

pressive contributions of those case analyses is the insight that the ways of managing strivings—the relations between strivings and ego structures—is critical in distinguishing the ethnocentric from the non-ethnocentric. In addition, the articulate conception of both underlying structure and strivings *and* the ego defenses and capacities provides a clear base for comparison of cases—requires their comparison at each level and on each variable.

In the study by Smith, Bruner, and White, the authors also recognize both levels in their theoretical structure. But in the treatment of cases, the distinction seems blurred; the material considered under basic strivings does not remain at the same level across cases. While in one case emphasis is placed on strong underlying dependency needs (although the man manifests a surface autonomy in certain respects), in another case the stress shifts to strivings for independence. One wonders whether we aren't in fact confronting two ways of handling essentially similar core needs. The answer depends on whether the independence striving is viewed as reactive or primary. The authors have settled on the latter view, but a clear discussion of this point is needed to inform the reader of the factors that led to this position.

No such statement is necessary if no comparative statements are to be made about the cases. The few comparative assertions that are made are compelling, but the lines of evidence are not as delineated as they might have been. One also has the feeling that more comparison would have been possible if distinctions among personality levels had been more carefully maintained.

The difference between Sanford's case studies and those in the present book are to a great extent determined by the purposes they serve. While the *Authoritarian Personality* study, with a heavy clinical orientation, relates a rather simply conceived attitudinal structure to a very complex personality analysis, Smith and his colleagues—approaching the task from the opinion term of the relationships—have related a lucidly and extensively analyzed opinion structure to a less articulated personality system. Particularly in the functional analysis, they begin with aspects of

the attitudinal fabric and present personality material which is analogous to or in other ways intimately related to this design.

This procedure, which we can only infer, points to one other hazard the authors faced in this research. When one selects a single opinion area to relate to personal themes, the risk is great that, depending on the level of involvement of different subjects in *this* topic, it will engage more or less personal material from various levels of the personality. The fact that the two long cases of men who hold differentiated attitudes toward Russia are also more interesting in the personal description lends substance to the suspicion that this approach has its special attendant problems—just as do less focussed approaches.

Despite these problems, the book represents a substantial contribution to the study of attitudinal processes. It formulates the important problems immediately ahead in this field, and provides insightful directives to future research. It is exceptionally well written.

ELIZABETH DOUVAN
Survey Research Center
University of Michigan

INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH, UNIVERSITY OF FRANKFURT

Sociologica: Aufsätze, Max Horkheimer zum Sechzigsten Geburtstag Gewidmet. Frankfurt: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1955. 470 pp. 25 Marks.

Gruppen-Experiment: Ein Studienbericht Bearbeitet von Friedrich Pollock. Frankfurt: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1955. 559 pp. plus xvii. 25 Marks.

Betriebsklima: Eine Industriesoziologische Untersuchung aus dem Ruhrgebiet. Frankfurt: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1955. 120 pp. 9.50 Marks.

With the publication of these three volumes, the Institute for Social Research at the University of Frankfurt has inaugurated a series entitled "Frankfurt Contributions to Sociology", under the general editorship of Theodor W. Adorno and Walter Dirks.

Of the three volumes, *Gruppen-Experiment* will probably arouse the greatest interest among social scientists. It reports a study of German political opinion, for which material was gathered during 1950 and 1951 and analyzed by Professor Pollock and his collaborators during the following years. The study makes a number of valuable contributions in at least three fields: the methodology of opinion research by the group discussion method, the state of German political opinion in the postwar years, and the theory of opinion formation.

As defined by Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno in their preface, the purpose of this research was to further the over-all aims of the Frankfurt Institute: namely, to train a new generation of sociologists, to revive the great German theoretical tradition, and to combine this tradition with empirical methods developed in the United States, France, and England. A more specific objective of the group discussion research was to penetrate the surface of public opinion and to make possible scientific judgements about the actual attitudes of characteristic groups of the West German population to political questions.

