each of these degrees of intimacy. It was explained to them that in this way they could show how friendly they would be towards those they liked and how distant with those they disliked. The concept of 'distance' is such a familiar one in everyday life that it was found surprisingly easy to get this idea "across" to the subjects.
subjects. Usually in this, the Bogardus method of studying social distance, no opportunity is given for the subject to record doubt, but doubt itself is a psychologically significant, potential attitude which is too important to be neglected, and was therefore included for any suggestive features it might display.

This concludes the description of the various sections of the booklet issued to each subject taking part. Frank responses were encouraged, and, I think, in actual fact, secured by the promise of confidential treatment of all statements.
ANALYSIS OF DATA.

From the information vouchsafed on the Personal Data sheet, the following groupings of the subjects could be made.

SEX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>623</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RELIGION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROTESTANT</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROMAN CATHOLIC</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPISCOPALIAN</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEWS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTIAN SCIENTISTS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONE STATED</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLITICAL CONVICTIONS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Conviction</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LABOUR</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSERVATIVE</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNIST</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH NATIONALIST</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEPENDENT</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONE STATED</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(It is interesting to note here the close parallel between this configuration and the actual results of the election).

AGE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 years</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 years</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 years</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 years</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in Years</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No age stated</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLACE OF ORIGIN:**
- Edinburgh: 634
- Other Places: 230

**CHURCH ATTENDANCE:**

(self)
- Yes: 622
- No: 180
- Sometimes: 41
- No Answer: 21

(Parents)
- Yes: 595
- No: 191
- Sometimes: 56
- No Answer: 22
WIRELESS TALKS.

YES 493
NO 186
Seldom 13
Sometimes 152
No answer 20

FILMS (OTHER COUNTRIES.)

YES 738
No 82
Sometimes 14
Seldom 9
No answer 21

VISITS TO OTHER COUNTRIES.

YES 177
No 653
No answer 34

NEWSPAPER READING CHOICES.

Evening News 258
Daily Express 217
Daily Mail 97
Scotsman 89
Sunday Post 78
Daily Mirror 55
Dispatch 53
Bulletin 44
Daily Record 43
Weekly News 32
News of the World 26
News Chronicle 24
Daily Herald 23
Evening Dispatch 20
People 13
Journal 12
Sunday Mail 12

Sunday Paper 11
Sunday Pictorial 9
Glasgow Herald 6
Dailies 6
Sunday Express 5
Daily Telegraph 4
Observer 3
Reynolds News 3
Sunday Dispatch 2
London Times 2
SUNDAY GRAPHIC 2
GLASGOW WEEKLY 2
Weekly Scotsman 2
Empire News 2
Courier 2
Daily Worker 2
John Bull 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUNDAY CHRONICLE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOON RECORD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAILY GRAPHIC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALKELTH SQUEAK</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARMERS WEEKLY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORWARD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIBUNE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKETCH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOA JOURNAL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHETLAND TIMES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST LOTHIAN COURIER</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAITHNESS COURIER</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENOCK TELEGRAPH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERALD OF WALES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALTIMORE EXPRESS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK TIMES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEWISHAM TIMES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENING TIMES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORDER TELEGRAPH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTEREST IN OTHER COUNTRIES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRALIA</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANADA</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWITZERLAND</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW ZEALAND</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH AFRICA</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORWAY</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRICA</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIA</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH AMERICA</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLLAND</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEDEN</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSIA</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAIN</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGYPT</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRINIDAD</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST INDIES</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRELAND</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENMARK</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPE</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORLD</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREECE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRIA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIRET</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALAYA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDO-CHINA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICELAND</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLAND</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERMUDAS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZECHOSLOVAKIA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABRADOR</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERU</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR EAST</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINLAND</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALKANS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAVA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.S. ISLANDS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSIA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GROUP I.** Professional men, proprietors or large businesses, and higher executives.

**GROUP II.** Commercial service, clerical service, large land owners, managerial service and business proprietors.

**GROUP III.** Artisan proprietors, petty officials, skilled labourers with some managerial responsibility, small shop-owners and business proprietors.

**GROUP IV.** Skilled labourer who work for someone else, building trades, transportation trades, manufacturing trades, involving skilled labour, personal service, small shop-owners doing their own work.

**GROUP V.** Unskilled labourers, common labourers, helpers, "hands", peddlers, varied employment, vendors, unemployed, (unless it represents the leisured class or retired).

Thus the father's profession as a guide to the probable socio-economic /
socio-economic status of the family the following grouping was made:

GROUP I. 53
GROUP II. 61
GROUP III. 95
GROUP IV. 251
GROUP V. 254
UNSTATED 150

The foregoing data are shown graphically in the Diagrams Section. See Figures 1 to 16. Pages 467 to 474.
Since such large numbers were prejudiced against the Japanese, Jews and Russians, it was deemed more convenient to isolate the unprejudiced groups against these particular nations for the "breakdown of the data". By subtraction the numbers of prejudiced in each group could be calculated.

**FIGURES AND PERCENTAGE OF PREJUDICED IN EACH OF THE GROUPINGS IN THE BREAKDOWN OF DATA.**

(The figures found here are complementary to those given in the graphs Figures 22 to 77).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>JEWS</th>
<th>JAPANESE</th>
<th>RUSSIANS</th>
<th>NUMBER IN WHOLE GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>510 82</td>
<td>436 70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>211 87.5</td>
<td>154 63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>721 83.4</td>
<td>590 67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLACE OF ORIGIN.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JEWS</th>
<th>JAPANESE</th>
<th>RUSSIANS</th>
<th>WHOLE GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>518 80.1</td>
<td>523 82.5</td>
<td>435 68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other places</td>
<td>204 88.7</td>
<td>198 86.1</td>
<td>155 67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>722 83.5</td>
<td>721 83.4</td>
<td>590 67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Socio-Economic Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>JEWS</th>
<th>JAPANESE</th>
<th>RUSSIANS</th>
<th>Whole Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstated</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JEWS</th>
<th>JAPANESE</th>
<th>RUSSIANS</th>
<th>Whole Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstated</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>JEWS</td>
<td>JAPANESE</td>
<td>RUSSIANS</td>
<td>WHOLE GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14 87.5</td>
<td>15 93.7</td>
<td>13 82.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>21 87.5</td>
<td>20 83.3</td>
<td>22 91.6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>32 91.4</td>
<td>32 91.4</td>
<td>29 82.8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>194 83.6</td>
<td>195 84.0</td>
<td>153 65.9</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>190 81.1</td>
<td>190 81.1</td>
<td>158 67.5</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>123 84.8</td>
<td>125 86.2</td>
<td>100 68.9</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>60 83.3</td>
<td>58 80.5</td>
<td>45 62.5</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>32 96.9</td>
<td>26 78.8</td>
<td>22 66.7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>17 85.0</td>
<td>20 100</td>
<td>15 75.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>15 83.3</td>
<td>14 77.8</td>
<td>11 61.1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5 83.3</td>
<td>3 50.0</td>
<td>3 50.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 33.3</td>
<td>3 100.0</td>
<td>2 66.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3 60.0</td>
<td>3 60.0</td>
<td>4 80.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1 50.0</td>
<td>1 50.0</td>
<td>1 50.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 50.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstated</td>
<td>5 62.5</td>
<td>4 50</td>
<td>4 50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### POLITICAL CONVICTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JEWS</th>
<th>JAPANESE</th>
<th>RUSSIANS</th>
<th>WHOLE GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalist</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communist</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RELIGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JEWS</th>
<th>JAPANESE</th>
<th>RUSSIANS</th>
<th>WHOLE GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopalian</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Talks</td>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>Whole Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes Seldom</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Films of Other Countries</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Russians</th>
<th>Whole Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes Seldom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visits to Other Countries</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Russians</th>
<th>Whole Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CHURCH ATTENDANCE (Self).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JEWS</th>
<th>JAPANESE</th>
<th>RUSSIANS</th>
<th>WHOLE GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>523 84.1</td>
<td>535 86.0</td>
<td>442 71.0</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>125 69.4</td>
<td>138 76.6</td>
<td>109 60.5</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td>37 90.2</td>
<td>33 80.5</td>
<td>33 80.5</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>17 80.9</td>
<td>15 71.4</td>
<td>6 28.6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>722</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHURCH ATTENDANCE (PARENTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JEWS</th>
<th>JAPANESE</th>
<th>RUSSIANS</th>
<th>WHOLE GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>490 82.3</td>
<td>509 85.5</td>
<td>417 70.1</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>163 85.3</td>
<td>151 79.2</td>
<td>121 63.3</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td>52 92.8</td>
<td>48 85.7</td>
<td>44 78.6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>17 77.3</td>
<td>13 59.1</td>
<td>8 36.3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>722</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a clearer representation of the foregoing section, refer to Pages 480 to 483 (Diagrams.) and the relevant diagrams on Pages 484 to 487.
### Political Discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Russians</th>
<th>Whole Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>722</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Newspaper Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Russians</th>
<th>Whole Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>722</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a clearer representation of the foregoing section, refer to Pages 480 to 483 (Diagrams.) and the relevant diagrams on Pages 484 to 489.
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS.

SEX.

It is interesting to note that, although the females in this sample were shown to be significantly less prejudiced than the males, generally speaking, a larger percentage of females are prejudiced against the Japanese.

PLACE OF ORIGIN.

Within the term "Other Places" it must be admitted, were included few other large cities. Broadly speaking, therefore, it refers to the more or less rural areas in the Lothians and other parts of Scotland. The results indicate that the more strictly urban group show less prejudice except in the case of the Russians.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS.

Both Jews and Russians arouse the greatest number of prejudiced responses among the group designated as III. This was the group, covering the following classes of occupations.

"Artisans, proprietors, petty officials, skilled labourers, with some managerial responsibility, small shop-owners, and business proprietors", that is, neither the topmost nor the lowest /
lowest stratum in the occupational hierarchy. The Japanese this time are the exception, arousing the greatest percentage of prejudiced responses among Group II. (Commercial service, clerical service, large land owners, managerial service, and business proprietors).

NATIONALITY.

It is interesting to know that subjects who described themselves as being Scottish, that is subject to the narrowest type of ethnocentrism, seem to have shown a greater percentage of prejudiced responses against the Jews than any other group. One would have expected a greater degree of sympathy for the Jews, since some of the ethnophaulisms against the stinginess of the Scots resemble those associated with the Jews.

On the other hand, the group claiming British nationality were strongest in their condemnation of the Russians. Perhaps we can detect here the influence of political propaganda.

In actual fact, the group which declined to state any particular nationality, for reasons which we can only guess, produced the greatest number of prejudiced responses against the Japanese. However, this group was numerically almost negligible, so that, probably /
probably more reliance can be placed on the 84.5% prejudiced responses against the Japanese, and again produced by the Scottish group. It would seem that the narrower the ethnocentrism the greater the tendency to national prejudice.

AGE.

Somewhat unexpectedly, the greatest amount of prejudice, as revealed by percentage responses against the Jews was found in the 19-20 years Age-Group. Lower age-groups, namely the 12-13 and 13-14 year-groups exhibited the greatest amount of prejudice against the Japanese and Russians respectively. It was found that there was a certain degree of association, not significant to be sure, but nevertheless present, indicating a decrease of prejudice with age. Now we find in this further analysis, that the anti-semitic attitude is more resistant apparently than the other prejudiced attitudes to the presumable "wearing-away" process of increasing years.

POLITICAL CONVICTIONS.

Question: "What Government Party would you vote for if you could vote to-day?"

"Conviction" is too strong a term to use here, but it is a convenient one. The question was included in order /
order to gain some conception of the kind of political atmosphere or background of the subjects. The results must be interpreted with the greatest of reserve. The majority of the subjects were under twenty-one (forty-nine to be exact, were over twenty-one) and were merely asked to state the party they would vote for if they were old enough to possess the vote. Probably, the greater number of the subjects did actually name the political party favoured by their parents. It was hoped that this would be the case and it probably did happen, but we have no way of proving it. I must admit that personally I was astonished at the number of "Conservative" responses, from a sample which was in the bulk not drawn mainly from the upper economic levels. The resulting configuration of results bears a striking resemblance to the actual results of the election which followed soon after. The group describing themselves as having Liberal preferences were most prejudiced against the Japanese and the Russians. The "Communist" group showed the greatest amount of prejudice against the Jews.

**RELIGION.**

The great majority of the subjects were Protestant, as can be seen from Graph 2, p.467. This group exhibited the greatest degree of prejudice against the Jews. The influence /
influence of the Old and New Testament may be greater here than one usually imagines.

The Roman Catholic group showed the greatest percentage of prejudiced responses against the Russians, which is not surprising.

Prejudice against the Japanese was almost evenly divided among the major religious groupings. The prejudice in this case seems to transcend all religious differences.

**WIRELESS TALKS.**

Question: Do you listen to talks on the wireless?

The talks intended in this case were not specifically political talks and the subjects were advised of this. The answer to the question was sought as a likely indicator of the part played by selective listening in the subject's domestic background. If any kind of talks is listened to regularly or even at all, it indicates the use of the wireless at a higher than purely entertainment level. Again the results are to be interpreted with the greatest caution. They are to be regarded as nothing more than a rough index of "serious" listening on the part of the subject or his immediate associates.

Those declaring that they seldom listen to talks of /
of any kind were most prejudiced against the Japanese and Russians. The subjects who declared that they did not listen to talks at all were most prejudiced against the Jews. With the above-mentioned proviso in mind, we may perhaps say that the results suggest that increasing use of the radio on an instructive level is associated with a decrease in the degree of national prejudice.

CHURCH ATTENDANCE.

It is difficult to know what degree of faith to put in the honesty of the replies to a question of this sort. In a recent survey carried out in Birmingham (see 80,000 Adolescents. Bryan Reed) which asked a similar question, designed to discover what amount of church attendance was common among adolescents, it was found that many, especially girls declared that they attended church, but when asked to specify whether it was "last week", "last month" etc. revealed that they went on such occasions as weddings or funerals. However, in the same survey a greater degree of church attendance was revealed than the investigators believed possible. (See Page 159 (Table given.)). Likewise, in our present study it would appear that a large number of adolescents do attend Church or Sunday School /
School (including Bible Class). A close correspondence seems to manifest itself between church attendance on the part of the parents and church attendance on the part of the family. Of the group stating that they do attend some such religious congregation, a large percentage are prejudiced against the Japanese. Those who attend "sometimes" are most prejudiced against the Jews and Russians. These findings are in keeping with what many of the Frenkel-Brunswik studies have revealed, namely that extreme prejudice (it happened to be anti-semitism) was often coupled with the more extreme form of outward religious conformity.

**CHURCH ATTENDANCE (Parents).**

Those subjects whose parents attend church "sometimes" show the greatest number of prejudice responses against all three ethnic groups.

**POLITICAL DISCUSSIONS.**

Question: Do your parents talk about politics?

This question was used again as a possible indicator of the seriousness of the subject's informal education in political matters. In all cases it was found that the greatest number of prejudiced responses was aroused in the group disavowing any such political influence. Might this not suggest that political ignorance /
ignorance and prejudice have a closer association than is generally believed?

NEWSPAPER READING.

Question: Do you ever read newspapers?

Again, not a specific question it was intended more to discover whether one more avenue of communication between individual and community was opened up or not, and if so how frequently.

The great bulk of those who admit that they do read newspapers showed prejudice against the Japanese and the Russians. Anti-semitic responses in this group were also high.

The group, admittedly small, declaring that they do not read newspapers showed a high percentage of prejudiced responses against the Jews.

FILMS OF OTHER COUNTRIES.

Question: Do you like films showing life in other countries?

The question did not apply only to the type of film known as a travelogue. This latter type of film can be so boringly treated that it would kill for ever any interest in other peoples. It was further explained that within the question were included all films which had /
had as their setting for the story some country other than our own. The groups denying all interest in other countries showed the greatest percentage of prejudiced responses against the Jews and Japanese.

Those with a slightly greater degree of interest were prejudiced to the greatest extent against the Russians.

VISITS TO OTHER COUNTRIES.

This question was an attempt to divide the group up into those who have had some experience of groups different in some way from their own. It meant simply a journey outside Scotland, even if it were only to England, Ireland or Wales. An astonishing number of subjects had not travelled outside Scotland. The more widely travelled group exhibited the greatest percentage of prejudiced responses against all three, Jews, Japanese and Russians.

DESIRE TO VISIT OTHER COUNTRIES.

There seems to be an inverse relation between prejudice against countries and the desire to visit them. The amazing popularity of the U.S.A. is coupled with an extremely widespread desire to visit it among the young people investigated. It is interesting to note how low /
low down in the scale of interest are the "prejudice-
provoking" countries Japan and Russia.

**NEWSPAPER CHOICES.**

Subjects who did read newspapers were asked to add
the names of those which they read most frequently or
regularly. It was thought that the Sunday papers would
reap the greatest frequency of choices. It was the
strictly local papers which showed the greatest popularity.
(Evening News mentioned two hundred and fifty-eight times;
the great national paper the Daily Express mentioned two
hundred and seventeen times). Interestingly enough, a
similar question was included in the Birmingham investigation.
There it was the Sunday papers which loomed large in
popularity figures. I should be very much interested to
know whether this is one of the regional differences between
Scottish and English towns.

The following tables are given for comparison. They
are taken from the book "80,000 Adolescents" by Brian Reed,
and published by Allen and Unwin.
SUNDAY NEWSPAPER READING BY YOUNG PEOPLE.

**GIRLS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News of the World</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Pictorial</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The People</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Mercury</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Dispatch</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Express</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Graphic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds News</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Chronicle</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire News</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Observer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Times</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**BOYS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News of the World</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Pictorial</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The People</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Mercury</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Dispatch</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Express</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Graphic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds News</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Chronicle</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire News</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Observer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Times</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Church Attendance (expressed as percentages).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Once a week or more.</th>
<th>Went last Sunday.</th>
<th>Once a Seldom or never.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GIRLS.</strong></td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOYS.</strong></td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined</strong></td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Figures taken from 30,000 Adolescents by Bryan Reed).
ETHNOCENTRISM.

An interesting fact emerged from the attempt to measure ethnocentrism. The subjects were asked to write down in order the names of the race, nation, or people which they liked best. In spite of the fact that the names of people were asked for, many of the subjects wrote down the names of countries. This was taken to stand for the name of the people. A count was made of the number of times each nation or people appeared on these lists. It was found that Canada (Canadians) received the greatest number of choices, namely seven hundred and ninety-eight. The complete list goes as follows:

Canadians 798  Irish  111
Americans  477  Germans  81
Australians  467  Negroes  22
Scots  357  Poles  17
English  156  Jews  9
New Zealanders  111

Since this raw count made no allowance for position on the list, it was thought feasible to introduce some kind of weighting to see how it would affect the placing of the various peoples. The raw counts were weighted in the following way.

Since six positions were possible, it was decided to multiply by six all first place counts, to multiply by five all second place counts, by four all third place counts, by three all fourth place counts, by two all fifth place /
place counts, and by one all sixth place counts. In this way, if any nation was mentioned only once, but in the first place, it acquired a weighted count of six, whereas if any nation was mentioned only once, but in the sixth place its weighted score still remained 1 (i.e. 1 x 1).

For convenience, I have called the raw counts the extensity of ethnocentrism and the weighted counts the intensity of ethnocentrism. An interesting change of position was noted. When weighting was introduced in this way, the Americans soared into prominence, and so did Scotland. I cannot help thinking that this is a better indication of ethnocentrism than the former method revealed.

The placing was then as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americans</td>
<td>2217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australians</td>
<td>2179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadians</td>
<td>2119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Fig. 21. on Page 479.
COGNITIVE ANALYSIS OF BELIEFS.
(See pages 490 to 492, Diagrams Section.)

Personally, I found this the most absorbing part of the whole research project. It came nearest, I think, to a psychological analysis of the prevailing cognitive structures of the group studied. It was infinitely interesting to go through about eight hundred subjects' responses, hardly expecting to find any common ground for comparison, and then to see them arranging themselves in what might be called cognitive patterns. It was easy to detect approval, disapproval and impartiality. What was even more interesting was to discover that the range of topics or areas of opinion were not illimitable but could be broadly distinguished and usefully labelled. Expecting the natural criticism that my own categorization might be termed arbitrary or capricious, I have given a verbatim recording of these responses and the categories or cognitive areas to which I have allocated them. Sometimes, a subject could manage to telescope within one sentence two or three ideas, coming under separate opinion categories. Sometimes the favourable attitude might be coupled with an unfavourable one in some other area and so on. After all /
all the categorizations had been made a count was taken of the beliefs under the three broad divisions, Favourable; Unfavourable; and Neutral. The frequency distributions are shown diagrammatically for swifter comparison and reference.

RANGE OF COGNITIVE AREAS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAVOURABLE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>UNFAVOURABLE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the first points to strike the observer is the amazing difference in the range of cognitive areas. In all three cases the range of cognitive areas which are unfavourable far exceeds the range of either the neutral or the favourable. Taking frequency of mention as a criterion of stereotypy let us examine which, if any, of the cognitive areas exceeds the fifty mark (i.e. receives more than fifty separate mentions). The clearest case of extreme stereotypy is to be found in the frequent mention of No. 1 (Unfavourable) in reference to the Japanese. (See Diagram 83, on page 491.)
**Instances of Extreme Stereotypy.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAVOURABLE.</strong></td>
<td>JEWs.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAPANESE</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RUSSIANS</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEWs.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEUTRAL.</strong></td>
<td>JAPANESE</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RUSSIANS</td>
<td>No. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JEWs.</td>
<td>Nos. 4, 6, 13, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAPANESE</td>
<td>Nos. 1 and 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RUSSIANS</td>
<td>Nos. 1, 2, 11 and 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNFAVOURABLE.</strong></td>
<td>JEWs.</td>
<td>No. 4. Treatment under Hitler administration (i.e. their ill-treatment was well-merited).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAPANESE</td>
<td>No. 1. Cruelty and brutality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RUSSIANS</td>
<td>No. 2. Cunning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unfavorable Stereotyped Beliefs.**

**JEWs.**
- No. 4. Treatment under Hitler administration (i.e. their ill-treatment was well-merited).
- No. 6. Unpleasant competitiveness.
- No. 13. Cunning.
- No. 18. Evil character.

**JAPANESE.**
- No. 1. Cruelty and brutality.
- No. 2. Cunning.
RUSSIANS.

No. 1. Secretiveness.
No. 2. Desire for hegemony.
No. 12. War-mongering (Aggressiveness and war preparation).
No. 12 Evil and treacherous character.

NEUTRAL STEREOTYPED BELIEFS.

JEWS.

JAPANESE.

RUSSIANS. Type of government. Political framework.
SOCIAL DISTANCE.  (See pages 493 & 494 Diagrams section.)

Kurt Lewin distinguishes two interpretations of the term "social distance" (a) the psychological interpretation, referring to the personality structure and its layers, ranging from the peripheral regions to the central core of the personality, and (b) the sociological interpretation, referring to the degrees of intimacy permissible between members of a group. Some other writers would see no need for the distinction and one can readily sympathize with such an easily defensible standpoint. The degrees of intimacy, it must be remembered, were arbitrarily chosen. The only gross misplacement seemed to be the second one (i.e. Live in the same house). This seemed to represent the closest degree of intimacy for this particular group. With few exceptions a greater amount of rejection was shown in this degree than in any of the others. The exceptions were:

(1) Jews (slight difference).
(2) Japanese (equal).
(3) Italians (less).
(4) Negroes (less).
(5) Muslims (equal).
It is curious also to note that even in the case of the highly popular Americans the amount of rejection in this degree of intimacy seems disproportionately large. Another point to be noted is the extremely large percentage of doubt expressed in connection with the Finns, and to a lesser extent with the Hindus and the Greeks. Relevant cognitive structures were in these cases probably entirely lacking or in an extremely nebulous form. The Figures (expressed as percentages) were as follows:

**First Degree of Intimacy.** Would you mind having a member of the following nation as your cousin? i.e. Would you object to being related by marriage?

For the graphical representation of **Social Distance**, see Pages 493 & 494 (Diagrams.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Degree</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Rejection</th>
<th>Doubt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americans</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germans</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadians</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poles</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotsmen</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finns</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabs</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negroes</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australians</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would you mind living in the same house with a member of the following race or nation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race or Nation</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Rejection</th>
<th>Doubt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMERICANS</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEWS</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRENCH</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANS</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANADIANS</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRISH</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSIANS</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPANESE</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLES</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTSMEN</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEKS</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALIANS</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINESE</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINNS</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARABS</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINDUS</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGROES</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRALIANS</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSLIMS</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would you mind having a member of the following nation as a (school) chum or friend?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Rejection</th>
<th>Doubt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMERICANS</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEWS</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRENCH</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANS</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANADIANS</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRISH</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSIANS</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPANESE</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLES</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTSMEN</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEKS</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALIANS</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINESE</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINNS</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARABS</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINDUS</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGROES</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRALIANS</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSLIMS</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fourth Degree. Would you mind having someone belonging to the following race or nation as a member of your club?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Rejection</th>
<th>Doubt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americans</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germans</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadians</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poles</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotsmen</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finns</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabs</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negroes</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australians</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fifth Degree. Would you mind having a member of the following race or nation in your school or sports team?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race or Nation</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Rejection</th>
<th>Doubt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americans</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germans</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadians</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poles</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotsmen</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finns</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabs</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negroes</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australians</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would you mind sitting next to in class or working next to a member of the following race or nation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Rejection</th>
<th>Doubt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americans</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germans</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadians</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poles</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotsmen</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finns</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabs</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negroes</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australians</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Seventh Degree. Would you mind attending the same school or working in the same place as a member of the following race or nation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Nationality</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Rejection</th>
<th>Doubt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americans</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germans</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadians</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poles</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotsmen</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finns</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabs</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negroes</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australians</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eighth Degree. Would you object to any member of the following race or nation living in your country?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Rejection</th>
<th>Doubt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americans</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germans</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadians</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poles</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finns</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabs</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negroes</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australians</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acceptance.
(Expressed as percentage).

DEGREES OF SOCIAL DISTANCE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americans</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germans</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadians</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poles</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotsmen</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finns</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negroes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australians</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rejection.
(Expressed in percentage)

DEGREES OF SOCIAL DISTANCE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Americans</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jews</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>French</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germans</strong></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadians</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irish</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Russians</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japanese</strong></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poles</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scotsmen</strong></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greeks</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Italians</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chinese</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finns</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arabs</strong></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hindus</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negroes</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australians</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muslims</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Expressed in percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Americans.</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English.</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jews.</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>French.</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germans.</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadians.</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irish.</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Russians.</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japanese.</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poles.</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scotsmen.</strong></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greeks.</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Italians.</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chinese.</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finns.</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arabs.</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hindus.</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negroes.</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australians.</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muslims.</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. QUALITATIVE CATEGORIZATION OF BELIEFS.

For ease of reference to the lists of cognitive areas providing the data and presented under the three themes Unfavourable, Neutral and Favourable, see page 401 (Diagrams.)
QUALITATIVE CATEGORIZATION OF BELIEFS.

I. JAPANESE.

U - Unfavourable.
N - Neutral.
F - Favourable.

Numbers refer to the lists of cognitive areas preceding the data and presented under the three classes Unfavourable, Neutral and Favourable.

For the graphical representation of this section, see Page 491. (Diagrams.)
COGNITIVE AREAS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unfavourable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cruelty and brutality</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cunning</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Disagreeable physical appearance</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Backward civilization</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Selfishness</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Aggressiveness</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cowardliness</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Yield easily</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Devoid of natural feelings</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Revengeful</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Dirty</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Slavish imitation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Unpleasant suavity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Superstitious</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Quickness to acquire new knowledge</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Not trustworthy (Treachery)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Lack of friendliness</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. General ugliness of character</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Unpredictable</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Arrogance and abuse of power</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. No sense of fair play</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Dishonest (deceitful)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Lazy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Megalomania</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Unintelligent</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Greed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Ingratitude (obstinacy in face of defeat)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Headlong rashness in battle (fanaticism)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Unruly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Broken in spirit</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See page 491.
--- 181 ---

**COGNITIVE AREAS.**

**JAPANESE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Religion</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Way of life (Strangeness of living conditions)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. System of education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mysterious, enigmatic character</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. War situations</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Physical Appearance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Attitude of other nations towards them</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Fatalism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Humorlessness, (facial expression, manner, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Overpopulation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Industry -- cheap labour</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See page 491.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COGNITIVE AREAS.</th>
<th>JAPANESE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>avourable.</td>
<td>Frequency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Clever craftsmen</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Docile</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Loyalty (to religion, Emperor etc.)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fearlessness in war</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Industriousness</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Determination</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Skill in athletics (ju-jitsu, etc.)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Quickness to acquire new knowledge</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Peaceloving</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Eagerness to please</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Quick to adjust to new circumstances</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Good qualities of the ordinary people</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Praise of artistic ability</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Agility</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Powers of resistance or endurance</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Sympathy for the herd-like following of unscrupulous leaders</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Expressed admiration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See page 491.
BELIEFS.

1. They are just how the abbreviation sounds - Japs.
2. They are cowardly and cruel and can only fight in groups.
3. Dirty, cruel people.
4. Don't go in for amusement much.
5. Sneaks in warfare.
6. "Sleekit" type of nation.
7. They are cheats and good knife throwers.
8. They have killed millions of people.
9. Are very unwilling and warlike.
10. They are always wanting war.
11. People, slant-eyed and cruel.
12. Very dirty race, when fighting.
15. Very determined people.
16. It is a fighting country.
17. Very faithful to their leader.
18. The Japanese are not fair fighters.
19. Japanese are heartless, sly and cruel.
20. They have the mistaken belief that to commit suicide is a good thing.
21. The Japs are certainly bad, but require guidance and could be improved.
22. They are murderers.
23. They rule their people too much.
24. Snob them all. They were bad to prisoners.
25. Dirty and evil-minded.
27. They use very cruel methods.
28. They are a very bad people.
30. Bullying types when power is available.
31. People who are very cunning.
32. Great fighters but no other good points.
33. Very good workers.
34. Voting for own 'Diet'.
35. Cruel murderers, cunning.
36. The majority are not very clever.
37. Also they have forgot (sic) "We" won the war.
38. No human feeling.
39. They are all obedient to their Emperor.
40. Good fighters against unarmed men.
41. Good fighters in the jungle.
42. A cruel race - will do anything for their country.
43. All right, but they are too easily swayed.
Japanese people have too much to do with religion.

Unfriendly to other countries.

Powerful and good race, if controlled.

Very hard-working people.

They are very treacherous.

Helping to build up their own country.

Very cruel and discontented.

Disloyal to neighbouring country—China.

A very cold-blooded people.

Cruel and low principle.

They are a very brutal race and easily led.

Very clever thinkers but can be cruel.

They were very cruel during the war.

The Japanese to me just seem sly.

Japanese are sly and cruel— they do everything underhanded.

Small and sly-looking.

Japanese are also all in for power and fighting.

They are sly and cruel when in command.

Ordinary but queer-looking.

"Sleekit" bad, but honestly.

A great soldier and a brave one.

Japanese should be shot. They are cowards, sneaks.

They still feel warlike and were very cruel during the war.

They are a cruel race.

An arrogant race.

Cruel, hard-hearted, blood-sucking, yellow rats.

Japanese are too crowded in their country.

The Japanese people are cruel and uncivilized.

They are some of them very cruel.

The Japanese have a very cruel trait in them.

They are very cruel.

The Japanese are typical cowards—brutal when winning.

Sly and sly-looking nation with quick fingers.

They committed awful crimes against humanity.

They are not to be trusted.

The Japanese were very cruel to the British in war-time.

Cruel race.

Educated but seem to enjoy cruelty.

Very determined to have their own way.

A horrid, sly deceitful race.

Thoughtless about human people.

The Japanese are very cruel and hard-hearted.

Very unusual people.

Japanese are quarrelsome—like wars etc.

Japanese are very inhuman.

They love fighting and will die rather than be defeated.
They would kill themselves rather than admit defeat.  

Japs are cruel, fond of themselves, and intolerant.  

Japanese do not like defeat and would rather commit suicide.  

Deceitful, underhand and inhuman.  

Cruel and unlikeable people, very treacherous.  

Japanese do not like defeat and would rather commit suicide.  

Deceitful, underhand and inhuman.  

Cruel and unlikeable people, very treacherous.  

Not to be trusted no matter what he may say to sway you.  

Japanese never seem to do much hard work.  

They committed cruel deeds in their country and appear so.  

They are cruel in looks and actions.  

Very cruel and not very understandable people.  

Cruel with odd customs.  

They are small, hallow-skinned and very sleek.  

They are greedy people with cruel slanting eyes.  

They are good fighters.  

The Japanese are a treacherous people.  

Japanese are very cruel.  

Japanese inclined to be cruel and very self-centred but clever.  

They are selfish and extremely cruel.  

Cruel and selfish.  

They are people who like to have power.  

They have a cruel nature.  

Japanese are very quick in their movements.  

They were cruel during the war.  

Japanese are a very cruel people.  

Japanese have a strong resisting army.  

The Japanese are sneaky-looking people and cruel.  

They are very cruel; they have no manners.  

They are very handy.  

Japanese are handy and very good fighters.  

Ruthless and brave,  

Cruel; but clever with their hands with luxury goods.  

Japanese are very cruel.  

Very cruel and heartless.  

Ugly and cruel people.  

Japanese are the people who are very atrocious.  

Some of their tortures are indescribable.  

They are too cruel and sly.  

Cruel and rather 'fey'.  

Intelligent but with queer ideas.  

Cruel and worship graven images.  

They hold grudges against the world but have brought all things on themselves.  

Japanese are cruel.
BELIEFS.

135. Very cruel.
136. Revengeful.
137. A people who live with each other but are merciless.
138. Clever but hard.
139. Are awaiting a chance to begin another war.
140. Cruel people who like to torture others.
141. Too little education, but too ready to kill.
142. Japanese are warmongers and kill without reason.
143. Japanese have not a very strong will-power.
144. They are a cruel nation.
145. The Japs like to think they are clever and like wars.
146. Very cruel and heartless people.
147. A cruel race.
148. Not satisfied with one war; still want fighting.
149. A very cruel and horrible people.
150. Not very nice and wicked.
151. They are cruel and like wars.
152. Too cruel and insisting.
153. Japs think they are great.
154. Japanese called the war with China an incident.
155. They are clever but are twisters.
156. They are good at making things.
157. Industrious, religious, cunning people.
158. Yellow cowards.
159. They are held under by the upper classes.
160. Religious, stupid, dirty, primitive race.
161. They are very cruel and thoughtless.
162. Excitable.
163. They are cruel by nature, unintelligent and imitative.
164. Apt to be cruel to other races.
165. Fatalists.
166. Japanese; they are torturous.
167. Japanese are fearless, cunning fighters.
168. Very haughty and foolish.
169. They are always fighting the Chinese for no reason at all.
170. Primitive, cruel.
171. No feelings.
172. Japanese tortured us during the war.
173. Japanese are a greedy nation.
174. They are good wrestlers.
175. They are industrious but treacherous.
176. Japanese are not very clean.
177. Not able to be trusted. Clever with their hands.
178. The Japanese are really a homely peace-loving people.
179. They have a peculiar religion.
180. They are small and sly.

JAPANESE.

Categorization.

135. Very cruel.
136. Revengeful.
137. A people who live with each other but are merciless.
138. Clever but hard.
139. Are awaiting a chance to begin another war.
140. Cruel people who like to torture others.
141. Too little education, but too ready to kill.
142. Japanese are warmongers and kill without reason.
143. Japanese have not a very strong will-power.
144. They are a cruel nation.
145. The Japs like to think they are clever and like wars.
146. Very cruel and heartless people.
147. A cruel race.
148. Not satisfied with one war; still want fighting.
149. A very cruel and horrible people.
150. Not very nice and wicked.
151. They are cruel and like wars.
152. Too cruel and insisting.
153. Japs think they are great.
154. Japanese called the war with China an incident.
155. They are clever but are twisters.
156. They are good at making things.
157. Industrious, religious, cunning people.
158. Yellow cowards.
159. They are held under by the upper classes.
160. Religious, stupid, dirty, primitive race.
161. They are very cruel and thoughtless.
162. Excitable.
163. They are cruel by nature, unintelligent and imitative.
164. Apt to be cruel to other races.
165. Fatalists.
166. Japanese; they are torturous.
167. Japanese are fearless, cunning fighters.
168. Very haughty and foolish.
169. They are always fighting the Chinese for no reason at all.
170. Primitive, cruel.
171. No feelings.
172. Japanese tortured us during the war.
173. Japanese are a greedy nation.
174. They are good wrestlers.
175. They are industrious but treacherous.
176. Japanese are not very clean.
177. Not able to be trusted. Clever with their hands.
178. The Japanese are really a homely peace-loving people.
179. They have a peculiar religion.
180. They are small and sly.
BELIEFS.

181. Rather superstitious and somewhat cruel. #1 + # 14
182. A little unfriendly but quite helpful. #17 + # 10
183. They are clever but mysterious. #1 + # 14
184. Japanese — very clever with its people's hands. #1
185. They were cruel to prisoners during the war. #1
186. Come through a crisis easily. #1
187. The Japanese are uneducated but sly. #1 + # 12
188. They are very cruel. #1
189. Japanese are very clever with its people's hands. #1
190. They are fighting people — always at war. #1
191. Cruel and unfriendly. #1 + # 19
192. Very sly — not sure what they would do next. #1 + # 19
193. Some are very cruel although not all. #1
194. The Japanese are backward in civilization. #1 + # 18
195. Are apt to be cruel but very loyal. #1 + # 10
196. Too clever, cruel — do not try to benefit others. #1 + # 15 + # 15
197. Very cruel, indeed, and like to see people being hurt. #1
198. Cruel people; but clever enough in war or peace. #1 + # 10
199. Extremely cruel but rather a backward race. #1 + # 18
200. Cruel and not at all pleasant. #1 + # 18
201. The Japanese are never content. #1 + # 18
202. Capable of great brutality but probably a majority of decent people. #1 + # 10
203. Sly, untrustworthy people. #1 + # 18
204. They are yellow and fought for the Germans. #1 + # 15
205. They are cruel and sly in warfare. #1
206. Skillful. #1
207. Very torturous in war. #1
208. They are very cruel in some ways. #1
209. They were very cruel during wartime. #1
210. Cruel and warsome (sic) #1 + # 18
211. They seem to be easily led. #1 + # 10
212. Had atom bomb dropped on them. #1
213. They seem to have no feeling. #1
214. Very brutal during the war. #1
215. Japanese have no thought for other people. #1
216. They give in when they are getting the worst. #1
217. Bad people. Went to wars. Cruel. #1 + # 18
218. They are cruel and tortured people a lot. #1
219. Wicked, dirty at all times. #1 + # 18
220. They are people who kill in cold blood. #1
221. They are very faithful to their Emperor. #1
222. They are cruel and uninteresting. #1 + # 18
223. Sly, un-sporting people are they. #1 + # 18
224. Good toy-makers. #1

JAPANESE.

Categorization.

181. Rather superstitious and somewhat cruel. #1 + # 14
182. A little unfriendly but quite helpful. #17 + # 10
183. They are clever but mysterious. #1 + # 14
184. Japanese — very clever with its people's hands. #1
185. They were cruel to prisoners during the war. #1
186. Come through a crisis easily. #1
187. The Japanese are uneducated but sly. #1 + # 12
188. They are very cruel. #1
189. Japanese are very clever with its people's hands. #1
190. They are fighting people — always at war. #1
191. Cruel and unfriendly. #1 + # 19
192. Very sly — not sure what they would do next. #1 + # 19
193. Some are very cruel although not all. #1
194. The Japanese are backward in civilization. #1 + # 18
195. Are apt to be cruel but very loyal. #1 + # 10
196. Too clever, cruel — do not try to benefit others. #1 + # 15 + # 15
197. Very cruel, indeed, and like to see people being hurt. #1
198. Cruel people; but clever enough in war or peace. #1 + # 10
199. Extremely cruel but rather a backward race. #1 + # 18
200. Cruel and not at all pleasant. #1 + # 18
201. The Japanese are never content. #1 + # 18
202. Capable of great brutality but probably a majority of decent people. #1 + # 10
203. Sly, untrustworthy people. #1 + # 18
204. They are yellow and fought for the Germans. #1 + # 15
205. They are cruel and sly in warfare. #1
206. Skillful. #1
207. Very torturous in war. #1
208. They are very cruel in some ways. #1
209. They were very cruel during wartime. #1
210. Cruel and warsome (sic) #1 + # 18
211. They seem to be easily led. #1 + # 10
212. Had atom bomb dropped on them. #1
213. They seem to have no feeling. #1
214. Very brutal during the war. #1
215. Japanese have no thought for other people. #1
216. They give in when they are getting the worst. #1
217. Bad people. Went to wars. Cruel. #1 + # 18
218. They are cruel and tortured people a lot. #1
219. Wicked, dirty at all times. #1 + # 18
220. They are people who kill in cold blood. #1
221. They are very faithful to their Emperor. #1
222. They are cruel and uninteresting. #1 + # 18
223. Sly, un-sporting people are they. #1 + # 18
224. Good toy-makers. #1
BELIEFS.

225. They rarely invent anything of their own. (1)
226. They are dishonest. (1)
227. They wear long, loose gowns. (1)
228. They are yellow-skinned. (1)
229. Very cruel. (1)
230. Very cruel in war. (1)
231. Killed millions of people. (1)
232. Their country has not been open to the world for long. (1)
233. Too cunning and sly. (1)
234. The Japanese like torturing people. (1)
235. They are cruel. (1)
236. They are unkind and cruel. (1)
237. Sly and fight for their land. (1)
238. They are cruel. (1)
239. Liable to betray anyone. (1)
240. Their eyes slant too much. (1)
241. Frauds and failures. (1)
242. Joined against us during the Second World War. (1)
243. They're led astray. (1)
244. They always want to fight. (1)
245. They are good at art. (1)
246. They are very cruel and bestial although friendly. (1)
247. They are very brutal. (1)
248. They are very inhuman people. (1)
249. They are crafty and wicked. (1)
250. They are tormental (sic) and cruel. (1)
251. They are very cruel to anyone more fortunate than they. (1)
252. Japanese are very cunning. (1)
253. Japanese are cunning; sly. (1)
254. The Japanese are cunning, and sly but cowardly. (1)
255. Same as Germans, domineering and heartless. (1)
256. They have never been popular with the countries of the West. (1)
257. The Japanese are cowards. (1)
258. Sly and have ugly faces. They are about as bad as the Germans. (1)
259. They are Ruthless. (1)
260. Cunning. Want to conquer the world. Not a chance. (1)
BELIEFS.

JAPANESE.

Categorization.

261. Japanese are very dirty fighters.  
262. A cruel sinister race who have no mercy.  
263. They look wicked people who could be very cruel.  
264. They eat very strange (sic) food.  
265. Fairly intelligent nimble and dainty.  
266. A war-minded people.  
267. The Japanese are treacherous.  
268. They were all rigid when winning but squealed for mercy afterwards.  
269. Most uncivilized race in the world.  
270. They need some of their own medicine.  
271. Very cruel.  
272. "Fly" race.  
273. They are good craftsmen.  
274. "Sleekit". Would kill when your back is turned.  
275. They are a sly unreliable race. They believe in war.  
276. I hate them because of their treacherousness.  
277. They would think nothing of torturing other folks.  
278. No sympathy.  
279. Altogether over-abundant race.  
280. They are brutal people.  
281. A cruel disturbing country, but a great manufacturer.  
282. Not well-educated.  
283. Cruel and murderous race.  
284. They are clever but  
285. A nation under constant fear of earthquakes.  
286. The Japanese are a cunning treacherous race.  
287. Japanese are treacherous people who undercut prices.  
288. "Fly" race and no morals.  
289. Cunning and clever.  
290. Cunning and deceitful.  
291. Very cunning ruthless people and very conceited.  
292. Cruel, heartless to other people.  
293. Very dishonest - some of them.  
294. Cruel and ill-feeling towards others.  
295. Hateful people.  
296. Should be taught the right way to go about things.  
297. A race despised for dishonourable warfare.  
298. The Japanese will work for very little.  
299. They are very backward.  
300. They have a great hatred for the British.  
301. The Japanese Premier was executed.  
302. Are very clever.  
303. Their cruelty during the war.  
304. They seem very primitive.  
305. A race of madmen and fanatics.  
306. They are brutally cruel.
BELIEFS.