The problem of penetrating the surface of public opinion is also touched upon by Franz Boehm, who writes a lively introduction. He points out that the work clearly shows the existence of a "non-public" opinion, which exists alongside of public opinion as manifested in elections, public statements and the mass media.

To obtain their data, the Frankfurt Institute assembled 137 small discussion groups, totaling 1800 persons, in several areas of West Germany. All principal elements of the population were represented, although the subjects did not constitute a random sample. To encourage free expression, the discussions took place in informal surroundings, and each participant was given a pseudonym. These groups were then exposed to a recorded stimulus, which purported to be a letter from a sergeant of the Allied occupation army to a newspaper or magazine in his own country. The content of the recorded letter was carefully devised to introduce a number of controversial subjects. After explain-

ing that he had had an opportunity to observe and work with Germans over a period of several years, the sergeant then went on to praise certain aspects of the German character and political life, and to criticize others. For instance, he stated that Germans were still anti-Semitic, and might any day "once again follow a Hitler or a Stalin."

Following presentation of the stimulus, the discussion leader invited comments, using a non-directive approach. The proceedings were recorded, and when transcribed amounted to over 6000 pages. A code for analysis of this material was developed which included 12 main subjects, each of which had an average of 18 content categories subsumed under it.

On the basis of this analysis it was possible to present a rough quantitative classification of material related to the principal subject categories: East (Soviet bloc), USA, England, France, U. S. Occupation, Remilitarization, National Socialism, Concentration Camps, Germans, Jews, Bonn Government, and Form of Government. Expressions under each of the principal categories were classified according to "acceptance," "conditional acceptance," or "rejection". In addition, the attitudes expressed were broken down according to the socio-economic characteristics of the subjects. These were obtained from brief questionnaires which were filled out prior to the discussions. Degree of participation in the discussion was also noted. Altogether, there were 377 participants who said nothing regarding any of the 12 principal subject categories.

The results of this quantitative analysis tended to show in general negative orientation toward western nations, policies and values. For instance, expressions about the United States were made by 33 per cent of the participants. Of these, 17 per cent made favorable statements, 22 per cent were conditionally favorable, and 80 per cent were unfavorable. (Percentages add to more than 100, since some persons made statements falling in more than one category). Strangely enough, attitudes toward the American occupation were slightly less negative. On the subject of the Bonn government, only 13 per cent of those expressing an opinion made favorable statements, 81 per cent made conditional state-

ments, and 34 per cent showed a negative attitude. To balance this picture, it should be noted that attitudes toward the East were still less favorable.

It was also possible to make a number of observations about the attitudes prevailing in various socio-economic groups. Less educated workers and those under 20 years of age showed the most favorable attitudes toward democracy, while the peasants showed the least favorable attitudes. The peasants also showed the greatest sympathy toward Nazi ideology, and not a single one was willing to accept responsibility for the excesses of National Socialism. Indeed the peasants are the villains throughout, although the authors note that the more liberal rural elements were underrepresented in the sample. Classifications showing attitudes and degree of participation by sex, age, education, occupation, and length of military service are presented. No appreciable differences among religious groups were noted.

Approximately 150 pages of the report are devoted to a qualitative treatment of mechanisms for defense against guilt feelings. These pages have a dramatic quality and make fascinating reading. They include extensive quotations from the original transcripts. In one group the participants enjoyed a hearty laugh at the expense of the victims of the Nazi gas chambers. In another group the opinion was advanced that America unleashed Hitler against the Soviet Union with the intention of continuing the fight herself after the Russian power was broken. These are not advanced as typical statements, but only to exemplify the extremes to which efforts to avoid guilt feelings can lead.

The book closes with a description of the course of discussion in a typical group and an analysis of factors tending to promote group integration and disintegration. A number of appendices describe methodological problems, present statistical material, and reproduce portions of a monograph entitled "Aspects of Language."

This massive study makes a number of contributions to social research techniques, only a few of which can be indicated here. Although group discussions have been previously used as a mechanism of opinion

research, this is the most extensive employment of the technique of which the reviewer is aware. Each step of the procedure by which the extensive body of material was gathered and analyzed is carefully described, and will be of assistance in organizing other studies. Freudian depth psychology is extensively used as an analytical tool.

One cannot escape the impression, however, that too much is claimed for the group discussion method of studying opinions. At the start of the volume the author reviews criticisms which have been made of cross-section opinion polls as a tool for political research and—at least by implication—suggests that the method employed here will overcome these. It does overcome some of the difficulties, but also presents some new problems, which are freely admitted. For instance, the social pressure of the discussion group on individual opinions is ably documented. The bias of the stimulus letter is also recognized. Indeed, at various points the author appears to relent from his position of skepticism about quantitative opinion research. One appendix, for instance, contains a list of 57 statements on National Socialism, democracy, guilt, and so on, for possible use in a sample survey, although this listing is prefaced with a caveat about the limitations of opinion polls as a tool for investigating affect-laden ideologies. In addition, the study as originally planned contemplated the submission of questionnaires to the subjects several weeks after participation in discussion groups in order to test the stability of the opinions expressed. For technical reasons this comparison could not be carried out. Similarly, the author levels a number of strictures at quantitative research and at those whose empiricism is so thoroughgoing that it amounts almost to an effort to forbid creative thought. One may agree with many of his criticisms, but still place a high value on quantitative research. The analysis itself, in that it employs both quantitative and qualitative methods, does not demonstrate adherence to such an extreme position as one might expect from some of the preceding theoretical comments.

As an historical document, *Gruppen-Experiment* is a landmark which no person concerned with the postwar develop-

ment of German opinion can afford to ignore. Even though it does not show the quantitative distribution of attitudes throughout the population, it gives the fullest description of the content of various political attitudes which is currently available. The author cautions that attitudes have changed markedly since 1950/51, but many of the psychological phenomena he discusses appear to be so firmly anchored in the personality and the social environment that they will be with us for a long time to come. One should also remember, however, that the preponderance of negative expressions toward symbols of democracy may have been induced in part by the research methods used.

Finally, the analysis throws fascinating sidelights on a large number of questions of interest to social scientists: the process of opinion formation in groups; forces which interfere with the expression of political opinions; factors promoting group integration and disintegration; modes of speech used in political discussions, and so on.

There is a great deal in this book with which readers are likely to take issue. In addition, many will find it unduly wordy. Nevertheless, reading it is a worthwhile experience. The freshness and richness of the material is so great that it has a valuable stimulating effect. The Frankfurt Institute and Professor Pollock have performed a major service in making this analysis available.

The title of the third volume in the Frankfurt Institute series may be freely translated as *Factory Atmosphere—An Investigation in Industrial Sociology in the Ruhr*. It reports on a survey of attitudes toward work and working conditions on the part of employees in five coal and metal working enterprises of the Mannesmann Corporation. The study was directed by Ludwig von Friedeburg, with the cooperation of 14 members of the Frankfurt Institute. Polling was carried out by the Deutsches Institut fuer Volks-umfragen (DIVO) in Frankfurt.

In most respects *Factory Atmosphere* will seem like familiar territory to those who have seen similar surveys of American industrial enterprises. The researchers attempted to locate principal grievances, to gauge job satisfaction, to find out which

factors had the most direct bearing on attitudes toward work, and so on. On the other hand, labor mechanisms which have no counterpart on the American scene, such as co-determination, introduce questions which have not been faced by American organizations concerned with industrial research.

From a methodological point of view this survey is of interest chiefly because it makes use of the group discussion method, as described in the previous volume, to supplement the results from a cross-section poll. Altogether, 55 discussions with a total of 539 participants were conducted, using a recorded conversation between two workers as a stimulus. The content of the discussions is skillfully used to define more clearly a number of points which came up in the survey. For instance, the discussions make clear what is meant by "poor contact with the workers" or "an unsympathetic manner."

The first volume of the series, *Sociologica*, consists of 22 essays in three languages dedicated to Max Horkheimer on the occasion of his 60th birthday. The roster of authors and subjects treated is an eloquent testimonial to the number of distinguished scholars with whom Horkheimer has been associated, and to the wide-ranging research with which he has been identified. In a limited space one can do little more than recite the list of authors and note the general areas covered.