307. Cruelty to people. 308. Definitely a war-mongering nation. 309. Clever but underhanded. 310. Bar too much T.B. 311. Torturous people. 312. Capable of any torture. 313. They are brave and callous. 314. They are industrious. 315. They were cruel and brutal with prisoners. 316. Copied British designs for warships. 317. Too fierce when they got the upper hand. 318. They are hard-working nation. 319. Very easily led, quick in the uptake. 320. Very superstitious. 321. Small people but crafty. 322. They are a very hardy race. 323. The Japs are a set of greedy irritable people. 324. Had the atom bomb dropped on them. 325. They are cruel and good copiers. 326. A very clean-living nation. 327. A weak-minded nation who would do anything for the Emperor. 328. Are warmongers. 329. A small yellow race with polite manners. 330. Very suave and polite to hide real feelings. 331. The Japanese are a large race for a small country. 332. They never keep a promise. 333. They are yellow-skinned. 334. Wicked torturers. 335. Are very good ju-jitsu fighters. 336. They are cruel people but they are clever. 337. Grand ju-jitsu experts due to smallness of body. 338. They are a very artistic race. 339. They are sly and treacherous. 340. They are very cunning. 341. Great toymakers. 342. I wouldn't trust them either. 343. A sly lot of people who would knife you if you were not looking. 344. They want to rule the world. 345. Very small in physical stature. 346. Fairly intelligent but brutal in war. 347. They make the most of cheap labour. 348. People that done (sic) the torturing. 349. They can take an awful beating. 350. Nearly uncivilized in their ways. 351. Very despicable for their treatment of prisoners during the war. 352. Little, cruel, dirty yellow beggars.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BELIEFS</th>
<th>JAPANESE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>353. Very cruel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354. Unrivialized, unruly, war-making people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355. They are very cruel people at war.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356. Very true to their own faith.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357. Many Japanese are sadists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358. They are very bad.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359. Clever but crafty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360. A very treacherous people proved during the war</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361. Trouble-makers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362. A treacherous race of people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363. They are copiers and have no brains of their own.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364. They are not fair fighters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365. They are cruel and sly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366. Very cruel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367. Followed the Nazis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368. Very cruel, small.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369. They are very brutal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370. Small and yellowish in colour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371. Sneaks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372. Cowards and sneaks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373. They are a cruel and hard people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374. All out for themselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375. They are fond of war.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376. Are suffering the after-effects of the war.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377. Good toymakers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378. They are always ready for a war.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379. Cunning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380. They are a cruel race.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381. Cruel people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382. Slower workers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383. Uncivilized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384. Dirty fighters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385. Cruel and rough.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386. They stink; disgusting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387. Primitive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388. Sly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389. They are very agile.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390. Very disagreeable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391. Simple yet dangerous.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392. They are a queer skimmed nation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393. Cruel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394. Hard workers and quick learners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395. They do not keep their word.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396. Cruelty to women and children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397. Their staple food is rice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398. A very ignorant country.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399. They are very fond of rice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400. The people are quite ignorant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BELIEFS.

401. Too many of them to be comfortable. N 10
402. Very treacherous. M 1
403. They are cruel people. M 13
404. Ugly. M 13
405. Cruel. M 1
406. They are cruel people. M 1
407. The Japanese are rotten skunks. M 18
408. Sun Worshippers. M 1
409. Very good at ju-jitsu. F 7
410. Simple-minded. M 13
411. Fanatical fighters. M 1
412. Very religious. F 3
413. Copy other people's ideas. M 1
414. A race of fanatics who follow blindly. M 12 + M 28
415. Not learned. M 4
416. Courageous. F 1
417. Overcrowded, miserable and cruel. N 10 + M 11
418. Treacherous but that is their nature. M 6
419. They are cruel, sly and a very bad race. M 12 + M 28 + M 18
420. An ambitious race. M 1
421. Very clever with their hands. F 1
422. Cruel and unkind. M 11
423. Treacherous people. M 16
424. Always ready to double cross. M 10
425. A savage race of people. M 1
426. Ready to kill anybody. M 12
427. Very tricky in all trades. F 1
428. Rats. M 18
429. Very underhand. M 12
430. Like sheep. M 15
431. Very cruel and live like rats. M 12 + M 10
432. Ignorant. M 6
433. Very cruel. M 11
434. A cruel, cowardly nation. M 12 + M 7
435. Very dirty. M 1
436. Proper cold-blooded little butchers although typical cowards. M 7 + M 22 + M 1
437. Religious and tolerant. N 15 + F 10
438. Mellow and sadistic. M 1 + M 7
439. Should be wiped out. M 18
440. Japanese - a very cowardly nation. M 7
441. Brutes in every respect. M 1
442. In prison camps they were cruel to prisoners. M 1
443. They are very heartless. M 11
444. Quiet race without their leaders. F 2 + F 10
445. They are a cruel nation. M 11
446. The Japanese are too fond of creating strife and war regardless of life. M 6 + M 9

JAPANESE.

Categorization.

401. Too many of them to be comfortable. N 10
402. Very treacherous. M 1
403. They are cruel people. M 13
404. Ugly. M 13
405. Cruel. M 1
406. They are cruel people. M 1
407. The Japanese are rotten skunks. M 18
408. Sun Worshippers. M 1
409. Very good at ju-jitsu. F 7
410. Simple-minded. M 13
411. Fanatical fighters. M 1
412. Very religious. F 3
413. Copy other people's ideas. M 1
414. A race of fanatics who follow blindly. M 12 + M 28
415. Not learned. M 4
416. Courageous. F 1
417. Overcrowded, miserable and cruel. N 10 + M 11
418. Treacherous but that is their nature. M 6
419. They are cruel, sly and a very bad race. M 12 + M 28 + M 18
420. An ambitious race. M 1
421. Very clever with their hands. F 1
422. Cruel and unkind. M 11
423. Treacherous people. M 16
424. Always ready to double cross. M 10
425. A savage race of people. M 1
426. Ready to kill anybody. M 12
427. Very tricky in all trades. F 1
428. Rats. M 18
429. Very underhand. M 12
430. Like sheep. M 15
431. Very cruel and live like rats. M 12 + M 10
432. Ignorant. M 6
433. Very cruel. M 11
434. A cruel, cowardly nation. M 12 + M 7
435. Very dirty. M 1
436. Proper cold-blooded little butchers although typical cowards. M 7 + M 22 + M 1
437. Religious and tolerant. N 15 + F 10
438. Mellow and sadistic. M 1 + M 7
439. Should be wiped out. M 18
440. Japanese - a very cowardly nation. M 7
441. Brutes in every respect. M 1
442. In prison camps they were cruel to prisoners. M 1
443. They are very heartless. M 11
444. Quiet race without their leaders. F 2 + F 10
445. They are a cruel nation. M 11
446. The Japanese are too fond of creating strife and war regardless of life. M 6 + M 9
BELLI
JAPANESE.

Categorization.

447. They are very sly people.
448. They are very cruel people.
449. They are a very sly, wily race.
450. Lots of torture during the war.
451. Poor and illiterate - thus cannot be compared with civilized people.
452. Japs, cruel. I hate them for the things they did during the war.
453. They are very sly.
454. No good.
455. Are cowards.
456. Domineering to the Chinese.
457. Cruel people.
458. Are very treacherous.
459. They were ambitious.
460. Very small race but good fighters in war.
461. They are very cruel.
462. Diabolical fiends.
463. The Japanese are yellow.
464. Good cotton workers.
465. Malevolent.
466. They can live on very little rice.
467. Judicious experts.
468. Good at copying other people's work.
469. They all have a streak of cruelty in them.
470. Little boasters.
471. They were cruel during the war.
472. Very treacherous.
473. They think it is right to die for their country.
474. They are very simple but treacherous people.
475. They think only of themselves.
476. Unfriendly.
477. Japanese are a very cruel people.
478. Will follow their Emperor anywhere.
479. They are cruel.
480. Don't care what happens to anyone else.
481. Are the cruellest country in the world.
482. They make cheap goods.
483. They are well-known for copying.
484. They are so calculating.
485. Slave-drivers.
486. Hateful and cruel race.
487. Treacherous and brutal.
488. They wanted to have power in China but were defeated.
489. They think only of themselves.
490. Tortures.
BELIEFS.

JAPANESE.

491. They are very cruel to their women. 
492. Definitely should not be trusted, helped, or aided in any way. 
493. The Jap soldiers were very brutal during the war. 
494. Japanese are very cruel. 
495. They have no God except for the Emperor. 
496. Japanese people are good fighters. 
497. They have a desire to be powerful. 
498. The Japanese are coarse. 
499. The first atomic bomb was dropped on the Japanese. 
500. They tried civilization too quickly. 
501. Beaten people. 
502. Japanese are good makers of toys. 
503. They can go for a long period on dry rice and water. 
504. They believe in the Sun as their God. 
505. Hated everywhere. 
506. Nobody knows much about them. 
507. Ruling people. 
508. Very sly and tricky. 
509. Japanese are a cruel race. 
510. They have no feelings for other people. 
511. Warmongers and sneaky fighters. 
512. The Japanese are not to be trusted. 
513. Clever spinners of cloth. 
514. They are a cruel people. 
515. Traitorous nation. 
516. They are cruel and are cowards. 
517. Cunning but clever race. 
518. Should be shot for torture of prisoners. 
519. They are very good at close quarter fighting. 
520. If led by the proper people, sometimes all right. 
521. A people who will commit suicide when they fail when they have vowed to do something. 
522. Are good at ju-jitsu. 
523. Sly and quick. 
524. The Japanese are sadistic with high industrial potentialities. 
525. Japs are quick but cruel. 
526. Cruel, arrogant swines (sic) 
527. The Japanese are not to be trusted. 
528. They are very good at ju-jitsu. 
529. The Japs are very cruel. 
530. They are friendly to foreign soldiers. 
531. Like the Germans they are misled. 
532. They are a small race who still insist on Emperor worship.
BELIEFS.

533. Cruel people. F
534. Very good at making things. F
535. They are cruel, stubborn fanatics. M 1 + m 1 + m 2 + m 3
536. Are now suffering for bad deeds. m 7
537. They are cruel. M
538. They hate Chinese. M
539. They used ruthless methods during the last war. M
540. Well-educated and clever but also very cruel. F 8 + M
541. Japanese are not any good because their country is destroyed. M 20
542. They were good at making cheap toys. F
543. Gunning. M 3
544. Courageous. M
545. Very cruel and have slant eyes. M 1 + M 3
546. They wrestle until one gets killed. M 4
547. Very clever people, but are a bit backward. F 8 + M 6 + M 7
548. Not trustworthy. M
549. They are quite conceited about war. M 7
550. Cruel, hard people. M
551. Very "sleekit". M 2
552. They are no good. M 8
553. Simple nation led astray. F 10
554. Underhand and not to be trusted. M 2 + M 16
555. No idea whatsoever. M
556. Very sly and cruellest. M 2 + M 7
557. Ugly appearances. M
558. They do not grow very big. M 3
559. Cruel but clever with their hands. M 1 + F 1
560. Wrestle and not afraid of death. F 14 + F 4
561. Dark-skinned and seasoned to hot weather. M 8 + F 15
562. They are hard brought up. F 18
563. The "Japanese are known to be a cruel-minded people. M
564. They are paying for their folly. M 30
565. Not very nice people. M 8
566. Have too much dirty tactics. M 2
567. They are a very vicious nation. M 18
568. Nasty people. M 18
569. Cruel people. M
570. They are very vicious and torturing people. M 8 + M 6
571. They are very small. M 3
572. Their houses are made of paper. N 2
573. Some of them are hard but a lot make beautiful toys. M 1 + F 1
574. A weak nation. F 18
575. A country of mystery. N 4
576. They also wanted everything and got nothing. M 20
577. The Japs are a race not to be trusted. M 16

JAPANESE.

Categorization.

533. Cruel people. M
534. Very good at making things. F
535. They are cruel, stubborn fanatics. M 1 + M 7 + M 28
536. Are now suffering for bad deeds. N 7
537. They are cruel. M
538. They hate Chinese. N
539. They used ruthless methods during the last war. M
540. Well-educated and clever but also very cruel. F 8 + M
541. Japanese are not any good because their country is destroyed. M 20
542. They were good at making cheap toys. F
543. Gunning. M 3
544. Courageous. M
545. Very cruel and have slant eyes. M 1 + M 3
546. They wrestle until one gets killed. M 4
547. Very clever people, but are a bit backward. F 8 + M 6 + M 7
548. Not trustworthy. M
549. They are quite conceited about war. M 7
550. Cruel, hard people. M
551. Very "sleekit". M 2
552. They are no good. M 8
553. Simple nation led astray. F 10
554. Underhand and not to be trusted. M 2 + M 16
555. No idea whatsoever. M
556. Very sly and cruellest. M 2 + M 7
557. Ugly appearances. M
558. They do not grow very big. M 3
559. Cruel but clever with their hands. M 1 + F 1
560. Wrestle and not afraid of death. F 14 + F 4
561. Dark-skinned and seasoned to hot weather. M 8 + F 15
562. They are hard brought up. F 18
563. The "Japanese are known to be a cruel-minded people. M
564. They are paying for their folly. M 30
565. Not very nice people. M 8
566. Have too much dirty tactics. M 2
567. They are a very vicious nation. M 18
568. Nasty people. M 18
569. Cruel people. M
570. They are very vicious and torturing people. M 8 + M 6
571. They are very small. M 3
572. Their houses are made of paper. N 2
573. Some of them are hard but a lot make beautiful toys. M 1 + F 1
574. A weak nation. F 18
575. A country of mystery. N 4
576. They also wanted everything and got nothing. M 20
577. The Japs are a race not to be trusted. M 16
BELIEFS.

JAPANESE.

Categorization.

578. A fighting people. F
599. A good working class of people. F
580. They are wicked little rats. M
581. The Japs are cowards in fighting. M
582. I think they are all evil and not entirely human. M
583. Good at Judo. F
584. People who are cruel in war. M
585. They are dirty fighters. M
586. Good at Judo. F
587. They also lost the war. N
588. They killed many civilians during the war. N
589. They are treacherous. N
590. They employ cheap labour therefore they have cheap goods. N
591. Weak-minded but sly and cruel. N + M + M
592. They killed thousands of innocent people at the making of the Burma-Siam railway. N
593. They work long hours for small pays. N
594. They make lovely silk. F
595. They believe in different god. N
596. They do not believe in God after Hiroshima. N
597. They like to be well educated. F
598. They are clever with their hands but they are very cunning. F + M
599. The Japanese are cruel torturing people. M
600. They have been at war with China for hundreds of years. N
601. They double-crossed the Americans when they bombed Pearl Harbour. N
602. They are very treacherous. N
603. They are good at Judo. F
604. There are far too many Japs. N
605. The Japanese are cunning, clever and brave. M + M + F
606. Japanese are clever at copying ideas. M
607. Very keen of getting more possessions. M
608. They are very wily and have strength for their size. F + F
609. They are very treacherous. M
610. Can make a replica of anything. M
611. Cunning - otherwise clever. M + F
612. They are too ready for war - to fight. M
613. They are very cruel. M
614. Wicked. M
615. Seek to raise themselves to the standard of the U.S.A. ml
616. The Japs I hate because they have been our enemies. ml
617. They are ruthless and use cunning methods in war. ml
618. Ugly. ml
619. They are shifty individuals - not to be trusted. ml
620. Slinky and cruel. ml
621. Women are harlots. ml
622. A cruel and fanatical nation. ml
623. Good people with a high sense of honour. F2, F6
624. They are arrogant and cruel. ml
625. They are too sly and cunning. ml
626. They have a funny way. N1
627. They cannot stop fighting. ml
628. They are a nation which will soon be back in trade. F5
629. They have a funny way about them. N1
630. I wouldn’t trust them as far as I could throw them. ml
631. They have no heart and are not human. ml
632. They delight in torturing other people. ml
633. They are a set of mean sneaks. ml
634. They think they are the superior race. ml
635. They are a small quick kind of people, good at copying other nations. F8, U2, U5
636. The Japanese fought with the Chinese. N1
637. They are proud and cocksure even in defeat. U7
638. Experts at ju-jitsu. F7
639. Dirty fighters. ml
640. A queer type of people. ml
641. Some very nice Japs. F4
642. They are very brave. F4
643. Too yellow. ml
644. The Japs are very cruel. ml
645. They are very backward. ml
646. They are unfaithful. ml
647. They are cowards when beaten in war. ml
648. The Japanese are small, weak, and nasty. ml
649. They are never frightened of death. F8
650. They do not care what happens to themselves or to single Japanese. ml
651. They are cruel, industrious, and very clever at art. ml
652. They are very fanatical race, who worship their Emperor. ml
653. Cruel but clever. 
654. The Japanese are small and yellow in colour. 
655. They are good at fighting. 
656. The Japanese are very cruel. 
657. They are very cowardly and cruel. 
658. They are extremely cruel. 
659. They are very ignorant. 
660. They seem to be fighting, always, and are very merciless. 
661. They are cruel, obnoxious little scoundrels. 
662. They are a very cruel race. 
663. They have a very ugly countenance. 
664. The Japanese are a cruel, brutal, vicious race. 
665. Very cruel to our prisoners by torturing them. 
666. They are "sleekit" and cowardly. 
667. They love war and don't mind killing themselves. 
668. They would have done well without a war. 
669. Will definitely rule the Far East in time to come — finest yellow people. 
670. Japs — fanatics in our sense but clever in their way. 
671. A sly, two-faced race. 
672. Experts at ju-jitsu. 
673. Very religious. 
674. Cruel. 
675. Sadistic nature. 
676. Aggressive. 
677. Fate has forced them to be pleasant. 
678. The Japanese are cruel. 
679. They are in peace industrious, but in war very cruel. 
680. Very cruel. 
681. They are a very small race. 
682. The Japs are the most fanatical race in the world. 
683. Japanese are very small and some of them are kind. 
684. They don't value their lives. 
685. Brutal and treacherous, they seek to overcome authority. 
686. A terrible lot to be scorned and evaded. 
687. A most inhuman race. 
688. Japanese are simple people at heart. 
689. Industrious. 
690. A cruel race. 
691. An artistic race. 
692. They are crafty and always scheming for power. 
693. Believe that committing suicide is honourable.
Beliefs

Japanese

Categorization.

694. The things they did to their prisoners are terrible. ML
695. They are industrious but apt to be cruel. FS + ML
696. A great scavenger and destroyer. F17
697. They are sly. ML
698. They still desire world domination. ML0
699. They are very cruel and they are small in stature. M3 + ML
700. They are a dishonest, sly race. M3 + ML
701. The Japanese are a very cruel race. M3
702. The Japanese are cunning but very industrious. M3 + FS
703. They love simple and beautiful things. F2 + F6
704. The Japanese are unfortunate. F16
705. The Japanese are not to be trusted. ML0
706. The Japanese are not human; they are fanatics. M9 + M28
707. They will die if told to do so by their leading statesmen. ML0
708. The Japanese are too Oriental for us to understand. ML0
709. Nothing important. ML0
710. They are endeavouring to worm their way into favour. ML0
711. They go around like little rats. ML0
712. They were brought up to endure hardship. F15
713. Barbarous race - have no ideal of civilization. M1 + M4
714. They can be relied upon sometimes. F16
715. They are the cruellest race in the world. ML
716. They are cruel fanatical people. M3 + ML0
717. They are underhand and deceitful. M3 + ML0
718. They can't be trusted. ML0
719. They worship their Emperor. F1
720. They are fanatics. ML0
721. They would like peace now. ML0
722. They are too 'wee'. ML3
723. They are very cruel. ML
724. They are crafty and are lustful for power. M3 + M28
725. They like to see other people tortured. M1 + M28
726. They are very cruel. ML
727. They are dirty, poor people. ML3
728. The Japanese are very small. ML
729. A tribe of yellow rats. ML5
730. Small funny-looking people. ML3
731. Rice - staple diet. M1
732. They have very cruel methods of torture. ML
733. They are very fine fishermen. F1
734. The dirty dogs. M11 + M18
V. QUALITATIVE CATEGORIZATION OF BELIEFS.

II. JEWS.

U - Unfavourable.
N - Neutral.
F - Favourable.

Numbers refer to the lists of cognitive areas preceding the data and presented under the three classes Unfavourable, Neutral and Favourable.

For the graphical representation of this section, see Page 490. (Diagrams.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COGNITIVE AREAS</th>
<th>JEWS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unfavourable.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Frequency.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Religion.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Business acumen</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conflict with the Arabs</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Treatment under the Hitler administration</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Miserliness</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Competitiveness (unpleasant)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Disagreeable physical appearance</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Aggressiveness</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Self-constituted isolates</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Treachery</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Their intense in group loyalty.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Unpopularity and discontent</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Cunning.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lust for power</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Selfishness and greed</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Intellectual inferiority</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Cruelty</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Evil character</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Expressed contempt for their humility, real or assumed</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Intense preoccupation with money</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Historical statement (attitude to Jesus, etc.)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Ingratitude</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Dogmatism (especially religious)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Untrustworthiness</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Cowards.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Backward and superstitious</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Not co-operative</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Misuse of power</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Unscrupulous</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Direct expression of dislike or hatred</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Stiffnecked pride and obstinacy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Lazy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Hypocrites</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Prolific</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Secretive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Sex allusion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Page 490.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COGNITIVE AREAS</th>
<th>JEWES.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neutral.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Frequency.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Religion (tolerant attitude)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Business acumen</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conflict with Arabs</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Treatment under the Hitler administration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Need for a home</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Objective statement of anti-semitism</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tolerant attitude</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Inferiority complex of the Jews.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Difficult to understand</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Historical statement (Old Testament)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mysterious and enigmatic character</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Impartial attitude towards their solidarity</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Customs, way of life</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Prophetic statement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Page 490.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COGNITIVE AREAS</th>
<th>Favourable</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Religion</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Business acumen</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conflict with Arabs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Treatment under the Hitler administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Intellectual superiority</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Friendliness</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Industriousness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Courage and cheerfulness in discouraging circumstances</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sympathetic attitude towards the Jews in their struggle against prejudice and unjust treatment</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Chosen race</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Pride</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Thrift</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Goodness of character</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Good settlers and pioneers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Page 490.
BELIEFS.

1. Have a love of money and wish to go home. Ns
2. They have gone through many hardships. Ns
3. The Jews are greatly despised and misunderstood. Ns
4. They are very loyal to their religion. F
5. After money. Ms
6. Very good in the olden days but have deteriorated since. Mn
7. Jews are good in their own way. They are helpful. Fs
8. Selfish, and unkind, and unreliable people. Ms + M10
9. Jews - are out to get a home for their people in any country. Ns
10. They are cunning and sly. Ms
11. There are good and bad Jews - some very good. N7
12. They are very cultured but nervous. Fs + Ng
13. They cause a lot of trouble. Ms
14. The Jews are a miserly race. Ms
15. They have no country of their own in which to live. Ng
16. Some are very nice but others are not. Nv
17. Very selfish and never give things away. Ms
18. Mostly money making. Ms
19. They seem to own a great many important business firms. Ms
20. They look on the bright side of misfortunes. Fg
21. Downtrodden. Shy. Have had to look to money for interest. Fg + F
22. They are very faithful to their religion. F
23. They are in some ways stupid, silly and cruel. Some aren't bad. Ms + Ms + Ms + Ms
25. Very deceitful and not to be trusted. M10 + Ms
26. The Jews are never content. M12
27. A people who are having a bad time through little fault of their own. Fg
28. They cause a lot of trouble and have funny noses. M7 + Ms
29. Sly, not capable people. Ms + Ms + M10
30. They own many business places. Ms
31. Always become of importance by speaking. Ms
32. Great misers and quarrelsome. Ms + Ms
33. They have a different belief in Christ (?). N1
34. They seem to be awfully callous. Ms

JEWs.

Categorization.
BELIEFS.

35. Selfish people who receive money from other people when they don't need it. (Selfish people who receive money from other people when they don't need it.)

36. They seem to cause quarrels. (They seem to cause quarrels.)

37. Never like parting with anything. (Never like parting with anything.)

38. They live swicking (sic) people concerning money. (They live swicking (sic) people concerning money.)

39. They are very religious and quite bad. (They are very religious and quite bad.)

40. I think they are too quarrelsome. (I think they are too quarrelsome.)

41. They are very very mean. (They are very very mean.)

42. The Jews are wise, sensible people but they are not generous. (The Jews are wise, sensible people but they are not generous.)

43. They have long noses. (They have long noses.)

44. Anxious for money. (Anxious for money.)

45. Very rich and wealthy. (Very rich and wealthy.)

46. Jews are mean and unthinking for other people. (Jews are mean and unthinking for other people.)

47. They are badly treated. (They are badly treated.)

48. Jews make more of money than they should. (Jews make more of money than they should.)

49. Jews were responsible for the death of Jesus. (Jews were responsible for the death of Jesus.)

50. They want to get into their own land and are using force to do so. (They want to get into their own land and are using force to do so.)

51. They are nice at times. (They are nice at times.)

52. They don't like other countries. (They don't like other countries.)

53. They are very good at persuading. (They are very good at persuading.)

54. They are hard to understand. (They are hard to understand.)

55. They have been put out of their native lands. (They have been put out of their native lands.)

56. Misers. (Misers.)

57. They are now a miserly race. (They are now a miserly race.)

58. They are slovenly. (They are slovenly.)

59. They usually are the richest people. (They usually are the richest people.)

60. A good many are beggars. (A good many are beggars.)

61. They are treacherous. (They are treacherous.)

62. Very kind. (Very kind.)

63. They are money lenders. (They are money lenders.)

64. Most of them don't believe in Jesus. (Most of them don't believe in Jesus.)

65. The Jews are great believers in Christ (?). (The Jews are great believers in Christ (?).)

66. They do not believe in Jesus. (They do not believe in Jesus.)

67. They are fond of money. (They are fond of money.)

68. They are unkind but are religious. (They are unkind but are religious.)

69. They always are after money. (They always are after money.)

70. They are clever business men. (They are clever business men.)

71. Horribly shady and treacherous. (Horribly shady and treacherous.)

72. They always have dark features. (They always have dark features.)
BELIEFS.

73. They go around creating trouble.  
74. Hung Christ on the Cross.  
75. They're for each other.  
76. They are mean, selfish and bad.  
77. Jesus was a Jew.  
78. They are mean and grasping, as far as I know.  
79. They are kind to each other but not to strangers.  
80. They are brotherly towards each other but are very greedy.  
81. I don't see anything wrong with most Jews I have met.  
82. They are always fighting with the Arabs.  
83. Jews are very greedy and sly.  
84. Jews are very sly and always looking for quarrels.  
85. They are cruel people.  
86. Jews are usually clever especially where business is concerned.  
87. They were very kindly treated during the war, but now they are fighting in Palestine.  
88. They are very hard-working really and people should not run them down so much.  
89. The Jews are underhand cruel people.  
90. They are very religious.  
91. Their business ability is quite remarkable.  
92. They are too mysterious.  
93. They are always planning to do harm.  
94. The Jewish people's chief aim in life is money.  
95. Jews are usually kind generous people.  
96. Jews cannot be peaceful.  
97. They were crushed by Hitler in Germany and many were massacred.  
98. They want a country of their own.  
99. Jews are somehow underhand and not open.  
100. Jews have no country of their own and are trying to get one.  
101. They have narrow and quaint ideas.  
102. Miserly people; will not part with anything.  
103. Very dominant about religion and misery (sic).  
104. Jews are inclined to be very mercenary.  
105. Jews give the feeling of distrust wherever their name comes up.  
106. I find their presence causes discomfort to others.  
107. They are not understandable and do not show what they want.  
108. Trouble-makers - also great money makers.  
109. They are very mean people.
BELIEFS.

110. They are good business people as they are owners of big stores. 
111. Jews are a scattered people. 
112. Jews are inclined to be selfish. 
113. They have no country of their own and money grabbers. 
114. Jews are out to make all they can. 
115. Jews are very greedy and are always fighting with people. 
116. They are greedy and whatever they do they want money. 
117. Are mean and spiteful. 
118. They are a people who deal greatly in money. 
119. Always seem to be inclined to want to fight. 
120. Jews are mean - not very pleasant to have dealings with. 
121. They work hard and get on in the world. 
122. Jews should be treated as any other people. 
123. They are wicked and cunning and untrustable. 
124. The Jewish people are not extremely well liked. 
125. They are fond of fighting and killing. 
126. Jews are very greedy. 
127. Jews are very greedy; they would not give anything for nothing. 
128. Certainly rather downtrodden abroad. 
129. Troublesome. 
130. Jews have a very queer religion. 
131. A trouble-making nation. 
132. Sly and spiteful. 
133. The Jews are always quarrelling and never satisfied. 
134. Jews are people who seem to like fighting. 
135. They are very mean and have shares in most large firms. 
136. They are very fond of money and are cunning. 
137. They do not believe in Jesus. 
138. As a nation they are united - make true friends. 
139. The Jews are sometimes greedy and go above themselves. 
140. Jews look after their money and are rich. 
141. They are very particular who they talk to. 
143. They are usually very pious. 
144. Don't mix without their own race.
145. On the whole are rather grasping - too miserly.  
146. Mean, selfish people.  
147. Too ready to make money for their country but out of another country.  
147. They hate to part with anything if they can help it.  
148. They are money grubbers and out for everything they can get.  
149. They are very nice people, but very much persecuted.  
150. The Jews are the nicest people in the world and very hard-working.  
151. The Jews have had to suffer all through the ages but have been very brave.  
152. Very clever.  
153. Jews are very quarrelsome and never satisfied.  
154. They are always ready to start wars.  
155. Not nice people to speak to.  
156. They are never pleased when anyone tries to help them.  
157. Seem to have plenty of money.  
158. They are too religious.  
159. Greed and money are brothers of the Jews.  
160. Jews like to have a poke at the Scots.  
161. They are a cowardly and miserly race.  
162. Always fighting other people.  
163. They deserve a "break".  
164. Very cunning miserable people.  
165. They were and still are unjustly treated.  
166. Jews are misers.  
167. They are very revolting.  
168. They are grovelling and wily.  
169. Make money by hook or by crook.  
170. They like making money.  
171. Always help their own people.  
172. The Jews are willing to build up trade and gain money, but will always help each other.  
173. The Jews club together - always ready to help one of their own kind.  
174. Jews are out to make as much money as then can.
BELIEFS.

175. They are a nation combined together. N lav
176. Men who turn and attack their own people. \( \mu \gamma \)
177. They are always quarrelling over land or finance. \( \mu \gamma \)
178. They keep on fighting the Arabs and lose a lot of life. N
179. They want to be left alone in some country. N
180. Jews are dirty people. \( \mu \gamma \)
181. They are a religious people. N
182. They are cunning. \( \mu \gamma \)
183. Too religious. \( \mu \gamma \)
184. Sleekit (sic) and money lovers. \( \mu \gamma + \mu \lambda \theta \)
185. They are greedy for money. \( \mu \gamma \)
186. They are selfish people. \( \mu \gamma \)
187. Unmodernized and old-fashioned. \( \mu \lambda \theta \)
188. Cheats in all the trades and professions. \( \mu \gamma \)
189. Very mean. \( \mu \lambda \theta \)
190. Bad men. \( \mu \gamma \)
191. They worship God very much. N
192. Jews are very miserly and won't give anything away. \( \mu \lambda \theta + \mu \lambda \sigma \)
193. They are not too good. \( \mu \lambda \theta \)
194. Longing to take away from other nations. \( \mu \lambda \theta \)
195. A very dirty race. \( \mu \gamma \)
196. Mean - want land from Arabs. \( \mu \lambda \theta + \eta \lambda \)
197. Very disgraceful people - not worth bothering about. \( \mu \lambda \theta \)
198. Very greedy people. \( \mu \lambda \theta \)
199. They want to be alone. \( \mu \lambda \theta \)
200. Very religious and clannish. \( \mu \lambda \theta + \mu \lambda \sigma \)
201. The Jews do not believe in the New Testament. \( \mu \lambda \theta \)
202. Jewish people are not willing to help others. \( \mu \lambda \theta \)
203. They are going the wrong way about retrieving their own land. \( \mu \lambda \theta \)
204. They have their faults but require more sympathy. N
205. They are very bad enemies. \( \mu \lambda \theta \)
206. They own most places. N
207. They have too much money. \( \mu \lambda \theta \)
208. Neither work nor want. Like to be boss. \( \mu \lambda \theta + \mu \lambda \lambda \)
209. They are very greedy. \( \mu \lambda \theta \)
210. They are not to be trusted. \( \mu \lambda \theta \)
211. They are bad. \( \mu \lambda \theta \)
BELIEFS.

212. They are unfortunate but make too much of it. $F_9, M$.
214. Money lenders, usually of no good reputation. $M_{10}$.
215. They are out to make money. $M_8$.
216. Attempting to put the Arabs out by force of arms. $N_3$.
218. Have their own meat and groceries. $N_5$.
221. A greedy and untrustworthy race. $M_5 + M_6$.
222. They are greedy for money. $M_5$.
223. The Jews are a business people. $N_3$.
224. Could are able to form a useful colony in Palestine. $N_3$.
225. The disturbers of the peace. $M_5$.
227. A very hard people to get on with. $M_5$.
228. They are crushing the Arabs slowly. $N_3$.
229. The largest population in the world. $N_5$.
230. Trying to take too much property from the Arabs. $M_5$.
231. Should never have left the promised land. $M_5$.
232. They are very selfish. $M_5$.
233. They do not agree with other countries. $M_5$.
234. They are a rather cringing nation. $M_5$.
235. Their belief is strong but they are a determined minority. $F_9 + N_5$.
236. Able to make money where others fail. $M_{10} + M_5$.
237. The Jews forget what Britain did for them. $M_5$.
239. They have a very hard life. $F_9$.
240. The Jews are supposed to be the money-makers. $N_3$.
241. They have no country of their own and live all over the world. $N_5 + N_1$.
242. They always seem to get the worst of it. $F_9$.
243. Are all out for money but are usually unjustly treated. $M_{10} + F_9$.
244. They can't come to agreed terms with the Arabs. $N_3$.
245. Religion is bad. $M_5$.
247. The Jews are a fussy race and cannot settle down. $M_5$.
248. Had a bad time of it during the war. $F_9$.
249. They are a wealthy people. $N_3$.

Jews.

Categorization.

212. They are unfortunate but make too much of it. $F_9, M$.
214. Money lenders, usually of no good reputation. $M_{10}$.
215. They are out to make money. $M_8$.
216. Attempting to put the Arabs out by force of arms. $N_3$.
218. Have their own meat and groceries. $N_5$.
221. A greedy and untrustworthy race. $M_5 + M_6$.
222. They are greedy for money. $M_5$.
223. The Jews are a business people. $N_3$.
224. Could are able to form a useful colony in Palestine. $N_3$.
225. The disturbers of the peace. $M_5$.
227. A very hard people to get on with. $M_5$.
228. They are crushing the Arabs slowly. $N_3$.
229. The largest population in the world. $N_5$.
230. Trying to take too much property from the Arabs. $M_5$.
231. Should never have left the promised land. $M_5$.
232. They are very selfish. $M_5$.
233. They do not agree with other countries. $M_5$.
234. They are a rather cringing nation. $M_5$.
235. Their belief is strong but they are a determined minority. $F_9 + N_5$.
236. Able to make money where others fail. $M_{10} + M_5$.
237. The Jews forget what Britain did for them. $M_5$.
239. They have a very hard life. $F_9$.
240. The Jews are supposed to be the money-makers. $N_3$.
241. They have no country of their own and live all over the world. $N_5 + N_1$.
242. They always seem to get the worst of it. $F_9$.
243. Are all out for money but are usually unjustly treated. $M_{10} + F_9$.
244. They can't come to agreed terms with the Arabs. $N_3$.
245. Religion is bad. $M_5$.
247. The Jews are a fussy race and cannot settle down. $M_5$.
248. Had a bad time of it during the war. $F_9$.
249. They are a wealthy people. $N_3$. 
Always out to make more money.

They are poor miserable creatures or hard money-making people.

Jews are among the most wealthy people in Britain.

The Jews should be more co-operative with the Arabs.

The Jews would do anything for wealth and importance.

They are always trying to make money.

The Jews have been making a lot of trouble in Palestine by rebellions.

Jews are rich and greedy though there are some pleasant Jews.

They love money.

Jews always appear to be wealthy and help each other.

They drive a hard bargain but are not very kind.

They are able to make money under any circumstances.

They have been deprived for a long time of a home of their own.

The Jew owned the shop I worked in and they were very greedy.

Very unfair.

Very clever but are misusing their powers.

All out to make money.

They have had a very hard deal in past years.

Believe other people should share but will not do so themselves.

The Jews are always fighting.

They are in need of help and understanding.

I dislike them because they have caused so much trouble in Palestine.

They are an ambitious race.

Sly sort of people.

Always causing trouble.

Very loyal among themselves but otherwise very unscrupulous.

Greedy and always fighting.

The Jews are a very hard up race.

They are very good business men but are not very particular in their methods towards success.

A bad race for the world but persecuted too much.
281. They wish to have a country of their own.

282. They are very stupid about their worship.

283. Inhuman race and most deceitful.

284. They are a poor people.

285. I think Hitler was stopped too quick.

286. They are miserers and hoard up their money.

287. If they would stay in their own country.

288. They're misers and hoard up their money.

289. They will cause treachery wherever they go.

290. They are corrupt.

291. They would stick a knife in you as quick as look at you.

292. Cause of trouble.

293. Always causing trouble.

294. They are a murderous and treacherous race.

295. The Jews are scattered all over the world.

296. They are a quiet but mean race.

297. A fighting race who will not lower their pride.

298. The Jews have good business heads.

299. The Jews are trying to take land from the Arabs to which they have no right.

300. They are very treacherous.

301. Greedy people and like a lot of their own way.

302. Always thinking of fighting.

303. I'm sorry for the Jews but I think they could help themselves.

304. Their religion means a great deal to them.

305. They are a very unsettled race of people.

306. A good many greedy - a good many good Jews too.

307. All out for themselves.

308. They are very unsettled.

309. They seem to have no fixed abode in this world - unwanted.

310. The Jews are sad to be the chosen people of God.

311. Their misery (sic) manners.

312. They have no country of their own.

313. The Jews were badly treated by the Germans.

314. Try by fair or unfair means to get on.

315. They are very greedy and deceitful.

316. He is a rogue but a good business man.

317. They are always quarrelling and fighting.

318. Want everything for nothing.

319. They would like to overrun the world.

320. Friendly - hard-working.
Categorization.

321. Out to make money. \( \mu_{20} \)
322. Always out to make money. \( \mu_{10} \)
323. They have plenty money. \( N_1 \)
324. They've been pushed around. \( F_q \)
325. Caused more death and destruction than anyone. \( \mu_s \)
326. They are an intelligent people. \( F_s \)
327. They would do anything for money. \( \mu_{19} \)
328. They never part with what they have. \( \mu_s \)
329. They are very mean. \( \mu_s \)
330. The race would have been exterminated if Hitler had lived. \( N_w \)
331. They have all got big noses. \( \mu_7 \)
332. Pig-headed in religion. \( \mu_4 + \mu_1 \)
333. They change the country they support too often. \( \mu_{10} \)
334. The Jews are always making trouble with other people. \( \mu_{13} \)
335. Have rioted to get control of Palestine. \( N_3 \)
336. The Jews are good handlers of money. \( F_\nu \)
337. They are always trying to grab money. \( \mu_{10} \)
338. Always causing trouble. \( \mu_5 \)
339. They have never had a land of their own. \( N_5 \)
340. Always trying to get the better of one. \( \mu_{11} \)
341. Trying to get rights from cold world. \( F_q \)
342. They are one of the causes of fighting in Palestine. \( \mu_3 \)
343. The Arabs were giving them what they deserved. \( \mu_3 \)
344. They are very brainy. \( \mu_5 + \mu_{15} \)
345. They seem to me as greedy and selfish. \( \mu_5 + \mu_{15} \)
346. Help each other when in a position. \( N_2 \)
347. Always quarrelling with others. \( \mu_8 \)
348. They do not mix with other people. \( \mu_9 \)
349. They are rather uninteresting people. \( N_8 \)
350. They stick together and try to help each other. \( F_u + N_7 \)
351. They are all trying to get back to Palestine. \( N_5 \)
352. They cause a lot of trouble. \( \mu_8 \)
353. Always wanting money and land. \( \mu_{11} + \mu_{19} \)
354. Their greed for money. \( \mu_{10} \)
355. A dead loss. \( \mu_{16} \)
356. They have better businesses than other people. \( F_1 \)
357. Try to get as much money as possible. \( \mu_{10} \)
358. Very industrial. \( N_1 \)
359. Very shrewd business men. \( F_1 \)
360. Out to make as much money as possible. \( \mu_{10} \)
361. Most of their people scattered all over the world. \( N_5 \)
362. Are always causing trouble with the British. \( \mu_8 \)
363. Always seem to get on top. \( \mu_{11} \)
364. A wandering race; nobody wants them. \( N_5 + \mu_{12} \)
365. They want Palestine but are not entitled to it. \( \mu_3 \)
BELIEFS.

372. They have a clever way of making money quick. J7.
373. They don't appreciate all that Britain has done for them. J6.
376. I think they had a very raw deal with some other countries. J6.
377. They have a head for business. N1.
378. They are thrifty but not greedy. J7.
379. They are troublemakers. J6.
381. Fighting for a land that is really theirs. J6.
383. They start trouble from the least small thing. J6.
387. They do not require to fight. J6.
388. They have lovely temples. J7.
389. They want all Palestine for themselves. J6.
392. They don't appreciate a thing that is done for them. J12.
394. They like to fight. J6.
396. They are traitors. J10.
397. They are bad for fighting. J6.
398. They are troublemakers. J6.
399. They are very unsettled. J12.
400. They grab all. J15.
401. All out for money. J10.
404. They never seem to work; they own most of the big shops in Princes Street. J1.
406. They don't believe in Jesus Christ. N10.
408. They should be out of the country -- the trouble they are causing. J6.
BELIEFS.

411. They are money grubbers. $M_{10}$
412. They would live where even a Scotsman would die. $M_{19}$
413. Many have shops. $N_{1}$
414. Like to get money other than working for it. $M_{20} + M_{19}$
415. Cut throats. $M_{18} + M_{6}$
416. They own half the businesses in the world. $M_{1}$
417. Wish to have freedom of the Middle East. $N_{3}$
418. They want a country of their own even if they have to steal it. $N_{5} + M_{19}$
419. They are very untrustworthy. $M_{14}$
420. Troublesome and underhand. $M_{8} + M_{13}$
421. Troublemakers. $M_{8}$
422. Greedy lazy people. $M_{11} + M_{15}$
423. Clever people but too clever for their own good. $M_{13}$
424. They always seem to make money. $N_{1}$
425. They are always moneymakers. $N_{1}$
426. The Jews are mean and murderous. $M_{5} + M_{18}$
427. They are a very mean type. $M_{5}$
428. Most of them are business men and women. $N_{1}$
429. They are great financiers. $F_{1}$
430. Very careful. $F_{1}$
431. A greed for money. $M_{5}$
432. Money making. Most big stores. $N_{1}$
433. All over the world. $N_{5}$
434. Help each other to establish themselves. $N_{14}$
435. They are hunted and oppressed. $N_{14}$
436. They like to make money. $M_{11}$
437. Mean and greedy. $M_{5} + M_{15}$
438. Many are greedy but most are not. $M_{15} + F_{3}$
439. They are troublesome and riotous people. $M_{8}$
440. They fight for what they want. $F_{8}$
441. You can't trust them. $M_{14}$
442. Holy people, they think. $M_{14}$
443. Mean, quarrelsome people. $M_{5} + M_{8}$
444. They are very dishonest people. $M_{18}$
445. They try to get something cheaper than the actual price. $M_{5}$
446. Mean and selfish; would not give you a kind look. $M_{5} + M_{15}$
447. Cause too much trouble. $M_{8}$
448. Poachers. $M_{10}$
449. Hold most of the world's money in a tight grip. $M_{1}$
450. Money makers (bad) $M_{18}$
451. A very greedy and quarrelsome race. $M_{8} + M_{15}$
452. Rats - selfish. $M_{8}$
453. Good business men. $F_{1}$
454. Definitely a set of robbers. $M_{18}$
BELIEFS.

JEWISH.

Categorization.

455. Misers. M$  
456. A very badly treated race. Fq  
457. They are a very unsettled people. M$  
458. They are going to start a war. M$  
459. Trouble-makers and big financiers. M$ + N$  
460. Always getting into trouble. M$  
461. They would steal a stick from a blind man. M$  
462. Cause of unrest in Palestine. M$  
463. Mean. M$  
464. Meany (sic) M$  
465. Jews are a filthy lot. M$  
466. Unhappy in not having a country. Very well able to better themselves in business. N$ + F$.  
467. Looked down on by most folks. M$  
468. Very stubborn. M$  
469. They are apt to act behind your back. M$  
470. Fond of money and don't care how they get it. M$  
471. They are very greedy. M$  
472. The Jews are too greedy for money. M$  
473. They seem to be a very unfortunate, wandering race. Fq  
474. They are very worthless. M$  
475. They seem to be very cruel towards other nations. M$  
476. If they followed their Lord in the way He told them to do, they would be good people. N$  
477. Lots of rioting among the people. M$  
478. They ignore the people from whom they make money. M$  
479. Jews - I feel rather sorry for them and therefore uncomfortable. Fq  
480. They want to own every shop in the world. M$  
481. Sorry for them. Fq  
482. Would like to rule the world. M$  
483. They start wars. M$  
484. They are scattered all over the world. N$  
485. They have an art of money making. N$  
486. Always causing trouble between countries. M$  
487. They are troublemakers. M$  
488. Mean. M$  
489. They have their own churches. N$  
490. A money hoarding race. M$  
491. Always after money. M$  
492. Tenacious. F$  
493. They think the Saviour from God is still to be born. N$  
494. They preach about God but do not act it. M$  
495. Troublemakers. M$  
496. They are very religious. N$
BELIEFS.

497. They are very dangerous. 
498. They suffered during the war. 
499. Hard workers - like to get on. 
500. A race without a country. 
501. Very misery (sic) but ready to settle down. 
502. They want their own country in which to live. 
503. Too handy at attacking defenceless people. 
504. They are hard workers. 
505. Too much trouble made by them. 
506. They like everything their own way. 
507. They always help one of their own race who is in trouble. 
508. The Jews are well-known for their belief they are the chosen people. 
509. They are greedy about everything. 
510. Very religious people. 
511. They are causing trouble. 
512. Practically all Jews can be recognized right away. 
513. They are striving to be recognized as a nation. 
514. To much money between their fingers. 
515. Always looking after business and you never see a poor Jew. 
516. Money makers. 
517. Jealous. 
518. They are very good at managing a business. 
519. They still believe that they are the chosen people. 
520. They are a wandering nation. 
521. They are mean miserly people. 
522. A nation which has been broken up by Hitler's power. 
523. Mixed up with everything concerning money. 
524. Always wandering around trying to find a country. 
525. Swarthly. 
526. They are the cause of the last war. 
527. Very religious. 
528. They have large noses. 
529. They're a very quarrelsome people. 
530. Terrible race of people. 
531. Greedy and cunning. 
532. They are superstitious. 
533. Jews are causing a lot of trouble just now. 
534. The ungrateful way they treated our troops. 
535. This people, I believe, are mean and want too much for nothing. 
536. They fight and disagree with the Arabs. 
537. The Jews are a race without a country. 
538. The Jews have no home of their own. 
539. The Jews are fighting the Arabs for Palestine. 
540. They have become successful though downtrodden.

JEWS.

Categorization.

497. They are very dangerous. 
498. They suffered during the war. 
499. Hard workers - like to get on. 
500. A race without a country. 
501. Very misery (sic) but ready to settle down. 
502. They want their own country in which to live. 
503. Too handy at attacking defenceless people. 
504. They are hard workers. 
505. Too much trouble made by them. 
506. They like everything their own way. 
507. They always help one of their own race who is in trouble. 
508. The Jews are well-known for their belief they are the chosen people. 
509. They are greedy about everything. 
510. Very religious people. 
511. They are causing trouble. 
512. Practically all Jews can be recognized right away. 
513. They are striving to be recognized as a nation. 
514. To much money between their fingers. 
515. Always looking after business and you never see a poor Jew. 
516. Money makers. 
517. Jealous. 
518. They are very good at managing a business. 
519. They still believe that they are the chosen people. 
520. They are a wandering nation. 
521. They are mean miserly people. 
522. A nation which has been broken up by Hitler's power. 
523. Mixed up with everything concerning money. 
524. Always wandering around trying to find a country. 
525. Swarthly. 
526. They are the cause of the last war. 
527. Very religious. 
528. They have large noses. 
529. They're a very quarrelsome people. 
530. Terrible race of people. 
531. Greedy and cunning. 
532. They are superstitious. 
533. Jews are causing a lot of trouble just now. 
534. The ungrateful way they treated our troops. 
535. This people, I believe, are mean and want too much for nothing. 
536. They fight and disagree with the Arabs. 
537. The Jews are a race without a country. 
538. The Jews have no home of their own. 
539. The Jews are fighting the Arabs for Palestine. 
540. They have become successful though downtrodden.
BELIEFS.

541. Underhand, furtive. μ.3
542. Jews own about all the shops along Princes Street. μ.5
543. They are most excellent business men. μ.7
544. Caused a lot of trouble in Palestine. μ.3
545. Wish to own Palestine. N.3
546. They are all over the world. N.6
547. Nobody likes them. μ.5
548. Nobody likes them. μ.5
549. They are all out to make trouble. μ.6
550. Cruel to the Arabs. μ.8
551. They are all out to make trouble. μ.6
552. They seem to have plenty of money and keep it to themselves. N.6 μ.8
553. They go all out for money and power. μ.4 μ.10
554. The Jews are a fighting people. F.8
555. They are a fighting people. F.8
556. The Jews are a barbaric race and not trustful (sic) μ.7 μ.4
557. They are a lot of misers. μ.10
558. Disagreeable - people cannot trust them. μ.7 μ.10
559. The Jews are always fighting with the Arabs. N.3
560. Very queer race. N.7
561. Should stop fighting. μ.8
562. They are very clever business men. F.1
563. Chats and troublemakers. μ.8 μ.10
564. The Jews are a people who like a great deal of money. μ.10
565. They are good at handling money. F.1
566. They are good at handling money. F.1
567. Tight as 'old Nick' himself. μ.5
568. Intelligent but miserly. F.6 μ.5
569. They are not nice people. μ.8
570. They are not nice people. μ.8
571. They all ought to be shot. μ.30
572. The Jews tried to take Israel at all costs. N.6
573. They will cut your throat as quick as look at you. μ.18
574. They help each other. N.6
575. They help each other. N.6
577. They do not stay in one country long enough. N.5
578. They are greedy and crafty when in business. μ.15 μ.13
579. They are greedy. μ.15
580. They killed some of our soldiers. N.6
581. Fighting the Arabs. N.6
582. Too concerned with money. μ.10
583. The Jews cause all the trouble in the world. μ.8
584. They say Israel is their country. N.5
585. They are misers. μ.5
586. Most of them have large noses. μ.7
587. They do not like to give something away. μ.15
588. They would like to possess at least part of Egypt. N.6
589. Always looking for trouble and wanting more than they've got. μ.6

JEWISH CATEGORIZATION.

541. Underhand, furtive. μ.3
542. Jews own about all the shops along Princes Street. μ.5
543. They are most excellent business men. μ.7
544. Caused a lot of trouble in Palestine. μ.3
545. Wish to own Palestine. N.3
546. They are all over the world. N.6
547. Nobody likes them. μ.5
548. Nobody likes them. μ.5
549. They are all out to make trouble. μ.6
550. Cruel to the Arabs. μ.8
551. They are all out to make trouble. μ.6
552. They seem to have plenty of money and keep it to themselves. N.6 μ.8
553. They go all out for money and power. μ.4 μ.10
554. The Jews are a fighting people. F.8
555. They are a fighting people. F.8
556. The Jews are a barbaric race and not trustful (sic) μ.7 μ.4
557. They are a lot of misers. μ.10
558. Disagreeable - people cannot trust them. μ.7 μ.10
559. The Jews are always fighting with the Arabs. N.3
560. Very queer race. N.7
561. Should stop fighting. μ.8
562. They are very clever business men. F.1
563. Chats and troublemakers. μ.8 μ.10
564. The Jews are a people who like a great deal of money. μ.10
565. They are good at handling money. F.1
566. They are good at handling money. F.1
567. Tight as 'old Nick' himself. μ.5
568. Intelligent but miserly. F.6 μ.5
569. They are not nice people. μ.8
570. They are not nice people. μ.8
571. They all ought to be shot. μ.30
572. The Jews tried to take Israel at all costs. N.6
573. They will cut your throat as quick as look at you. μ.18
574. They help each other. N.6
575. They help each other. N.6
577. They do not stay in one country long enough. N.5
578. They are greedy and crafty when in business. μ.15 μ.13
579. They are greedy. μ.15
580. They killed some of our soldiers. N.6
581. Fighting the Arabs. N.6
582. Too concerned with money. μ.10
583. The Jews cause all the trouble in the world. μ.8
584. They say Israel is their country. N.5
585. They are misers. μ.5
586. Most of them have large noses. μ.7
587. They do not like to give something away. μ.15
588. They would like to possess at least part of Egypt. N.6
589. Always looking for trouble and wanting more than they've got. μ.6
BELIEFS.

590. They are a hardworking people. F?
591. They want a country which the Bible says they shall not get. N: S: N:
592. They cause much trouble in the world. M S
593. Rotten greedy people always trying to get the best of things. M 7 + M 6 + M 8
594. Very unhelpful to you. M 2
595. A wandering tribe which should be exterminated. N S: M 10
596. Greasy - underhand. M 7 + M 3
597. They are fighting for a country just now. N S
598. Very good at making money. F
599. They always manage to get houses when other people can't M 9
600. They think of no one but themselves. M 5
601. They are out for money. M 10
602. Can get no peace to live. F 9
603. The Jews are business-like men. F 7
604. They are very unlucky. F 4
605. Nothing seems to satisfy them. M 5
606. They are a quarrelsome country. M 5
607. They were ill-treated by the Germans. F 9
608. They are always after money. M 10
609. Very greedy people. M 5
610. They are greedy and troublemakers. M 8 + M 5
611. Cannot live at peace. M 8
612. The Jews are nearly all money-grubbers. M 10
613. They have plenty of money; also they nearly all have businesses. N L
614. A greedy and dirty nation. M 5 + M 7
615. Ill-treated by Nazis. F 9
616. They are always fighting to make Palestine their. M 5
617. An unsettled people. N S
618. A country which is very religious. N 1
619. They are a greedy crowd. M 5
620. They are unreliable. M 24
621. I think they are out to make money. M 10
622. They are greedy. M 5
623. They are people who are always out for blood. M 8
624. Always fighting. M 8
625. They seek their own country. N S
626. They are at last trying to get a country of their own. N S
627. They started the fighting with the British. M 3
628. They are liars. M 24
629. They will fight until they get a country of their own. N S
630. Very intelligent but take too much for granted. F s + M 22
631. They have been the cause of the trouble in Palestine. M 3
ELIETS.

JEW.

Categorization.

632. Great business men.\textsuperscript{F1}

633. They nearly caused another war.\textsuperscript{M21}

634. They are fighting for superiority. \textsuperscript{M14}

635. I dislike them because they are quarrelsome.\textsuperscript{M30}

636. A race wanting a land to themselves. \textsuperscript{M5}

637. They are always thinking about money. \textsuperscript{M10}

638. The Jews have a great standard about their religion but carry it too far. \textsuperscript{F1+M10}

639. Very religious. \textsuperscript{F1}

640. They made trouble in the East lately. \textsuperscript{M3}

641. They caused the fighting in Palestine after the war. \textsuperscript{M3}

642. They tried to get back their country from the Arabs. \textsuperscript{N3}

643. The Jews are disliked because of their lust for money. \textsuperscript{M11}

644. The Jews are mean and possessive. \textsuperscript{M8+M15}

645. Too much (sic) tough guys. \textsuperscript{M7}

646. They are an unwanted race. \textsuperscript{M12}

647. Jews are fond of money but work hard for it. \textsuperscript{M10+F7}

648. They stand for their religion. \textsuperscript{F1}

649. They are very businesslike and can always get money. \textsuperscript{F3}

650. They are mean. \textsuperscript{M5}

651. Cannot be trusted and are selfish. \textsuperscript{M19+M5}

652. They are very persevering and support each other. \textsuperscript{F8+N11}

653. Mean. \textsuperscript{M5}

654. They pray too much and fast. \textsuperscript{M8}

655. They never do anything unless there's money in it. \textsuperscript{M10}

656. A race which has remained a race with no love of anyone else. \textsuperscript{M5}

657. The Jews have caused a lot of trouble out East. \textsuperscript{M8}

658. They are poor people who would need a country. \textsuperscript{F9}

659. They attacked British troops right after the war. \textsuperscript{M10}

660. Greasy and tight with money. \textsuperscript{M7+M10}

661. They would overrun the world, given the chance. \textsuperscript{M14}

662. Too excitable for reliance. \textsuperscript{M14}

663. They are good business men. \textsuperscript{F1}

664. They are mean, dirty, money-grubbing rogues. \textsuperscript{M5+M7+M10}

665. Always out to make money regardless of what cost. \textsuperscript{M10+M14}

666. They are always fighting. \textsuperscript{M8}

667. There are far too many of them. \textsuperscript{M34}

668. Stupid in their uprising against C. Twist (?) \textsuperscript{M16}

669. They are always fighting for nothing. \textsuperscript{M8}

670. They are a group of idiots. \textsuperscript{M16}

671. They are a shower of crooks. \textsuperscript{M18}

672. They are bloodthirsty men. \textsuperscript{M17}

673. Mean with their money. \textsuperscript{M5}

674. They are a set of dirty rascals. \textsuperscript{M18}
BELIEFS.

675. Some of them have a habit of grabbing at money. \( \mu_1 \)
676. They make good business people. \( \pi_2 \)
677. The Jews have been greatly persecuted for many years. \( F_q \)
678. They are prosperous and will get into Palestine. \( N_7 + N_3 \)
679. They would sell the "granny". \( \mu_{10} \)
680. Too mean. \( \mu_5 \)
681. Too many have shops. \( \mu_2 \)
682. They should be back in their own country. \( N_6 \)
683. Unliked everywhere. \( \mu_1 \)
684. They are terrible, stupid and mean. \( \mu_{14} + \mu_5 \)
685. They are cruel and greedy. \( \mu_7 + \mu_{15} \)
686. The Jews are mean. \( \mu_5 \)
687. All out to make money. \( \mu_{10} \)
688. They are too fond of money. \( \mu_8 \)
689. They have a wrong idea of religion. \( \mu_1 \)
690. The Jews are sly. \( \mu_{13} \)
691. They deserve Israel which they have received. \( F_q + N_5 \)
692. They are always after money. \( \mu_{10} \)
693. They think they can do what they like. \( \mu_{41} \)
694. They are very unfair and are money grubbing. \( \mu_{19} + \mu_{10} \)
695. They have a stupid religion. \( \mu_1 \)
696. They own half the property in Britain. \( N_7 \)
697. The Jews are the biggest crowd of money grabbers. \( \mu_{10} \)
698. They are the superior race and are very religious. \( \mu_{17} + F_1 \)
699. They try to charge more for goods than is really necessary. \( \mu_5 \)
700. They are "spivs". \( \mu_{12} + \mu_9 \)
701. Their love of money. \( \mu_{10} \)
702. If they didn't steal they might get along better. \( \mu_{18} \)
703. They will never be happy till they rule the world. \( \mu_{14} \)
704. Shifty-eyed, untrustful crowd. \( \mu_{15} + \mu_{14} \)
705. Clever, first-class business men, greatly persecuted. \( F_q + F_2 + F_4 \)
706. All out for money. \( \mu_{10} \)
707. Have been cause of much suffering. \( \mu_8 \)
708. They are a d--- nuisance. \( \mu_8 \)
BELIEFS.

719. Shrewd. 
720. They are brought to look upon themselves as downtrodden. 
721. Money makers. 
722. The Jewish are, or to me, appear, to be mean but I do know of exceptions. 
723. Most of them are honest and religious. 
724. They are always scrounging and saving up. 
725. Are fairly sociable but they like to make large amounts of money. 
726. They are the biggest crowd of rogues on earth. 
727. Jews are very greedy and try to get money without working for it. 
728. Causing a disturbance in Palestine. 
729. Persecuted by Hitler. 
730. A clever but misguided people. 
731. A lonely but trouble-making race. 
732. They can be honest or otherwise. 
733. Dislike them for their terrorist activities. 
734. Dislike them for their terrorist activities. 
735. Unfortunate that their religions beliefs are slated. 
736. In the main they are distasteful, too quarrelsome. 
737. They are crafty and mean. 
738. Jews are very secretive but friendly among themselves. 
739. They seem to be able to get things that others can't. 
740. They are avaricious. 
742. We cannot completely trust them. 
743. They are parasites on humanity. 
744. Jews in this country often become misery (sic). 
745. The Jews generally are swindlers and frauds. 
746. They can make money. 
747. The Jews know how to make money. 
748. The Jews have been the cause of nearly all the trouble. 
749. They are too rich in this country for comfort. 
750. Ruination of the States. 
751. They support their own people. 
752. They always seem to want money. 
753. They want what really is not their. 
754. Clannish. 
755. They like money too much. 
756. They are too fond of money but have been punished. 
757. Oily. 
758. They are always looking for money. 
759. They are mean. 
760. Attend Church on Saturday.

JEWS.

Categorization.
BELIEFS.  

JEWS.  

Categorization.

761. They are great financiers. 
762. They suffered great persecution during the war. 
763. They have too many women. 
764. Very mean. 
765. They are troublesome. 
766. They like getting their pound of flesh. 
767. A rotten lot, they are. 
768. They are people who would cheat you at any corner. 
769. Most of the Jews are fat and rich. 
770. They are just a set of rats and misers. 
771. Always trying to make money. 
772. Good business men. 
773. The Jews all keep their hair long. 
774. They go to the Church on Saturdays. 
775. They have a stupid religion.
QUALITATIVE CATEGORIZATION OF BELIEFS.

III. RUSSIANS.

U - Unfavourable.
N - Neutral.
F - Favourable.

Numbers refer to the lists of cognitive areas preceding the data and presented under the three classes, Unfavourable, Neutral, and Favourable.

For the graphical representation of this section, see Page 492. (Diagrams.)
### COGNITIVE AREAS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unfavourable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Secretiveness</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Desire for hegemony (Domineeringness)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cruelty</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Obstinacy</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Unwillingness to co-operate (Unfriendliness)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Unwillingness to agree with people (Unsociability)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lack of trust</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Untrustworthiness</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Political fanaticism (Proselytizing)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Criticism of their leaders</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Warmongering (Aggressiveness, and war preparation)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Evil character (Treachery)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Inquisitiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Suspiciousness</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Cowardliness</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Misuse of power</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Foolishness</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Arrogance and boastfulness</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Ignorance and lack of education (&quot;gagged&quot; etc.)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Restlessness and discontent, lack of happiness</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Poor workers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Exploitation of the masses</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Disapproval of the Communist way of life</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Selfishness</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Uncivilized (Backward)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Atheism</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Dirty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Bad-tempered</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Cunning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Physical or psychological characteristics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Unsportsmanlike</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Desire to be different</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Severity of character</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Avowed dislike or hatred</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Bureaucracy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See page 492.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COGNITIVE AREAS</th>
<th>RUSSIANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral.</td>
<td>Frequency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Size of country, climate, population etc.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Type of government, political framework</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Physical appearance of the people</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Way of life, economic and social conditions</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Power. (Limited to a statement of fact)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong> Attitude to other peoples.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong> Musical ability</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.</strong> Lack of knowledge. (Non-committal statement)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.</strong> Unpopularity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.</strong> Recent historical events</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong> Leveling forces at work in society</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> Prophecy.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See page 492.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Areas</th>
<th>Russians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favourable</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Hardworking. Industrious</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Military excellence</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sympathy with the masses of common people</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gratitude for their aid in the recent war</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Skill (as craftsmen etc.), intelligence and powers of organization</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Friendliness</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Their way of life (modernistic, progressive)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sensibleness, and nobility of character</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Powers of endurance</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Physical appearance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Forced into military preparedness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Grim determination</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Idealism (true to their ideals)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Skilled in horsemanship (athleticism)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Obedience</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Severity of character</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Equality of sexes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See page 492.
BELIEFS. RUSSIANS.

Categorization.

1. Always fighting. F
2. The six hundred at the top are the head ones. F
3. They are hard and cruel and always out to help themselves. F
4. They like keeping you in the dark. F
5. Hard workers. F
6. They are very keen on war. F
7. They are not very clever; they are bad. F
8. They want too much power for themselves. F
9. They are too willing for war. F
10. The Russians are a most unpopular nation. F
11. They are too secretive. F
12. The Russians want everything for themselves. F
13. They won't co-operate. F
14. They plot against the allies. F
15. They want to make everyone a Communist. F
16. They are not liked too much. F
17. They are secretive and nobody knows much about them. F
18. They are not over-friendly towards us. F
20. They are fanatical in politics. F
21. They disturb the peace of Europe. F
22. They like to overpower others. F
23. Most of them are distrustful. F
24. Very stubborn. F
25. Very selfish. F
26. Are arguing with the Americans. F
27. Communists. F
28. Strong fighters. F
29. They like ruling everyone else. F
30. They have a funny government. N
31. They are cruel and they want to own quite a lot of things. F
32. Very quarrelsome and stupid. F
33. The ordinary people don't get much to say. F
34. Bad people for company; also not very brave. F
35. They are holding in news. F
36. They want the secret of the A-bomb. F
37. Mean and cruel. F
38. There are many of them. N
39. They are brave but not generous. F
40. They feel that they are superior to any other nation. F
41. They want to be masters; they are very hard workers. F
42. They are unagreeable. F
43. They are two-faced. F
44. Russians are very selfish and unfaithful. F
**BELIEFS.**

45. Russians are very ungrateful and spiteful. 

46. The Russians are powerful and hardworking. 

47. They are hard-hearted and grasping. 

48. They do not let other people know what goes on in Russia. 

49. Russians are very ungrateful and spiteful. 

50. The Russians are powerful and hardworking. 

51. Oppressed people with Communist in government. 

52. Equality of the sexes is prevalent. 

53. They are just mischief-makers. 

54. Russians have rather unjust ideas. 

55. I just don't know very much about them. 

56. Russians are fools. 

57. They have only two classes; the very poor and the very rich. 

58. Cannot come to an agreement with any other nation. 

59. Russians are too secretive and the common people grossly and wrongly suppressed. 

60. Foolish in ideas and want to cause trouble. 

61. Great number of people who cannot be trusted. 

62. Not to be trusted; not friendly, too domineering. 

63. Russians have Communist views. 

64. Not very nice people was the impression given during the war. 

65. The men seem to be cruel and the women loved but mastered by them. 

66. Definitely not understandable. 

67. Communism got completely out of control. 

68. They are usually fat, fur-topped and never without cigars. 

69. They want to fight and rule over everybody. 

70. They are politicians. 

71. The Russians are kept down. 

72. Russians are a hardy people. 

73. Hardworking with a well-organized country. 

74. Russians are always fighting, and want everything. 

75. They are very apt to boast. 

76. They want to fight and rule over everybody. 

77. Cruel and have no thought for others. 

78. They are a people who believe in Communism. 

79. Always accuse people of things. 

80. Russians are very cold with hardly any feelings. 

81. They are sly and crafty. 

82. Russians have snow a lot. 

83. Russians want more than they can get. 

84. They are not very friendly; they can easily start a war.
BELIEFS.

RUSSIANS.

Categorization.

85. Russians are very powerful. 
86. Russians are too powerful and would rather fight. 
87. They keep too much to themselves. 
88. Wonderful ballet - dancers. 
89. Russians are all equal. 
90. Argumentative but intelligent. 
91. All out to make war. 
92. Russians are very quarrelsome and disagreeable. 
93. Russians are people who disbelieve in Royalty. 
94. They are wishing to rule the world. 
95. They are stubborn and like their own way. 
96. Dominated by a few in power and are like mass-produced robots. 
97. Domineering and greedy. 
98. They exclude (sic) themselves from the rest of the world, and give rise to suspicion. 
99. Russians are good fighters. 
100. Far too ready to fight. 
101. Sly, untruthful. 
102. A servile people who grovel in the dust before a dictator. 
103. A nation that cannot be trusted. 
104. Very secretive, always wanting more power. 
105. War-makers not easy to be friendly with. 
106. Too little education; therefore can have no opinions. 
107. Russians are people who take one for granted. 
108. Want to rule everyone. 
109. They are a nation who follow their leaders blindly. 
110. The Russians are not nice because they are always fighting. 
111. Some are kind but the majority are unkind. 
112. Ready for war. 
113. They are too hard on their own people after such a war. 
114. A people who are out for revenge. 
115. Very clever and kind people. 
116. They are people who would not make wars with countries. 
117. Wanting too much for themselves and not willing to co-operate. 
118. They want too much power. 
119. They are too fond of expansion. 
120. Russians had to rely on the snow when they fought. 
121. They are a double-crossing race. 
122. They do not like Germans. 
123. Unsocial and cold-hearted people. 
124. Good fighters in war. 
125. They are a lot of fanatics. 
126. Very hard working people.
BELIEFS.

127. They are as good as the Americans. F
128. They do not mix with other nations. M
129. Very disagreeable. M
130. They don't know what the world beyond Russia is like. M
131. Hard-working but apt to be backward. F
132. They think of none but themselves. M
133. "Skelet" people. M
134. They are secretive and cautious. M
135. Boys play with weapons. M
136. They are good but they have bad leaders. F
137. They are unfriendly. M
138. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
139. They are all right but they are ruled by ruthless military law. F
140. They are overruled by swelled-headed people. F
141. They want Germany so they can have some North Sea ports. M
142. The people are of good build and have furry clothes. F
143. Russians are dictators. M
144. They are energetic people. F
145. They are energetic hard-working people. F
146. Not very brainy. M
147. Minorities very illiterate. M
148. They are secretive and cautious. M
149. They are also dictators and very badly behaved. M
150. Political race. N
151. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
152. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
153. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
154. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
155. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
156. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
157. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
158. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
159. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
160. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
161. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
162. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
163. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
164. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
165. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
166. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
167. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
168. They are good but they have bad leaders. F

RUSSIANS.

Categorization.

127. They are as good as the Americans. F
128. They do not mix with other nations. M
129. Very disagreeable. M
130. They don't know what the world beyond Russia is like. M
131. Hard-working but apt to be backward. F
132. They think of none but themselves. M
133. "Skelet" people. M
134. They are secretive and cautious. M
135. Boys play with weapons. M
136. They are good but they have bad leaders. F
137. They are unfriendly. M
138. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
139. They are all right but they are ruled by ruthless military law. F
140. They are overruled by swelled-headed people. F
141. They want Germany so they can have some North Sea ports. M
142. The people are of good build and have furry clothes. F
143. Russians are dictators. M
144. They are energetic people. F
145. They are energetic hard-working people. F
146. Not very brainy. M
147. Minorities very illiterate. M
148. They are secretive and cautious. M
149. They are also dictators and very badly behaved. M
150. Political race. N
151. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
152. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
153. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
154. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
155. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
156. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
157. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
158. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
159. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
160. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
161. They want the secret of the atomic bomb. M
162. They won't give in if they know they are in the wrong. M
163. No minds of their own. M
164. The Russians believe in Communism. N
165. They were too easily overrun by Communists. M
166. They are under the influence of Communist leaders. N
167. The Russians think they are the rulers of the world. M
168. They are good but they have bad leaders. F

- 231 -
BELIEFS.

169. They like the land. N4
170. They are warmongers. M
171. Fighters. F
172. They are always wanting war. M+M
173. They are very cruel. M
174. They are always hiding something. M
175. Dirty double crossers. M+M
176. The people are good and hard-working. F+F
177. They cannot make friends and are never satisfied. M+F+F
178. They want to rule the world. M
179. They assisted in the Communist coup in Europe. N
180. People who would like to rule the world. M
181. They are State machines. M
182. Believed in obedience by force. M+F
183. Obstinate. M+F
184. Ruthless men but brave fighters. M+F
185. They are sturdy to stand up to their winters. F
186. A cruel mischievous race. M+F
187. They grab all they can get. M
188. Russia is a country of secrets. M
189. Cause trouble. M
190. If Communism spread the world would become like Russia. N
191. Always wanting their own way. M+F+F
192. Always disagreeing. M+F
193. Very disliking people and not hard workers. M+F+F
194. The Russian Communists are the source of the riots. M+F
195. Good soldiers but cruel. F+F
196. Trying to get power without war. M+F+F
197. They are very discontented. M+F
198. They do not agree. M+F
199. They do not seem to have any feelings at all. M+F
200. Too much dictatorship in their ideals. M+F
201. Great workers content to follow blindly. F+F
202. They can endure much but are not very happy. F+F
203. A go-ahead nation and clever. F+F
204. I do not like the idea of women working along side the men and the children in nurseries. M+F
205. Russians are all for equal rights. N+F
206. Russians like to have everything their own way; they are strong. M+F+F
207. Stolid and determined. M+F
208. Russians do all they can to capture all countries and make them Communist. M+F
209. They are greedy and want their own way in everything. M+F+F
210. Great farmers - forced to be soldiers by the rest of the world. F+F
211. Hard workers. F+F
212. Russians are good people but are spoiling the peace plan. F+F

RUSSIANS.

Categorization.

169. They like the land. N4
170. They are warmongers. M
171. Fighters. F
172. They are always wanting war. M+M
173. They are very cruel. M
174. They are always hiding something. M
175. Dirty double crossers. M+M
176. The people are good and hard-working. F+F
177. They cannot make friends and are never satisfied. M+F+F
178. They want to rule the world. M
179. They assisted in the Communist coup in Europe. N
180. People who would like to rule the world. M
181. They are State machines. M
182. Believed in obedience by force. M+F
183. Obstinate. M+F
184. Ruthless men but brave fighters. M+F
185. They are sturdy to stand up to their winters. F
186. A cruel mischievous race. M+F
187. They grab all they can get. M
188. Russia is a country of secrets. M
189. Cause trouble. M
190. If Communism spread the world would become like Russia. N
191. Always wanting their own way. M+F+F
192. Always disagreeing. M+F
193. Very disliking people and not hard workers. M+F+F
194. The Russian Communists are the source of the riots. M+F
195. Good soldiers but cruel. F+F
196. Trying to get power without war. M+F+F
197. They are very discontented. M+F
198. They do not agree. M+F
199. They do not seem to have any feelings at all. M+F
200. Too much dictatorship in their ideals. M+F
201. Great workers content to follow blindly. F+F
202. They can endure much but are not very happy. F+F
203. A go-ahead nation and clever. F+F
204. I do not like the idea of women working along side the men and the children in nurseries. M+F
205. Russians are all for equal rights. N+F
206. Russians like to have everything their own way; they are strong. M+F+F
207. Stolid and determined. M+F
208. Russians do all they can to capture all countries and make them Communist. M+F
209. They are greedy and want their own way in everything. M+F+F
210. Great farmers - forced to be soldiers by the rest of the world. F+F
211. Hard workers. F+F
212. Russians are good people but are spoiling the peace plan. F+F
BELIEFS.

213. Too much democracy of industry - the women do the heaviest work. M1

214. They are very greedy for power. M1

215. Kept under the thumb of Stalin. M1

216. Changeable in politics; rather ruthless. M6

217. The people are very hard-working and get little in return. F5 + F7

218. Are ready any day to have war with us. M1

219. Russians are too powerful a nation. M1

220. The Russian people are uneducated and are quite happy to have their lives ruled. M1 + M10

221. They have tried to help us out of some difficulties. F5

222. The Russians are causing some trouble and cannot agree with the British leaders. M5 + M6

223. Russians are causing a great deal of uneasiness all over the world. M6

224. They have a wild sense of rhythm. M7

225. Russian people do not seem to have any say in their government. M9

226. Clever, secretive, severe. F5 + M1 + M4

227. They do not know much about the world outside Russia. M1

228. Mostly peasant, not well educated, but good fighters. N2 + M1 + F1

229. Good fighters, but not very clean fighting. F2 + M2

230. They are a race by themselves. N5

231. Talk behind people's back. M5 + F6

232. The Russians like to boss over everyone. M5

233. Russians appear allies but it remains to be seen. M5

234. A very secretive people who don't talk much. M1

235. People who like to fight. M11

236. They are very cruel. M5

237. Covers a very varied type of people. N4

238. Arrogant and unco-operative. M5 + M11

239. They're very secretive. M1

240. These people have an ideal which is Communism. M9

241. They will never be a great nation. M13

242. Unsociable. M6

243. Communists all through. M11

244. They are very troublesome. M5

245. They want to rule the world like Germany. M1

246. The Russians believe in equality. M9

247. I don't like them because of the Iron Curtain. M1

248. They are very treacherous. M5

249. Poor politicians. M10

250. The Russians like serious music. N7

251. They are as bad as the Germans in my opinion. M12

252. A well-to-do country; everyone is equal. F7

253. Out for themselves. M5

254. Great for their music player. N7

RUSSIANS.

Categorization.

213. Too much democracy of industry - the women do the heaviest work. M1

214. They are very greedy for power. M1

215. Kept under the thumb of Stalin. M1

216. Changeable in politics; rather ruthless. M6

217. The people are very hard-working and get little in return. F5 + F7

218. Are ready any day to have war with us. M1

219. Russians are too powerful a nation. M1

220. The Russian people are uneducated and are quite happy to have their lives ruled. M1 + M10

221. They have tried to help us out of some difficulties. F5

222. The Russians are causing some trouble and cannot agree with the British leaders. M5 + M6

223. Russians are causing a great deal of uneasiness all over the world. M6

224. They have a wild sense of rhythm. M7

225. Russian people do not seem to have any say in their government. M9

226. Clever, secretive, severe. F5 + M1 + M4

227. They do not know much about the world outside Russia. M1

228. Mostly peasant, not well educated, but good fighters. N2 + M1 + F1

229. Good fighters, but not very clean fighting. F2 + M2

230. They are a race by themselves. N5

231. Talk behind people's back. M5 + F6

232. The Russians like to boss over everyone. M5

233. Russians appear allies but it remains to be seen. M5

234. A very secretive people who don't talk much. M1

235. People who like to fight. M11

236. They are very cruel. M5

237. Covers a very varied type of people. N4

238. Arrogant and unco-operative. M5 + M11

239. They're very secretive. M1

240. These people have an ideal which is Communism. M9

241. They will never be a great nation. M13

242. Unsociable. M6

243. Communists all through. M11

244. They are very troublesome. M5

245. They want to rule the world like Germany. M1

246. The Russians believe in equality. M9

247. I don't like them because of the Iron Curtain. M1

248. They are very treacherous. M5

249. Poor politicians. M10

250. The Russians like serious music. N7

251. They are as bad as the Germans in my opinion. M12

252. A well-to-do country; everyone is equal. F7

253. Out for themselves. M5

254. Great for their music player. N7
BELIEFS.

RUSSIANS.

Categorization.

255. I think they are depending too much on one leader. N
256. A very ignorant race. M
257. They are a solid people, easily governed. F
258. They are a fighting race. F
259. The Russians are warmongers. M
260. Russians are trying to get more power all the time. M
261. Communist and very bad toward British marriages. M
262. Like their own way. M
263. Want too much for their own country. M
264. A very grim determined race, but a people who will follow ideals. M
265. I wish I knew more about the Russian people. M
266. Very few people like them. M
267. Few people like them. M
268. Disagreeable and powerful. M
269. Seem to be always wanting wars. M
270. All out for themselves. M
271. They seem to want to be top-dogs; easily misled. M
272. Russia is misusing them too. M
273. They seem never to be satisfied with what they have. M
274. Russians are nearly all Communist. M
275. Are easily kept under by a ruler. F
276. Good horsemen. F
277. They are great Communists. M
278. They are very ignorant. M
279. Russians are good horsemen. F
280. They are great fighters. F
281. Cruel to people. M
282. Unfriendly toward the United Nations. M
283. Agreeable if they get their own way. M
284. Definitely a warmongering nation. M
285. A country that never seems to be satisfied. M
286. Will not agree with any other country. M
287. They keep themselves behind the Iron Curtain. M
288. Staunch to their beliefs. F
289. Very self-contained. M
290. They would betray their brother. M
291. Ar run by Communists. M
292. They are trying to stop peace in the world. M
293. Half of them aren't civilized. M
294. Very good fighters. F
295. Drifting from God and trying to make man supreme. M
296. They want to conquer the world. M
297. The Russians try to spread Communism all over the world. M
298. Communism is spreading according to the wireless. M
Beliefs.

Russians.

Categorization.

299. They are a backward race but very numerous. 
300. Always ready to disagree with everybody. 
301. A bad nation which is now trying to start another war. 
302. Are warmongers. 
303. They are trying to spread Communism. 
304. They are good horsemen. 
305. Have unjustly arrested the Cardinal Primate of Hungary. 
306. They are Communists. 
307. They are always wanting their own way. 
308. Russians, a stupid and secretive people. 
309. Large nation. 
310. Leaders want all their own way. 
311. Russians are too ambitious and mostly Communist. 
312. Survive under extreme cold; must be hardy. 
313. They are a very collective people. 
314. They are too much Communist dominated. 
315. They live on the smallest of wages. 
316. Their secretism (sic) about political facts. 
317. I wouldn't trust them at all. 
318. Always making trouble out of nothing. 
319. Trouble-makers. 
320. Peasants, for the most part, ignorant. 
321. Russians have too much Communism about them. 
322. A very good fighting nation. 
323. Have no minds of their own. 
324. A bad lot like the Nazis but with politics. 
325. Very great race; know what they want for life. 
326. Not very clean-living people. 
327. A very selfish and warlike people. 
328. Very greedy. 
329. Uncivilized, unruly, bad-tempered people. 
330. Russians are very secretive and held down by their leaders. 
331. They are a very stubborn race and ignorant. 
332. The Russians are cunning. 
333. Very bad because they in every man being the same, which does away with individuality. 
334. Communists. 
335. People of high politics. 
336. Russians are good horsemen. 
337. Pigheaded; want war with America and Britain. 
338. They do not give anything of any importance away. 
339. Very disagreeable. 
340. Communists. 
341. Quarrelsome. 
342. Wind and snow. Protected by furs.
BELIEFS.

RUSSIANS.

Categorization.

343. Want everything for themselves. "wanting"
344. Secret and clever. 4 + 5'
345. They are a hindrance to world peace. 6
346. They go in for horse-riding. 4
347. They always say 'No'. 6
348. Are troublesome to U.N.O. 6
349. Good and big armies. 4
350. Unfriendly. 6
351. Queer people. 6
352. Dirty fighters. 6
353. They are selfish. 6
354. Clever people. 6
355. Poor. 6
356. If they were taught by labour it would be all right. 6
357. They are a hard-to-please lot. 6
358. Can do a lot with their huge country. 4
359. Dour and dirty. 4 + 17
360. They are a race who are out for all they can get for themselves under cover of the aims of Communism. 6 + 6
361. Disagreeable and unco-operative. 6 + 6
362. Ruthless for their own ends. 6
363. They are after equal rights for everybody. 4
364. They should keep their Communism to themselves. 6
365. They are not willing to co-operate with other nations. 6
366. Masterful and greedy. 4 + 14
367. They are kept well under heel. 6
368. Do not keep their word. 6
369. A healthy hard-working nation. 4
370. Dirty. 4
371. They always seem to oppose any propositions. 6
372. Communists. 4
373. A very ignorant country. 4
374. They are very suspicious. 4
375. Very determined. 4
376. Bullying people seems to delight them. 4
377. Very brave and sensible in time of war. 6
378. Obedient. 4
379. They are driven by dictators. 6
380. The Russians are aggressive and are Communists. 4 + 4
381. Want to rule the world. 6
382. Too much communism. 6
383. They are Communists and not much known to the outside world. 4 + 6
384. Want all people in one class. 4
385. Rotten sportsmen with a selfish and undemocratic viewpoint. 4 + 4
386. Communism. 4
387. Not individualists. \( N \)
388. Tenacious and solid people. \( F_3 \) \( F_\) w
389. They want to rule the world. \( M \)
390. Frightened to speak for themselves. Frightened of leaders. \( M_1 \)
391. The masses opposed to Communism enforced by those in power. \( F_3 \) \( N \)
392. Half good, half bad; very good fighters. \( N \) \( F \)
393. They keep to themselves too much. \( M_1 \)
394. Hardy people; some good-living. \( F_3 \) \( F_\)
395. Treacherous people. \( M_1 \)
396. Russians are a bad country for keeping up the Iron Curtain. \( M_1 \)
397. They try to be the dictator. \( M_1 \)
398. I don't like them; they are Communists. \( M_1 \)
399. Look to the state for everything. \( N \)
400. Always say 'No'. \( M_6 \)
401. Very underhand. \( M_1 \)
402. Very cunning. \( M_1 \)
403. Trouble-makers. \( M_1 \)
404. Trouble-makers. \( M_1 \)
405. Very ignorant. \( M_1 \)
406. They are atheists. \( M_1 \)
407. Ignorant, unhealthy, on the whole typical peasant people. \( M_4 \) \( M_3 \)
4D8. A backward race coming up to twentieth century standards. \( M_1 \)
409. Communist. I like it. \( F_1 \)
410. Dominated by the Communist Party. \( N \)
411. Have no faith. \( M_6 \)
412. Russians like to be different from the rest of us. \( M_1 \)
413. Don't care about anyone else. Always look after themselves. \( M_1 \)
414. Try to force ideas on everyone else. \( M_1 \)
415. They wanted hold of the secret of the atomic bomb. \( N \)
416. Severe and very silent. \( M_1 \) \( M_1 \)
417. Quiet race without their leaders. \( F_3 \) \( M_1 \)
418. The Russian ideals of power are very far-fetched. \( M_1 \)
419. Sullen and hard-working. \( F_6 \) \( F_1 \)
420. They think that they are always right. \( M_4 \)
421. Would like to dictate to the world. \( M_1 \)
422. Dour people who have never had the opportunity of knowing others. \( F_6 \) \( F_3 \)
423. Russians, I detest them - they are treacherous and scheming. \( M_1 \)
424. They want to rule the world. \( M_1 \)
425. Clever but not sincere. \( F_5 \) \( M_8 \)
426. Are warmongers. \( M_1 \)
427. They want the whole world to think as they think. \( M_1 \)
428. Stalin is the ruler. \( N \)
BELIEFS.