One group of essays is bound together by an interest in (although not necessarily identification with) Freudian psychology. These are papers by Theodor W. Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, Heinrich Meng, and Nevitt Sanford. Franz Neumann and Otto Kirchheimer contribute essays oriented toward political sociology. The papers by Georges Friedmann and Friedrich Pollock are concerned with industrial sociology.

Several of the contributions might be grouped together under the heading of social philosophy. These include the ones by Raymond Aron, Morris Ginsberg, Franco Lombardi, and Leopold von Wiese. Another group shares a concern with art and literature. Here fall the papers by Walter Benjamin, Wilhelm Alff, Leo Lowenthal, and Arnold Hauser. A varied range of subject matter is covered in other papers by Bruno Bettelheim, Hadley Can-

tril, Hans Naumann, Paul Tillich, Allan H. Barton, and Paul F. Lazarsfeld.

The final contribution to the volume is a research report of particular interest to students of current German history. In "Results of Denazification—Its Effect in Small and Middle-Sized Communities of the Three West Zones," Walter Dirks documents the complete failure of the Allied denazification policies in West Germany. In all the places where an investigation was made, no appreciable changes in the communal life had been brought about by denazification. Instead of accomplishing its purpose of democratic reform, denazification left behind it little more than a legacy of bitterness and a tendency to discriminate against those who had attempted to carry it out.

For several years social scientists have been aware that the University of Frankfurt must again be counted among the major centers of social research. These three volumes underline this development. It is to be hoped that they represent the beginning of a long series.

W. PHILLIPS DAVISON
The RAND Corporation

EKIRCH, ARTHUR A., JR.

The Civilian and the Military. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956. xi + 340 pp. \$6.50.

In 1798, Benjamin Rush suggested that over the portals of the War Department there be painted the caption: "An office for butchering the human species." In 1956, the characteristic public image of a large armed force is of an instrument for maintaining peace by its deterrent effect on potential aggressors. Thus has the American anti-militarist tradition succumbed to hot and cold war influences in the view of Professor Ekirch.

His book is an excellent, thorough chronological account of American opinion, pro- and anti-, regarding the place of military organization and military ideas. He describes a constant struggle to avoid militarism in the United States from colonial times to the present. He concludes that we are closer to an acceptance of militarism now than ever before. Particularly good are the chapters on liberal ca-

pitulation to war policies in 1917, on the inter-war struggles to eliminate compulsory military training from the campuses, and on the tendencies toward militarism inherent in the cold war.

There is but one defect I would mention: the author has let his personal anti-militarist position color his judgments of men and events. He avoids the problem of combining an adequate defense force with maintenance of internal freedom by simply deriding as militarists those, such as Elihu Root, whose concern was the improvement of our defense system to protect freedom within the nation. But as a case study of changing public images and the propaganda efforts involved, *The Civilian and the Military* is a valuable contribution on a topic of much current interest.

MICHAEL D. REAGAN
Princeton University

KELLEY, STANLEY, JR.

Professional Public Relations and Political Power. Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1956. 247 pp. \$4.50.

Notwithstanding the realistic descriptions provided by novelists, a scholarly evaluation of political public relations is invaluable. Mr. Kelley has documented the fact that the operations of the professional public relations man "have become a significant influence in processes crucial to democratic government." He devotes one chapter to a summary treatment of business public relations, including the highly developed procedures of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company and the National Association of Manufacturers; such early campaigns as the 1934 defeat of Upton Sinclair for the governorship of California; and the prevention campaign of Wendell Willkie in 1940. Appropriately the history, operations, and tactics of Whittaker & Baxter's CAMPAIGNS, INC. are treated in detail as an example of effective political public relations conducted as a commercial enterprise. This is followed by three case studies, including the Whittaker & Baxter-directed campaign of the American Medical Association to defeat national health insurance; the 1950 Tydings-Butler senatorial campaign in Maryland, directed by