429. Believe all men should be equal. N
430. They have nothing to live for. F
431. They veto other nations. F
432. They are very stubborn. M
433. They are out to make trouble. M
434. Serious-minded. F
435. They are foreign. N
436. They keep very much to themselves. M
437. All Communists. N
438. They are most un-democratic. M
439. Great communists. N
440. They have good ideas but are wasting their chances. F
441. Very disagreeable people. M
442. Believers in dictatorship. N
443. They don't like the Americans. N
444. Good workers. F
445. An unreliable race looking for war. M+F
446. Very secretive and sly. M
447. They want their own way in the world. M
448. They are democratic and industrious. F+F
449. Their lives are ruled by the State and are not allowed much freedom. F
450. The leaders keep the people uninformed. F
451. They like to be awkward. M
452. Never content with what they have. M
453. Are a nation who are very domineering in their ways. M
454. Their true living conditions are unknown. N
455. The Russians are a Communist people. N
456. They are all Communists. N
457. A very military race. N
458. They are unable to settle in their own land. M
459. They are ruled by a dictator. N
460. They are very secretive. M
461. They are very greedy for land. M
462. Very dirty. M
463. They are good horsemen. M
464. Ignorant. M
465. They want everything for themselves. M
466. They are very secretive. M
467. Communist with intent to hypnotize other countries. M
468. Hard to get on with. M
469. A very sad-looking people. F
470. A communist country. N
471. Rogues - untrusting. M+F
472. They think they are the bosses. M
473. Very secretive. M
474. They are suspicious of everyone else, and secretive natures. M+F
475. They are slow to use European methods. M

RUSSIANS.

Categorization.

429. Believe all men should be equal. N
430. They have nothing to live for. F
431. They veto other nations. F
432. They are very stubborn. M
433. They are out to make trouble. M
434. Serious-minded. F
435. They are foreign. N
436. They keep very much to themselves. M
437. All Communists. N
438. They are most un-democratic. M
439. Great communists. N
440. They have good ideas but are wasting their chances. F
441. Very disagreeable people. M
442. Believers in dictatorship. N
443. They don't like the Americans. N
444. Good workers. F
445. An unreliable race looking for war. M+F
446. Very secretive and sly. M
447. They want their own way in the world. M
448. They are democratic and industrious. F+F
449. Their lives are ruled by the State and are not allowed much freedom. F
450. The leaders keep the people uninformed. F
451. They like to be awkward. M
452. Never content with what they have. M
453. Are a nation who are very domineering in their ways. M
454. Their true living conditions are unknown. N
455. The Russians are a Communist people. N
456. They are all Communists. N
457. A very military race. N
458. They are unable to settle in their own land. M
459. They are ruled by a dictator. N
460. They are very secretive. M
461. They are very greedy for land. M
462. Very dirty. M
463. They are good horsemen. M
464. Ignorant. M
465. They want everything for themselves. M
466. They are very secretive. M
467. Communist with intent to hypnotize other countries. M
468. Hard to get on with. M
469. A very sad-looking people. F
470. A communist country. N
471. Rogues - untrusting. M+F
472. They think they are the bosses. M
473. Very secretive. M
474. They are suspicious of everyone else, and secretive natures. M+F
475. They are slow to use European methods. M
BELIEFS.

476. Trying to make another war.
477. They are trying to start another war.
478. They want more and more power.
479. They are overpowering.
480. Russians are always trying to be the bosses.
481. One can be sent to the salt mines for almost anything.
482. Not to be trusted.
483. The Russians are trying to make Communists rule the world.
484. Russia is a Communist country.
485. They are all Communist minded.
486. Russia will one day be America's worst enemy.
487. They are not co-operative.
488. The Russians are a hardened people living in difficult times.
489. Russians were the first troops to enter Berlin.
490. Poor race and mostly peasant.
491. Too secretive.
492. Communists.
493. They fought bravely when Germany invaded them.
494. Nobody knows them but themselves.
495. Not liked at all.
496. Like trouble.
497. Very athletic people.
498. Russians are Communists.
499. Kindly people but want to have everything.
500. People do not see papers.
501. The Russians are a Communist race and desire to rule the world.
502. They like having their own way.
503. They hide their intentions for peace.
504. Disagreeable - will do nothing openly.
505. They are the cause of Communism.
506. No very bad (sic).
507. Cheats and trouble-makers.
508. A very silent people.
509. Haven't got a good education.
510. Communist country - hard.
511. They are vicious and possessed of fanatical ideals.
512. They are poor like slaves.
513. Russians are trying to make war with British.
514. They have too much love for the veto.
515. They are a rotten lot of people.
516. They are just like the Germans.
517. They are a very aloof nation.
518. Stubborn people.
519. Would like to rule Europe.
520. True to their country.
BELIEFS.

521. Are not being obliging. M?
522. They are going to start a war. M
523. They endure very severe cold. F?
524. They look like starting another war. M
525. An unagreeable people. M
526. A country which always causes trouble. M
527. They are determined like the Germans. F
528. The Russians are trouble-makers. M
529. I think they are being misled as was Germany. F
530. Trouble-makers - not to be trusted. M
531. People who want the world to themselves. M + M
532. They blocked roads and rail transport to Berlin. N o
533. Their likeness (i.e. liking for) of Stalin. N
534. They are kept under the thumb. F
535. They are trying to get more territory. M
536. They are very secretive. M
537. Sparing. M
538. People under Communist party. N
539. Keeping up an unnecessary blockade and cold war in Germany. N o
540. Not a democratic country. They do as they are ordered. N
541. They were making a big fuss over the Berlin control. N o
542. The people were Communists. N
543. They are brutal. M
544. People conquering another people and then following the same line of rule as the conquered people. N
545. They are self-centred and only think of themselves. M
546. The Russians think too much about politics and have cruel ways of punishing. M
547. The Russian people are very hard workers. F
548. They are causing trouble in Europe and Asia to-day. N o + M
549. They started the blockade in Germany. N o
550. They are trying to spread Communism. M
551. The Russian people are too easily led. F
552. The Russians are forceful and strong. F
553. Always making trouble. M
554. They want to be awkward. M
555. Russians are very hard-working. F
556. They are most peasant folk. N
557. They are keen farmers and also industrial. F
558. They are followers of the Communist party. N
559. They do not follow their own doctrines. M
560. Communists and hard and cruel. M
561. They are too strict. You have got to work for your food. M

RUSSIANS.

Categorization.
BELIEFS.

562. Communists. $N_2$
563. Seekers of world power. $M_1$
564. The Russians made the Berlin blockade thus preventing British trains from getting in. $N_{10}$
565. They are trying to get more power. $M_{10}$
566. A quiet person but will not speak freely. $M_1$
567. I don’t like them. $M_{13}$
568. Communists and red-tape men. $N_{12} + N_{15}$
569. Very backward race led by a few 'brains'. $M_{15}$
570. They are a nation of peasants. $N_9$
571. Domineering imbeciles. $M_1 + M_{13}$
572. They are domineering and Communists. $M_1 + N_2$
573. They have no common decency. $M_1$
574. They are a lot of dirty b--$--es $M_{12}$
575. They talk far too much. $M_{15}$
576. Shoot the leaders. $M_0$
577. They are never satisfied. $M_{15}$
578. They are all right considering $F_6$
579. They are all wrapped up in politics. $M_9$
580. They are very foolish. $M_7$
581. They are never satisfied. $M_{10}$
582. Warmongers trying to conquer Europe. $M_{11}$
583. They think they can run every country like their own. $M_{15}$
584. Most of them are cruel. $M_3$
585. They are a simple people who work hard. $F_7$
586. The Russians as a people are very social $F_6$
587. They are born trouble-makers. $M_{11}$
588. Very true to their Veto. $F_{11}$
589. Too troublesome. $M_{11}$
590. Troublesome. $M_{11}$
591. A strong Communist race. $N_1$
592. They are all ignorant about facts in the rest of the world. $M_9$
593. Nice people but the leaders are cruel. $F_3 + M_{10}$
594. The Russians are very secretive. $M_1$
595. They are very domineering and arrogant. $M_{12} + M_{15}$
596. They are ready to believe anything told them. $M_{19}$
597. They are planning to become masters of Europe. $M_1$
598. The Russians are offensive. $M_{11}$
599. They don’t believe in letting foreigners know about their country. $M_1$
600. They are ruled by dictators. $N_1$
601. They are very queer and keep everything to themselves. $M_1$
602. They are cruel, and well just cruel. $M_3$
603. There is a dreadful gap between the rich man and the peasant. $F_3$
604. They are oppressed by their leaders to do anything. $M_{10} + F_3$
605. Stupid and of a heavy build. $M_{17} + N_3$

RUSSIANS.

Categorization.
606. They prefer to hinder rather than help. 
607. They always want their own way. 
608. The Russian is a very secretive person. 
609. They think they have a hold over the U.S.A. 
610. They are very suspicious that we might make war on them. 
611. They are very high-handed. 
612. Headstrong and untrustworthy. 
613. They want a war so that they can dominate the earth. 
614. The Russians are not told about the lives of other peoples. 
615. They are very pig-headed. 
616. They are a very changeable race. 
617. A silly lot of people - very stubborn. 
618. Keep everything hidden from us. 
619. They always say 'No'. 
620. The Russians are too ambitious. 
621. They are stubborn and trouble-makers. 
622. Russians are all Communists. 
623. The people are domineered from the Kremlin. 
624. Boastful people. 
625. Communists. 
626. Most of them are round-headed and square-jawed. 
627. They are very sly. 
628. They would like to rule Germany at least. 
629. They like to try to be masters of the world. 
630. Russians are very cunning. 
631. They are all eager to force Communism on the world. 
632. They want to control the world. 
633. Learned people with big ideas. 
634. I don't know anything about them. 
635. They are following in the footsteps of Hitler. 
636. They are very fussy. 
637. Very disagreeable in their world policy. 
638. Queer dress and warlike. 
639. Haughty show-offs. 
640. No idea whatsoever. 
641. Warlike people always looking for trouble. 
642. A fighting nation. 
643. Backward in most things. 
644. Senseless brawny people. 
645. They are practically in slavery. 
646. They like to fight. 
647. They are a very powerful nation. 
648. The Russians are people who are badly governed.
BELIEFS.

649. They are terribly strong. N
650. They would like everyone to do as they say. M
651. A country that wants war. M
652. The Russians take advantage of the British and American's not wanting war. N
653. They are disliked by nearly everybody. N
654. Always want to create war. M
655. Very quarrelsome people. M
656. They are very bossy. M
657. The Russian people are easily led. F
658. Most of them are hard and cruel but the poor people are farmers. M, N
659. A disagreeable country. M
660. A country of Communists. N
661. They are asking for war. M
662. They are too quiet and business-like. M
663. Are a nation with no imagination and principles. M
664. Russians, they don't seem to want cooperation. M
665. A race with no will of their own. F
666. Not given a chance to think for themselves. M
667. After world domination. M
668. Very close themselves but want to know other people's business. M
669. For the most part ignorant of world affairs. M
670. Aggressive. M
671. Their government hold them down by fear. F
672. The Russians are suspicious, secretive and unco-operative. M
673. They are led to believe untrue stories of the Western world. F
674. Always keeping home affairs to themselves. M
675. They are unsociable. M
676. The Russians are, I firmly believe, out for war with Britain and the United States. M
677. Russians are mostly all peasants. N
678. If placed in Britain they would be astonished at the freedom about them. N
679. A coming race if politics are influenced by America. N
680. A Russian State would be intolerable. N
681. They have allowed themselves to be dominated by a clique. M
682. Too recluse. M
683. A misguided people. F
684. An oppressed people under a dominant government. F
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BELIEFS</strong></th>
<th><strong>RUSSIANS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>685. They are generally ignorant of other people.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>686. They do not like free speech.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>687. They don’t allow people to get behind the Iron Curtain.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>688. They are controlled</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>689. Ignorant of world affairs</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690. They are very obstinate and self-centred.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>691. They are sensible and level-headed.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>692. They are a threat to the Western countries.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>693. They are governed by a dictator and are suppressed.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>694. They act too suspiciously.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695. The Russians are ruthless, but believe their incursions to be to the benefit of the people whose countries they invade.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>696. They have done great work for their country since 1918.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>697. The Russians have scored over the West during the Berlin crisis.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>698. The Russians are perhaps the most stoical people.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699. The majority of Russians are uneducated.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700. Many are oppressed because of their beliefs.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701. Too domineering and should be shown that the West has power.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702. A new powerful nation with new ideas on living.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703. The cold war includes any horrid action.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704. They have to guard against cold.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705. They know what they want.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706. They are not understood by many people.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707. Dishonest, corrupt, with an eye to overpowering everything.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708. They are too aggressive.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709. They are world-dominating but in a warlike way.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710. Their materialistic views on life are rubbish.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711. A people who suffer from great hardships.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712. They are careless.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713. They have not many churches.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714. They are Communists.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715. They have a great nation.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716. Russians had no right dropping the Iron Curtain.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717. They have a great nation.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718. They are revolutionary.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719. They are very reserved.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720. They think Communism is good.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721. They are very happy.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722. They are clever but very bossy.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Categorization:**

**BELIEFS:**

- 244

**RUSSIANS:**

- 255

**Categorization:**

- 244
RELIEFS.

RUSSIANS.

Categorization.

723. The Russians are hard-working. F
724. Heathens. M16
725. Cruel, stupid, and very ignorant. M3+ M17
726. Communists. N1
727. They are all Communists. N1
728. They are trying to start a war M11
729. They are rotten Communists. M18
VI. PERSONALITY DATA.

Personality study, although excluded by some social psychologists from their field, would by others be regarded as vitally important for the fuller understanding of social issues - in fact the latter would go so far as to define personality as "the crux of social intercourse". If as many psychologists are beginning to think, personality can best be defined in terms of how the individual turns towards or away from, with what intensity and with what consistency, it would seem that prejudice and its study would form a convenient bridge between the two disciplines. When critically considered, the most varied approaches to the study of personality show an underlying uniform tendency towards two basic dimensions in personality description. Many psychologists well-known and not so well-known have gravitated towards some such conceptual schemes. There is a goodly lineage of authority for the idea that the two ultimate and basic concepts in personality description should be (a) Direction of behaviour (including response to relationships); (b) Intensity or degree of energy-mobilization.

Individuals vary in their degree of internal arousal.
VI. PERSONALITY DATA.

Personality study, although excluded by some social psychologists from their field, would by others be regarded as vitally important for the fuller understanding of social issues - in fact the latter would go as far as to look upon personality as "the crux of social intercourse". If as many psychologists are beginning to think, personality can best be defined in terms of what the individual turns towards or away from, with what intensity and with what consistency, it would seem that prejudice and its study would form a convenient bridge between the two disciplines. When critically considered, the most varied approaches to the study of personality show an underlying uniform tendency towards two basic dimensions in personality description. Many psychologists well-known and not so well-known have gravitated toward some such conceptual scheme. There is a goodly lineage of authority for the idea that the two ultimate and basic concepts in personality description should be (a) Direction of behaviour (including response to relationships); (b) Intensity or degree of energy-mobilization. Individuals vary in their degree of internal arousal.
Behaviour, which maintains the same direction may show variation in energy level. Individuals are usually counted upon to preserve more than momentarily their loyalties, their aversions, their prejudices, their desires. The orientation of these loyalties, aversions, prejudices, desires, represents the directional aspect of behaviour. The intensity of them represents the dimension of energy-mobilization. Many apparently discrete types of personality theories, are seen to display a merely superficial diversity, when we judge them in the light of these two concepts.

It might be worth while to mention a few typical theories. For example, Rosenweig's three types of reaction to frustration (1) extrapunitive; (2) intropunitive; (3) impunitiv merely applies descriptive terms to the direction of response. Horney's well-known three types of neurotic pattern (i.e. towards people, away from people, against people) does exactly the same. Even, Freud's various dynamisms, projection, sublimation, conversion and others also refer to the direction taken by energy, though the energy referred to is the peculiarly Freudian variety. Ross Stagner in 1937 proposed rather similar categories under the headings (1) approach-withdrawal and (2) increased or decreased organismic activity. We might also detect a resemblance to Lewin's forces, which have direction and magnitude. Even Allport's attitudinal traits denote /
denote **directional** aspects of behaviour. They are
(1) directed toward self
(2) directed towards others
(3) directed towards values.

There is even a degree of similarity to Henry A. Murray's schematization of personality. He states "In the development of the need-theory the notion of energy or force was employed to account for differences in intensity and endurance of directional behaviour. To carry the line up to the present day, Gardner Murphy in his emphasis upon the canalization or channelling of behaviour draws attention also to the same directional aspect of behaviour, that we have seen running through all the other theories.

Tomkins in his book on the T.A.T. gives an interesting psychological lead in the interpretation of personality using the T.A.T. as the basic diagnostic tool. Tomkins' approach is a novel one. He makes much of the concept of repression, but to understand what he means by 'repression' we must be prepared to re-formulate Freud's concept. Tomkins maintains that within the individual there is a conflict between what is repressed and some repressing force. The result of this conflict, dependent upon the relative strength of the two forces is a highly important /
important determinant of personality. If the repressing force should happen to be strong enough to bring about complete repression of the disturbing elements, this would not be characteristic of the neurotic state as Freud maintains, since psychoanalytic theory tells us that the repressed wishes or desires will seize every opportunity to gain fulfillment or expression in some form or other. For Tomkins, repression, if successful, that is, if the repressing force is strong enough to triumph, will result in a state of calm or equilibrium.

Tomkins even goes so far as to make the following statement. "It follows from these assumptions that as the total pressure of the two wishes in conflict increases, the pressure available for the remainder of the system decreases. Thus a conflict between two wishes of low pressure rarely involves pathogenic sequelae, but a conflict between two wishes of high pressure is the condition par excellence for pathology since if each wish involved almost half of the total pressure of the personality there would be civil war within the individual.

Whether a conflict will be pathogenic and more specifically whether the repressed will return are also functions of the relative pressure of the two forces/
forces in opposition to each other. It was our hypothesis that as the repressing force increases in pressure relative to the repressed force the possibility of return of the repressed wish decreases and further that this entails a reduction in the disturbance of the personality as a whole. Conversely, we assumed that as the balance between the two forces in opposition approached equality there would be a greater tendency of the repressed wish to return and an increase in general disturbance to the personality as a whole.

Our doctrine was in this respect contrary to that contemporary opinion which attributes serious pathogenic potentialities to deeply repressed material. We maintain, in effect, that the deeper the repression the less pathogenic the conflict.

I propose to apply Tomkins' method and to attempt to analyse the protocols of selected subjects, selected for their extremely high and extremely low prejudice scores. For convenience, let us call them respectively the "prejudiced" and the "unprejudiced". In keeping with our view that the prejudiced mind tends to be in a state of more rigid equilibrium than that of the unprejudiced, it would harmonize with our hypothesis /
hypothesis if it could be shown that, using Tomkins' method of analysis of protocols, greater or more successful repression was shown in the protocols of the prejudiced subjects, and less or less successful repression shown by the unprejudiced.

The frequency of anti-social wishes, therefore, indicated in any protocol will not be a measure of the amount of repressed aggression. Rather sparseness of such material, infrequency of mention of such wishes would be a better index of the amount of repression which has taken place, a high index presumably being characteristic of the unprejudiced mind and a low index of frequency characteristic of the prejudiced mind. The best comparative index available is also suggested by what Tomkins has to say about the degree of remoteness in the fantasies of subjects. "As the repressing force increases in pressure relative to the pressure of the repressed force, the conditions under which the latter may be given expression in T.A.T. stories becomes more and more remote (i.e. divorced from normal life interactions). As the ratio approaches equality the expression of the repressed force will appear under less and less remote conditions in the stories".

This /
This gives us an invaluable hint as to what on our hypothesis we should expect to find in the protocols. Something in the nature of the following will emerge if what our hypothesis states is even partially true.

**UNPREJUDICED.**

1. Stories in the first half 1.
   of the series should show aggressive or anti-social material

2. Stories in the second half 1. should show as much as or less than the first half in the way of anti-social tendencies.

**PREJUDICED.**

1. Stories in the first half of the series should show little aggressive material or anti-social tendencies.

2. Stories in the second half should show more perhaps far more anti-social wishes than the stories in the first part.

This comparison between the two halves of the test is based on the fact that the remoteness of the kind suggested by Tomkins is more easily attained in the picture series of the second half. Strongly repressed material, if it is going to appear at all, will do so under the more concealing conditions found in the latter half of the test. For this reason the prejudiced might be expected to show an increase in mention of such tendencies. This intra-individual comparison or ratio should be of the greatest interest. As far as inter-individual comparison is concerned the unprejudiced subjects should on the whole show more aggressive or anti-social tendencies than the prejudiced.
Analysis of Protocols for anti-social or aggressive wishes.

A brief description is given of each aggressive wish as expressed in the protocols. (See Page 255. The numbers refer to the numbers of the pictures in the T.A.T. series.

Three out of Four of the Prejudiced subjects do show the expected ratio of second half to first half in the series of pictures, that is they show an increase in number of such aggressive tendencies appearing in the second half of the series.

None of the Unprejudiced subjects showed an increase in number of such aggressive tendencies appearing in the second half of the series.

It must be admitted that as far as the total number of such aggressive wishes is concerned there is little difference as between prejudiced and unprejudiced.

Of course the number of subjects dealt with here is too small to give significant results, but it is noteworthy that Tomkins' intra-individual ratio of the second half to the first half of the series does seem to bear out our hypothesis concerning the relationship of 'repression' to prejudice.

After /
C.L. (P 2)

Geo. Lowe, (Prejudiced).

1. -------
2. -------
3. Girl in prison for stealing.
4. -------
5. -------
6. Son killed. Another killed by bomb.
7. Dismissal of dishonest bank clerk.
8. -------
9. Dismissal for dishonesty.
10. -------

11. Monster living on animals as prey.
12. -------
13. -------
14. Housebreaking, (twice)
15. Man's wife attacked and killed. Son had committed murder. Son robbed and abandoned in ditch, after being murdered. Man dies of grief.
16. Wild stallion throws riders.
17. Accident. Lots of people killed (when lift collapses)
18. Spy attacked by counter-spies.

---

C.F. (P 1)

Christopher Pentiman, (Prejudiced)

1. -------
2. -------
3. Man wounds his friends.
4. Murder.
5. -------
6. -------
7. -------
8. Man wounded in accident.

11. Chased by monster.
13. (After it had attacked boat)
15. -------
18. Struggle and fight between men and burglar.
19. Threatening creatures whales, pre-historic monsters etc.
20. -------
J.M. (P 3)

James McArtney. (Prejudiced)

1. ------ 11. ------
2. ------ 12. ------
4. ------ 14. ------
6. ------
7. Quarrel.
8. Thoughts of murder. 16. ------
9. ------ 17. ------

M.R. (P 4)

Maxwell Robertson (Prejudiced)

1. ------ 11. ------
2. ------ 12. ------
5. Jealousy 15. Relation have been killed. Isolation.
6. Parental (mother's) opposition to daughter's boy friend 16. ------
7. ------
10. Accident. 19. ------
11. ------ 20. ------
D.E. (U.1)

Diana Etheridge. (Unprejudiced)

1. ------
2. Mother's opposition to daughter's marriage. Angry scene. Thoughts of disobedience.
3. Angry with father who has forbidden something. Disobedience.
4. Fight between husband and wife's lover. Divorce.
6. Husband's disapproval of his wife's actions. Remorse follows.
7. Child who steals.
8. Envy.
9. Accident; row preceding.
10. Now over a trifle.

M.W. (U.4)

Maryon Wardrop. (Unprejudiced)

1. Revenge for contempt of others.
2. Jealousy; resentment.
3. Stealing.
5. Unfaithful husband.
6. Unfaithful wife.
7. --------
8. Aggressive violence.
10. Sister loses reason. Opposition to parents.
11. Wicked goblin; Attack by reptile; killing of grotesque creatures.
12. Fear of unknown.
13. --------
14. --------
16. --------
17. Stealing.
19. Some invisible force.
20. Remissness in duty.
Margaret Jenkins. (Unprejudiced)

1. Resentment against parents.
2. Ashamed of parents.
3. Husband killed.
5. Burglary.
7. Criticism of parents.
8. 
9. Jealousy, hatred; desire for revenge and injury; Murder.
11. Fighting against mysterious, strange shapes.
12. Year of dark.
16. Raging torrent offering opposition.

M.F. (U.2)

Margery Ferguson. (Unprejudiced)

1. Borrowing someone else's property.
2. 
3. Destruction of pet.
5. 
6. Using someone's property without permission.
7. Inattentive parent.
8. 
9. Danger of natural forces.
10. (tides)
After having closely scrutinized the protocols in search of such aggressive material I was under the impression that the protocols of the unprejudiced were richer, more colourful, more varied and generally more interesting to read than those of the prejudiced.

2. Events.
Example: It is his birthday.

Example: He ploughed the field.

4. Perception.
Example:

5. Attention.
Example: He listened for the sound.

6. Interest.
Example: He was curious.

7. Intention.
Example: He planned to do it.

8. Sentiment.
Example: He was in favour of religion.

Example: He pondered over the problem.

10. Expectation.
Example: He thought it would rain.

11. Wish.
Example: He wanted to do it.

Example: He was angry.
He was depressed.

13. Physical sensations.
Example: His arm was hurt.

14. Memory.
Example: He remembered his childhood.
I, therefore, began to make what Tomkins calls a "level analysis". By "level" Tomkins means the place of psychological function involved in the story. He differentiates the following seventeen levels.

1. **Object Description.**  
   Example: the scene is a farmhouse.

2. **Events.**  
   Example: it is his birthday.

3. **Behaviour.**  
   Example: he ploughed the field.

4. **Perception.**  
   Example: 

5. **Attention.**  
   Example: he listened for the sound.

6. **Interest.**  
   Example: he was curious.

7. **Intention.**  
   Example: he planned to do it.

8. **Sentiment.**  
   Example: he was in favour of religion.

9. **Thought.**  
   Example: he pondered over the problem.

10. **Expectation.**  
    Example: he thought it would rain.

11. **Wish.**  
    Example: he wanted to do it.

12. **Feeling. Mood.**  
    Example: he was angry.  
    he was depressed.

13. **Physical sensations.**  
    Example: his arm was hurt.

14. **Memory.**  
    Example: he remembered his childhood.
15. Daydreams.
   Example: He imagined himself as a great violinist.

   Example: He had a nightmare.

17. Special states.
   Example: He was intoxicated.

The frequency of the different levels is regarded by Tomkins as being highly diagnostic. An exhaustive analysis would not only determine the frequency of the various levels but would also consider sequences of levels and the frequency (within levels) at sequences. Tomkins has found that certain subjects employ only one or two levels, but that this is rare.

For the limited analytical procedure which was employed in this investigation, Tomkins most pregnant statement is the following, taken from his book: "In such cases as we have used the level which is invariant is a literal representation of the predominant level on which that individual functions."

The number of times each level was mentioned by a subject was counted as well as the number of times for all the subjects, keeping the scores of prejudiced and unprejudiced, and the two halves of the test separate.

In four cases only were the prejudiced superior to the unprejudiced in the number of levels used. These four levels were (1) Object Description; (2) Perception; (3) Expectation; (4) Wish.
It was hoped that this analysis would show a clearer distinction between prejudiced and unprejudiced. The results of this analysis are shown on Page

They are certainly much less equivocal than was expected.

The frequency of the different levels is regarded by Tomkins as being highly diagnostic. An exhaustive analysis would not only determine the frequency of the various levels but would also consider sequences of levels and the frequency (wheels within wheels) at sequences. Tomkins has found that certain subjects employ only one or two levels, but that this is rare.

For the limited analytical procedure which was employed in this investigation, Tomkins most pregnant statement is the following, taken from his book: "In such cases as we have seen the level which is invariant is a literal representation of the predominant level on which that individual functions."

The number of times each level was mentioned by a subject was counted as well as the number of times for all the subjects, keeping the scores of prejudiced and unprejudiced, and the two halves of the test separate.

In four cases only were the prejudiced superior to the unprejudiced in the number of levels used. These four levels were (1) Object Description; (2) Perception; (3) Expectation; (4) Wish.

Only /
Only in the case of the **Object Description** level and the **Expectation** level was the difference a large one. In all the other thirteen levels the total number used by the **unprejudiced** exceeded the number used by the **prejudiced**.

The result seems to be indicative of some significant difference between the prejudiced and the unprejudiced related to the predominant plane of psychological functioning, as revealed by the quantity and quality of the levels used.

I suppose it would be generally admitted that the level of Object Description is probably the lowest plane of functioning that can be manifested in response to the test. It was here found that our **prejudiced** subjects tended to respond on this level to a greater extent than did the **unprejudiced**. The only time, therefore, when they showed a clear numerical superiority over the unprejudiced happened to be on one of the lowest levels of fictive response to the T.A.T.

The unprejudiced, at least, those isolated for study here, would appear to have a greater amount of what we might call for want of a better term **motility of mental functioning**. This word we might use to describe a state which is the opposite of such rigidity in psychological functioning as keeps the subject restricted /
restricted to one or just a few levels. If we may go as far as Tomkins in saying that the invariant level which the subject is found to exhibit in the T.A.T. protocols may be taken as characteristic of his general mental activity, then there might be good ground for positing some relationship, more than merely fortuitous between prejudice and a certain mental rigidity factor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAXWELL ROBERTSON</th>
<th>JAMES MCARTNEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Object Description</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Events</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Behaviour</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Perception</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Attention</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Interest</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Intention</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Sentiment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Thought</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Expectation</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Wish</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. Feeling, Mood</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. Physical sensation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14. Memory</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15. Daydream</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16. Nightdream</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17. Special states</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 138 | 118 | 256

**JAMES MCARTNEY:**

| **1. Object Description** | 31 | 18 |
| **2. Events** | 2 | 2 |
| **3. Behaviour** | 11 | 12 |
| **4. Perception** | 23 | 17 |
| **5. Attention** | 1 | 1 |
| **6. Interest** | 1 | 1 |
| **7. Intention** | 2 | 2 |
| **8. Sentiment** | 1 | 1 |
| **9. Thought** | 11 | 7 |
| **10. Expectation** | 8 | 7 |
| **11. Wish** | 4 | 3 |
| **12. Feeling, Mood** | 10 | 9 |
| **13. Physical sensation** | | |
| **14. Memory** | | |
| **15. Daydream** | 1 | |
| **16. Nightdream** | | |
| **17. Special states** | | |

**Total:** 105 | 81 | 186
## CHRISTOPHER FENTIMAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object Description</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentiment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling, Mood</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sensation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daydream</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightdream</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 85 133 218

## GEORGE LOWE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object Description</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentiment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling, Mood</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sensation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daydream</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightdream</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 126 77 203
### MARYON WARDROP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Object Description</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Events</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Behaviour</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Perception</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attention</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Interest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Intentions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sentiment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Thought</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Expectation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Wish</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Feeling</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Physical sensations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Memory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Daydreams</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Nightdreams</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Special states</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DIANA ETHERIDGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Object Description</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Events</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Behaviour</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Perception</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Intentions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sentiment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Thought</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Expectation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Wish</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Feeling, Mood</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Physical sensations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Memory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Daydreams</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Nightdream</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Special states</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MARYON WARDROP</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DIANA ETHERIDGE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret Ferguson</td>
<td>M.2</td>
<td>Margaret Jenkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Object Description</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Events</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Behaviour</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Perception</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Interest</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Intention</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Thought</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Expectation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Wish</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Feeling, Mood</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Physical sensation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Memory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Daydream</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Nightdream</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Special states</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LEVELS.

**PREJUDICED.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st half.</th>
<th>2nd half.</th>
<th>Whole series.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprejudiced</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>19.25</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EVENTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st half.</th>
<th>2nd half.</th>
<th>Whole series.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>22.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprejudiced</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>33.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BEHAVIOUR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st half.</th>
<th>2nd half.</th>
<th>Whole series.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>19.25</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprejudiced</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>41.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PERCEPTION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st half.</th>
<th>2nd half.</th>
<th>Whole series.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprejudiced</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ATTENTION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st half.</th>
<th>2nd half.</th>
<th>Whole series.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprejudiced</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INTEREST.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st half.</th>
<th>2nd half.</th>
<th>Whole series.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprejudiced</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INTENTION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st half.</th>
<th>2nd half.</th>
<th>Whole series.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprejudiced</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>10.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>1st half.</td>
<td>2nd half.</td>
<td>Whole series.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SENTIMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprejudiced</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THOUGHT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>24.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprejudiced</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPECTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprejudiced</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>14.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WISH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprejudiced</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEELING; MOOD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>12.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprejudiced</td>
<td>19.25</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>30.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHYSICAL SENSATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprejudiced</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEMORY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprejudiced</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAYDREAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprejudiced</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NIGHTDREAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprejudiced</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIAL STATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprejudiced</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following is a summary of the sociological and personal data relating to prejudiced and unprejudiced subjects.

**PREJUDICED.**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 13-9 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. 16-9 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 13-6 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. 15-3 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 14-4 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. 15-0 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 13-5 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. 15-1 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationality.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. British</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Scottish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Scottish</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Scottish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Scottish</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Scottish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father's Occupation.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Secretary of the Church of Scotland.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Chartered Accountant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Deceased.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Company Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church Attendance (Self).</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Yes (Episcopalian)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Yes (Presbyterian)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Yes (Church of Scotland)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PREJUDICED.

**Church Attendance (Parents).**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Yes (Mother)</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Talk about Politics.**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Doubtful.</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Doubtful.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Newspaper Heading.**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Dispatch.</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Daily Express; Glasgow Herald.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Scotsman; News Chronicle.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Scotsman; Evening Dispatch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Glasgow Herald; Express.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wireless Listening.**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Depends</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>If interesting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Politics.**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Scottish Nationalist.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Labour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BELIEFS OF PREJUDICED AND UNPREJUDICED SUBJECTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUSSIANS</th>
<th>JAPANESE</th>
<th>JEWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prejudiced.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>No Statement.</td>
<td>Very brutal during the wealthy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Great misers and quarrelsome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I detest. them.</td>
<td>Their eyes slant too much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>They always have dark features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>They are not liked too much.</td>
<td>They don't like people who kill in cold blood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unprejudiced.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>They like to rule everyone.</td>
<td>They have a peculiar religion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Russians - suspicious country - very vast.</td>
<td>Japanese - country clever with their hands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>No statement.</td>
<td>Japanese are really a homely peace-loving people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Equality of sexes is prevalent</td>
<td>Come through a crisis easily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: No neutral or favourable beliefs expressed by the prejudiced. Beliefs of the prejudiced tend to be far more stereotyped. (See figures within the brackets.)

Second Place:
1. Canada (Kind-hearted)
2. British (well-educated)
3. English (My friends one)
4. Australians (They are kind to foreigners)
5. Canada (I like its people and country)
6. Finland (General kindness and prosperity)

Third Place:
1. French (Good, friendly)
2. Greeks (No reason)
3. Canadians (My cousins are Canadians)
4. Chinese (They are kind but have a different language)
5. England (I like English countryside and London)
6. Russia (Its magnificent palaces and cultivated dancing)

Fourth Place:
1. South Africa (No reason)
2. Americans (I have spent holidays with my friends there)
3. Australians (I like the people)
4. South (Kind hearts under sometimes a cold manner)
Nations which are most liked.

Prejudiced.
1. British (Very kind). 21
2. Norwegians (Good fisherman and sailors) 25
3. Scotsmen (I am one) 22
4. Scots. (Very generous) 20

Unprejudiced.
1. Americans (They are very kind and also very like the British).
2. Americans. (Warm and generous - always ready to help others).
3. Scotland (Because it is my native land).
4. China. (So happy and thrifty when left alone)

Second Place.
1. Canada (Kindhearted)
2. Britain (Well-educated)
3. English (My friend's one).
4. Australians. (They are kind to foreigners).

Third Place.
1. French (Good, friendly)
2. Greeks (No reason)
3. Canadians (My cousins are Canadians)
4. Chinese (They are kind but have a different language).

Fourth Place.
1. South Africa (No reason)
2. France (I have spent holidays with my friends there).
3. Americans (They help other people in danger etc.)
4. Scots (I like the people)
5. South Africa (No reason)
6. France (I have spent holidays with my friends there).
7. Americans (They help other people in danger etc.)
Fifth place.
1. 1. -
2. 2. -
3. Arabs (They’re good horse-riders)
4. 4. Poland. (The love of music).

Sixth place.
1. 1. -
2. 2. -
3. Americans (They send us food)
4. 4. -

The reasons people give for their dislikes would in themselves provide sufficient subject matter for a thesis. The above are recorded for the purpose of showing how ethnocentrism (mention of British, English, Scottish) and purely personal reactions influence the choice of reason in prejudiced and unprejudiced alike.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nations which are disliked most.</th>
<th>Unprejudiced.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prejudiced.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unprejudiced.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Arabs (Always fighting)</td>
<td>1. Turkey (They go on whatever side is winning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Palestine (Misers)</td>
<td>2. Russia (Suspicious in all its political dealings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jews (They're cheats)</td>
<td>3. India (Not because of people, but because of snakes and heat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Jews (They are not kind)</td>
<td>4. []</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2nd place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Prejudiced.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Unprejudiced.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jews (Always fighting)</td>
<td>1. France (They do not stick together)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Japanese (Torturous)</td>
<td>2. Jews (Frying for power in all towns and country)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Italians (They do people out of work)</td>
<td>3. Ireland (I don't know)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. English (They like everything to themselves)</td>
<td>4. []</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3rd place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Prejudiced.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Unprejudiced.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Russians (No reason)</td>
<td>1. Russia (They will not agree to anything)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Russia (Rebellious; disagreeable)</td>
<td>2. []</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Russians (They are too greedy)</td>
<td>3. []</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Russians (They are very unkind)</td>
<td>4. []</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4th place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Prejudiced.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Unprejudiced.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Japanese (They are cruel)</td>
<td>1. []</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. India (Rebellious)</td>
<td>2. []</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Poles (They're greasy)</td>
<td>3. []</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mexicans (They like killing people with knives)</td>
<td>4. []</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5th place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Prejudiced.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Unprejudiced.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Muslims (Quick-tempered)</td>
<td>1. []</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Italians (They are unkind)</td>
<td>2. []</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3. []</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. []</td>
<td>4. []</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6th place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Prejudiced.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Unprejudiced.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Irish (Too much of a temper)</td>
<td>1. []</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2. []</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3. []</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4. []</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Point to be noted in the above reasons - no personal reactions or personal experiences recorded - the case of either prejudiced or unprejudiced (with the exception perhaps of the confessed ignorance in the phrase "I don't know").
VII. CONCLUSIONS.

It will appear from the results that all approaches to the investigation of national prejudice are equally effective in eliciting the kind of information required. The effective approach revealed beyond a doubt the extreme degree of prejudice against the Japanese and Jew.

The attempt to produce the intensity of prejudice produced a notable result. (See Fig. 60, Page 479.)

The Social Distance technique revealed exactly the same result in more behavioural or motoric form. The same rejection of the Japanese is evidenced in all degrees of intimacy.

What is of the greatest interest to us in this investigation since it supports our hypothesis that there is the closest of links between prevailing cognitive structures (or if you like, stereotype) and attitudes is the finding that the nation against which there is the greatest amount of intense negative feeling and behavioural rejection is also the one subject to the greatest amount of stereotype in cognitive structures.

Moreover /
VII. CONCLUSIONS. (Mass Data).

It would appear from the results that all three approaches to the investigation of national prejudices are equally effective in eliciting the kind of information required. The affective approach revealed beyond a doubt the extreme degree of prejudice against the Japanese and Jews. (See Fig. 18 Page 476). The attempt to measure the intensity of prejudice produced a similar result. (See Fig. 20 Page 478). The Social Distance technique revealed exactly the same result in more behavioural or motoric form. The same rejection of the Japanese is exhibited in all degrees of intimacy.

What is of the greatest interest to us in this investigation since it supports our hypothesis that there is the closest of links between prevailing cognitive structures (or if you like, stereotype) and attitudes is the finding that the nation against which there is the greatest amount of intense negative feeling and behavioural rejection is also the one subject to the greatest amount of stereotype in cognitive structures.

Moreover /
Moreover, the stereotypy in the case of this particular nation is most prevalent among unfavourable cognitive structures. Another finding of some note is that the range of unfavourable cognitive structures tends to be comparatively large in the case of the 'prejudice-provoking' nations.
Summary of Results from Break-down of Data.

The prejudiced against the following three ethnic groups belong predominantly to the categories specified hereunder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JAPANESE</th>
<th>RUSSIANS</th>
<th>JEWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other places (i.e. country)</td>
<td>Edinburgh (i.e. town)</td>
<td>Other places (i.e. country)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic status Group II</td>
<td>Socio-economic Group II</td>
<td>Socio-economic Group III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group 12-13</td>
<td>Age Group 13-14</td>
<td>Age Group 19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal (Politics)</td>
<td>Liberal (Politics)</td>
<td>Communist (Politics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant (Religion)</td>
<td>Roman Catholic (Religion)</td>
<td>Protestant (Religion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom (Wireless talks)</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. (Films)</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Visits to other countries)</td>
<td>(Church Attendance self)</td>
<td>(Political discussion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Church Attendance parents)</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Political discussion)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Newspaper reading)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prejudice Scores.

Using a technique similar to the Pressey X-out method it was possible to find a prejudice score. When these scores are represented graphically the distribution takes on a close approximation to the J-curve of conforming behaviour. The Chi-square Test of significance was applied to these scores to reveal what relationship, if any, existed between (1) Age and Prejudice Score; (2) Sex and Prejudice Score; (3) Socio-economic Status and Prejudice Score; (See Contingency Tables).

Scale of National Prejudices.

When a further analysis of the above scores is made to yield a total count for each of the nations concerned, and when these totals are turned into percentages and represented diagrammatically it is found that there are certain nations which are more "prejudice-provoking" than others. They are seen to arrange themselves in what looks like three orders of magnitude. (See page 476, Diagrams.)

First Order of Magnitude. (i.e. above the 60% line of prejudice response ...................... Jews, Japanese, Russians. (Russian Jews).
Second Order of Magnitude. (i.e. above the 40% level of prejudice response) .......................... German Jews. Poles. Italians.

Third Order of Magnitude. (i.e. above the 20% level of prejudice response) .......................... Germans. Turks. Arabs. Negroes. Muslims.

Fourth Order of Magnitude. (i.e. above the 10% level of prejudice response) .......................... Irish. Mulattoes.

All the other nations were submerged below the lowest threshold here considered, that is the ten percent level of prejudice response.

The rest of the investigation concerned itself only with those nations or peoples included within the first order of magnitude. The position of the Poles and Italians is noteworthy. There seems to be less hatred of our recent enemies the Germans than of some of our recent allies. In nearly all investigations into prejudice against peoples the Turks hold a high place. That this also holds true of this investigation can be seen from the results.

This is a prejudice which is clearly the influence of strong associations, both historical and semantic.

(See /
(See Appendix). Quite unintentionally, the operative effect of including the word Jew was clearly illustrated in this investigation. See near-the identity of prejudice expressed against Russian Jews as compared with Russians. Similarly, the greater dislike of German Jews as compared with Germans. No clearer proof is required to show the strong anti-semitic feeling which in our particular investigation far surpasses colour prejudice.

**INTENSITY AND EXTENSITY OF PREJUDICE.**

A slightly different manner of recording the intensity of prejudice was chosen. It can be seen graphically in Fig. 19. Out of interest I also made a count for the lesser prejudice-provoking nations, that is the Germans, Poles and Italians. The raw frequency figures, in the diagram, stand for the number of times each of these nations was allotted to each of the six permitted degrees of dislike. I have never seen this suggested anywhere but I think probably it is true that the J-curve distribution pattern represents the counterpart in the behavioural field of stereotypy in the cognitive field. Here we can see it only too plainly. If we look at the red and /
and orange lines, representing the Russians and the Japanese respectively, we find that the lines of the graph closely approximate to the J-curve. Whereas, in the case of the less disliked nations a totally different gradient can be observed. When weighted to reveal intensity, the prejudice against the Japanese was shown to be the most intense. This part of the investigation should really represent a finer assessment of prejudice than did the first part, in which underlinings were made whenever the sound of the nation's name suggested anything unpleasant or disagreeable. In the finer discrimination thus obtained much less anti-semitism is shown than we were led to expect, or rather anti-semitism seems to be more widely spread but not so intensely experienced (or perhaps expressed) than other types of prejudice.

The chief points emerging from the Social Distance part of the investigation are the following:

1. The closest degree of intimacy would appear to be that experienced in domestic proximity.
2. That is, the misplacement of the second degree of intimacy is obvious from the results. This is probably a sad reflection on the generally accepted cramping in present-day housing conditions.
(2) Of the three critical peoples in this particular study, the Jews, Russians and Japanese, it is of note that the region of doubt is greatest in the case of the Russians.

(3) The Social Distance technique would appear to be similar to the technique used to obtain a finer gauge of the intensity of prejudice. (i.e. it shows the greater intensity of prejudice against the Japanese in all degrees of intimacy, although the first count of prejudice did not show this up clearly.

(4) The sixth degree of intimacy (sit next to or work next to) seems to resemble the second degree in that it would appear to be misplaced although only slightly. Again, it is a case of physical proximity which, when unpleasant, is apparently more obnoxious than that resulting from co-membership in any group.

(5) The nations giving rise to the greatest amount of doubt in the minds of the subjects are worthy of note. They are notably the Finns, with the Greeks, Muslims and Hindus not far behind.
(6) The extent of doubt reactions tended to approach uniformity through all degrees for each nation considered. i.e. If the percentage of doubt expressed was large for the first degree of intimacy it tended to remain large throughout all the other degrees and vice versa.
CONCLUSIONS. (Personality Data).

(a) When cognitive structures are under review and the belief responses of subjects are examined for stereotypy and its opposite atypicality, it is found that the unprefused tend to give the atypical or idiosyncracy response more frequently than the prejudiced.

(b) The responses given by the prejudiced show a greater tendency to belong to the unfavourable category than do those of the unprejudiced.

(c) Stronger and more successful repression (in Tomkin's sense) is manifested by the prejudiced than by the unprejudiced, i.e. the ratio second half/first half tends to exceed unity.

(d) The unprejudiced appear to exceed the prejudiced in the number of levels per protocol. The word "motility" of psychological functioning was suggested as a term that might be usefully employed to describe this characteristic of versatility.

(e) The invariant level in the case of the Prejudiced tends to be Object Description more often than with the Unprejudiced, i.e. the plane of psychological functioning tends to be more consistently on a lower level with the prejudiced.
"The beliefs men hold", says Korzybski, "react upon the nervous system. If the beliefs are scrambled, so will the nerve functions be". Stuart Chase also writing on an allied topic stresses the importance of cognition perhaps even more than I have tried to do in this thesis. He says, "Within each of us lies a picture of the world. It stands for the whole realm of material objects, happening relationships, out there. Into our picture has gone everything we know or think we know. It is our map of reality, without which we could not find our way through life at all. We are well-adjusted in proportion to its correctness and in proportion as we remember its limitations".

Stereotypes, as I have said before, are functionally equivalent to wrong concepts about reality. Prejudice-formation would seem to be attendant upon stereotype-formation to a very great extent. If prejudice is to be extirpated some re-educative process is necessary. Seeing that the processes which lead to illusions and prejudices are the same as those which lead to correct perception and realistic social concepts the process of re-education must be something in the nature of a change of culture. This total change is necessary because /
because no piece-meal method of altering an individual's 'map of reality' is satisfactory. Change of cognitive structures does not necessarily of itself produce a change in attitude. Nor does a change in sentiment necessarily involve a change in attitude. Changes in knowledge and belief, changes of values and standards, changes of emotional attachments, any needed change in everyday conduct can only be brought about by a change within the total life within the group. I suppose it is for this reason that so many reformers in history have been eccentrics, cranks or isolates of some kind. It is this sort of person who is often the first to be won over to some new way of thinking or behaving, the reason being that he has not the same necessity for breaking away or weaning himself away from existing group attachments. He is self-centred rather than group-centred. New systems of beliefs and values are never accepted unless the individual also accepts membership within the desired group. They cannot be affixed externally by any force, unless aided and abetted by a feeling of belongingness or identification within the individual. The oft quoted /
quoted researches of Coghill suggest that development in the social field also is the resultant of "individuation within the total man" rather than an accretion of originally distinct particles.

In any field of conduct and belief, the group and all the media used to influence it, members, both voluntarily and involuntarily, appear to exercise a strong pressure upon its individuals in the direction of compliances. In myriads of ways, and in all areas of human activity - political, religious and social - our beliefs about what is good or bad, right or wrong, real or unreal are influenced by our reference group, whatever it may be. In the field of space perception the process responsible for the creation of inadequate visual images (illusions or false percept) are identical with those which give rise to adequate visual images (reality). To hark back to an earlier statement in this thesis, denying any fundamental distinction between rational and irrational thinking, it cannot be stressed often enough and firmly enough that the acquisition of the normal and the abnormal are fundamentally alike, and that prejudice regarding other human beings is a form of social illusion, characteristic /
characteristic of unreality in belief or conduct.

The three approaches I chose for investigation are also the three best avenues for any process of ameliorative socialization or re-education. A successful process of re-education would affect the individual in three ways.

(a) His cognitive structures would be changed.

(b) His affective outlook would be changed. His valences, and values, his attractions and aversions to groups and their standards, his feeling-reaction to sources of approval and disapproval.

(c) There would be a change in his action-ideology, and this would affect his motoric action and influence the individual's degree of control over his social and physical movements.

All three must be changed if the process of re-education is to be effective, but such studies as the present only serve to show that the area which requires to be changed first and foremost is the first of these mentioned above. If we could only get people's cognitive maps of reality to correspond to reality in fact then we should be well on the way /
way to dispelling social illusions, the most pernicious form of which is undoubtedly stereotypes, especially unfavourable ones, of other races and people.

For the benefit of those who distrust any quick and easy transition from illusion to reality in social conditioning we might quote this unsurpassable gem of an epigram to be found in Lin Yutang's treasury of the wit and wisdom of China, and attributed to Lusin. Perhaps it's quotation may help us to close this investigation with a hope for a better future in the field of re-education in international relations. It runs: "The Chinese have only two names for foreign races. The one is "foreign races"; the other is "Your Majesty". The social scientists who wish us all to become "athletes of reality" would insist upon our teaching the first of these terms to our children. Perhaps the time has not yet come for such objectivity in outlook. If we still seem only too ready to cling to the emotionally-toned word, perhaps it might be a step in the proper direction to start by learning the humble and more humanistic "Your Majesty".
VIII. APPENDICES.

i. THE HISTORICAL ASPECT OF ETHNIC PREJUDICE.

The denigration of other nationalities and races by means of opprobrious terms and epithets is by no means a recent phenomenon in history. Name-calling of this variety has always been, it appears, a popular pastime. Some of these slurs cast by one nation at another have become so deeply embedded in our language that it requires all the art of the philologist, etymologist and linguist combined to strip them of their accumulated connotations and reveal the original gibe of the ethnically prejudiced. Moreover, one is limited severely if one restricts oneself to the study of English alone.

A careful study of "ethnophaulisms", as A.A. Roback cleverly calls these slurs (using the Greek roots for "a national group" and "disparage") reveals the retaliatory or recriminatory nature of many of the gibes. Taking into account not only the slurs in English but those in other languages, A.A. Roback has collected some 3,000 of them. Whether the mechanism at the root of this phenomena is social projection or not the fact remains that many of the derogatory locutions have their exact counterpart in some other language with only the reference reversed. Even if one regards them, merely from the numerical standpoint, it /
it is somewhat startling for the ordinary person to reflect that there are about one thousand slurs of this nature in the English language alone. Many of these locutions would not however merit the term "standard English". They are sometimes slang on colloquial terms but this only makes them all the more significant. Anyone without philological pretensions knows that there is nothing static about slang. The slang of to-day is often incorporated without demur into the standard language of to-morrow. Moreover nothing linguistic could be of more significance to the social psychologist than a study of the current neologisms of any period. It is in colloquialism and slang that we get nearest to the pulse of the living social organism. Many vivid expressions are only permitted entrance within the structure of standard English when they have become sufficiently emasculated to excite no displeasure in the mind of the user. Many ethnic slurs have no doubt in this way been lost altogether, since they have never acquired sufficient veneer to parade unmolested in the realm of standard English. However, many robust specimens still remain crystallised in epithet and phrase in a form which leaves no doubt as to their original birthplace, the ethnically prejudiced mind.

The /
The spadework in this field of investigation has been carried out not by psychologists but mainly by philologists. They, however, have revealed rich material but since interpretation, particularly psychological, is outside their ambit the psychologist can only avail himself of the fruits of their researches and accept their statement as to the historical relationships between the peoples at the time when the coinage of the word took place, or when the idea became prevalent.

Eric Partridge after editing afresh Francis H. Grose's Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue, which itself is a pioneer in this field and contains just under fifty derogatory references to other peoples with the Scotch, Irish, Dutch coming in for a larger share than the others, was sufficiently stimulated to write a brief chapter on this topic, entitled "Offensive Nationality" in Words! Words! Words! He deals with the topic in a summary but entertaining fashion in some seven pages, largely devoted to illustrations. But in this brief space Partridge surveys the centuries, and shows that at various periods in the world's history different people have had their turn of being the world's Aunt Sally or butt for derision.

Partridge tells us that the Greeks and the Turks were the scapegoats in the sixteenth century. One example /
example cited by Partridge and dating from 1528 is to be found in the Oxford English Dictionary. "In card playing he is a goode Greeke", that is to say that he is a cheat or card sharper. Incidentally, this slur still lingers in modern French. "Etre grec en quelque chose" means To be a Greek at something (i.e. to be a shark at ). The same type of slur exists in Polish in the phrase "Nieudawaj Greka (Don't pretend you don't know). In Corneille even we find the line "l'amour, j'y suis grec". The noun "grec" in French means "A Greek, a sharper at cards, a "chiseler" (to indulge in Americanese), a crook. It even denotes a person who will not tip for his services. Curiously enough in modern French an "anglais" to the French cabby would also mean someone who will not tip, in other words "a tight-wad". It is difficult to account for the spread and persistence of this prejudice relating to the perfidy of the Greeks but it seems hardly plausible to attribute it to rivalry as Partridge does in his essay. It is equalled only by the perennial hatred of the Turks, which is just as inexplicable.

The next butt in the chronological sequence of unpopularity would appear to be the Spanish, who remained the target from about 1580 to 1650, only to be replaced by the Dutch. During the eighteenth and the /
and the nineteenth centuries the French seem to have been the world's most unpopular people. To a lesser extent this was shared by the English, Welsh, Scotch and Irish. It was only at the period of the first World War that the Germans came in for their share of calumny. Treating the matter in the historical fashion it seems almost obvious to Partridge that there is some direct relationship of rivalry between the people who have come into focus as a commercially successful people and the people they have just displaced or the people which is striving to usurp their place, and that it is this element of rivalry which stimulates the mutual slinging of slurs.

But it is difficult to account for the unconcealed hatred of the Turks which was common during the sixteenth century, when the Saracens were "the bogey men" for young and old. During the Third Crusade all sorts of fiendishness were attributed to the Turks, and yet they could not be regarded as the rivals of any nation in the ordinary sense of the word. (See page 476 for prejudiced responses to Turks, No. 28.) Religious conflict did enter into it but this would infuse an entirely different spirit into the whole relationship. Trade rivalry or jealousy as being the most obvious cause for hatred a jealousy between peoples seems quite a satisfactory reason to Partridge for the existence of hatred and prejudice. Strangely enough /
enough, the Jews, who from the point of view of potential trade rival, have been the world's most harmless national group, have nevertheless consistently throughout the centuries been the favourite butt of the world's criticism.

Quite apart from international or intergroup rivalry the Jew for many centuries was precluded from the sphere of inter-individual rivalry in business, politics and even art. During the Middle Ages usury was the one field of endeavour left open to them; since it was prohibited to the Christians. With few exceptions the Jew in nearly all countries were poor and excluded from the activities of ordinary citizens. If, in Spain, prior to the discovery of America and in Renaissance Italy they were allowed to flourish, it merely opened up to them the field of individual competition, that is non-political rivalry. Although rivalry, especially commercial rivalry may be a factor in the inception of prejudice, that it is not universally so becomes apparent in the case of anti-Negro prejudice which has always been common, and which, obviously, is not due to the potential dangers to world trade offered by the world's negro population.

Equally interesting and slightly more penetrating psychologically is Ernest Weekley's Chapter on "Xenophobia" (in Words and Names) which was published shortly /
shortly after the essay by Partridge. Weekley however does not adhere very closely to the avowed intention of his chapter headings and wanders into spheres far outside the scope of his topic. For example, in referring to such matters as "Irish stew", "Scotch collops", "Welsh rabbit", "Attic salt" one has overstepped the bounds of xenophobia and is within the relatively harmless field of national references.

The philologist's task is a fairly simple one. He merely searches for sundry references to other nationalities. He is not concerned with analysing the amount of animus contained within any one of these; therefore it is not his duty to draw the line between a harmless national reference, probably based on geographical grounds and the true slur, more or less disguised, based on frankly psychological grounds. For example, to talk of "Welsh rabbit" is to make a perfectly harmless national reference to a dish, which may have originated in Wales, but to use the phrase "to welsh" in the sense of to run away to avoid one's obligations, to default, to fail to carry out an agreement is tantamount to a slur against the Welsh, disguised though it may now be by familiar usage and the use of the small letter in place of the capital. A similar contrast could be drawn between "Irish stew" and the many, often humorous, but none
the less slurring allusions to the Irish in such phrases as "Irish draperies" meaning "cobwebs", "Irish confetti" meaning "bricks", "Irish fan" meaning "a shovel or spade" and so on through examples too numerous to mention.

The psychologist, however, unlike the philologist has definite limitations within which to work. His exclusive concern is with disparagements of other national and racial groups, including, if necessary, any critical references to one's own group. Although he is indebted to the historian and philologist for correct information as to (a) historical period and conditions and (b) the commercial and/or political relations between the countries involved, what is of greater moment to the psychologist is the content or grade or real nature of the slur, and to a lesser extent the propinquity geographical or ethnic between the nations involved.

One very common slur is to refer to the member of any nationality by the same term (untranslated) as that by which he is known among his own people. It would be quite unmannerly in good society to call a Jew or a Pole, a Yid or a Polack respectively, although these are quite harmlessly respectable terms among the Jews and the Poles themselves. A similar slighting or slurring tendency would be detected in the use of the terms Dansker, Russky or Swenaker. Such hairbreadth's /
breadth's distinctions are for the psychologist to detect, if not to explain. The allusion may be a mere nuance, or undertone but it contains the core of the slur, whose real nature or quale is the evaluation (or devaluation might be more appropriate) of a foreign people or alien element. This core in any folk locution is nearly always unfavourable when applied to any other nation, but all degrees of criticism may be found from bantering chaff to extreme prejudice or hatred.

Of all ethnophaulisms the most harmless are those which gibe good-humouredly at some national dish. The Italian is a "macaroni"; the Hungarian is a "goulash", and the Frenchman a "frog-eater". "Rosbif" characterizes the Englishman in France, and to many an American "chili con" stands for a Mexican. Ethnic prejudice is little more at this level than wonderment at the strangeness of an unfamiliar habit. Such comparisons require to be made, and on an international scale not only to reveal the nature and content of the slurs themselves but to light up the slurring tendencies, specific to any national group, and the specific areas of human conduct which magnetise such propensities.

For purposes of comparison some segmentation of ethnophaulisms along national lines is necessary.
The necessary research has not been done in the field of Arabian, Chinese, Hindu or Japanese literature and language. As far as other languages are concerned, however, a great deal of invaluable work has been done. Propinquity as one might expect is revealed by these researches to be an active cause in the fostering of intergroup or inter-national hatred. A.A. Roback in his matchless volume on this topic draws attention to the fact that ethnic propinquity has seldom been taken into account on any studies dealing with ethnic prejudice. He adduces as relevant the struggles and animosity existing between the Poles and the Russians, the Spaniards and the Portuguese, the Irish and the Scottish, the Jews and the Arabs. However, since racially cognate groups are very often in close geographical proximity, his criticism would seem to be somewhat invalidated.

A somewhat more recherché cause for the fomenting of ethnic prejudice may be the acclaim given to the obiter dicta of the literary giants of the various peoples at different periods of their history. It is a commonplace in literary studies that men like Voltaire, Wagner, Beethoven and Carlyle and other anti-semitic celebrities have sought literary vengeance on the whole race of Jews probably because of some personal /
personal injury received at the hands of one particular Jew or Jewess. Men of genius have sometimes shown violent and entrenched ethnic prejudice which to lesser minds devoid of prejudice seems incomprehensible. The Scotch seem to have been the butt of the nations in earlier centuries. We know only too well what Samuel Johnson thought of the Scotch and Thomas Jefferson, whose nobility of character is well-known, entertained the lowest opinion of the English. To go back still farther in history we find Petrarch, who is of the pre-Chaucer period, writing thus: "Of all the barbarous nations none is more cowardly and ignorant than the English excepting only the rascally Scotch". Not to leave out our near neighbours the Irish Thomas Huxley is known to have said: "What a pack of liars! The Irish cannot tell the truth". And if we may again hark back to the old notion of the perfidious Greek, we find David Hume, a man whose sagacity at least was not of the lowest, writing in 1741: "The integrity, gravity and bravery of the Turks form an exact contrast to the deceit, levity and cowardice of modern Greeks". All the men mentioned so far were undeniably great as regards intellect and yet even they fell victim to this pernicious habit of mud-slinging.
mud-slinging. The completion of an encyclopaedia showing the ethnic prejudices of the great men in the world might be both a rewarding and amusing task.

Another factor in fomenting prejudice and one which does not strike one at first blush is the semantic conditioning to which we are subject as speakers of one particular language. One cannot help feeling that the euphonious or cacophonous nature of the sounds emitted when a certain name is pronounced may have a great deal to do with the affective attitude towards the referent. What is even more important is the coincidence in meaning between the name of a national group and the name of some homely, ludicrous or even detestable object. English, fortunately does not offer many examples of this nature but other languages present ready illustrations. In this connection A.A. Roback cites an example against himself. He declares that for long he was under the impression that the Barbary Coast in North Africa was so named because of the barbarousness of the inhabitants, whereas the Barbary or Berbery states are etymologically distinct from our sense of barbarous, it being pure coincidence that the name of an Arab tribe inhabiting that part of Africa should be Barbar or Berber. Sherif stresses the importance /
importance of the semantic conditioning of language in his book "Outline of Psychology" when he says:-

"As a matter of fact comparative linguistics show very plainly that any speech demands unconscious selection on the part of its speaker.

The name of another long-feared and hated group the Tartars may have been unduly affected by linguistic associations. The original name, as most people know, was Tatars. The interpolation of the extra r may be due to the natural proclivity of English-speaking people to add an r to a vowel (witness the common English pronunciation of "idear" for "idea") but on the other hand it may have a lot to do with the association of the name with the Latin Tartarus, meaning hell, and the Tartars in modern parlance certainly were of the "hell raising" variety among many European peoples. So here we can distinguish two broad linguistic categories which might account for not a few ethnic prejudices and which we might for psychological purposes designate as assonance-affect and association-affect.

Let us take association-affect first and try to adduce a few cogent examples. In German and in Swedish the word for Finn and the word meaning "pimple" are homophones (Finnie). No amount of explanation as to the origin can possibly wipe out the rather unfortunate /
unfortunate and unpleasant association. What is more this very point can be pursued a lot further. In the Czech language "uher" means a "boil" and also a "Hungarian". Likewise in the Hungarian language the word Mad'ar has the same two meanings. Furthermore in the Polish language the same coincidence in meaning is found in the word "Wegier" (meaning "Hungarian" and "abscess in animals"). The matter verges on the ludicrous when we discover that in Polish the word "Zyd" meaning a Jew can also mean a "boil"! One is almost tempted to believe that there is a lot more than coincidence at the bottom of all this or that perhaps the coincidence in sound has passed into the much more dangerous territory of coincidence in meaning.

Assonance-affect is something about which it is difficult to pontificate in any language other than one's own and even then it is something very subtle and often purely personal. Most people, however, would probably agree that the word Jew itself is not exactly euphonious. The original Yehudi (cognate with the Hebrew word for praise and glory) has passed through many changes in its Creek, Latin and French forms. The rough sibilant sound at the beginning of the word Jew and the absence of the /
the d altogether is not an improvement upon the soft liquid Y combined with the presence of the D. The total unpleasant effect is intensified when the J is pronounced as it sometimes is like a ch. In its final form it has fared worse in the French language as the word Juif sounds more like a hissing explosive than the name of a people. Small wonder that the French Jews take refuge in such terms as the more ancient Hébreu or Israélite. Even in Russia the abrupt name "zhid" is not used unless a derogatory sense is intended, other designations being employed on other occasions.

It would be an endless task to consider all the ethnophaulisms ever directed by one nation at another but it will help to provide a comparative background if we search such authorities as are available for the ethnophaulisms, deposited in our language in the form of phrase or proverb, and relating to what we have found to be the three most unpopular ethnic groups, namely the Japanese, the Russians and the Jews. Let us start with the Russians. Not surprisingly, the ethnophaulisms in English, having the Russians as their butt are few in number. We find the following:-

Ivan - a Russian, especially a soldier (from the very common given name, Ivan, corresponding to John).
Russian - an animal difficult to handle.

Russian Bear - Russia, collectively, as a military force, especially under the Czarist regime.

Russian boots - leg chains.

Russian law - "A hundred blows on his bare shins. (John day, 1641, cited by Partridge).

Russian socks - Rags covering the feet of the Russian soldiers prior to the Soviet outfitting of the army.

One solitary proverb can be traced, namely "Scratch a Russian and you will find a Tartar", and even this can be found in French and German as well.

There is one highly disguised ethnophaulism, relating to the Russians, or Slavs. It is the word "slave". On this very point there is an extremely interesting section in Roback's book on the subject, which is worth quoting in full.

"Indeed the most tragic of all the slurs or ethnophaulisms I consider to be the word "slave". Little do we realise, unless we are conversant with a particular field of history or philology, that what has become a synonym for an abject bondsman connoted at one time the glory and fame which the Slavs in so designating themselves, boasted of. When the Germanic hordes during the Middle Ages waged an annihilating war against the Slavonic tribes reducing them to captivity in Teutonic style,
the Slavs simply became slaves. In this instance the Slavs were not renamed. That were not so bad as to have their original denomination become a byword of such a character".

The Russians come in for rather hard treatment at the hand of the Poles and the Germans. A few illustrative examples may reveal some of the undercurrent of feeling between these peoples.

The two Polish words Moskal and Moskwicin are used only in a pejorative or contemptuous sense and at one time were interdicted in Poland. They correspond very roughly to the use of Muscovite in English. Slurring references to the Russian calendar are often made. One runs as follows:

Ruski miesac, polezysz mi z; I'll see to it that you are laid up a Russian month. (Twelve days behind the Julian month, it must have seemed a boringly long period to the Poles). Other attitudes towards the Russians are enshrined in national sayings and proverbs like some of the following given here.

Whoever goes to Russia must return home.
If there is no magic in it there is none in the Russian either. (That is to say, clever as it is, the Russians used no magic to devise it, and we can do the same).

You'll /
You'll get such drubbing you'll remember it a full Russian month. (Familiar reference when any tedious period of time is signified). The faithless Muscovite has sold his soul to the devil. (Polish folk jingle). The Muscovites eat children alive. (Polish folk or children's jingle).

It's getting cold; the wind is blowing here from the Muscovites.

We can now turn to the German sayings or proverbs to see how the Russians fare at their hands. From even a rough perusal of any collection of such ethnophaulisms it would seem that the Germans are the most inventive of all peoples in this realm of wordy warfare. They would seem to be the people par excellence of the ready oath and the feeling-charged expletive, although they themselves do not figure in an unusually unfavourable light in any language.

Many writers believe that this is owing to the confusion arising from the use of the word "deutsch". The prejudiced attitude against the Dutch has left its mark in many languages, notably in English, and though the Dutch, properly speaking, may have done much to merit it, there is no denying the fact that many of the allusions are pointed at the Germans, if not /
not as a separate people, then at least in conjunction with the Dutch. (Szwal - insulting name used by the Poles against Germans).

The word *russe* itself in German is subject to the phenomenon to which I have already drawn attention, namely the influence of semantic conditioning. *Russe* means (1) A Russian; (2) The black beetle; (3) A cockroach. (An amusing piece of retaliation which is worth noting is that the Russians call cockroaches *Prussaki*). A similar slur also exists in Polish. (4) A glutton for punishment. *Der ist ein Russe* may be translated "That man will stand anything", or "is as tough as they make 'em"; "den russischen Adler machen" means "To do the Russian eagle" that is "to turn one's back on someone." (The imperial eagle was a two-headed creature). There is one very interesting German reference, dating back to 1778 according to the authority Wander. It runs as follows: "The Russians act out of terror and compulsion; the Germans out of obedience; the Swiss because they want peace; the Poles in order to have a free voice; the French for the sake of their king's glory and the English for the love of freedom".

"A Russian without the knott seldom does good". "Once /
"Once the Russian has minced the meat, a German will be found".  
(The Germans were known as sausage-friends in Russia).  
"Scratch a Russian and the bear will growl".  
"Why, no Russian would think of it!  (German street expression) equivalent to "How can you accuse me of such!"  
"Don't let the Russian die and he won't let you live".  
"In Russia all but God and the Czar steal".

The Russians however can also turn a critical eye upon themselves or sections of themselves. The two terms which come most readily to mind are the words katsap and russak. The former probably arose out of the Ukrainian versus Great Russian hostility. It means a Russian but the picture suggested is one of a surly, crude, and bearded rustic. The second term is not quite so contemptuous, but nevertheless is never used unless in a depreciative sense.

How do the Russians appear to the French? Two interesting specimens are worth calling. The word "Russe" itself, besides, of course meaning "Russian" also has another meaning containing a slur. It can mean someone with aristocratic pretensions; a person who poses as a nobleman. The next one is a familiar one, namely: "des chaussettes russes", which are rags worn wound around (Russian) soldiers' feet. "Porter des chaussettes russes"is just another way of saying "wearing no socks".
The bitterest of all the ethnophaulisms directed at the Russians, however, were produced much nearer their own home than any we have yet considered. They are to be found in Ukrainian folklore and literature. Here are some of the most outstanding -

If the Russian tells you it's dry just put your collar up.

The Russian knows the way, yet he asks for directions.

The wolf is berated while the Russian nabbed the mare.

He swears like the Russian in the village.

He has become so Russian that he is ready to cut the heels off the living flesh.

Be friendly with the Russian but take care that you always have a rock ready on your chest.

The Russian looks like a crow but he is slyer than the devil.

The devil you can ban with a cross, but of the Russian you can never get rid.

"Father, father, the devil is in this hut." "That's nothing, child, so long as it is not a Russian".

Cut the fields away before the Russians and flee.

Please God that I don't meet a pope (i.e. an orthodox Greek priest) or run into a Russian, then there is nothing to fear.

Pshaw; the Russian is no great shakes.

The /
The Cossack never drinks to that which is but to that which is yet to come.

How can we know a Russian? Go to sleep and he will rob you.

A Russian is as sly as four Jews.

In Hungarian there is another interesting reference from the semantic point of view. It is the word "russzni" meaning a Russian, but also a "small, spiced fish", or "a bug" (when used colloquially).

In the Roumanian proverb, "Carry the Russian all day on your back and in the evening he'll complain of being tired". We see another aspect of the Russian character revealed.

The Swedes, unlike any other people seem to be struck by the craziness of the Russians. Rysk in Swedish means Russian but it also means "mad" or "crazy". I am told that a common phrase is "är du rysk, pokjeP" which means "Are you crazy, boy?"

The Russians capacity for unbridled enjoyment is reflected in another Swedish phrase, "leva som en ryss", which translated means "to live like a Russian" or to be a roistered, or in slangy language "to make whoopee". According to certain writers this is still one of the pet stereotypes of present-day Americans and is incorporated /
incorporated into the "typed" character of the Russian as Hollywood sees him. Even in these few selected references it is possible to detect very different grades of prejudice. The inveterate distrust of the experience-taught Ukrainians contrasts sharply with the almost playful pleasantries of the remoter Swedes.

When we come to consider the problem of ethnophaulisms directed at the Jews we simply do not know where to start. Throughout the centuries libel upon libel has piled up against the Jews in every language under the sun. It is believed that the Spanish language with the possible exception of German holds the numerical record for slurs of this kind. Roback points out that it is precisely the two countries that have been most guilty in their treatment of the Jews that indulge in the most vituperative form of linguistic attack. German proverb simply abound in derisory references to the Jews and Grimm's dictionary lists over a hundred derivatives (in compounds) of the word "Jude", most of them being highly derogatory to the Jewish people. So it would be better to tackle first the relatively simpler task of listing the slurs associated peculiarly with the Japanese.

To /
To the Russians the Japanese have for centuries been makaki, that is "monkeys". In English the established allusions are rather harmless. "Jap" itself is a colloquialism. The slangword "Japan" means bread. (No doubt a play on the French du pain).

"To japan" is also a slang phrase meaning to "ordain as a minister". "The Japanese knife trick" the use of one's knife to convey food to the mouth. Fierce as a Japanese mask, meaning "hideous or frightful". Silent as a Japanese - "Ominously taciturn or watchful". Japland (American slang for Japan).

The commonest of all and the most impregnated with feeling is the word "yellow", which is associated with the yellow races (Chinese and Japanese) and also means "cowardly and underhand". Recent historical events, notably the Pearl Harbour incident have only served to intensify the semantic association. Using the amount of dictionary space allocated to any particular country as a criterion of its significance in the eyes of other peoples, we find that Japan can hold its own with any European country and even with ancient China. One wonders how such a comparatively small group of islands so remotely situated could have made such an impression on the minds of others. Feeling-tinged /
Feeling-tinged, though many of these references are, it is the rare word or phrase which could fairly be called a slur. It is only within recent years that bitter feeling has been publicly aroused against the Japanese as a whole.

Who shall say, on the other hand, how hoary with age many of the slurs against the Jewish people must be? Many authorities have noted that the Jews tend to be highly self-critical. Confession in many cases is considered to be more incriminatory than accusation. If this were so the Jews stand self-indicted on many scores. The psychological mechanism behind this is somewhat obscure, but Jewish anti-Semitism is not unknown and may be even more pathogenic than the ordinary variety. To digress a little, the Germans who hurl, right and left, at all nations with lavish impartiality such slurring epithets as "die dummen Schweden" the "dumb" Swedes. "Russische Schweine" Russian pigs. "Schmutzige Franzosen" dirty Frenchmen. "Scheissfranzosen" the muck French. "Judensau" sow of a Jew. Stinkjude Stinking Jew. "Verhasste Engländer" hateful English, appear to be the least self-critical of all the nations.

Probably no Biblical prophecy has been fulfilled /
fulfilled with greater fidelity to detail than the one given to King Solomon to the effect that God would make the Jews "a proverb and a byword among the nations."

There are approximately 258 proverbs and sayings in Roback's collection, each one containing one or more slurs against the Jewish people and contributed by just over thirty different peoples, the leit-motiv throughout being the grasping greed and stinginess of the Jews. Even in Icelandic there is the slurring term gydinger - a Jew (or a shrewd dealer, profiteer). Swedish has a corresponding term okrare - a usurer, a profiteer, a Jew. Some of the Arabic slurs might be worth listing and considering since Arabs and Jews have been in close contact for centuries. Here are some of the Arabic ethnophaulisms from Roback's collection.

A Jew found meat selling at next to nothing; "It stinks" he said, because the price was too high for him.

The Jew is needed; "Oh no" says he "This day is a holiday for me. (Because his services were not paid for).

When the Jew grows poor he looks to his old accounts.

Water with worms is better than the favour of Jews.

A Jew if he cheats a Moslem is happy that day.
Don't trust a Jew if he has become Moslem, even though he remain so forty years.

If power return to the Jews, go into your house and close it.

What a pity that the Jew has his eyes.

You went to the Jewish quarter and called "O lovers of the Prophet". (Referring to the faithlessness of the Jews).

The German allusions to the Jews are at the same time the most bitter and the most varied. Here are some chosen at random.

If you beat my Jew, I'll beat yours.
The Jews sold Jesus Christ; were He alive now, He would have been sold by the baptized Jews.
Before the Jew dies he is ready to eat pork.
A Jew says left is right and hindmoutch is his foremouth.
A Jew remains a Jew though he sleep till noon.
Jews and fleas are the most impatient creatures on earth.
You act like the Jew who asks the way, though he well knows it himself.
Woman and Jew - all one crew.
He is just like a Jew; you throw him out of the front door and he comes in again from the rear.
He can cheat a Jew (i.e. he is so cunning that he can go one better).
For Jew and raven bathing is in vain.
He /
He that would cheat a Jew must himself be a Jew.

And so, almost endlessly with most of them harping on greed, stinginess, and unscrupulous actions.
VIII. APPENDICES.

ii. THE INFLUENCE OF THE FILM IN THE PROPAGATION OF STEREOTYPES.

The social psychologist Stephen Kracauer who has made a special analysis of the social and cultural implications of the film, has recently under the aegis of UNESCO turned his attention to this very problem, namely how national types are portrayed on the screen. In an important essay on this subject, which originally appeared in "The Public Opinion Quarterly", published and sponsored by Princeton University and now included in a shortened form in the recently published Penguin Book, "Cinema 1950", he considers in detail one special sector of what is a very wide problem, and examines the portrayals of British and Russian nationals as shown on the American screen, from about 1933 to the present time.

Hollywood, he maintains, is both a leader and a follower of public opinion. According to Kracauer, Hollywood reflects what it believes to be the popular attitudes of the time, but it also turns these often vague attitudes into concrete images. Infinitely more penetrating, however, is his analysis of the periodic "silences" in Hollywood's treatment of other nationals. For obvious economic reasons film-producing companies must keep a close watch on the fluctuations of public opinion.
opinion. They must be ever ready to make the necessary adjustments to fit in with the mass trends of the moment. Some initiative may be displayed by individual producers, but broadly speaking, the screen images of other nations are in keeping with the current attitudes of the American people. Likewise, campaigns for or against any particular nation must be in harmony with current attitudes if they are to receive any public support. Therefore as a witness to the current social attitudes towards other peoples, films may be regarded as being among the most important social documents of our time. Unfortunately, the same economic reasons that prompt the makers of films to move pari passu with changing public attitudes, also have an inhibiting effect upon them when any highly controversial topic is involved. It is to Kracauer's credit as a social psychologist that he has first of all drawn attention to the significant nature of what he terms Hollywood's silences, and has made an analysis of typical lacunae in recent film history.

One quotation, although choice is difficult, is such a well-authenticated argument as his essay contains, should be sufficient to illustrate his point.

"The temporary withdrawal from certain peoples at certain times can be explained only by factors affecting /
affecting commercial film production. Significantly, pre-war Germany as well as post-war Russia provoked impassioned controversy in the United States. Before the war the country was divided into isolationists and interventionists; immediately after the war it heatedly debated the problem of whether the United States should be tough or soft in her dealings with the Kremlin. I believe it is this split of public opinion which accounts for Hollywood's evasiveness in both cases. Hollywood as I have pointed out earlier is so sensitive to economic risks that it all but automatically shrinks from touching on anything controversial. Germany and Russia were tabooed as "hot stuff" as long as everybody argued about them and a decisive settlement of this nation-wide strife was not yet in sight. They disappeared, that is, not in spite of their hold on the American mind, but because of it".

Kracauer, likewise detects in the present scarcity of post-war British characters in American films a delicacy in handling the current attitudes to Labour rule in Britain, which is a direct challenge to the American belief in free enterprise. The present reticence which is being evinced towards Russia is significantly produced in answer to Hollywood's estimate of its immediate audience. But we in Britain are mainly dependent upon U.S.A. for our supply of films and consequently in this country /
country are provided with film products, which were not designed with our needs primarily in view. As far as attitudes to other nations are concerned, the influence of current films in this country will be mainly directive, and not reflective of developing trends. This can be seen even from this study in the pronounced absence of what might be called "visual stereotypes of the Russians". Our findings substantiate our supposition concerning the directive influence of films upon attitudes in this country. According to estimates from recent surveys, (The Hulton Readership Survey) two in every five of the population go to the pictures every week. In a recent survey of just over 1,000 adolescents cinema attendances, it was found that of a group of 1004 adolescents, consisting of 504 girls and 500 boys, 206 of the girls and 223 of the boys attend the cinema more than twice a week. Even if we limit ourselves to this country alone and exclude the world figures, the audience figures for any picture are simply tremendous. It is not to be wondered then that Hollywood's unconcern for reality when it comes to Russia is reflected in such a survey of young people as we have undertaken.

The following quotation from Kracauer's essay deploring the American handling of Russian themes in the film medium might be taken in its entirety as a description of the kind of stereotypes we have encountered in this study. As the American films sow, so do we reap, in the form of stereotypes /
stereotypes about the Russians. Kracauer expresses it thus: "All Hollywood films about Russia raise topical issues, and many of them, I presume, would never have been produced were it not for the purpose of externalising American attitudes towards the Soviet regime. This explains why the characters in them are so poorly instrumented. As compared with English screen figures, Hollywood-made Russians are sheer abstractions. Instead of being introduced for their own sake, as are the English in many cases, they merely serve to personify pros and cons in the ever-fluctuating debate on Russian Communism. It is as if they were drawn from editorials ....... (Emphasis mine).

The subjective element in America's attitude to the Russians is all too apparent to anyone who surveys the vicissitudes which the Russian screen image has undergone in the immediate past. Using films as our evidence, we may say that no nation, without exception as portrayed in American films has shown such instability and ephemerality of stereotypes as have the Russians. The Ninotchka of Garbo, showed us that the Russian woman also could indulge in frivolity and be as yielding as her less proletarian sisters. But this gave way in the war years to the stereotyped image of the unyielding intrepid woman fighter, Stalin became Uncle Joe and so on. But another volteface has taken place recently and now we are beginning to see /
see sinister bureaucrats, not unlike the Nazis of the war years, and all the formerly idolized virtues of the collective farms even are giving way to the condemned vices of the secret police. Sometimes the film magnates find themselves in a quandary when mis-timing brings about the issue some expensive production which has to be slightly doctored to make it acceptable to audiences after some fresh turnabout in attitude. If, as some people say, all stereotypes are partly subjective and partly objective in nature, then surely the stereotypes of the Russians must contain a preponderatingly subjective element. Probably "visual stereotypes" have a greater percentage of objectivity than any others and this may account for the decidedly pronounced absence of visual stereotypes in our study, relating to the Russian people.
Euphony and phonetic symbolism are two topics, the study of which has now gone beyond mere idle speculation. As far as I know, no experimental studies have been carried out, using the names of peoples, races and nations as stimuli. A brief survey of recently conducted work in this field will be sufficient to indicate the interest of psychologists in these and allied topics and also, unfortunately, the equivocal nature of the results so far obtained.

Since the time of Sapir's study in 1929, this very topic has received the attention of experimentalists in the field of psycholinguistics. It is usually designated as the problem of phonetic symbolism. It was Sapir's belief that certain sounds have an "expressive symbolism" founded upon an unconscious or intuitive logic which is not necessarily based on experience with the stimuli in their normal functional aspect. Sapir investigated the relation between sound and size and their corresponding word symbols by reading lists of nonsense words, differing only in one vowel, to a group of subjects asked to differentiate on the basis of size. (For example, given the two nonsense words /
words mal and mil, which represented arbitrarily a
table, the subject was asked to decide which of the
two was the larger. His findings were to the
following effect. Open vowels referred to the larger
of the two objects and closed vowels to the smaller.
This, he held to be in conformance with his belief.
Thorndike was also one of the early workers in
this field of study. He called his work 'Experiments
in Euphony'. His subjects were asked to rate words
for pleasantness or unpleasantness of the sound alone
without regard to their meaning. Their responses
showed the influence of past associations, indicating
that words may function as substitute stimuli the same
as other objects. This was further confirmed by the
use of nonsense words which were rated pleasant or
unpleasant on the basis of their resemblance to
meaningful words that had one or the other type of
association value. The differences commonly assumed
for the superiority of vowels and liquids and the
inferiority of gutturals and aspirates were disproved
by artificial words composed of these sounds. The
controlling factor was association.
More recently, Newman (1933) has continued
experimentation along the same lines, including darkness
and brightness in addition to magnitude, the subjects
again
again being asked to differentiate. His findings were similar to Sapir's. Bentley and Varon in an accessory study on phonetic symbolism in 1933 conducted experiments to check Sapir's findings and were convinced that there is insufficient evidence for any symbolic values inhering in vowel or consonantal sounds as such, and are of the opinion that Sapir's and Newman's results were due to the fact that the subjects unwittingly made comparisons on the direct basis of differences associated with the sounds themselves. What is more, Bentley and Varon experimented with nine categories of object aspects, angularity, foolishness, endurance, liquidity, sentimental attachment, motion, noisiness, solidity, strength. Most of their results seemed to lead to the conclusion that here and there in a language certain words may have sounds with appropriate or associated values when the subject's attention is drawn to them, but to ascribe such symbolizations to the words themselves as reflections of an unconscious or intuitive logic is going beyond the facts, to say the least.

Fox's work in the study of phonetic symbolism is also interesting. He presented his subjects with a series /
series of nonsense figures each accompanied by a list of six nonsense syllables, out of which the subject was asked to choose the most suitable name for the different figures. There was some agreement in the names chosen, especially for the sounds, i, z, and k, which were selected for sharp and angular figures, and the sounds m, l, u, and b for smooth and/or voluminous ones. The author gives the following explanation. "With general instructions, O's tend to report as reasons for their choices associations involving their knowledge of languages and of familiar physical objects.

Panconelli working in Hamburg (1937) obtained results more or less in keeping with those of Bentley and Varon. Subjects, in his experiment, were made to listen to the sounds of sawing and pounding. They were then required to reproduce the stimuli using symbols. This they did by using such widely varying symbols, that the author was led to conclude that they corresponded more to the hearer's ideational world, rather than to the actual auditory stimulus. Panconelli, therefore, believed that he had refuted Sullivan's theory, which claims a close relationship between the sounds of natural phenomena (such as thunder) and their phonetic symbolization.
Another experiment, the findings of which have some immediate bearing on our topic is that conducted by Esper (1933). He showed that instability of verbal responses occurred when stimulus objects because of common features set up an associative interference so that the sound or articulation corresponding to one evokes the symbol for the other, such associative interference being indicated by "simultaneous or successive activation by one stimulus object of two or more response mechanisms and where the tendency is strong, by lengthened reaction time in the verbal response to the object".

Starting from the assumption that language is a form of conditioned behaviour and reinforced by the phenomena of generalization gleaned from experiments dealing with verbal and other conditioning stimuli, Cofer and Foley recently (1942) laid the theoretical groundwork for a series of experiments involving the word association technique. In a follow-up study (1943) they attempted to determine whether or not generalization in word association could occur along more than one homophone gradient from a given word and along synonym gradients two transformations removed from the original word. Their findings showed generalization along the predicted dimensions in support of their theoretical analysis.
Experimental results in this field are at the present stage of inquiry highly contradictory and much more experimentation will be necessary to establish the relationship of such experiments to the language behaviour of organisms. It would seem that there has been no dearth of research in this area but when one surveys the many conflicting results one feels acutely the lack of a proper orientation towards linguistic behaviour. There has been no increase in the understanding of linguistic behaviour at all commensurate with the wealth of interest and the amount of experimental work related to it. On all sides there is testimony to the incompetence or we might say inadequacy of psychologists in the language area. This need has made itself felt with the greatest urgency among workers in fields related to language study, who have had to devise such makeshift arrangements as taking whatever feeble theoretical framework came closest to hand or constructing their own behaviour foundations without the psychologist's help. The social psychologist as well as these many other workers eagerly awaits further developments in the field of language study, whether they lie in the realm of theory or experimentation.

However, the trend which is already apparent
in the existing body of research indicates the dimensions of *assonance-effect* and *association* as being of importance at least in the evocation of symbolization. Quantification of the effect which either of these has upon symbolic processes or any assessment of their functional importance has yet to be made in the light of further experimental evidence.
VIII. APPENDICES.

iv. T.A.T. PROTOCOLS OF PREJUDICED AND UNPREJUDICED SUBJECTS.

T.A.T. No. 1.  

D.E. (Unprejudiced)

This little boy - he's very fond of music. He likes to play the violin. Bad at the moment. For some reason or other he has to stop playing. Before starting he always wanted to do this. Always had the urge to play the violin. He was very thrilled when left this violin to play. He has more or less taught himself. His parents are poor. He has been told that he will have to sell it. They need money for food. Later he will get some money, become rich, be able to buy a violin. Later he becomes a great concert violinist. He has a great urge to this. He is very fond of music ..... very musical. Just now he is thinking of some way that he could possibly keep on playing and become violinist. Does not know that later he will be a great violinist. He is very sad. He knows that he must have money. He was told that his family was so poor they would have to sell the violin. He is very sad because his parents would see no other way of doing it.

No. 2.

The girl is of a good family. She is in love with the man working on the land. The woman is her mother /
mother. She is against the idea of her marrying the man. She refuses to co-operate. The girl is trying to think of some way to marry the man without going against her mother's wishes. She is very sad - she cannot think of anything. Her mother is very stern and says she is to have nothing else to do with the man. The man knows this. He is poor, but rich in love.

Before this there was an angry scene between the mother and daughter. The girl has just told the man that she is in love with him. He understands her mother's views. She could see no way of going against her mother's wishes. It will probably end up by the girl going away and never seeing the man again. She does not want to go away from her mother of whom she is very fond. The girl is thinking that she would like very much to go against her mother's wishes. She is wondering how to do this. Why should she always obey her mother. The mother is sorry for the daughter. She is doing what she thinks is right. He's quite resigned to the fact that he is never to see her again.

No. 3 GF.

This young girl has just come out of the room. She has had a very angry scene with her father who has forbidden /
forbidden her to do something she has been doing. At the moment she thinks it very unfair very unjust of her father. She is trying to find some way out of the difficulty. She is very sad. Thinks her father very unfair for wanting her to do this. Her father has always been a quick-tempered man. No doubt in the end he will meet her half-way. He is angry about her going out with this boy she's met. He thought she was too good for this young man. Her father will probably tell her that if she waits till she is older everything will be all right. She says she must go to him immediately. The father sees her point. He sees she is right. He lets her go and in the end they will get married.

No. 4.

This man has been fighting someone and the girl is in love with the person he has been fighting with even although this man is her husband. He has hurt her thoroughly. The girl is in doubt whether the man she loves is dead or not. She's feeling very hurt and angry. It is difficult to choose between the two men. He is angry at the man for trying to take his wife away from him. In the end she will get divorced /
divorced from her husband and marry the man she loves. He accepts this. The man she loves and who loves her was found by her husband in his own house. Naturally he was very angry at this. Her reaction -- nothing for it but divorce. This is done in the end. The husband is still very much in love with her and always has been.

No. 5.

This woman is looking into a room where she has found her daughter with a young man. Very shocked at this. She is angry and hurt. She never thought her daughter would do such a thing. She doesn't realize that her daughter is in love with this man and that they have been meeting for some time. She loves her daughter. She is willing to do the best thing for her. This is the first time she has caught her doing anything she does not approve of. She is very surprised. She forbids her daughter to go out with this young man, to bring him into the house or ever to see him again. There are angry scenes. She persuades her mother that she is not a child and cannot be treated like one (as her mother likes to make out). She'll tell her mother she must go on meeting this young man because she is in love with him. The mother will not hear of it. One night /
night she goes out to meet this young man and goes away with him. The mother is stupid. If she had only seen her daughter's way in the beginning she would have been able to keep her daughter near her.

No. 6. GF.

They have been married for some time - very happily. They are very much in love. He has just found his wife doing something of which he disapproves. They have had a row about the children. They are both fond of the children. They have different views of the way they should be brought up. At the moment he is very angry. He is trying to see her side. The wife is very stubborn. They are fond of one another really. They have had this disagreement. They have made too much of it altogether. In the end it will all work out happily for the husband is very fond of his wife. He is more fond of her than she of him. He wishes her to be very happy. Scene has had to do with one of the children just starting school. The wife has been telling the child how he should act - should stick up for himself. Husband thought that if his wife kept on telling him such things he would end by being a bully. Children of his own age would not like him. And so they had this row.
No. 7 GF.

The little girl is being read a story by her mother who is very fond of the child and wants to do everything for her. This child is very naughty and has been corrected by her mother by being read this short story. The girl will not understand what her mother is telling her. She is obstinate but sad. She is beginning to wonder Mother is not right after all. In the end she will persuade her that she knows best. In the end the child will go out and play. The mother never forgets how she might have made a mess of her daughter's life if she had not done what she did. She persuades her that it was very wrong to do such a thing. She does this by reading a story with a moral. This girl had been playing with her friends in the street where she saw a shop with some fruit hanging out of it. Being led on by her friends she had taken some of the fruit from outside the shop. She was caught by the shopkeeper who knew her and told her mother.

No. 8 GF.

The girl is very poor. She works in the big house as a servant. She is servant to a young girl who is very rich and is just going to a ball. She has beautiful clothes. This girl in the picture has just helped to get /
get ready. The rich girl has just gone. This girl sat down to wonder why some are born rich and others are never able to dress. She must dress others and never have a life of leisure. She'll always have to work for her living. Knows that she will never be able to be rich like that. All her life she'll have to work hard until she gets married to a man of her own class who makes her very happy. Sometimes she wonders why she ever wanted to be rich like the people she used to work for. In the picture she has just finished helping the girl to get ready. After she'd gone she thought that that was what she would like to do.

No. 9 GF.

These two girls have seen someone who's been hurt down on the seashore and are rushing down to give help. Before this they have been having a row about the man who is hurt and might be dead. But now when the time comes they are both rushing to help him because both love him. They do not think of personal feelings. To help the man they love is their one thought. The man must not die. He must live. They must be able to help. Before this the man had been with the pair of them. He was trying to decide which one to marry.
He loved both but unfortunately was able to marry neither. He was hurt when he fell after he left them - so the two girls who had always lived together because they were both equally sorry that this man had died lived together for the rest of their lives. They never married - either of them.

No. 10

This couple have been happily married for some time time until just before this scene they had a row over some little thing. Then they remembered it was the anniversary of their wedding. They have had happy times together. Their children are grown-up. Don't need them any more. Before this scene they had both quarrelled over some very small incident which didn't really matter. They are very fond of one another indeed. They were very sorry when they had quarrelled. They're both thinking they're very lucky to be married to each other. What a happy time they have had. After this their grown-up children will come to the house and they will talk of the days of their children's childhood. Then they will be happy once more alone. They will go on loving for a long time. They will have many differences, many quarrels but will always make it up again.
T.A.T. No. 11.

It's a sea monster that everyone has heard about. It cannot be proved that it is there. It is only seen on a damp misty day. No one believes those who have seen it. There are many stories as to what it can be. People on these rocks on misty days have strangely disappeared. One man tried to find out the cause. As a matter of fact he did not believe the tale. When he saw it and knew it was there he knew he'd never be believed. He tried to find some way of killing it or bringing back some proof of its existence. This was not easy to do. He tried to entice it out of the water.

Each time he had a rope. Each time he had a rope. Each time he seemed to catch it it disappeared. It seemed to be evading him. He discovered that as soon as anything touched it disappeared into thin air. He found that the tide was coming in. He was likely to be caught in these small island rocks. He did not know what to do. He decided to leave and see if it would follow him out of the water, so that he could kill it. He turned round and killed it as he thought. It was lying quite still. He cut a bit of the body off. He was
was going to take it home as proof. He carried it in the bag which he had with him. At home he found the bag was empty. Nobody believed him just as he had had disbelieved many people.

No. 12.

This small boat is now in the country in England. It looks quiet and peaceful. It looks part of the country side. Has a long history behind it. It began its existence on a large river, much bigger than this little stream. Some men decided to get into it and sail down this river. They found themselves getting to the sea and they could not stop themselves. They were in the sea with this small boat. They could not stop and they could not row. They could not go back. The boat was taking them somewhere, but there was no strong tide. In the end they came to land - a small island. They thought they could land in safety. They tried to get into a small natural harbour, that they had not noticed. They went on. They landed. They found the land fertile and yet nobody lived there. They stayed there. They saw the boat being tossed around in the small harbour. The mooring rope was nearly broken. They got into the boat and it began to take them /
them back in the direction in which they had come. It did not take them to the very exact place. It took them to a small stream and took them up this stream, and then stopped. The water was still. They were not rowing. It seemed as if someone was pushing it. At last it stopped still under the trees. The men got out and pulled it on to the bank. The next day they came back to see if it was there or not. It had absolutely vanished. No sign of it there or anywhere else. They went to the place where they had found the boat originally. The boat was found by entirely different people on the other side of the country. It took them to the same place and took them up this stream and was left there by them.

No. 13 G.

This little girl is climbing up the steps wondering what she'll see around the corner. She has been climbing for some time. Each time she turns a bend she finds more steps. She's wondering what she'll see at the top. There is nothing there but a bare room. No inhabitants but rats. She has heard many stories about this place. Everyone who climbs these stairs has something to tell about what they see. It has taken her some time. It was getting dark. When night fell the room seemed to change before her eyes. It was not bare any more. It was /
was furnished but she could not see it properly, it was so dull. A man entered this room and sat down on one of the chairs which suddenly appeared. He took some money out of a small bag and started to count it. She realizes he is a miser who had stolen the money. He is gloating greedily over the money. She couldn't understand why he did not say anything to her for standing there not far from him. She realized that he did not see her. She thought he must be blind. She realized she was invisible to other people. At length the man went away and as the morning came the room changed back into its former shape. She wondered whether she had just imagined this and fallen asleep. Then she found on one of the chairs an old coin which did not belong to this age. She left the room and going down the stairs she discovered other signs of the man's existence. Although she went many more times she never saw any sign of him after that.

No. 14.

This man is climbing into a well-lit room. This house is haunted. He has decided to explore it for himself. As he approached it he thought it was in darkness. When within a few yards he found it well-lit. He looked in. There was nobody there. He opened it cautiously /
cautiously and climbed in. He saw a room like any other room in many other houses. It was a well-used room. It was not shabby nor was it new-looking. He went into the room and found a small cupboard in the corner, which he opened. At first he thought it was empty. Then in a corner he saw a small package. He did not open it but left it where it was. He sat down on one of the armchairs to await results. Suddenly all the lights went out. It was dark. There was a sound at the window by which he had entered. He looked but there was nobody there. All at once the lights were on again. The room was still empty. Hurriedly he went to the small cupboard and saw that the package had gone. He looked round the room to see which the intruder had got out. For the first time he realized that there were no doors in this room. The only way of entering and leaving was by the window. When he looked at the window it was all shuttered up and barred. He tried to open it but it was impossible. After some time he decided to wait and see what would happen next. He went to the window. The shutter opened easily. It fell apart in his hands as though rotten with age. He got out of the window. Going away from the house he looked back and saw that the lights were no longer on in the house. The house looked as derelict as it had always done in the daytime.
No. 15.

This scene by someone is an old church-yard by the village church. He was seen at the same time every night for a long time but only by this one person. He thought that this man was trying to haunt someone who had done something wrong to him during his lifetime, and had either caused his death or someone's death who was dear to him. This man decided to approach this object in the yard to see if it could speak or what it looked like close at hand. As soon as he got within a few yards it disappeared as though in a hole in the ground. When he reached the spot where it had been standing there was nothing to be seen. He looked at the grave standing near at hand. It was the grave of a man who had died in the eighteenth century. The next night this man decided to wait very close at hand and wait until the object appeared. The object appeared out of the earth and for the first time it was seen by a person close at hand. He was seen to have his hands and feet tied together and to be very old and wrinkled. The features of his face were shown quite clearly. He had a very hard look in his eyes. As soon as the man made any move this old man disappeared into the earth. This went on for some nights and one night he wondered if he could not try and speak some nights to him. He spoke some words /
words and the old man remained perfectly still without moving at all. Suddenly he mentioned a certain man's name at which the old man gave a horrible scream and fell at the feet of the man. The man cautiously approached the body. As soon as he touched it it crumbled away. The next day he approached the same grave but did not see anything of the old man or his remains.

No. 16.

This man is sitting beside a fireside in his own home. He is contented and happy. Suddenly the door of his living room opens and closes again. He has a feeling of someone being in the room. He thinks nothing of it - probably just the wind. He sees a chair moving as though being drawn up to the other side of the fireplace. The cushions are arranged as though someone were sitting down. He looks from chair to door and from door to chair. He doesn't know what to think. He decides to talk to the invisible person. There must be someone sitting there. He asks the invisible object what his name is. He is told that she has no name. She said that she died in a motor crash not so very long ago and had always wanted to live in a house like this. She decided to come back to earth. She said she felt just as she had always felt when alive. It felt queer not to be seen by anyone. The man is getting /
getting frightened by this time because of some crime he has committed. He had been needing money at the time and done something which had resulted in an accident to a man. He thought he was now being paid back. He did not know what was going to happen next. However, the person sat in the chair for a long time. This man watched nervously. He saw by the cushion that she had arisen and gone somewhere else. He did not know where to look. He saw the door open and close and thought she had left for good. Every night after that this person came in and sat down. He thought there must be some way of getting rid of this object. He decided to recompense fairly the family of the person whose death he had caused. After this he was left in peace every night after that.

No. 17. GF.

These men are thought by the girl watching them to be smugglers. Yet she did not think that smugglers carried out their work by day. She asked many people what these men did. Nobody knew what she was talking about. She pointed them out to her friends but they did not see anything. They just laughed at her. Every day it was the same. Men were carrying sacks - one ordered them about. She never saw what they did with their burdás. They walked over the bridge, told them out and carried them away. She thought they must use some hut. She decided to /
to explore this place and find out. She went right down to the river bank and hid herself. As usual, the men unloaded the stuff turned the corner and went into the small hut and came back empty-handed. After getting into the smallest boat, she went into the hut where they had entered with the sacks. She saw nothing. It was entirely empty as it had always been. She began to make enquiries. She asked if there were any smugglers on the river. She was told a story about smugglers a long time ago, who used to bring contraband goods into the country, at the very spot where she thought she had seen them. They were found a few years afterwards and put into prison. But it was not until they had sold many of the goods. She watched them the next day. She discovered that they were dressed in old-fashioned clothes. They went into the hut and still came out empty handed. She realised that she was watching something taking place in the past a long time ago and was seeing into the past.

No. 18GF.

This woman is trying to see the features of the face of her daughter who was killed a long time ago. She had wished that her daughter could come and see her and when she did come she was very sorry that she had wished for such a thing. This daughter had been killed in a very bad accident.
accident and had been crushed to death. The people who discovered the accident had been unable to see the body of the girl. When she came back to earth the mother was pleased at first, until she tried to get hold of her and she vanished into thin air. Looking closely she saw that her daughter's features were disfigured and she could not recognize her to be her own long-lost daughter. She thought that her daughter would be able to live just as before even although dead, and had no body which could be touched. She was very much mistaken. She found that her daughter could not live like that again. This daughter could not be seen by anyone but those who wished to see her. The only person who wished to see her was her mother. Disappointed, frightened and shocked to realize that her daughter was dead and that she would be far better off with just memories of her daughter. One day the girl disappeared completely. The mother began calling her. She was answered by the voice of her daughter who said she was unable to live as a human being any more, and that her mother should not try to make her by wishing her to come back to earth again.
No. 19.

This is what one man thought he had seen as he was crossing a graveyard one night. The thought that all the spirits and ghosts were rushing at him, trying to touch him and mock him. It was a very dark night. There was a thunderstorm. It began to rain. He tried to turn his steps homeward but found he was just running into more and more of these spirits. He found he was unable to get away from them. He stood still and all the spirits advanced towards him. They were closing in on him. He began to think he was being punished for some crime. One advanced out of the crowd. This one said he would be one of them. He was going to die. The spirit gradually took the shape of the man he had been when younger. Then the first man asked how he knew. It was because spirits knew everything and they were just preparing him. They told him he would have a very horrible death, and if he tried to avoid it he would be followed by these spirits every night. The haunted man wanted to know the reason why. They couldn't tell him. They had no power over these things even when they knew what was going to happen. The man began to believe the spirits. He thought the best way to get out of this trouble would be to commit suicide. He tried many ways. He couldn't do it. He resigned himself to be killed in the way the spirits said. he /
He went on living for many years until he was a very old man. He died a natural death of old age. Before his death he often wondered if he had been dreaming and thought that if he had committed suicide he would have done it for nothing.

No. 20.

This is a man who walks along this way every night. He's a prisoner and is unable to escape. He's in prison for a crime which he did not commit. As he walked round and round the camp he tried to think of some way in which he could prove himself not guilty. As he walked round the camp, inside the wire -- they found one of the guards had fallen asleep. He then realized that the gates were not locked. He was free. He walked joyfully out into the darkness of the night and immediately tried to think of some way to pay back the man who was the cause of his suffering so much in prison. As he walked round he heard someone coming towards him. It is a man. He decided that the best thing to do would be to approach him fearlessly as if he had authority to be out at night. He sees that it is the man he is looking for to pay him back. He follows him and tries to kill him but is not able to for the man does not seem to have any body nor is he breathing. Yet he is walking along the road. This man can see him. He follows him until the man who is followed reaches the prison gate which /
which he has just come out of. The gates are now locked. The guard is awake but the man now appears to be on the other side taking his place. He is walking as the original man used to walk around. Even though the innocent was proved guilty the man who is really guilty is taking his place in the prison.
Living in a tenement it is hard to raise money to be able to play the violin. How he would like to go to a school where other boys play music. How he would love to pick up his brother's violin just to play a few little notes. His fingers ran along the strings. What a pleasant sound they made. Nobody was looking. Just for a minute nobody would know. If I ask my father would he let me take the violin too? That was only a dream. Maybe some day when he was older. He sits and dreams, looking at the violin. What does he dream about? Maybe he sees himself grown up, and playing the violin before an audience, playing military music. The violin is light in his hand. The piece finished, the conductor shakes him by the hand. He goes to his dressing-room. He still hears the applause from the great crowd. Maybe that would be his first concert. Maybe he would have a hard struggle. He would just have to wait to see what the future would bring. Now he sees his brother come in at the door. He looks up. "I was only looking at it. I never touched it. There is no harm in looking. Would you help me to play like you? Perhaps he becomes famous - his wildest dream is realized. His brother helps him to learn the violin.
No. 2.

The ploughman - what is he thinking about? Most probably of his straight furrows and the harvest which is to come. Will it be a good one? Maybe. Well, we shall see. Spring is in the air and it is a warm summer-like day. He has a lot more work to do. He must hurry. Or he will not be finished before nightfall. If his furrow is straight and makes a good crop, his future will be bright, and he will have everything that he wishes. The elder sister is feeling the sun on her face. How warm it is to-day. I have so much work to do, and outdoors it is so inviting. The farm is poor. We try to make both ends meet. Perhaps in the future the farm will grow and be prosperous like many others.

No. 3 GF.

They have taken away her one possession - her pony. He was so old they really had to destroy him. What was she to do now? There was nothing left that belonged to her. He meant so much to her daily life. They were not wealthy. Her father could not afford to buy her another pet. Surely there must be something she could do. Maybe she could work in the village. To earn the money and buy back her pony. Everything was not as black as it looked. There is always some good behind the bad. To-morrow she would go down to the village and ask the greengrocer if she might do his rounds for /
for him. Fired with the new idea, she became once more her old and happy self... Thinking about her plans for starting afresh. What would her future be? Maybe she would earn enough money to buy back her pony. This was her aim. That was her goal.

No. 5.

Her husband was headstrong. He wished to be master of everybody. How was he to realize that people must be ruled by their superiors? Now he was out of a job. What were they to do? Her husband stands looking at the man he has accused. What is he thinking? Naturally, he thinks he is in the right. What job was he to take now? He ponders while they stand glaring at each other. What will be the outcome of this quarrel? Revenge? Perhaps. But that will not be the best. He wishes he could say he was sorry and take the blame. But his foolish pride will not let him. His wife - what is she thinking? How shall we live? No job. No food. If only the quarrel would end. What can I say to put things right? How can I save his face? If only I could do something. Perhaps we shall have to move from the neighbourhood because of the gossip? How can our reputation be upheld? The two begin to feel foolish. They go forward to each other. Each holds out his hand for a warm grasp of friendship, and understanding.
No. 5.

Only the firelight flickers in the room. All is quiet. What is going on? A man old and with shiny hair sits slumped by the fire asleep. The housekeeper - what does she think? He is always like this sleeping when he comes home from work. He must take a rest. It started last year when the new order came in. He must hurry he said to get this order through. Perhaps this will speed up our export. Then a great many orders came in which made him tired and disagreeable. He always had his dinner at seven and retired to the sitting room to read or sleep. What could she do to help him forget his tiredness? Maybe she could ask him to go away for a holiday. Yes, that's what she would do. He was awakened abruptly and she felt she was wrong in disturbing him..... The carriage was at the door. The stout little man, wrapped up well, waddled down the steps. The housekeeper stood fluttering her white handkerchief and called a greeting after the little man as he drove off.

No. 6.

The carpet was so thick that she never heard him coming. Were you working? he asked softly. She turned round in surprise. What could I say? He had startled me. He would ask me what I had been doing. What /
What could I say? Yes, I have been reading. In an ordinary house that would have been permissible. But this library was priceless. I was sure that he doubted what I was saying, towering over as if he were reading my thoughts. I repeat again, What were you doing? A small voice said, "Reading, sir". What? A book. On what? History. Show it to me. The book was produced. It was one that was bound with morocco leather. Do you like reading? Why didn't you tell me? You could have had the key to the library. Any day you wished. Come, let us put the book back together. I will give you the duplicate key so that in your spare time you may rove in the library at leisure.

No. 7 GF.

What a pity it was raining. I did so want to go out. Yesterday was such fun and we had planned to go much further to-day. Mother came in and asked as it was raining, would she read to me. Oh, yes. I have nothing else to do. It would do to listen to a nice quiet story. I listened with only one ear as my mind was far away. Mother read but I am sure she was only reading with her eyes and not with her mind. We were quiet for a minute. Only the clock on the mantelpiece made a sound. Then Mother turned the page. I'm sure she /
She was thinking of all the jobs she had to do. It was nice of her to come to read to me. But look! the sun was shining. It was coming through the clouds. Maybe the rain would stop. Yes, I could see that the raindrops no longer fell in the puddles. Maybe I could go out. My Mother would let me go. Yes, but I must wait till the chapter was finished. It won't be long. Just about five more lines. Now the sun is out. Yes, I will ask if I can go out to play now.

S.G.F.

She was just new to this large house and every day there was something new to see. Maybe just a vase or even a chair but everything was so beautiful. By accident she had stumbled upon this room. It was covered in sheets. But there was one beautiful picture on the wall. Oh, she had to sit down to look at it. It was exquisite. She had never seen anything like it before. The flowers were as if they were just placed in the vase and had been put in the frame. What was she thinking about? Yes. The meadow beside the house where she lived. when she was a little girl. She remembered how they had picked the flowers and made them into garlands for each /
each other's heads. Those were happy days. Would she ever go back to the first scene of her childhood. Maybe when she was older and had worked hard she would take a train and ramble back again in the beautiful Surrey country side, that she had known when a child.

§ GF.

How would they get back. They had a long stretch of sand to run before they came to the opening. One sister was counting the minutes that she had left to get to the upper stages of dry land. Would she get there in time? Could she race the sea? The other sister was sitting high in the tree. She remembered her mother's warning. You must reckon with the tides. You cannot stay too long. Be careful. They had taken books and knitting to do. It was a beautiful day and they had plenty of time. They were drowsy and had fallen asleep. They realized too late that the tide was coming in. By now her sister might have been upon the dry land but her feet were slow, and the sea was coming in. Oh, we must hurry. What will we do? Will we never be home to-night? Surely someone will find us. Worry made her sleep and when she awoke there was a bright light on her face. Yes, her sister had reached the house in time and at low tide had brought the rescuers to rescue the other sister.
The war is over. I am lucky to be home with my own family. How many people must be sad to-night. I am safe in the family circle. I have my mother and my father and my brothers. What must my mother be thinking? Yes, she is happy, too. Glad to think that after five years she has her son back. You went away, it seems, five hundred years ago. He travelled far and wide in many distant countries. How often we thought of him, when we heard a place name and how often he thought of us, when he got our letters. Now all was over. He would never go away again. His father has reserved a place in the Bank for him after a holiday he would start. What was her son thinking? He was wondering how many people he would know after these five years. Maybe they were all away. Who were in his class when he was in school? Well, to-morrow he would rise late and wander slowly down the familiar village street. Maybe he would be successful. Yes, he would be successful. He would rise to a high position in the Bank. That would be his future.
No. 11.

This was the third night that I had dreamt. To-night the scene is clearer in my mind. The queer shapes and rocks were the same but clearer. Yes, I walked along on the narrow path. The jagged rocks cutting into my bare feet. The shapes which I could not distinguish were becoming clearer. A large fish with webbed feet was swimming towards me. Would I manage to reach safety before this animal attacked me and threw me into the cavern that was far beneath. Ahead I knew not what lay before me. I could only press on hoping to reach firmer ground. As I came nearer the narrow path which led over the bridge I saw a man trying to fight for his life and trying to pass a large animal. His companion had reached safety but the unfortunate man who was left was surely doomed. If I hurried I too might be able to reach safety. The animal was horrible and the path was narrow. As I crossed the bridge I could not bear to look down. I had reached the other side thankful. What lay beyond? Perhaps I could find out. A bright light shone on my eyes and I was rudely awakened. Perhaps the next night I would find out what lay beyond the narrow bridge.
The staircase seemed so long. What was at the top? As you climbed higher and higher you imagined fantastic houses and castles. You had climbed you felt sure for hours on end. It was a tiring job but you could not resist the temptation. You simply had to see what was at the top. Could it be a garden? Surely not. How would people reach it? It could be a house. Nobody would live in it. As you looked over the banister it made you sick to see the people and traffic looking so small. How far now? Surely no further now you saw the sky. You were on your last flight. Excitement rose and as you came to the top you stood on a platform with a balustrade round, looking down on to the heart of the great city of London.

Was the place that I had been told of just a myth? They said that in Spring the cherry tree was laden with beautiful blossom. In Summer when the wind blew the red cherries blew and bobbed in the wind. In Autumn the leaves turned to golden brown and in Winter when the snow was on the branches the tree was covered with sparkling gems. The river reflected many scenes. This was the haunt of many children who came in search of small fish. The boat belonged to the squire, who lent it out to people in the Summer. My mother used to go in this boat with her brothers.
brothers and sisters. In the Winter they would skate and the ground would be beautifully patterned with hoar frost. It is Autumn now but perhaps in the Spring I shall go to see the cherry tree and the beautiful daffodils which grow in that pleasant place.

No. 14.

I do not know how I happened to arrive at the ancient house. I went inside. All was dark. The faint sunlight filtering through the windows outlined beautiful and ornate furniture. Some rooms were hung with tapestry and some had gilt pictures. The chairs were covered with dust-sheets and under these the tapestry chairs were all moth-eaten. I had a sudden longing to reach daylight. The room was musty and I got out and closed the door, leaving the room just as I had found it. There was a rickety stair. I climbed it and found myself up against a thick panelled door. There was a key in the lock and I turned it. A slow rusty grinding - then the door swung open with a laboured creaking - and I stood in an empty loft. There was a window at the end of the room and after much trouble I managed to open it, letting the cool air rush in to the empty and solitary house.

No. 15.

I have heard people say that in our village there is a man who goes to stand over a grave in the dead of night. I wish /
wish to go. So, one night, in December, it was cool but not cold — and I walked like the night watchman to the churchyard. I sat beside the Church and awaited — perhaps it was too cold for our fantastic friend, but no — He came between the graves to a moss-covered cross. His head was bent but I could see that his eyes were hollow. His figure which was clothed in black was thin and stopping. His gnarled hands were pressed together and his fingers showed white with cold. He was muttering under his breath. I could not hear what he was saying and after many minutes he turned and disappeared as quietly as he had come. Once more I was left in the silence of the country churchyard.

No. 16.

There is a picture hanging on the wall... I went to see the place which was depicted last year. I was pleasantly surprised. The picture showed a house, rambling and large, bare, without any trees. My curiosity was aroused. So I packed my trunk, and went to visit Sherwood as it was called. I arrived at a small station, and as it was I decided to walk. It was not far to my destination. When I arrived, I found two large gates with lions sitting above them. I let myself in and found myself standing in a drive way between two avenues of fine oak. Then as I travelled I became aware of the sweet smell of honeysuckle /
honesuckle. Then into my view came a beautiful low-built house. This was not what I had expected. The roof was of thatch and not as the picture had said "tiled". It was long and narrow and not long and tall. I went to the front door and asked if this was the original Sherwood. The answer was "no", but this is a new house, built by the same family and in memory of the old house we called it "Sherwood".

No. 17 GF.

I was told that smuggling took place in our town. They say that seeing is believing. I decided to see for myself, if the fact was true. The sun was just coming from behind a large cloud. A boat slipped noiselessly along the quay-side. All was quiet. In the view of the morning I leaned over the bridge and could see the figures grotesques and black in the water. Now they were taking sacks out of the boat. What did they contain? I could not see. I only knew that they took them into the warehouse which stood close by the quay. Now the sun had risen to its full height, and was sending shafts on to the water. The men were forgotten in my mind. Until I heard again their rough voices breaking the silence of the early morning. They again piled into the boat and rowed away as noiselessly as they had come.
She had been so happy in the morning when she left the house. Now she was back looking drawn and pale. What were we to do? We could not afford a large doctor's bill. They said that there were certain beds kept for people who could not pay the full price. But would there be one for her daughter? The doctor would be here and the eye looked no better. What could they do? The door-bell brought him back to earth, and I laid my daughter gently on the couch. The doctor was admitted and behind him I could see two uniformed men carrying a stretcher. They lifted her as lightly as if she had been a feather, placed her in the stretcher and carried her to the waiting ambulance. I followed leaning heavily on the doctor's arm. The journey was slow and silent. At last we reached the hospital and she had not spoken but as the ambulance came to rest at the door she turned and smiled and said slowly, "I know that I will be better because they are good people who'll take care of me".

No. 19.

My house was sheltered by trees, but to-night I dreamt that the trees were shifting and twisting. The windows had quaint circles round them, and the grass had turned to water. It was lashing up and occasionally it touched the window sills. The wind was high and the trees were blown like feathers in the wind. The sky was grey and threatened a heavy rainstorm. Perhaps that was what wakened me. Because
I woke to find rain beating upon my window-pane in a high wind blowing furiously from the outside.

No. 20.

I came across the old man as he stood under the street lamp. It was late and I was returning from a friend's house. What was he doing at this late hour? I walked past him, wondering what he could be thinking about. Perhaps he was out of work. Perhaps he had nowhere to sleep. The bright lights in the distance seemed to beckon him and once more he coiled his battered coat around him and walked in the direction of the city. Perhaps he would find work tomorrow, but now it was time to go to bed and sleep and forget the day's hardships.
No. 1. M. J. (Unprejudiced).

This is a little boy. He's thinking about a violin. His parents have both been good at the violin. They would like him to be good too. He has other ideas and is not interested. He has been sent to practise and has struggled. At last he put it down on his music. He thinks of the things he might do if his parents were not so set on his being a violinist. He looks as if he were going to run away. He'd probably be sent home again. His parents would probably realize that he had no interest in playing the violin and let him stop; He has a stubborn looking face. Just because his parents were good he sees no reason why he should be good. Other boys of his age do not have to stay in and practise the violin. They could be out playing football or something.

No. 2.

Well, the woman by the tree, she's feeling proud because it's her husband's land and farm. She's proud that he's got such a good farm. She does not see any need why he should change it. She's proud of him. He's strong. She loves the country. He's more practical. Wondering how he's going to get his crops in. His farm is his business. He only looks on the farm as something to make money out of. The girl — she's /
she's been at college in the town, and has come back with new ideas. She has made new friends - a new circle of friends. She's almost ashamed of her parents because they live in the country, because they're farmers. She would like to stay in the town. She wishes they were richer and they could invite her friends without feeling ashamed. She wants a good time and pretty clothes. She'll probably come to realize that there's nothing to be ashamed of. Her parents are just as good if not better than the town people.

No. 3 GF.

She's just got a telegram. She's shutting the door. She's shutting the door. She's shutting the front door on the telegram boy. She's sick with fear about what the telegram is going to say. Afraid to open it. She's sure that something is wrong. Her husband might be in China and she's sure it's urgent - she seems to be in her nightdress and it must be urgent if he came at night with the telegram. The end will probably be that after she's got over her first despair she might feel calm enough to open it and face whatever was inside. She's standing quietly and just facing it resolutely. Bad news. Might be her husband who's killed.
The man just got a threatening note and he's determined he's going to follow it up to see what the outcome is even though it's a great risk. The girl is trying to persuade him he should ignore it. He pays no attention at all. She's using all her power to persuade him not to. He's quite determined. He's going to see the thing through. He would not listen to her. He is so irritated by the thought that he is determined to sift it right to the bottom. He carries out his decision. He'd probably rush rashly into the whole thing, accuse openly, make scenes just in the heat of the moment. Probably calm down as quietly as he flew up and let the whole thing drop, and be ashamed to mention that he ever thought of taking it up seriously.

She stays in this house by herself. She's a bit inclined to be harsh and tight-fisted. She's upstairs one night and she hears a noise in her parlour. She comes downstairs and opens the door and sees a man standing in the middle of the floor. She's more angry to find that he's in her precious house than to think that he might be doing damage. Instead of rushing and phoning the police or giving the alarm she just marches into the room and proceeds to give him a long lecture on being in her house. Before
she's started up he just pushes past her and rushes out of the door. She's so absolutely astounded. She'd be so enraged thinking that she never think of the criminal side of it -- more annoyed that he should be in her house at all -- she just sets to put the room to rights, with duster and Hoover and begins to remove any trace of his offending presence in her house.

6 GF.

He looks as though he had said something. She's absolutely shocked. It is a great joke to see that she is shocked. She's sophisticated and he likes to take her down a peg or two. He's leading her on. Making her think that he wants to marry her. She's very much on her dignity. He thinks that she looks rather nice when startled out of her usual sophisticated air. She thinks that he is the most tantalizing man that she's ever met. He's seen her as she really is without her airs and she realizes how stupid she is being so aloof. Probably get married and be happy.

7 GF.

This woman's reading her daughter a story. The girl is interested. She's thinking. All she's thinking is how hard the sofa is. She's getting pushed up to one end, and how terrible her mother looks in that frock. She /
She thinks how she might be enjoying herself by herself. Her mother goes on blissfully unaware that she is not paying the slightest attention. When the mother finishes she comes back to earth and thanks the mother very sweetly and tells her how much she has enjoyed the story.

8 GF.

She's an artist and she's just had word that one of her pictures has just been accepted. This is almost too good to be true. This is above her wildest ambitions. She sits there and dreams about it all. All she could do. All she's going to do. Before this she's been always struggling and hoping that she'll get her chance one day and now that it's come she doesn't quite know what to do. She becomes famous. Lots of people buy her pictures. She's rich and doesn't need to think where the next penny will come from. She never quite forgets her first feeling when her picture was first accepted.

9 GF.

The girl in the tree - well she's a maid at the hotel. The girl in the evening frock and shoes is staying at the hotel. She's jealous of her. She has plenty of money and beautiful clothes. She hates her and one day when she's off duty in the evening she's been sitting in a tree reading when this girl comes out of the hotel, in evening frock from a dance, and runs along the sands. She thinks she'll /
she'll follow her out of curiosity. The girl who is the maid thinks that perhaps now she can get revenge on this girl. She hopes that she might be able to injure her in some way. Cripple her or disfigure her for life. She runs along behind her. The girl in the evening frock never notices her. The maid follows the girl in the frock to the cliffs and she's so madly jealous of her that she makes up on her and pushes her over. She has no sooner done it than she realizes what she's done. She throws herself over after her.

No. 10.

They're married. Got a grown up family. All of the family are away from home. Feeling both individually that they are rather unwanted. Because their children are married and have families of her own. They've realized that even though all their children are gone and they don't need them any more that they still need each other. .... One of them might have had bad news. Instead of thinking that they had to bear it alone they find the other surprisingly kind, sympathetic, and understanding. They just lived on as they had always done before and they were close because they both realized that they needed each other.

No. 11.

It suggests a drunkard's nightmare. He sees himself flat on the ground surrounded on one side by impassable cliffs /
cliffs and jagged rocks and yawning beside him a bottomless pit. Does not know how he got there. There seems to be a bridge. Doesn't know how to get over it. He's fighting his way along a bridge desperately. Doesn't seem to be making any progress. Only seems to be getting nearer and nearer to the precipice. All around him he sees strange shapes. Thick black clouds hover and hideous beasts' necks outstretched, seem to be coming to him out of the blackest parts of it. He struggles vainly along the ledge. Jagged obstacles rise to meet him. The ledge seems to become narrower.

No. 12.

He was old when he returned to his childhood home. His first place to visit was down to the old stream that ran at the foot of the garden. The first thing he saw was the old boat in which he and his brothers and sisters had played when young. It lay there as though it had just been left the day before by the children. Under an aged cherry tree surrounded by grass. He remembered it had first been brightly painted and ably managed by the children themselves. He remembered the excursions, typing up the boat in some shady place while they ate their tea. But all he saw was the aged boat, leaky, worm-eaten, with only faint traces of its former colour, its benches broken and its tackle lost.
No. 13. G.

She was very young and she determined that one day she would be famous. The idea appealed to her and she thought about it all day. At night she had a curious dream. She was going up a "card" staircase, twisting and turning. Part of it was in bright light, the other parts could only be seen dimly. She seemed to be going up slowly but surely. Those parts in the sunlight were past quickly; those in the shadow took longer. Often she thought she had almost reached the top - she rounded a corner only to find herself as though back where she started. She struggled on. Encouraged by the bright patches. Always looking up; never back.

No. 14.

Ever since he was a child he had distrusted the dark. He had always been afraid that the darkness might forget to go and would remain forever. Even when he was grown up he would sometimes open the shutters in the windows at night just to make sure that he would have the pleasure of flinging them open in the morning and letting daylight flood in. He loved to stand at the window just before sunrise and watch the sun appearing over the top of the hills spreading its rays over the world, even though he had seen it hundreds of times. There was always the breathless suspense in case the sun would not come over and the thrill when it did.
No. 15.

Just because he liked to walk along the cemetery and read the inscriptions on the tombstones he was always afraid that people might think him morbid. At night he would lie awake thinking that the people would picture him as a kind of human Death, gloating over the tombstones. He could almost see himself there calling out with hideous pleasure the names on the many tombstones that surrounded him. Always he looked the same in his nightmares. Straggling hair over his ears, old-fashioned frock-coat, bony hands. His eyes - sockets in an otherwise pale face.

No. 16.

It's a cold wintry day. The entire background is grim castle walls. Huge black ravens croak, and flock about them. Almost dwarfed by the size of these walls the crowd of people is not laughing and joyous but grim and silent. There is a space in the middle of them -- a space avoided as if Death were there - Death will be there. High gallows rear their gaunt sides to the sky. The rickety platform creaks. A procession is seen entering the square. First come the priests, clutching their flapping robes. They are followed by the soldiers, between whom walks a young girl, calm, dignified. Behind her stalks the hideous black figure of the headsman, bearing aloft his grim warrant of office, the axe. He is followed at respectful distance by a crowd of weeping women. All related to or intimate friends of the girl who walks serenely in front. She is Lady Jane Grey, and this is the day of her execution.
This was a favourite place to stand on the bridge. Up there the sun shone on her and she watched the happenings below in the role of a mere curious onlooker. She always felt detached as though she had no part in it - the daily life that went on beneath the bridge. Though she knew she must return to it sooner or later. From the bridge quite a different aspect was noted. She watched the men at their daily task with interest rather than with the thought (practical thought) that if they worked more quickly two ships would be unloaded instead of one, and that there would be more bread on the table. Upon the bridge things never seem quite real. The sun was shining and she saw things that from the world under the bridge she could never see because people had no time to see the sun shine there.

No. 18.GF.

The whole attitude -- the whole lot is brutish. The whole attitude -- the set of the mouth. Fumbling with her hands. Dress - rough shape and design. Even her hair is cut raggedly. She (the other) looks so helpless - not the kind that you would like to help - it's yielding Helplessness. Her attitude suggests surrender (contemptuous tones) - not doing anything for herself. She's just limp and uninteresting like a rag doll. They look like two neighbours in a tenement. The staircase is like a tenement stair. (Sneering) They're just
just as easy to fly into a temper as they are to be borne
down if anyone appresses them. A petty quarrel. The
other -- probably the one who is getting the worst of the
argument lost her temper. The other shakes as a dog
would shake a rat. They are so childish they'd probably
end up by not speaking to each other for a week. To them
this is quite a serious incident. But it's only because
their intellect doesn't amount to much. If they had more
intelligence they would realize how funny the look and how
stupid. (The whole account given in very contemptuous
tones).

No. 19.

He had been frustrated. The only thing he could
find to console him was reading. He had even tried to
picture in his imagination the stories from books --
always something to prevent him from completing the
picture. His favourite picture has always been David
Copperfield. A favourite part in it was the story of the
people who lived in an upturned boat. The whole idea of
it fascinated him. Even in his dreams there was always
something preventing him from just getting to the place
he wanted. He could always see the little house --- but
always a raging torrent between him and it. Fantastic
shapes rose behind it. It was always just unattainable.
It began to frighten him to think of it.
No. 20.

It was midnight. He was walking home. Nobody else was about. It was so quiet that it seemed as though nobody else had ever been about. There was a light haziness in the air and the lights looked through it as though through wool. It was cold - no wind. The whole atmosphere was tense as though it was waiting for something. He felt as though it was almost sacrilege that his feet should make the slightest noise. He began to wonder if it was really him that was walking there. He was sure that he wasn't dreaming. The silence began to oppress him. He jumped even if his own coat rustled. "He had the strange feeling that he was walking the world as a ghost, as an onlooker and the feeling became so intense that it relieved him as he walked under a street lamp to find that he was still there as material as ever."
No. 1. M.W. (Unprejudiced)

A young boy is contemplating a violin which rests on a table in front of him. This little boy has been to a concert and he's come home feeling very keen on violin music because he has just heard a great violinist. Father has allowed him to have lessons. After the first lesson it is not as wonderful as it might have been. This piece of music is his first piece. It is so simple compared with what he has heard. After this he may practice or give it up as a bad job. Rather sceptical at the moment. What could I do? He seems rather a thoughtful little boy. Perhaps goes and tells one of his parents. Perhaps his mother. Perhaps she has confronted him. On Saturday he goes to a concert. Gets inspiration from hearing great players. Longs for the day when he'll be really good himself. He may love the beauty and shininess of new violin. Perhaps likes thought of glitter and publicity if he could play. Might in his mind feel that people might respect him more. That he wasn't just that little so-so-so in the form below. But I think perhaps at the moment he may just be dreaming of all the glitter he may have later as he thinks of this violin which may bring him fame.

No. 2.

Country scene in the foreground is a young woman with in her hand; in the background a man is working in the fields and an older woman is looking on.

In /
In this picture the girl in the foreground appears to be rather bitter. She's gazing at a little boy behind her. Another young girl of about her own age is slightly behind her. The former is carrying books and looks as if she might be a student. In her eyes there's a look of almost mild bitterness and her mouth looks a little contemptuous perhaps. The girl behind her has rather a sweet face and appears to be very happy. She is looking at a man who is ploughing. He is probably her husband and she is bearing his child. The student on the other hand probably feels some resentment because she is not in the same happy state but cannot bring herself to feel that she is missing anything. They may be sisters but I do not think it is likely. They are completely different in dress apart from anything else. It may be that the scholastic tendencies of one girl have perhaps brought her up to the times. But it seems strange that the girl with the books should be seen in such a strange setting, the field and country background generally. Shall we say that perhaps her parents are simple country folk who would not let her have an education. She has tried to do as she may with the books she could get hold of. She's quite young. Her hair is still in plaits. She has sensitive hands. I don't think she'd ever take part in any hard work or manual labour. Well, this scholarly girl may eventually through hard work and sheer determination achieve some of her
her ambitions. The sweet-faced young woman in the background should have a happy life, I think, with her strong young husband and though she may not have any particular social aspirations, I think perhaps on the whole the more thwarted girl may through sheer determination become something more outstanding.

No. 3 GF.

A young woman is standing with downcast head, her face covered with her right hand. Her left arm is stretched forward against a wooden door.

Well, this girl is called Joan. She's quite young about seventeen. Until quite recently she lived very happily with parents and had had a comparatively sheltered life. Unfortunately she is rather selfish and though she fully realizes this she feels she can't do anything about it. One day she being a very generous girl, really, wanted to give a present to one of her friends. She had no pocket money, and so she went and took, say, a pair of stockings from a drawer of her mother, as a gift for her friend. Her mother always having been very sweet to her did not find out about this for some time. One day Joan came home and found Mother sad. Although obviously deeply hurt, she was very kind to her. She did not scold. Was not violent. Did not ask her what she had done. Just seemed very deeply wounded. Joan, after being with her for some time became so moved that she could not /
not stay any longer with her. Outside she had to stop. She burst into tears there, covering her face with her hand while she leant against the door. Later, Joan went and said she was sorry and apologized to her mother, and being very tender-hearted she cried again bitterly. Said how sorry she was. She would do anything rather than hurt her dear mother. Led by this lesson Joan has since had a very happy life, because she realized that it wasn't everything to look big and generous. Not outward appearances which count most. What matters is the things you are yourself without assuming good appearances.

No. 4.

A woman is clutching the shoulders of a man whose face and body are averted as if he were trying to pull away from her.

The setting of this is a theatre. It is outside a dressing-room door. Inside the dressing-room one of the girls of the chorus is changing. One of her companions has gone outside to talk to a man whom she's been going about with. He has discovered something about her, perhaps about her past that he does not like. Rather a violent scene has taken place. Now rather a stony indifference on his part. He has been greatly deceived and is greatly cut up about it. He is withstanding the shock with every muscle tense. The attractive young woman with whom he had been so friendly has been raise and now /
now sees just how far she may have been mistaken. She's trying to lure him back again with sweet words and caresses. She's not a very nice type of girl, not merely because she is in the chorus and on the stage. Nothing bad in that. She has a feline expression, and a rather sensuous mouth. That rather catty expression is enhanced by her nails which are long and sharply pointed, giving almost the impression of claws. Against the glitter of the stage and all the noise of backstage, rushing feet, glare of lights this scene is not very unusual for on the stage and in stage life, so many poles apart come together for a short time and then are parted again. This meeting was one of these brief encounters. The girl could only live the stage life alone. The young man being of a totally different calibre is strong and later he makes a name for himself not in a big way but by sticking to his principles. (Higher). The girl's life will go on, an ever changing kaleidoscope but never with anything in it that really matters because one feels that she is not one of the sincere artistes of the stage.

No. 5.

A middle-aged woman is standing on the threshold of a half-opened door looking into a room.

This is the sitting room of a very homely suburban house. Life there goes on in much the same way day after day. The lady we see looking through the door has /
has to cope with all the cares and worries of the household alone. It is a house where not a great deal of money comes in nowadays. Before the war they must have been comfortably off. Cares have aged her, and though she may not have really changed to her overworked husband she is perhaps not quite the charming young woman he once knew. All the same it is with great horror that one day she opens the sitting-room door and finds inside her one loving and devoted husband with the flashy young secretary who's lately come into his office. Stark reality stares her in the face now. She sees perhaps what she may seem to him and how different she is from this bit of New World nonsense. (said in very sarcastic tones), seated in her sitting-room. A sickly feeling of uncertainty has overwhelmed her now. Does she come in and make a scene or does she retire unnoticed to nurse her grief alone? She's not a strong person, though of somewhat domineering nature at times and so she takes the latter course. She continues to live happily, well, not quite happily, now with her husband until she feels that she can bear the strain of harbouring this secret no longer. Amid denials and excuses she remains cold having steeled herself for this moment and proposes the breaking up of their once-happy home. She is granted a divorce, and now an old and bowed woman, she stays alone, living in the past before that day when she learned of her husband's abuse of her trust.
A young woman sitting on the edge of a sofa looks back over her shoulder at an older man with a pipe in his mouth who seems to be addressing her.

Mary is the young secretary of a large steel company. She is married and her husband is a traveller with a firm of grain merchants. Recently she has had a new supervisor younger than the former, to whom she has become rather attracted. A very great friend of her husband's, Jack, also works in the same firm as she does. One evening, invited over for coffee he surprises her alone in the lounge. In an agreeable humorous vein he twits her about her good-looking young boss, but is rather amazed at the look of horror which dawns on her face. Has someone surprised her secret? Jack is really considerate and being fond of his friend is not likely to tell of his wife's infatuation. The matter rests and on the surface all appears quite happy. Jack alone knows of the storm within the young wife. This case is a fortunate among many less so. The young couple are enabled to leave town by the death of an uncle who leaves them quite a substantial allowance per year. No longer is the wife forced to work and the husband finds a job where he can stay at home. Thus this marriage was saved from ultimate collapse by death, usually the bearer of sorrow but in this /
this case that of joy. For not only were the young couple once more united but the conscience of an old friend was eased and put at rest and a friendship saved, for had the affair continued he would have felt bound to tell the husband and so would undoubtedly have lost a friend.

No. 7. M.F. An older woman is sitting on a sofa close beside a girl, speaking or reading to her. The girl, who holds a doll in her lap, is looking away.

Every afternoon the little girl's mother would tell her a story. I could see them from my window opposite. One day I saw them in their usual position, Mother with child affectionately seated close as the usual tale continued. But the little girl's face wore an expression of faraway amazement. Her doll lay neglected in her linked hands and her mind seemed far away in palaces with princes and princesses richly clad, or perhaps she herself was among the fairest of all, being borne away on some white charger by a knight-errant. Or again, she might be in some fairyland drinking out of acorn cups or playing with the rabbits on the grass. Her mother appears oblivious of the child's serene dreaminess and reads on, eyes intent on book, but who knows how long this little girl may live in this paradise. At night, when she is in bed, just before she drops off to sleep, her last thoughts may be on the story that she heard that afternoon. Most children live very much /
much in dreams, when they are swinging in the trees, or rushing about playing in the fields, and it is only as they grow older, when they reach the prosaic age of school, that dreams and fairy stories at Mother's knee have to be banished from mind. Even in school, however, some children continue to be dreamers and the little lass here looks as if she might be one of these. Perhaps she will not be a great athlete, but more interested in the tales of history and living in the lives of those who have come many years before. Perhaps she will make her name by writing stories such as she heard when she was a little girl, to be read by other mothers to their children.

No. 8 GF.
A young woman sits with her chin in her hand looking off into space.

In the studio it grew unbearably warm. The little model, kneeling, half-sitting on a chair gazed thoughtfully out of the window. Lulled to sleep or semi-sleep by the buzzing of the flies over the remains of the meal, by the scrape of palette knife against palette, and the soft sound of the brush over the hard canvas. In her nostrils was the scent of oil paint, of linseed oil and turpentine. Those implements without which no artist calls himself artist./
artist. Behind her is the plain wall. Her graceful form is set off and the pale oval of her face surrounded by dark hair but tell nothing of her strange thoughts, as she sits there perhaps uncomfortable and cramped. She must show nothing of it to the painter. Nor must she move an inch, lest rude epithets and perhaps even empty paint pots be hurled at her. On many occasions before sad scenes had been witnessed in this same studio by the pensive girl. Skilled artists are not always the most amiable people to work for, and though when business is kind she may enjoy days of rest and joy, there are times when money is scarce and model as well as artist suffer. Thoughts of all the things of the past crowd through her brain as she sits there in this studio where so many hours she has spent weary and trying times. But reflecting on them would she have missed any of it? Have given up any of the painful precious moments for a drabber but more secure life? No! For in the life of an artist's model, only the model alone can know what real achievement can be obtained from a success due in part to one's own effort. The girl may model all her life. As she ages, sitting for the character sketches needed in drawing the graciousness of court scenes, where aged duchesses smirk behind fans or for the character sketches for an old woman, perhaps of the brave women who stand at every /
every corner. On the other hand, she may tire of the glamorous-for-a-time job and seek fortunes elsewhere, perhaps trying the stage or perhaps marrying. Whichever path in life she takes, she will, I think, look on with the same serenity of countenance with which in our picture she looks on the artist's studio.

No. 9 CF.

How often do we see in glaring headlines 'Sensational Escape on the Riviera' or 'Fatal drowning while on holiday'? Who knows what tragic incident may be behind these glaring letters? It's about one of these that this picture tells.

Two friends were staying on the Riviera and having a happy holiday. One evening, due to the warmth of the climate after dinner they went down to the beach. The way led down a steep slope, where palm trees brushed hair, and little stones roll from under high heels. The tide was nearly in when they went down and all hope of a walk along the shore was given up on seeing it. The foremost of the two girls suddenly gazing along at the sharp cliffs saw the tragic sight of a human body floating in on the surf. With what horror did she view it? How could she know that it was her own brother? Her friend, less moved by the spectacle, followed her and it was only later, when they arrived back at the hotel, after having had no walk, needless to say, that it was discovered whose the body really was. The bereaved sister was heartbroken, but the friend accepted matters more stoically. Behind the headlines /
headlines of the death lay yet another of these tragic tales. Though the friend recovered quite readily from the rather harrowing experience, the unfortunate, highly-strung sister had the misfortune to become involved in rather shaky dealings and upset by the outcome of these and by the death of her brother the unfortunate girl's reason went.

No. 10.
A young woman's head against a man's shoulder.

Clare and John were two young people who had the misfortune of rather unhappy homes behind them when they met at the age of sixteen, while still at school. For three years they had a happy and loving friendship and though pressed by John's parents who were firmly opposed to having anything to do with Clare they continued to remain friends until the age of 21, when with hardly a penny in the world they married. Clare was a girl of very deep emotions. When she had first met John at school she had been smitten by the wistful loneliness of his face. During their years of friendship a deep bond had sprung up between these two and only the few friends who witnessed this friendship can tell how deep a bond it was. It was an unhappy situation for Clare who had finished her training as a teacher when they married alone supported them. John had yet to undergo three years of his training. On the day when they married and the vows were sworn these two young people /
people were together in the firelight that evening. In each other's arms they vowed eternal friendship and love, and that each would stand by the other. This is depicted by the picture. These young faces lighted by the firelight are as yet untroubled by the cares of the world. Later, however, having gone through many hardships together their faces may be more lined but still between them will exist the bond which grew up between them at school.

No. 11.

A road skirting a deep chasm between high cliffs. On the road in the distance are obscure figures. Protruding from the rocky wall on one side is the long head and neck of a dragon.

Once upon a time there was a very wicked goblin. He lived in the depths of the Tyrol and spent his making himself a general nuisance. Now at the same time living in that land was a very kindly land-owner and the peasants all knew him as the good Graf. He knew all about the wicked little goblin and how he made himself a nuisance to all the people. And so he determined to punish him. This was not very easy for the Graf was just a human and the goblin was able to change himself into all sorts of shapes because he had magic powers. However, the Graf was not going to be put off. He worried about this day and night, and one night when he was asleep in bed he had the /
the strangest dream. He dreamt that he was led out of bed by someone he could not see. Still following this mystic guide he went through the great halls of his castle, down through the kitchens and eventually found himself in the deepest dungeons. There were rings in the walls all round the dungeon for this is where his prisoners or prisoners of former days had been kept. Led by the unseen power he went round each of the rings in turn and pulled. When he came to the last nothing so far having happened suddenly there was a grinding noise and in his amazement he nearly tumbled into the hole in the floor which had just appeared at his feet. A weird sort of echoing voice seemed to come from this hole and there were groans and shrieks and a smell of brimstone. Then in the midst of all this he heard a faraway voice. The voice seemed to tell him that this was the way to the destruction of the goblin. On hearing this the Graf suddenly woke to reality, and found himself still in bed and in no murky cellar. Next day inspired by his dream he went down to his deepest cellar and did as he had done in the dream. Just as it happened the great slab of stone moved off disclosing a hole. Rather timorously he lowered himself into the hole feeling with his feet for footholds in the clammy rock. He seemed to climb down for miles until at last he found himself standing on a narrow ledge. Before him heaps of crumbling /
crumbling rock. High cliffs rose on either side and smoke filled the air. While taking this in it was with horror that he saw a reptile-like creature emerging from a hole half way up one of the cliffs and coming upon him with great force. He made a rush towards a sort of bridge which led to the other cliff-face. Now he was being pursued by other animals, grotesque creatures which at last he felt forced to turn and fight. Almost forced into the dry ravine he managed to kill them and only the reptiles which was undoubtedly the goblin himself remained to be defeated. It was a weary man who at length endeavoured to climb back up the steep cliff, his mission accomplished, and in that country now the peasants no longer live in fear of the goblin, all due to the good Graf's courage.

No. 12 BG.

A rowboat is drawn up on the bank of a woodland stream. There are no human figures in the picture.

John lay in bed. He had measles. He felt most disgusted with life. Only that day he and his friends had planned to go to a place commonly known as the Wilderness, but which to them was simply Paradise. It was a place of greens. Willow trees bend down to touch the water of the stream which flows through it. The fruit trees would be in bloom, he thought, and he could almost feel the warm sun and hear the buzzing of the bees. Lulled to sleep by these thoughts /
thoughts he was in the old boat which had met shipwreck many times. He seemed to be just floating aimlessly along the stream until he came to the little wood very like the one he knew so well but then he fancied he could see unknown people lurking behind the trees. He got out of the boat and fearfully crept along the tall grasses. Suddenly something rushed from beneath his feet. He leapt back and the sound of swishing grasses came to his ears from the other side. Terrified he started to run not knowing or caring where he went. At last he came into a wide open space. Cool green moss carpeted it and to his amazement groups of young people of about his own age but dressed oh so differently were clustering round some archery butts at one end of the sward. These children were dressed in the stiff brocades of hundreds of years ago, and as they chattered and moved about plumes waved and jewels gleamed. He approached these now and was hailed with amazement. He joined in their sports and after being royally treated for many hours regretfully bade them farewell. Once more he is back in Paradise. The old boat is on the bank where it was before. As he awakes with a start he realizes that what he thought was the sun's warmth on his back is just a hot water bottle.

No. 13 G.

A little girl is climbing a winding flight of stairs.

Mrs. Munns was a char. Day in, day out she spent her time /
time washing dirty office steps. Hundreds of them, grimy with the feet of office boys and business men. She usually ate her lunch at eleven in the park and one day she was there as usual enjoying a very tasty sandwich when suddenly her head felt heavy and she fell asleep. In her sleep, perhaps due to her cheesy sandwich, she had a nightmare. She was climbing stairs and as soon as she reached the top where there seemed to be a simply wonderful meal prepared, still more stairs appeared. They curved and twisted and as she struggled manfully on, leaning on the handrail she thought of the many times when she had gone up other stairs and how she had been annoyed then. But they at least had come to an end. At last the stairs came to a dead end. Nothing pleasant in sight now and she stood there thinking of the best way to get down again. While she stood thinking a pole slanting out from the stair caught her eye. The most improbable things happen in dreams and certainly did here. For Mrs. Munns sat down on the pole and started to slide down towards the end of it. Things seemed to be unending in this place. For though she slid until her poor seat felt very uncomfortable she did not appear to get anywhere. At last in despair she started to cry. As she happened to have her tongue out her tears tasted like her very recent cup of tea. Sad to say just as she was about to enjoy a few more tears she awoke to discover that one of the
the little urchins of the district had most certainly been enjoying her lunch and the real tea.

No. 14.

Far up the wall of the theatre just beside the scenery hoist was a window, a narrow window which looked out over the theatre. From the wings if anyone had bothered to go and look, could be seen the whole of the auditorium. While on one side there was a blaze of light in the theatre on the other it was black as night for lights were not considered necessary where the scenery hoist was. The hoist was a great scaffolding of iron tubes and bars. At the top two great wheels clanked and squeaked and there were great drums round which coiled the cables which loomed over the whole. It was impossible for anyone to get up to this window or so old Mac the head scene-shifter thought. But one day as he was watching carefully a piece of scenery being raised to the fly-galley his eyes were caught by the beam of light shining through the window, from the crowded house. Imagine his horror, seeing the figure silhouetted against it. Far above his head and quite oblivious of the sensation he was creating was a youth. Mac did not like to call out as was his first impulse, lest the youth should fall down but as he scratched his head in perplexity the agile figure stood up and stiffening seemed to fall into the air, and without apparent effort glided through a maze of ropes and pulleys back stage to an open fanlight through which /
which with a mocking laugh at the benumbed Mac he soared and disappeared into the thick fog which was enveloping the town. Many weeks later Mac was going up in the hoist when he happened to glance at the window. Thinking of his experience of the week before he glanced at the narrow ledge barely wide enough for a bird to sit on and as he mused his eye caught sight of the smallest particle of feather and fine from its parent material. The surly Scot was startled out of his usual calm for who could possibly have put the feather and material up there? Later, telling his mates about this uncanny experience one of them said that it must have been Apollo come down to grace the theatre named after him with his presence. In the cold light of day that seems absurd but it was the easiest answer. It saved unnecessary thought. He received it with a grunt and the matter was forgotten in all the tumult of the arrival of a new show.

No. 15.

He looks like Scrooge. He stood in the midst of the tombstones, a gaunt figure, in full-skirted black coat with wisps of grey hair hanging lankly to his upturned collar. His bony hands were clasped before him in a pose almost of prayer. All around him were these shapeless white stones. Here and there a cross broke the monotony of the stark tablets but these passed unnoticed as he stood wrapped in thought. What thoughts can course through a man's mind in a cemetery in the dark of evening. All are not like these which coursing through his brain are the workings and stirrings of remorse. He had killed all these people around him, so his thoughts seemed to say. All his fault—his fault. For the man, though no murdered had in fact been /
been instrumental in the death of these people whose souls stood around. One night in the early years of the first World War, when lights were all supposed to be dimmed, blinds drawn and not a glimmer to be seen, he, an old set man, refused to obey, the commands of the rather brusque policeman and left lit all the lights in his house. He left his windows uncovered. That night the zeppelins came over and the next morning only he remained alive of the happy little community in which he had lived for so many years. He was unmarried, had no children, no relations upon whom he could bring shame by his deed, and though reviled by all he continued to live in his almost wrecked house, an embittered man speaking to no one. This had gone on for many, many months and now he had come to see the memorial of his dastardly act. Why had he done it? He had no particular political inhibitions (?) It was as if something had entered him that was not himself and now he stood in the dark, cold cemetery there rushed on him all the feelings of compunction which should have come so many months ago.

No. 16. Blank Card.

Amid costumes, greasepaint, and all the paraphernalia associated with the stage wits a youngish and very harassed-looking /
looking produced. For the time being the room in which she is sitting is empty but not many minutes ago members of her cast were rushing in and imploring for just a little more powder or a safety pin 'for goodness' sake' and they were flying out again in hot haste lest they should be late for the stage. She was thinking over the events of the morning. One of those hectic days when nothing went right. The scenery which had been quite docile the day before and at the dress rehearsal absolutely refused to stand upright and added to that the young scene-shifter had quite different ideas as to where it should be put. The faces of the youthful actors has perspired so freely that coated with greasepaint they looked like cooks in the hottest kitchen. Hair had refused to stay in place and her own 'kirby' grips had gone to aid in the coiffures of others, to the sad disarray of her own. Wrapped in these thoughts it was disconcerting to say the least of it to be rudely disturbed once more by demands to 'stick on my beard again'. At last this gallant blade whose beard refused to stay in place was off, and a burst of clapping proclaimed that the curtain had rolled up as far as the moth-eaten curtain could be said to roll up. With hands tightly clasped she sits waiting to hear of the success or failure of her juvenile cast. Thoughts of costumes and make-up /
make-up crowd through her brain and she did hope that the audience would not knock over the pot-plants banking each side of the stage. A final burst of applause breaks in on these thoughts and it is with a sigh that she is unwillingly dragged from her peaceful room to receive a bouquet of roses amid the throng of shiny young actors. But even the shiny faces do not worry her now. The reception given by the audience, combined with the attractive flowers have done everything to restore her composure, when once more she sits in the dressing-room which all too soon will be a class-room once more, removing beards now all too firmly fixed and unpinning all the fineries of the mock court.

No. 17 GF.

The black keel of the coal barge grated softly on the shingle as it drew into the pier, by the side of the tall warehouse. The water lay black struck only here and there by the cautious sun's rays. Black clouds banked overhead and partly obscured the sun as urged on by the threats and curse of the foreman, grimy men hauled the sacks from the depths of the barge and took them into the shed. On the bridge just beyond the warehouse a girl stood gazing into the black waters. Perhaps she was waiting for one of these young men who after taking in his load would join her and with whom she would go to the local cinema if it rained as the lowering clouds threatened. Nobody knew, least of all the girl, what the /
the tall smooth walled building was really for and had she done so I fear that the pleasures of the cinema would have been given up and the pleasure of male company, for these men carrying the coal though they did not know it, were part of a great underground movement. The tall buildings so conveniently near by the river hid arms and the coal was used for melting down coins and any other articles which might be used in their black warfare. All round the district men were posted who by stealing and perhaps by honest means could obtain materials and firearms or explosives and who by night would bring them to this gaunt sentry by the bridge.

18 GF.

Murder is no uncommon thing, but if anyone had told one of the two mouse-like sisters who lived in the pleasant suburbs of an industrial town that she would commit murder no one would have been more mocking than she and yet after many years of happy life together it was this very mocking in the elder sister's mind that drove her to kill her sister. It was not premeditated, oh no! But years of living together, seeing few or no friends, just living in each other's lives had got on the nerves of both and at last one day after many bitter words arising from the desire of the younger to go to a play which was in town, the
the moment came when the hands of her sister gripped her throat. The gentle pressure became tighter and tighter until with a gentle thud the slight body fell helpless to the end of the stairs. The actual opportunity had come when coming out of the kitchen the embittered middle-aged woman had caught her sister, younger than she and more attractive as she slipped on the bottom step of the stairs. It was not difficult then for these hands to slip from shoulder to throat and for the steady pressure to bring death.

No. 19.

Everything has wings. Everything has wings? said my brother. Yes. But only in my mind. Oh! Tripet; he answered. You going off? Yes, I'm going to play cricket now. I wish the ball would have wings. But I thought of his remark when he had left me. And then I could see before me the crests of the waves sprouting white wings and clouds having black sinister ones. All seemed to be bowing before some invisible force, their wings all bending the one way. Rocks were rising from the sea where my little winged waves were playing. Though these did not have wings they seemed to be human. Two great eyes peered at me. Shadows marked out a grotesque face. This head as I had seen it had a chimney. Behind the chin and far away, I think behind the /
the head, were some of these jagged rocks, forbidding but they had eyes too powerful - eyes that could see me far away. The black clouds rushed through the sky. They seemed to thrust out long arms as they went, and propelled themselves by these. Water, rocks, and clouds - they all seemed to merge into one mass whirling violently round with a pair of great eyes in the middle.

No. 20.

The dimly illumined figure of a man (or woman) in the dead of night leaning against a lamp post.

In the Rue d'Alsace the gendarme stood leaning against the lamp post. It was pitch black night and the cold air made him shiver and put his hands in his pockets. Above him the lamp gave off a warm glow shining up to the sky like a beacon and the lights of Paris twinkled at from near at hand and far away. They seemed to be watching him but as he dismissed the thought from his mind as being absurd he thought of another occasion when at night while on duty he had fallen asleep leaning against another very similar lamp post. He had been awakened by a comrade who had taunted him saying that with all the eyes of Paris on him he should not do such a thing. With the memory of this in his mind as fresh as if it had been yesterday, he looked round him with a start realizing how near he had been to falling /
falling asleep, as on that previous occasion, and seeing these lights twinkling at him as though enjoying his discomfiture, -- in the cold the lights were really very sharp. He stamped his feet as he stood there and felt that he couldn't possibly fall asleep on a night like this. Nevertheless, early the next morning a business man on his way to catch an early train came upon a scarlet heap beneath a lamp post. It was the gendarme who despite the eyes of Paris had once more fallen asleep on duty.
No. 1.  C.F. (Prejudiced).

He's making some music for a violin which he is going to play in an orchestra the following week. He's going to play a solo part in the concert. He's the youngest in the orchestra. He has just got a new violin. He's thinking about the concert, wondering if he's going to have good luck with his new violin. He's feeling a bit nervous. Both his parents have given him some encouragement. If he does well he is going to have an outing to the seaside. The night of the concert comes. His turn comes. He has lost all his nervousness. He plays right through, without a hitch. He's congratulated by his parents and he's taken to the seaside. He is also thinking how he's going to like it.

No. 2.

They are thinking about the future - how the crops are going to grow. They are looking at the landscape. They are thinking how they will get on in life in the future. The farmer's just got a new horse and he is taking it out. He's going to keep it all his life. He's wondering if they are going to get hot weather or good crops. His wife and he hope to have their dreams come true and they will live happily. They are thinking how their daughter is getting on at nursing. They are thinking: "Is she going to pass her exams well?" Everybody will be all right. They are going to get on in the future.
He's just gone out of his mind and tried to wound one of his friends. He's disgusted with himself for doing such a thing. He's owned up about it. His friend is not badly wounded and getting better. He was given the gun by someone. He's just owned up to his parents who have forgiven. It would have been kept in his mind all his life. He will live happily ever after. He will be friends with the one who had the accident. They will live the same length of time and die happily at the same time. He throws the gun into the river and destroys it and he will never do it again. It's a poor home and he hasn't much. He managed to save up by doing odd jobs.

They are in a cafe. A man's given them a note that they'll be murdered at midnight. He's trying to get away to catch his friend. She won't let him or he'll get into trouble. He now decides to pack up and go away to a foreign country together and forget about it. He'll work on a rubber plantation and they'll own a hotel, and they'll find some British there and they're very happy. They make great friends with negroes on the plantation. They have never had any trouble on the plantation. They have been praised for their work. They teach the negroes about the plantation.
plantation, and they build a church where they worship on Sundays and they become missionaries to teach the negroes, and they pass away happily. They die naturally, both at the same time when they're very old. The girl in the background is the girl's friend. She's a dancer. A party has been interrupted. She's wondering what they're saying and if there will be a tragedy. She thinks it better not to ask questions, but leave it to them, and not to bother them.

No. 5.

The woman's just come in after hearing someone in her husband's study. There is a lot of money there. They're saving it up. She doesn't want it stolen. She doesn't want her property damaged. She finds someone at the safe trying to take it away and instead of running away she gags him and gets a doctor to see his injuries because she hit him on the head with a stick. He's taken away in a car. Nothing has been stolen. Nothing is damaged except the safe, slightly. She doesn't want to tell her husband. He finds the footprints. She forgets about the trouble forever and they have no more trouble. They are glad to know it was only a young chap trying it for fun and he has stopped it for good. She hopes that her flowers have not been ruined or anything damaged. She has good furniture. She finds her jewellery has been left alone. She also finds that there is a trapdoor under the carpet and she manages to fill it up and close it. It is one of her best rooms and has hardly ever been used except on special occasions.
No. 6 BM.

The young man's going away and his mother doesn't want him to do so. She's wondering why he's leaving home so early. She'll have no one else to help her. She wonders if she can come to see him and she'll have no one to talk to - it's such a lonely spot. He's wondering if he should cancel the taxi to the station. He's going over to France as a reporter. He phones up and cancels everything. He goes back home. They live happily ever after. He gets married and his mother lives with him to a good age. They use his mother's house and the other generations keep it tidy and as nice as they did - not making it a slum place. They didn't spoil the appearance. They hope they won't make it lowish. Their thoughts come quite all right. Their life is as they want it to be. When they are dead they think of their children - of how they are keeping it. They want it to be kept plain.

No. 7. BM.

The father and his son are at a cricket match. His son has never been to one before, and his father is telling him the history of the game, and the different expressions used. He doesn't know that his son is to be a famous cricketer before his father dies. He thinks of his young days sitting beside his father not knowing that he would be famous /
famous one day. He wonders what his father thinks as watches him. He hopes that his father will die happily and remember the time when he was young. The young man turns out to be a great athlete. A memorial will be put up when he dies. He is just absorbing all his father tells him. He doesn't know that his father was a professional. He wonders how his father has so many pictures in the house. The father did not want his son to tell people. He wanted privacy. He didn't want too much public to come in. It was a good thing because if he told it his son would get all the bother. The son was a quiet type. He lived the same life as his father and passed away happily, a natural death.

No. 8. B.M.

The man has just been wounded and his friends are examining him to get out the bullet. He sees a vision of himself as a schoolboy. It is the eighteen hundreds. The dress is old-fashioned. They hadn't invented how to cure diseases and extract bullets. He dies and they think how stupid they have been and wish they had taken him to experts. They throw away the rifle. They cannot get it out of their minds. They think how he would have got on. He would have been cured and lived happily. He has just died by carelessness. The wound did not heal. It lay open. They are thinking if they had /
had just minded their own business he might have been cured by someone else. By someone else who knew the job. He had been trying to shoot a seal and someone had pushed him and the bullet had slipped and struck him. He was kept from slipping overboard. They couldn't keep their balance steadily on the slippery floor because the ship was on stormy seas. They flung themselves overboard to drown. It is all forgotten. Everybody forgets it. No one asked about it.

No. 9 B.M.

The troops have just finished a battle. They are resting in a field. They are trying to cool down. They are not allowed to take off their uniforms. It is in Flanders during the last war 1914-1918. They are British troops and half their comrades have been injured and they hope the war will soon be over and they hope they can spend their leisure the way they want it. They don't like being cramped up. When they get up they will feel cramped and loosen themselves and just as they get up they hear the war is finished. They race off to the hospital to see their friends. They dance and are quite gay and they manage to get a hospital ship. They are singing on hospital ship. Everyone flocks down to the quayside to meet them. They thought /
thought the war was horrible and that they would never have another one. They didn't know they would have to fight again. War ruins half the population. They hoped there won't be another and they don't know why it came about. They are glad they had better equipment and were in the war with better trained troops. They are glad to get it over. They just want to live their ordinary lives.

No. 10.

They are just going to be tried for suspected murder. The wife's seeing her husband off. She doesn't believe he did it and how they ever thought he had done it. After a few days of the trial, he is found not guilty. He goes to her and tells her the news and they go out to the theatre. They are able to help the police to find the real murderer. The real murderer was a foreigner the police had been looking for since the last war. He was a traitor. He was responsible for a train disaster. He was hanged and the others lived happily ever after and just died a natural death and it was all forgotten.

T.A.T. No. 11.

One day I decided to go up some mountains that I had seen the day before to see what was in them. After walking a few hours I found myself in huge mountains on every side and caves. I did not know what was in them. I decided to go /
go and explore them. The first one had nothing in it. The second had a little more interest in it. It had been used as a home for young snakes, where mothers come to lay their babies, and when they had come out of their old skins. The floor was covered with all kinds of skins of snakes and bits of skin lying about. I picked up one of each and started to go to the next cave. Before I could get in the heat was so intense that I just couldn't get into the cave, so I went on to another one and inside there was a noise of hissing going on— the sound that snakes usually make. I found some skeletons of men lying around. In one cave one big flying dragon with its wings spread out ran to cover itself. Before I could get near to observe more closely the monster had risen up and begun chasing me out of the cave. Fortunately there was a small path up the side of the cave. I managed to climb up above the entrance of the cave and wait until the dragon had gone. Then I went further up to the other caves. Next I decided it was too late to do any more. I decided to go back home. Just as I was coming in the gate I tripped over a root and I awoke and found myself lying on the bedroom floor none the worse of my dream.

No. 12 BG.

One day I decided to go a picnic into the jungle with friends but we discovered on the map that there was
a river going up so we decided to hire a boat for use. At dinner time we were all set to go. We packed our stuff into the back of the boat and started off. We called on a friend further up the river and borrowed his outboard motor to use if we were in danger (chased by some animal or something). After about half an hour's rowing up the river we came to a secluded spot sheltered by high trees on each side with an opening to the river. We then hauled the boat up on to the grass where the water couldn't get it. We spread our ground sheets on the grass and started tree climbing. We left one chap in charge of the boat and other stuff while we went tree-climbing nearby. We had also brought some revolvers with us in case we needed them, if we wanted to get away. We did not need them at all. After an enjoyable afternoon in the heat of the tropics we packed up and went home. On the way down we managed to kill an otter trying to attack the boat. We took it home and skinned it. Before we did anything else we wrote that day up in our diaries, so that we wouldn't forget it.

13 B.

On tour in Canada one day with a Youth Organization party we were passing a small village where we had dinner and had a look round, and just as I was going back to the bus I saw this little boy sitting at the door of his house probably thinking what he would do when he grew up. We gave him some chocolate and asked him if he would sit for a photo. He said he would and I took it, just before the bus was /
was leaving and when I got home I took it to the developing shop and asked them to enlarge it and this is the photo I took. I now send air mail letters about once a month to this wee boy and he replies in the same way. I hope soon to ask him to come down and stay with me some day. I don't think he will forget that day I was at the village. He was just a humble village boy and he hardly ever wore shoes or socks. Just lived a humble life.

No. 14.

One night when I was sleeping in bed I noticed that a window across the road that was not usually open was open and I decided to see what they were doing. In case of being seen I kept my light off and went over to the window. I did not know that someone behind was watching me but they couldn't make out my appearance because I just seemed to be a shape carved from the wall of the room and not a living human being at all. All the time I had just been able to see him after glancing around very slowly. I lowered myself from the window sill and on to the floor. He hadn't noticed this movement as I had done it very slowly and he was too late to notice that I had gone, before I had him on the ground gagged and bound. Later on I discovered that he'd been trying to rob the money from a safe across the road and it was he who opened the window. I handed him over to the police, and went back to bed none the worse of my disturbance.
No. 15.

One night I was walking through the grounds of a church and I discovered it was the graveyard and after walking for a few minutes I came across what seemed to me like a man risen from the grave and so cold that he was just standing there like a rock. I could not see his eyes but he had a very thin chin and high cheek bones. His eyebrows were high and he was completely bald except for some hair down the side. He had a funny kind of coat which spread out at the bottom and he seemed to be worshipping a god or someone in a grave below him. The first thing I did after having one look at this chap was to clear out in case he started to go mad. I've nearly forgotten that night, and I hope that I'll forget it forever for I've never seen such a ragged looking man like him in my life. The grave stones seemed to me as if they had been put in the ground. Other people like him because they were not placed in rows but wherever they could find a space for one. It really seems as if it were a contractor's yard for keeping stones of whatever kind they were. I don't suppose they knew how to keep a graveyard in those days.

No. 16.

The picture that I think would be in this is a car lying at the bottom of a gorge and over the gorge would be a bridge with part of the side knocked down. One day I was walking /
walking to a friend's house and I happened to be passing this bridge when I saw the bricks scattered all over the road and when I looked over the bridge I saw down below what looked like a tiny speck but was really a car which had probably skidded on the road and gone over the parapet. I hurried as fast as I could to the friend's house and found he had a telephone which I managed to use and I connected the nearest garage to get a break-down to come. Instead of spending the afternoon having tea I was helping to get the car to the top. It seemed to me a very short time but when I looked at my watch it was really ten o'clock, and after seeing that the car was safely back on the road I said good-bye to my friends and hoped the people in the car were all right. I asked them to write and tell me if they were all right.

No. 17 BM.

Several notices had been posted up on the boards outside the windows saying that there was a circus coming to the village. An old hall which had been out of use for some time seemed to be appearing in a fresh coat of paint. I went over and broke in the door and inside I found some people whom I took to be circus people practising for the show. There was one man just about directly above me, half way up the rope and looking through the window at the view over the houses. Without warning he /
he drooped down and just about hit me in the back of the neck but I managed to jump aside. He asked me if I would like to come along every day and if I'd like to help in the preparations for the circus and help to put up the tent. I said I would. I said good-bye. I went home to tea. Every day I went along to help. After they sold - I still remember that day and other days before when I helped to get the circus ready.

18 B.M.

I happened to be living in a boarding-house in the country and one morning I heard a funny noise which seemed to me as if two people were struggling or fighting. I put on my coat and went out of the door. Looking through window I saw a man as white as a sheet getting his coat on. Two hats appeared over the back of his shoulders. I couldn't see his whole face. It was turned sideways, trying to see who his assailant was. I reckoned it was a robber who had been responsible for some robberies lately in the village and I reckoned that this man had been trying to find where the robber stood and where he held his loot and evidently he had just stepped in at the right moment to find the burglar waiting for him. I went and 'phoned police and told them and after a few minutes struggle the robber was safely in chains and the other chap was in bed having a cup of tea, trying to calm himself after his experience of the morning before.
The morning was very dismal after the night before when it has been pouring with rain. All the streets were soaking. Nobody seemed to be coming out to play. I got out a cross-word (No, a jig-saw) puzzle and after a few hours of changing pieces I found the jig-saw to be something I'd never seen in my life before. I couldn't make head nor tail of it. I took a piece of it and put on a card and after that I just bundled the whole thing up. I saw ghosts, monsters, whales, prehistoric monsters coming back to life. I got them out of my mind as soon as possible. I shoved the jig-saw back into the box. In the afternoon the weather seemed to be clearing up and later on I went out to play with my other friends. I told them about the jig-saw puzzle and they asked me to show it to them. They asked me to take it away as they could not bear to look at it.

The scene was in France after the first World War 1914-1918. I was coming from the station at night when I saw this peculiar scene. It seemed to me it was a German soldier or a policeman leaning up against a lamp-post with some light burning on the other side of the street. The only thing I could see of him was an arm, one pocket and his /
his cap. He seemed to have no face and his cap seemed to be stuck in mid-air and he had no side. I waited a few minutes and when it began to grow lighter he was not a policeman at all but just a French civilian leaning up against the lamp post thinking of what the war had been like and how his own comrades had managed.
No. 1.  

G.L. (Prejudiced).

This is a boy. He is thinking about a piece of music he has composed. He is going to try it out on the violin. He's a young composer. He's finding it difficult. He is about eight but he has had lessons. He is going to play the music. It will be a success. It will be a concert in his house. It is a rich house. He is feeling sad because he thinks he can't play the music. He is thinking how he can play it. He's studying his violin.

No. 2.

It has been desolate land by the sea and men are working on it now. A woman is leaning against a tree and thinking what she will grow and what she will do with the money. Her daughter is thinking of her education. She is feeling sad because she can't go to school, because she is not rich enough. It is Poland. The woman's dress makes me think it. It is the poorer working class that they belong to. It is very hard rocky ground. They are ploughing furrows. They may be growing corn or potatoes. It is warm weather. It will be early summer or late spring. It won't be a good crop; it is too near the sea. The girl will go to school. The grandfather dies and leaves the money.

No. 3 BR.

A young girl is in prison. She is angry. She is leaning on a chair or a bench and she is sitting on the floor.
floor. She is unhappy because she wants to get out. She has stolen something. She couldn't help it. She had lost her handbag. She stole a car to get home. She is quite tall with black hair. She is about thirty. She is sorry. She wishes she hadn't done it. She left her handbag in a tramcar. She has two young children at home. Her husband was in the Army. She was frightened they would hurt themselves. The judge will give her a long lecture and fine her. She will be happy because her husband will be home on leave and pay the fine for her. Everyone forgets it.

No. 4.

It is a man and a woman in a room. They have been interrupted. There is a picture on the wall. They are in front of a window. There is a piece of curtain. The man seems angry. The woman seems to be saying: "What is the matter?" The man seems to be hot. The walls are made of wood. They want to go for a walk. The woman is suggesting a walk and the man said "Yes!" They are sitting down, I think. There is a woman sitting down. There is some writing above her. It is a description of the woman's sister. They are on the lookout for this woman because the one in the front does not want her to see the man. She might get jealous. They will go for a walk and she'll meet them. They'll be cornered because they are on a bridge. They manage to slip past. They get married. She - the other one - looks for someone else.
No. 5.

It is an old woman entering her living-room. To the left is a sideboard with book-ends. In front of the sideboard is a table with a lamp and flowers on it. She is quite elderly. She is married and has two daughters. She is looking for someone - one of her daughters. There is a young man at the door. She is not in the room. She'll shut the door and go to the library to see if her daughter is there. She wants to tell her the young man wants her. The young man is the boss's office boy to tell her to report an hour early the next morning. The girl has gone out. She comes in late, but the boy is away. She is late next morning. The mother didn't tell her. The young man never left a message. She got a row. She was told to report early the next morning.

No. 6 PM.

It is an old woman turned away from a young man, crying. There is a message from the Admiralty that her son has been killed on H.M.S. Courageous, a destroyer. The old woman is looking out of the window. The young man feels sad because he does not like to see a woman crying. He is twisting his hat in his hand. The old lady is thinking about her dead son. She can't see properly for tears. She is seeing a ship with the hull sinking. Her son is dead, floating around the ship. Two or three daughters have men alive in the ships. She is thinking /
thinking she won't see her boy any more, and she will be alone in the house because her husband died several years ago. She'll never forget her eldest son's death. Her younger son was in the Army and was killed by a bombed building falling on top of him in Germany.

No. 7 BM.

Here is a middle-aged man talking to his son. The father is looking affectionately at his son. The father's hair is grey and he has a brown moustache. The son has just got the sack and he is wondering what to do next. He's a bank clerk. The father is feeling sorry for his son. He is thinking if his son doesn't get work he is going to get poorer and poorer. The father is retired - too old to work. He is almost blind and a bit deaf. He works about the garden and at home. It's a great shock to him. He got the sack because he was looking at the ledger that should not be looked at. He will apply to the Labour Exchange for another job in a bank. After about two months he gets a job. He has applied and he is waiting for an answer. He goes twice a week to see what they have got.

No. 8 BM.

It is a boy having a vision in Raleigh's day. It is a seaman having an operation. It is a day dream. He is very interested in history. He has had a history lesson about /
about Raleigh and how they didn't have anaesthetics and cut bodies open with a knife. It is a naval doctor operating and Raleigh is looking over his shoulder. In the background is a dead body without an arm. At the end of the arm it has been bound tight with a rope to keep the blood in. The man is in great pain. His face is all twisted up. There is a small window with very small panes of glass. It is daybreak. The dream is taking place at night. He will forget the dream until after the next history lesson. The sea is stormy. The boat is tossing.

No. 9 BN.

It is three men sleeping in a field. They have put their hats on their heads to keep the sun away. One man has just wakened up. He is looking at the other three men. They are very dirty. They have pink lips against their dark faces - dirty faces. They are dreaming about when they will be clean and away from work. One man has just wakened and is wondering where he is and remembering where when he sees his friends. He looks at his watch and discovers that they are late for work. They work in a gold mine. They were searched and they got the sack. It is in South Africa. They got work in a diamond mine this time. They get on all right and stop smoking and drinking their money and settle down. They get farms.

One /
One has a tobacco plantation; the other a banana plantation; and the last has a cattle farm. The one who has a cattle farm has illness among the cattle by tsetse fly. He loses his farm but starts again and then he is quite prosperous the second time.

No. 10.

This is a fisherman and his boat has been wrecked. He is wet and pale. His wife is hugging him now that he is safe. They live in the Outer Hebrides in Scotland. They thank the coastguards and lifeboatmen who dare the elements and go to the men. The fisherman stops in bed for a week to get back his strength and get rid of his cold. He comes back in a month and sells his fish, buys a big boat and starts lobster fishing. He gets enough to buy a trawler and gets his friends to be a crew and they go out to the Atlantic for cod. They sell the cod. He pays his friends and keeps the rest of the money for coal, petrol, tins and stores. He has a week's holiday and gets away again. His son is quite big so the father gets another boat and gives the old one to his son and gets more friends and makes a crew for his son's boat and they go off to the Atlantic. Eventually they get a fleet between them. They retire and carry on the business /
business, employing men to work for them. The father
dies and the son carries on. The son sells his fleet
and buys a whaling ship and comes back with a good
catch. He sells it and gets another ship. The
family stay at home for a month. They soon have plenty
of luxuries in a grand house. They live happily.

No. 11.

This is the top of a cliff. A monster is in a
cave outside of the cliff. It is stretching its long
beak out to catch some birds, on a ledge. The birds
are walking over the bridge to the other side of the
chasm. The monster has got a large mouth with large
teeth in it, and webbed feet. The birds are quite
small with a large tail like a peacock. Three birds
are about to cross the bridge and are half-way over.
I can see nothing but bare rock and a small bridge.
The sun is shining down into the chasm - the rocks cast
great shadows. . . . . makes it eerie. The monster is
making weird noises. Birds are cackling and running
away. Lying about there are many skulls and bones of
dead animals that the master has eaten.

No. 12 BG.

This is a small punt belonging to a man out
hunting in the marsh for wild ducks. It has been
pulled up in some marsh beside a small stream. There
are tall reeds and rushes and many bog plants. A few trees. Very little fish in the stream because the bay throws a lot of mud into it. There are many flies. The boat has got two seats in it. A plank at each end. It's spring time. There's blossom in the trees.

No. 13 B.

It's a log cabin. In summer in Canada. A little boy barefooted is sitting at the door eating an apple. His father's a lumberjack. The mother and his two little brothers are in the wood gathering berries and fuel. His father's down the river sorting out a log jam. The log cabin is of rough bare logs with no garden surrounding - just dust and stones. Quite an old house. The roof's begun to leak, to warp, crack and grow mossy. The little boy's about nine. He has a rough shirt on and dungarees turned up at the legs. He's feeling that he would like to get out and play and get away from watching the house when mother's away. He's thinking what he might be doing if he was out playing.

No. 14.

It's at night and there's a man going through an open window into a lighted room. He's got long hair and a beard. He has very dirty and battered clothes. He's looking for a bed and food. He has no home of his own. He will get up before the others in the house and go away again. He's feeling very down-hearted. He's thinking of /
of what he'll get to eat. He was demobbed from the army and couldn't get a job. He travelled about trying to find a job after leaving London. He was coming up north and stopped at this large country house. He breaks in for food and shelter. He wakes up late and sees the sun shining and hears a dog barking. He hurriedly gets up and puts on his battered clothes. He gets out by the same way as he came in. He travels north again. He just carries on north until it is night. He breaks into another house for food and shelter. He just carries on till he comes to York. Eventually he finds a job there.

No. 15.

It's an old man, very haggard and thin. His cheek bones stand out. He has no hair on the top of his head. He has long hair at the sides. He is dressed in a coat and a pair of old trousers. He has his hands folded in prayer. He is standing before a cross. He's in a graveyard with many graves in it. He's thinking about his dead father who was killed in the Crimean War. His father took great care of him. So he takes great care of his father's grave. He cuts the grass and puts flowers on it. He sees that nobody walks on it and spoils the gravestone. He leaves the grave and goes home and finds
his wife almost dead. Someone had come in and hit her over the head with a poker. He goes for the doctor and takes him back to the house to find his wife dead. He sends the doctor away again and then informs the police. The police come and find out that it was his son who had hit his mother over the head with the poker and had run away with all his money. They searched the neighbouring country-side and could not find him until they found him in a ditch, robbed. He gets his wife and his son buried in different graves beside his father. He keeps them well, too. He keeps them well every day. He puts fresh flowers on them when the others are withered. Eventually he dies of grief himself and gets buried and all four graves lie unattended.

No. 16.

It's on a ranch in Texas. They're having a rodeo there. There are lots of wild horses and cowboys are trying to break them in. They're in an enclosure with a fence round it and a lot of cowboys and cowgirls are watching them. There's a great black stallion which nobody can ride. The mayor of the town is on the platform and he says that anyone can have a go trying to ride this horse. Several people have a try and they all get thrown off. At last this burly blacksmith whose muscles stand out and who has long black hair and bare shirt (no buttons, or collar) and a pair of light trousers /
trousers, boots and leather apron, mounts on this stallion's back, and rides round the enclosure triumphant because he can ride the horse. Everyone cheers him and carries him off the enclosure. He became famous because he could ride the wildest horse in Texas.

No. 17 EM.

It's a young man sliding down a rope. He appears to be of great stature. Brawny arms. Has just fallen off a lift. Taken off his shirt because he's sweating. His hands are ... the skin's off them. All bare. The rope's taken all the skin off them. Just goes down and down and down until he gets to the bottom of the shaft. He climbs out from the shaft. He is taken away to hospital. His hands are bandaged up until the flesh grows back again. New skin is grafted on. Becomes a normal man again. The floor of the lift had fallen out and everyone else had gone down to the bottom of the shaft but he grabbed on to the rope. The rest of the people were killed, and he was the only survivor.

No. 18 EM.

A young man has been grabbed from behind by another man. Just coming from a dark passage. The sunlight has just struck his face. He is shutting his eyes to the sudden light. The man that has grabbed him /
him is a German spy and the spies have found out that he is a messenger from London to the S.S. working in Germany. Try to kidnap him and take the plans from him that he was going to take to Germany. There is a short struggle. He gets kidnapped and taken to an apartment in a flat. He gets tied up and gagged. The men leave him, just coming back at night to feed him. After lying for about a week, he’s taken away in a car through all the back streets of London to the docks. When he gets to the docks he is put on a motor launch, with very powerful but silent motors. He’s taken to Germany up to Hamburg. He is taken down the estuary of the river there and taken off the boat, and dumped on the back of a lorry and taken to Berlin and taken before Hitler and tried. He’s put in a concentration camp. He stays there until the British liberate them after the war. He is set free again. He goes back to see his wife in England. He gets a quiet job as a bank clerk.

No. 19.

It’s a house with a terrific gale blowing round it. It’s blowing the snow over the grass and the water up to smother the house. It’s at night. The windows are lit up. The occupant of the house is snowed up for two or three weeks.
No. 20.

There's a man leaning against a lamp-post at night. It's in London. You can see the lights of many houses flickering in the background. The man's got a hat on. -- and a dark raincoat. The lamp-post sends out a bright glare over the wet pavements. He hasn't got a home, so he just lives in the back streets sleeping where he can by night and working by day. He was crippled and disfigured and none knew him. Therefore, he did not have a home or any relations that recognized him. He goes to a face specialist and gets his face put proper again - the skin is its normal colour - no burns on it. He gets married. Lives in a house to the end
No. 1.  

J. McA. (Prejudiced).

A young boy is practising the violin. Something is wrong. He is trying to find out what has happened. He is young. He is obviously a learner. He might be trying to compose. Obviously his thoughts are in vain. He is supporting his head with his elbows. His hair is long. He needs a hair-cut. He'll take up his violin and start playing. He is sitting on a chair. He has a white shirt. His mouth is closed. It looks as if the string was broken. He is thinking where he can get another one. His sleeves are rolled up or he has a short-sleeved shirt. The background isn't shown.

No. 2.

A farmer is ploughing in a fairly hot land. His wife is leaning against a tree. There is a girl in pigtails. You can see in the background a white house. A girl is holding two books in her hand. There is a tree. It looks like an island or peninsula jutting out. The girl is reading a book and thinking. The farmer has no shirt on. It is a pretty out of the way place. There are few branches. The girl is fairly tall. The farmer seems pretty strong. He is ploughing. Part of the field has been ploughed. The girl's jersey is a bit short in the sleeves for her. It will be a good harvest. I can't think of anything else. The girl has a white collar. They seem pretty angry with each other. It seems as if there /
there is some trouble somewhere. One book is thicker than the other. The girl has black hair. The farmer has curly hair. The girl's holding the books in her right hand. There is nothing more.

No. 3 PM.

The boy's crying. He is lying on the floor and his head is on the couch. He is fairly young. There is a carpet on the floor. He has black hair. He is wearing a pullover. He has black shoes. His head is buried in his arms. The couch is fairly long. I don't know why he is crying. He might have been hit. His mother or somebody has been at him for something. There is something on the floor beside him. I can't make out what it is. It is a poor home. He is a middle-class boy. He is not the sort that cries a lot, or he wouldn't be hiding his head in his hands. He is going to cry it out and forget about it. He has resentful thoughts about when he is older. Perhaps he thinks everybody is against him. It is a sad situation. I don't cry much not unless I'm hurt then I would cry.

No. 4.

The man looks pretty desperate. He has no tie on. Her nails are varnished and she has black hair. There's a lady in the background. They are in the house. It is not/
not a very good house. The lady's got the man in her arms. She's wearing a white blouse. He's wearing a shirt. Some quarrel has taken place. I don't know what. It is some love affair. It was a serious quarrel. She's sorry. He's been raging. His mind's made up. He may go away and leave her. It would be a tragedy, because they like each other. They might be married. They look foreign. They might be American. There is a curtain on the door so that no-one can look in. She's not particularly beautiful. He's grim. He's handsome. He's not the kind of man I'd like to be. He seems too fond of being hard to people. He's too quick to make up his mind. He is thinking about himself, not the girl. He may go off with the girl in the background. She's grinning. She's thin. She may go off with him. It looks like a bit of a movie. It has an American origin. The picture is square. His eyes are hard and harsh.

No. 5.

A woman is looking into a room. In the room there's a table with two leaves for putting up. There's a vase of flowers. There's a small table lamp and a small chest. There's a book-end with one book. Or it will be a bookcase with some books taken out. They haven't been replaced. The door opens in. It seems as if she was calling for someone. She will soon be reading one of the books. The light's on. She wants to get a person out of
the room. There's a design on the polished dresser. It is a small house but it's pretty rich. They are all right with money. They are educated people. They can read. The books have been taken out, and they wouldn't have book-ends if they weren't educated. She looks pretty well dressed. She's pretty old. She looks like somebody's mother. She has a natural expression. She might be French. She looks like a French person - the way her hair is done. She can't be bothered coming into the room. One of her relatives is in the room. If it was a guest she would come into the room. She wouldn't leave a guest alone in the room. She will just come out of the room.

No. 6 EM.

A man is leaving his mother. She's sad to see him go. He's got his hat in his hand. She's crying. It is a bare home. She is looking out of the window. She has a white collar on her dress. She has grey hair. The man's gripping his hat tightly because he's sad to go. He doesn't know what to say. They are foreign nationality, both of them. They look like the ones you see in the mountains. He's a lot taller. He looks British. She doesn't. Perhaps it is not her son. She might be crying because he is dear to her. He's a friend staying with her, a boy who is leaving to go to the University.
University. He looks studious. He's well-dressed. He's thinking what to say. In her there was no thought before of his leaving. They are going to be sad - very sad. They are parting for good.

7 B.M.

The man's old. He's talking to his son. He's got a moustache. He has a collar with a tie. He is giving some advice and the boy is thinking it over. The Man's got grey hair. He looks fairly young. He's shaved. The young man has a cardigan. They are father and son. He's giving advice. His hair's grey. The young man doesn't like the advice. He says it in his looks. The father is waiting for an answer. It might be a financial quarrel. It looks a family affair. The young man has blackish hair. The son will take the advice because he doesn't want his father to be cross. He's not the defiant type. He is an office worker, perhaps. They'll be friends. It is a temporary disagreement.

No. 8 B.M.

He's been to a picture. He's got his air-gun. He's thinking of murder. He's going to murder someone, or he is wishing to be a doctor and thinking of different ways of operation. The room's very poorly lighted. It is a very dirty place. There's a danger of germs. That looks /
looks like a mallet. It looks as if they were going to hit him on the head. The boy is young. He was probably at the pictures and is dreaming about it. He's a schoolboy. It is a dream. It's a daydream because he is dressed. There's a window in the background. It's a bedroom window or a dormer window. His mind is straying from his work. He'll probably be wakened up with a piece of chalk. He wants to become a doctor. He will, or perhaps it is only a thought.

No. 9 EN.

Lazy workers or sunbathers. They are using their hats to keep the sun off their eyes. They look pretty gruff. They might be drunk and sleeping it off, on the grass. One's opened his jerkin. His hand's on his belt. They are fairly young. They are not very high class. They might be Germans. They are in a fatigue squad to build a road. They might be Italians. They don't look British. They are not cleanly shaven. They won't get their work done. They will get their pay. They get very little if they are Italians. They get twopence halfpenny a day - or something like it. They won't have very bad consequences. They just won't get their pay. In Britain there's no flogging for laziness.

No. 10.

A girl is in love with a man. Something must have happened. /
happened. He's asked her to marry him. There's emotion. They are fairly young. He's not handsome. The man's hugging the woman. The man's got his eyes shut. It isn't a beautiful picture. You don't see much. They are thinking of each other. They will marry each other. It will be a pretty successful married life. They seem to like each other.

T.A.T. No. 11.

It looks like a goose or a duck. Looks like in the country among rocks. There's a bridge there. I should think it is windy. Human beings have been around. Looks as if there were birds here. The human beings have been trying to take them away and they are still lying there and the goose is trying to this back. She will get them back. It is very difficult. In the end she succeeds.

No. 12 BG.

Trees, boat, water and grass somewhere in the forest. There is blossom on the trees. It's just a forest with trees in blossom. In the river there is a punt. Somebody's probably been poaching -- trying to get rabbits. They've been chased away by the gamekeeper. They got away in the boat. Looks as if it had been easy for they have drawn up the boat on to the dry land.
No. 13 B.

It's a log-cabin sort of thing. They're pretty poor -- this boy's parents or else he's got on his plain clothes for 'mucking' about in; it's farming country. There's no decent road. It's a pretty rough house. The door's a bit squint. There's a wooden floor. He's thinking "What a place to live in". He's pretty unhappy about ---- His parents do not seem to be there alone. He's thinking of running away. His parents will come home and he will forget about his loneliness. I should think this is the country. He will grow into a lonely man. He'll think about his childhood. Or perhaps he won't be lonely. He would not marry. He would live by himself. He would take up the same job as his father. His mother would be the kind that would neglect him. He might get a lonely job. It would not be a very "educated" job. His father couldn't pay for his education. I'd like to see him happy --- with some company.

No. 14.

It's a boy looking out of a window--- looking at the stars. He wants to see the stars --- out of interest. He's been in bed in his room. Looks like a school-boy.

No. 15.

Gravestones, gravestones and a man. A criminal. He's got handcuffs on his wrists. He has probably murdered /
murdered somebody. He'd probably murder for money. He has murdered another man. Doesn't look as if he's got the money. He has been caught and handcuffed. He's probably escaped. Probably a good hiding-place. He's been caught eventually. Might have been caught, trying to get out of the graveyard. He was trying to hide the money. He was trying to bury it there because it is the most unlikely place for anyone to look.

No. 16.

I see some trees and a swallow flying around. There's nobody on it. I can see a fire-escape on part of the roof of the house right outside there. Nobody doing anything. Not in it myself. I like to picture my parents together. It's a clear picture. Grandpa's got glasses, and a moustache. I see a group of people in a train. They are sitting beside each other. They are both old. Both medium height. They are very happy.

No. 17 EM.

He's climbing the rope. He's in the gym. He's a man. He's got bare feet. He's there to climb the rope. He's fairly old. He's enjoying it. I guess that this is his job. He's probably a gym teacher. He's strong and looks happy.

No. 18 EM.

I see a pair of hands, tie, shirt, coat and jacket. That's all. A man standing up. Somebody else's hands.

The /
The hands are trying to strangle him. He's not resisting.

Going to be strangled till he's dead. No more ideas at all.

No. 19.

Can't make head nor tail of it. Might be a painting by Picasso. I don't like it. Don't like it.

No. 20.

Dan't make anything of it. There's a light in a light-house. There's a street-lamp and a man standing beside it. He's a gangster of some sort. Wants to murder somebody. It might be foggy. I see that the rays of light are magnified. He'll be caught shooting somebody. For no reason at all. Just to get money. He's young. Perhaps how he was ill-treated when he was young. Might have been cruelly treated. Whipped or something like that.
A little boy looks at the violin and thinks it's his violin. Like as if it's a new one and I think he's thinking that when he grows older he'll be able to play it very well. Thinking about some other boys that he knows. He thinks about their having no violin and his having one and he thinks he wished that they would have one and that he'd be beside them with their violins and wouldn't be by himself. He's thinking that he hopes he'll be like some very good violinists. He'll be like them and go on the stage and play to an audience of people. He hopes he'll be liked very well when he can play the violin. Thinks he'll be able to play it very well when he grows a bit older. He has just got it. He is just looking at it after it has come out of the paper. He doesn't know anything about it - how to play it or how to hold it. Thinks that some of his friends have sent the violin. Thinks he's been wanting it for a while.

No. 2.

It's on a farm and there's a man with a horse ploughing the land. There is a field on the side. Two women. One of the women has some books in her hand. The other is leaning against the tree with her arms folded. The one with the books in her hand is the wife of the man who /
who is ploughing. The farm is not very big. There are stones nearby where the women are standing. Thinking about how the crops will grow... about the husband who is ploughing. The other woman seems to be thinking the same. I think that the scene is at the other side of the farm and that there are three huts, where they put the horse and plough and that that's the house and that there's a forest on the left hand side. There are woods and some of the ground is all stony. It can't be ploughed. The man thinks he'll soon be finished ploughing the field with the horse and plough. He thinks he's finished ploughing. He's taking the horse home to its bed and is giving it something to eat. Then he goes to get his own tea. The woman and himself are thinking it would be better to have a bigger farm. They would have a better house, ploughs, crops, and a bigger house. I think that they will get it in the end.

No. 3.BY.

There's a woman sitting on the floor and her head is on a bench against the wall. I think there's a gun at her side. I think that she's shot herself. I think her husband went away from her. She didn't want him to go away and he went. She took a gun and shot herself. I think her husband will come back and he'll find her lying where
where she is now where she shot herself and he'll wish he had never gone away. He'll feel sorry for leaving at the time when he did, and his wife would not have shot herself if he had not gone away. They will marry again and he will not go away the next time they quarrel.

No. 4.

There's a man and a woman in the house. The man is wanting to do something and the woman won't let him. It looks a big house. I think the man has just come home from work. He has had his tea. He wanted to go and see somebody. The woman doesn't want him to go and tries to keep him back. The man has been quarrelling with somebody. The other man has been saying something about him. He wants to go and see the other man about what he has been saying. His wife won't let him. He wants to. He will go afterwards. He goes and sees the man and asks him what he said about him. He tells him that he should not have told anybody that because it was not true. Then he will go back. His wife will ask him where he has been. He tells her that he has seen the other man. I think they'll be happy and the other man won't say anything else. He won't have to go and see him again about anything.
No. 5.

There's a woman at the door. She's opened it and is looking into the door at something, across the room. It is at night because the light is on. There's a bookcase on the wall and three books on the dressing-table and a bowl of flowers on the table where the lamp is. It looks as if she were looking at something or somebody across the room. She is looking at her husband or her children. There might be another woman in the room and she does not like her. She's wanting to send her away and tell her not to come back again. Her husband will be very angry with her and not speak to her for a day or two. He might feel that he doesn't like her just now and wants to see the other woman. In the end he will like the woman at the door and won't bother about the other woman. They'll be happy together.

No. 6 EM.

There's an old woman and a young man in the room. The old woman is looking out of the window. The man is thinking of somebody in the house. Maybe his daughter that he wants to see and something has happened to her. He's waiting to see her but the old woman says that he is not to see her because she doesn't want to see him any more. I think he'll go away home and he'll come back another day and try to see her. He won't be allowed to. He'll feel very unhappy about it. In the end the old woman's daughter will be well again. He would come up again and he would see her. I think that he would marry her and they'd be very happy together in a house of their own.
No. 7 AM.

There's an old man and a young man. The old man is talking to the young man about something. The young man looks awfully sad at what the old man is telling him about. The old man is telling him about somebody that he knows. Someone is very ill and very far away from where the two men are. They are wanting to go and see but they are not awfully sure where they are. I think it is the young man's wife. She has been away on holiday and she has become ill. The woman will recover and she'll come back and the young man will be very happy and the old man will come and see them. He is the young man's father. I think they'll have a big house -- plenty of food and be very happy.

No. 8. AM.

There's two doctors and they're in an operating room. There's a light shining in the unconscious man. There's a young boy standing at the side. The old doctor and the young one are operating on the man who I think was shot in the side. The surgeons are cutting around trying to get the bullet out. The rifle is at the side. The young boy tried to shoot but somehow by mistake the man walked into the room and by mistake the bullet went into him instead. I think he's feeling that it was his fault that the bullet went into him ---- his father. The surgeons will get the bullet out. The man will get well again. Be able to get up. I think the /
the father will be grateful to his son for taking him to the surgeons who took the bullet out. There will be nothing else wrong with him. He will be able to go home and his son will be very happy that his father has recovered.

No. 9 BM.

This is the harvest time and the men are lying in the straw or grass because it's a holiday and the sun is shining. They have just finished working. It's about dinner time. They are lying in the sun. They will have to work again soon afterwards. Most of them are sleeping except one. I think that they're thinking about their homes, children and wives. Wondering if they'll get a better job. Get more money for food and clothing. I think that in the end what they are thinking will come true and they will help to get in all the corn and wheat.

No. 10.

There's a man and a woman. The woman seems to be sad. Because the man, I think, is going somewhere. He is kissing her good-bye. She hopes he'll soon come back. He'll have an accident which will stop him from going where he was going. But he soon recovers. He becomes well. He carries on with his journey. He does the work that he wanted to do, and then he'll come back home again and his wife will be very pleased that he recovered from his accident.
accident. She asked if he got on all right where he was. She asked him what he had been doing. He said he had been away to see about a job, which he wanted. He got the job. It was a very good one. They got a big house, plenty of food. I think they'll be very happy.

T.A.T. No. 11.

It's a very wet place, like a waterfall. There are birds at the side of a rock and I think a duck coming out of a hole in the rock, beside big stones and water splashing up off rock where the birds are; the rock is fine and smooth except for grooves where the duck come out and a small ledge and a steep ledge down the side. There has been a lot of rain running down through the cracks in the rock and stones into a small river at the bottom. I think the birds are drinking water and the ducks are coming out to get water to drink or something to eat. It will come out —— when the water slows up after most of the rain has run down —— there will only be enough for the birds to drink out of. There is a small bird at the side of the father and mother bird. —— It's bathing in the water and flapping about. When all the water is dried up it will be a steep rock with a stone at the bottom and a ledge where the birds can sit and drink and a hole where the duck can come out of.
I think it was winter just before this. There are no leaves and blossoms on the trees and there is a small boat beside the river. The river was covered with ice and they could not sail the boat. After that the snow came down and it covered all the grass and the trees. There is snow on the boat and on the sides. There are trees beside the water. Laden with snow that is pulling them down. There's a hill with snow at the top and side of it. The boat's been pulled in at the side of the river and left there. Bushes go right down beside the water's edge. Some dip into the water as it rushes past. All the trees are laden with snow and the bushes too. The trees in the wood --- some are tall --- taller than the others. The other trees have hardly any leaves except at the top. I think it would be lovely when the sun was shining on the snow. In the spring all the trees would be in blossom, and go down to the river. We'd see all the green grass beside the river and up the slope. The trees would have branches and leaves clustered on them. The reeds would be all green. The bushes would get all their leaves and stand upright as they did before. I think it is snowing at the time of this scene. It's been snowing through the night and has been coming down heavily and has covered all the branches and is making the river bigger as it flows along. It would end by the snow all melting and spring coming back and buds coming out on the trees and the man and the woman who came for the boat would sail down the river.
No. 13 B.

It's a wooden hut and the little boy is sitting on the doorstep and watching other little boys playing further along. I think that the hut has been roughly made and it is dark inside and has no window in it. It is very dirty outside. The hut is not safe. It is going to fall very shortly, and there's no door and it seems that it is on a plank or stone. There's nothing to be seen but the boy sitting on the doorstep. Has no shoes on. He has his finger in his mouth. It looks as if there had been rain or something. The house has been flooded. The sun has come out. The house is falling. The wood is all falling. He may be thinking about his father and mother. He wants to play with the other little boys and girls and have fun with them. The father and mother come home. They get the house patched up and a door on it. They put windows and glass in the house. And the little boy would get good clothes and be allowed to play with the other little boys. He thinks he would like to be in a bigger and better house than he'd got. He's very lonely and has nothing to do. The sun is very bright and is making shadows. He's been in the dirt. He was brought back to stay there. He'll be allowed to play again with the other little boys... and not just sit and watch ... be allowed to play with them. I think he's had an accident. He must have fallen, and hit his head somewhere. There is dirt on his face.
I think it's at night and I think it's a man and he has opened the window and is looking at the sky or the house across the road or the stars where the moon is shining. He'll be thinking what it will be like on the moon, and thinking of somebody else that he knows and who has had an accident and been hurt and wonders if they'll get well and be able to see him again. He's in his room. It is dark inside except for the window. He is like a black shadow looking at the window. I think that who he is thinking about will come and see him. He may be praying for them. His children. Maybe his children who are away for a good while. He is thinking about what they are doing. He's wondering if they'll come back and if they're thinking of him too. They would soon come back to him and make him happy again. They won't go away again. He'll be happy to be with them. He is just home from his work. He is looking out of the window in his working clothes. The children will come back and he'll be very happy with them. He'll come home and see them and not be lonely by himself. This'll be only one window in the room.... the only one he can look out of. He won't have to worry about the children being away from home when he comes back from work. He'll be able to go to sleep when he wants and not look out of the window.
No. 15.

It's in a churchyard. Lots of tombstones round about. The old man is praying in front of one -- a cross. There are people in the background beside other stones. They're praying as well. He's very old and is thinking of who's dead and is wishing to be beside them too. He has got his hands clasped together. He is praying hard for them and is standing in front of the stone. I think that he's very thin. You can see the bones in his hand. He's very frail. I think it's been in the wartime. Some of his relatives have been killed and been brought to be buried and he has come to pray. I think that he himself will die and be buried in the same place as his relatives. Some of his relatives will come and pray for him. He'll be happy with his friends and won't have to worry any more. He's thinking about how he felt when he and his friend were young ....... when he saw him before the war. Now he cannot see him any more. He is lonely. He stays by himself. He visits the cemetery every day. He prays very hard. He is wondering what his friend is doing and would like to be with him and stay with him.
No. 16.

I can see two sides of cricket teams and they are on each side of the field. There are two batsmen walking to be bowled. One's marking where he was. He is looking to find an empty space for the ball. He is all set getting ready to bowl. He runs toward the field and then bowls. He put on the block first. The bowlers throw back a ball. The bowler ran and bowled again and the batsman got the ball in the middle of the bat. The bowler bowled fast. The ball hit the middle stump. The batsman walked off. The batsman next him took his place. He asked the umpire for a guard and stood ready for the bowler. Bowler went back and bowled again. He tipped it and got one run. The bowler bowled the last ball down. The other batsman hit it for one. The end of the first over ....... Continues rapidly and fluently in this vein. The other side won by about twenty runs. That's all.

No. 17.

He's training in a gym and is climbing up a rope; he's got sandals on. He's thinking of his children and his wife at home. He is training to go into the army or the services. He's been a boxer or a wrestler and this is his training; for a fight or a match. He is thinking of what his opponent will be like and is wondering if he will be /
be short or tall. He's thinking that many people will be watching him as he fights and if he'll win or lose. He is hoping that he will win. I think that he will come into the ring and see his opponent - a big, strong man and he'll think that he'll lose. The other man will win a little and he'll make up for it. He'll overpower his opponent. His wife will be there watching him wrestling or boxing. Watching to see if he is going to win. In the end he'll overpower his opponent and knock him out. He wasn't very well off. He was going to box in the ring to get money to clothe and get food for his children, his wife and himself. He did that just to get money to help them.

He's fighting with somebody and out in the wet. The rain is going against him. It's on his face and coat. He's been knocked down and hurt and is holding on to a rail or something. There's a man behind him. He is holding up in case he falls. He'll be taken to his home and get his clothes dried and may be taken to hospital, if anything serious is wrong. The man behind may be a policeman. He is taking him home to his wife. I think he's got his eyes closed. He's groping along by the side. It is dark. There's only a light shining on his coat or his jacket; and his face and the hands behind. His head is facing the side. His mouth is about closed. He's thinking of where he had been and of the car which knocked him over. Thinking about where /
where it is just now. He feels sad and lonely. He was thinking of something. He walked out into the road and a car ran him over. Thinking about where he was and what he had been doing and how he had to get home because he was giddy and the rain was pouring down his face.

No. 19.

It is some sort of rock and there is water dashing against it. There are two caves in the side of the rock. It seems to be shadows. Water running over the top. There has been a storm. I think that there was ice over the rock and it's melted and it's leaving black marks where it melted and the rest is ice not melted. It's all running down inside. When all the ice is melted the rock comes back as it was before the ice got on the sides of it. It will end up when there's water running over the rock where the ice was. It'll cover up all the rock and the rock'll be black and have light patches on it.

No. 20.

It's a dark night. There's only one light shining on it. It's shining on some of the trees, and the path at the foot. The rays are coming from the part where the light is. There is a man leaning against it with a waterproof coat and hat. The light is shining down on him.
It shines on the top of his hat and the ends of his coat. It's been raining and it's misty. He's thinking about where he was and what he was doing and the other people he worked with and he's looking at a tree and thinking of his friends. Wondering if they are on the train that he was on during the day. He's thinking of his wife and children in the house. It may not seem big and not have much light. Their light was not electric light. It was gas. He feels he would like to be in a bigger house with good light, clothes, food, good job, to get more food, clothes for his children. Some day he might get what he was wanting and would not have to work on the train or bus. He's just thinking about what he's going to do. He can do it. He can help others. In the end he'll get a good house, clothes, food, for his wife and children and himself. The house is just a little way up the road from where he stands. He thinks of what they're doing in the house.
### VIII. APPENDICES.

#### CONTINGENCY TABLES 1.

**Relationship between Socio-economic Status and Prejudice Score.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12 upwards.</th>
<th>6-11</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>-2.74</td>
<td>-5.13</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>18.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>29.51</td>
<td>20.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.13</td>
<td>45.97</td>
<td>31.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>-3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>45.82</td>
<td>122.91</td>
<td>85.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(O-E) squared.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2.74</td>
<td>7.29 0.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5.13</td>
<td>9.74 0.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>26.01 3.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1.00 3.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>2.25 3.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>6.25 3.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>23.04 0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>9.00 0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>60.84 3.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>1.69 0.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>20.25 0.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3.25</td>
<td>10.24 0.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.04 1.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>0.81 0.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.49 1.908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Null Hypothesis could not be disproved. There is no significant degree of relationship between prejudice score, and socio-economic status.
### Relationship between Age and Prejudice Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12 upwards.</th>
<th>6-11</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>Scores.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Over 21 years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>-3.28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.741</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18-21 years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
<td>-2.054</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.08</td>
<td>73.054</td>
<td>43.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14-17 years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>-5.52</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>-5.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112.52</td>
<td>315.206</td>
<td>189.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>under and including 13 years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>-5.46</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>21.46</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(0-E) squared. \[(0-E)^2\] squared. 

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
10.627 & 10.63 & 2.24 \\
10.758 & 10.76 & .81 \\
.0004 & .0004 & .00005 \\
4.3264 & 4.3264 & 0.1659 \\
4.2025 & 4.2025 & 0.0575 \\
17.0569 & 17.0569 & 0.3888 \\
30.0704 & 30.0704 & 0.2706 \\
116.4241 & 116.4241 & 0.3693 \\
27.7729 & 27.7729 & 0.1467 \\
\end{array}
\]
Null hypothesis could not be disproved. There is no significant degree of relationship established between Prejudice and Age.
CONTINGENCY TABLES. 3.

Relationship between Sex and Prejudice Score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>12 upwards</th>
<th>6-11</th>
<th>0-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three quantities resulting are:

\[
\frac{1}{155} \times 126 \times 244 - 29 \times 622
\]
\[
\frac{1}{421} \times 314 \times 244 - 107 \times 622
\]
\[
\frac{1}{290} \times 182 \times 244 - 108 \times 622
\]

\[
\frac{1}{155} \times 240484.1
\]
\[
\frac{1}{290} \times 1787523.5
\]
\[
\frac{1}{421} \times 1041554.0
\]

Added, they come to 3069571.6
When divided by \((622 \times 244)\), i.e. by 15168 the answer is 20.4

Therefore, \[ x^2 = 20.4 \]
\( n \) (degrees of freedom) = 2.

For \( n = 2 \) in the tables \( x^2 = 5.991 \). Our calculated value is much greater than this and we may therefore conclude that there is a significant association between Prejudice Score and Sex.
SUMMARY.

Relationship between
(a) Sex and Prejudice Score. \( x^2 = 20.4 \) degrees of freedom being 2, and \( P \) being 0.05.
(b) Socio-economic Status and Prejudice Score. \( x^2 = 9.356 \), degrees of freedom being 8, and \( P \) being 0.34.
(c) Age and Prejudice Score. \( x^2 = 8.3943 \), degrees of freedom being 6, and \( P \) being 0.23.
VIII. APPENDICES.

vi. Diagrams.
GROUPING OF SUBJECTS

ACCORDING TO:

1 SQUARE REPRESENTS 5 SUBJECTS

FIG. 1  SEX.

FIG. 2  RELIGION.

FIG. 3  POLITICAL CONVICTIONS.
FIG. 5. PLACE OF ORIGIN.

FIG. 6. CHURCH ATTENDANCE (SELF).

FIG. 7. CHURCH ATTENDANCE (PARENTS).
FIG. 8. WIRELESS TALKS.

FIG. 9. FILMS (OF OTHER COUNTRIES).

FIG. 10. VISITS (TO OTHER COUNTRIES).
FIG. 11. NATIONALITY.

FIG. 12. TALK ABOUT POLITICS.

FIG. 13. NEWSPAPER READING.
**FIG. 14. NEWSPAPER READING CHOICES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE NEWSPAPER</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CHOICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Evening News</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Daily Express</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Daily Mail</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Scotsman</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sunday Post</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Daily Mirror</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dispatch</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Bulletin</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Daily Record</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Weekly News</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. News of the World</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. News Chronicle</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Daily Herald</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The Dispatch</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. People</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Journal</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Sunday Mail</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Sunday Paper</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Sunday Pictorial</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Glasgow Herald</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Daily Record</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Sunday Express</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Daily Telegraph</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Observer</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Reynolds News</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Sunday Dispatch</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. London Times</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Sunday Graphic</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Glasgow Weekly</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Weekly Scotsman</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Empire News</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Courier</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Daily Worker</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. John Bull</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Sunday Chronicle</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Noon Record</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Daily Graphic</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Dalkeith Square</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Farmer's Weekly</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Forward</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Tribune</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Sketch</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Ailoo Journal</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Sheftland Times</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. W. Latham Gainer</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Loftus's Courier</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Greenwich Telegraph</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Herald of Wales</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Baltimore Express</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. New York Times</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Levinhamb Times</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Evening Times</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Border Telegraph</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>NUMBER OF CHOICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Indies</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaya</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India-China</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermudas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labrador</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far East</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkans</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Java</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIG. 15. INTEREST IN OTHER COUNTRIES.**
SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF PARENTS

1 SQUARE REPRESENTS 1 SUBJECT

GROUPS.  I  II  III  IV  V  UNSTATED

NUMBER OF SUBJECTS.

Professionals, proprietors of large businesses, higher executives.

II Commercial service, clerical service, large land owners, managerial service, business proprietors.

III Artisans, proprietors, petty officials, skilled labourers with some managerial responsibility, small shop owners and business proprietors.

IV Skilled labourers who work for someone else, building trades, transportation trades, manufacturing trades, involving skilled labour, personal service, small shop owners doing their own work.

V Unskilled labourers, common labourers, helpers "hand", peddlers, retired employment, vendors, unemployed (unless it represents the leisured class or retired).
HISTOGRAM SHOWING THE FREQUENCY OF PREJUDICE SCORES.

FIG. 17.
Fig. 18.

**Frequency of Prejudiced Responses.**

Expressed as Percentages

**Fig. 18.**
INTENSITY OF PREJUDICE.

FREQUENCY OF DEGREES OF DISLIKE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEGREE</th>
<th>RUSSIANS</th>
<th>JAPANESE</th>
<th>JEWS</th>
<th>GERMANS</th>
<th>POLES</th>
<th>ITALIANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1380</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>2480</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>2557</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>1491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 19.
TOTAL INTENSITY OF PREJUDICE.
(WEIGHTED FREQUENCIES)
1 SQUARE = 10 FREQUENCIES.

Fig. 20.

**FIG. 20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RUSSIANS JAPANESE JEWS GERMANS POLES ITALIANS
ETHNOCENTRISM - LIKES.

GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION OF CHOICES - NATIONS OR RACES
(ACTUAL AND WEIGHTED CHOICES)
OR INTENSITY (STRENGTH OF THE LIKING)
AND EXTENSITY (SCOPE OR MASS OF THE LIKING)

INTENSITY REPRESENTED AS BLANK SPACES
EXTENSITY " SHADEd "
1 SQUARE = 10 CHOICES.

Fig. 21.

U.S.A. AUSTRALIA CANADA SCOTLAND ENGLAND NZEALAND IRELAND G.BRITAIN GERMANY NEGROES POLES JEWS

FIG. 21
### Comparative Representation of the Unprejudiced Towards Jews, Japanese, Russians

**Showing Their Relationship to Each Other and to the Whole Group as a Background.**

**Jews** | **Japanese** | **Russians** | **The Whole Group**
---|---|---|---
Male | 94 | 111 | 187 | 623
Female | 48 | 30 | 87 | 241
Total | 142 | 143 | 274 | 864

### Place of Origin

**Jews** | **Japanese** | **Russians** | **The Whole Group**
---|---|---|---
**Edinburgh** | 116 | 111 | 199 | 634
**Other Places** | 26 | 32 | 75 | 230
Total | 142 | 143 | 274 | 864

### Socio-Economic Status

**Jews** | **Japanese** | **Russians** | **The Whole Group**
---|---|---|---
I | 14 | 15 | 20 | 55
II | 7 | 5 | 16 | 61
III | 10 | 10 | 23 | 95
IV | 38 | 33 | 75 | 281
V | 48 | 40 | 92 | 254
Unstated | 25 | 30 | 46 | 150
Total | 142 | 143 | 274 | 864

### Nationality

**Jews** | **Japanese** | **Russians** | **The Whole Group**
---|---|---|---
British | 86 | 76 | 133 | 454
Scottish | 46 | 57 | 114 | 367
English | 14 | 6 | 7 | 24
American | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5
Irish | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1
Unstated | 5 | 2 | 8 | 16
Total | 142 | 143 | 274 | 864
### Table: Age Distribution by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>Japa</th>
<th>Hindus</th>
<th>Whole Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table: Political Convictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Conviction</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>Russians</th>
<th>Whole Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish National</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table: Religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>Russians</th>
<th>Whole Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Cat.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figures

FIG. 26: Age Distribution

FIG. 27: Political Convictions

FIG. 28: Religion
WIRELESS TALKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JEWES</th>
<th>JAPANESE</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
<th>THE WHOLE GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELLOM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WIRELESS TALKS - FIG. 33.

FILMS OF OTHER COUNTRIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JEWES</th>
<th>JAPANESE</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
<th>THE WHOLE GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELLOM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FILMS OF OTHER COUNTRIES - FIG. 34.

VISITS TO OTHER COUNTRIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JEWES</th>
<th>JAPANESE</th>
<th>RUSSIAN</th>
<th>THE WHOLE GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VISITS TO OTHER COUNTRIES - FIG. 35.
Break-down of data.
Showing in red the relative position of the
Unprejudiced against Jews.

FIG. 36. SEX.

FIG. 37. PLACE OF ORIGIN.

FIG. 38. SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS.

FIG. 39. NATIONALITY.

FIG. 40. AGE.

FIG. 41. POLITICAL CONVICTIONS.

FIG. 42. RELIGION.
FIG. 43. CHURCH ATTENDANCE (SELF).

FIG. 44. CHURCH ATTENDANCE (PARENTS).

FIG. 45. POLITICAL DISCUSSIONS.

FIG. 46. NEWSPAPER READING.

FIG. 47. WIRELESS TALKS.

FIG. 48. FILMS (OF OTHER COUNTRIES).

FIG. 49. VISITS TO OTHER COUNTRIES.
Break-down of data.

Showing in blue the relative position of the Unprejudiced against Japanese.
FIG. 57. CHURCH ATTENDANCE (SELF).

FIG. 58. CHURCH ATTENDANCE (PARENTS).

FIG. 59. POLITICAL DISCUSSIONS.

FIG. 60. NEWSPAPER READING.

FIG. 61. WIRELESS TALKS.

FIG. 62. FILMS (OF OTHER COUNTRIES).

FIG. 63. VISITS TO OTHER COUNTRIES.
Break-down of data.
Showing in green the relative position of the
Unprejudiced against Russians.
FIG. 71. CHURCH ATTENDANCE (SELF).

FIG. 72. CHURCH ATTENDANCE (PARENTS).

FIG. 73. POLITICAL DISCUSSIONS.

FIG. 74. NEWSPAPER READING.

FIG. 75. WIRELESS TALKS.

FIG. 76. FILMS (OF OTHER COUNTRIES).

FIG. 77. VISITS TO OTHER COUNTRIES.
COGNITIVE ANALYSIS OF BELIEFS.

FAVOURABLE, UNFAVOURABLE AND NEUTRAL TOWARDS JEWS

FIG. 78. FAVOURABLE BELIEFS.

See page 203.

FIG. 79. NEUTRAL BELIEFS.

See page 202.

FIG. 80. UNFAVOURABLE BELIEFS.

See page 201.
COGNITIVE ANALYSIS OF BELIEFS.

FAVOURABLE, UNFAVOURABLE AND NEUTRAL TOWARDS JAPANESE

FIG. 81.

See page 182.

FIG. 82. NEUTRAL BELIEFS.

See page 181.

FIG. 83. UNFAVOURABLE BELIEFS.

See page 180.
COGNITIVE ANALYSIS OF BELIEFS.

FAVOURABLE, UNFAVOURABLE AND NEUTRAL TOWARDS RUSSIANS

See page 227.

FIG. 84. FAVOURABLE BELIEFS.

FIG. 85. NEUTRAL BELIEFS.

FIG. 86. UNFAVOURABLE BELIEFS.

See page 225.
DEGREES OF SOCIAL DISTANCE.
EXPRESSED AS PERCENTAGES.

--- ACCEPTANCE. REJECTION. UNSTATED.

FIG. 87. 1. AMERICANS.

FIG. 88. 2. ENGLISH.

FIG. 89. 3. JEWS.

FIG. 90. 4. FRENCH.

FIG. 91. 5. GERMANS.

FIG. 92. 9. CANADIANS.

FIG. 93. 10. IRISH.

FIG. 94. 11. RUSSIANS.

FIG. 95. 12. JAPANESE.

FIG. 96. 15. POLES.

See pages 176 - 178.
Also section on pages 168 - 175 incl.


DEGREES OF SOCIAL DISTANCE.
EXPRESSED AS PERCENTAGES

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cousin**
LIVE IN SAME HOUSE
(SCHOOL) CHUM.
MEMBER OF MY CLUB
IN MY (SCHOOL) TEAM
(WORK NEXT TO)
SIT NEXT TO IN CLASS
(WORN, IN SAME PLACE)
ATTEND SAME SCHOOL
LIVE IN MY COUNTRY

**Fig. 97.**
18. SCOTSMEN.

**Fig. 100.**
25. CHINESE.

**Fig. 101.**
31. FINNS.

**Fig. 102.**
31. ARABS.

**Fig. 103.**
33. HINDUS.

**Fig. 104.**
34. NEGROES.

**Fig. 105.**
40. AUSTRALIANS.

**Fig. 106.**
45. MUSLIMS.

See pages 176 - 178.
also pages 168 - 175 incl.
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