BOOK REVIEWS

by the Army as “secret”; that secrecy held for no less than fifteen years—formal removal of the classification did not occur until November 1966, and it was nearly a year later before actual free access to the Project Clear report was gained. (Apparently, also, some of the original data and analyses have been irretrievably lost or destroyed.) The account by Bogart of the conduct of the study and of its subsequent handling by O.R.O. and the Army gives a fascinating picture of the now almost incredible difficulties of extracting data of great public importance from its bureaucratic imprisonment. The state of “race relations” in the 1950s is perhaps well revealed through reading of the fearful and hostile reactions to the research itself. Although Bogart’s account is not complete and although several major questions of interpretation remain, his naturalistic reporting is in itself a document well worth any sociologist’s attention.

The main body of the book consists of two research reports, written in 1951 and only slightly edited for the present publication. The first reports a field study, conducted in May and June of 1951, of the use of Negro troops in the Korean campaign. Written with a view toward its ultimate use by the Army, the report makes extensive use of quotations from interviews and of simple tables presenting survey findings. The conclusions and recommendations (pp. 182-185) did not hesitate to make evaluative judgments on questions of policy; although consistent with the findings, the recommendations were contrary to the fixed opinions of many high-ranking officers, not to mention many Congressmen. The Korean study emerged with a strong position favoring desegregation and equality of treatment. Receptivity to its findings undoubtedly was heightened by the overriding imperatives of combat effectiveness and the fact of prior “unofficial” desegregation by field commanders in the Korean combat.

Less “sacredness” could be invoked to support the findings and recommendations of the second report, “Part II—The Utilization of Negro Troops in the Continental United States.” Here again, however, the report sought to carry its message to the research consumer by defining its problem as one of “manpower utilization.” Much of the tone of the report undoubtedly will now seem strange, perhaps offensive, to some readers; that this is so is an index of how great has been the change in the prevailing ideologies and actual patterns of black-white relations since 1951. It required the courage of one’s convictions at that time to present as the report’s fifteenth and final conclusion: “Adoption by the Army of a policy of full-scale integration may be expected to produce problems during the transitional period, in certain kinds of situations. . . . There is every reason to believe that these problems can be successfully met by careful planning” (p. 321).

We know that officially-supported segregation in the Army had disappeared before 1955. A massive and socially conservative military Establishment moved much more rapidly to abolish segregation than did any sector of civilian society. How could this have happened? Bogart points to political and ideological influences which would eventually have brought desegregation even had there been no Korean War, but he holds that the prime catalysts were, “. . . the Army’s desperate need for combat manpower and its utter despair over the poor combat performance of [segregated and resentful] all-Negro units” (pp. 11-12). He notes also the unusual scope for drastic change that may be offered under conditions of crisis by an authoritarian “closed system” which must stress obedience and unity in the face of external threat.

How influential was social research in the desegregation of the U.S. Army? Bogart seems to believe that the prior work of the Research Branch under Samuel A. Stouffer was “ignored” by the military leadership (p. 10), and he says that desegregation “. . . would have come about without Project Clear, and perhaps not very differently or very much later” (pp. 6-7). The point can not be settled by evidence, and debate would be even less conclusive. This reviewer believes, however, that the stream of reports and studies from 1942 through 1951 was a modest but tangible factor in the mode and timing of a momentous change in institutional policy. In any case, Social Research and the Desegregation of the U.S. Army is a welcome addition to the documentation of that change.

ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR.
Cornell University


This is not a book on the dynamics of prejudice after the fashion of Allport or Saenger; rather it represents an attempt, growing out of a symposium on "Patterns of American Prejudice" held in March 1968 at the University of California, to analyze and rethink the problems of prejudice and discrimination as they exist in America today. While it does not purport to be a set of guidelines for reduction of prejudice, it does call attention to the fact that such reduction is essential and the greatest promise rests with the major social institutions.

Saunders Redding, in the first essay, looks at new elements in the Negro's struggle to secure his elementary rights, noting that it is the tactic and not the struggle that is new. In spite of rapid advances in many areas, it is the relative deprivation that is the primary dynamic in the continuing struggle. Two proposals for direction are evaluated: a cultural pluralism with solidarity within the minority group, a factor which is largely absent, and compensatory treatment for persons who have been deprived. Redding's approval of both of these strategies does not preclude his assertion that the real solution is an inclusive American
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Community, even if cultural pluralism is a characteristic of that community.

More specific examination of the working of prejudice is seen in other essays. The political institution is examined by Seymour Martin Lipset. Rodney Stark and Charles Y. Glock consider the religious structures to find that the church has been more instrumental in promoting than in alleviating prejudice. M. Brewster Smith discusses how prejudice is handled in the schools while Charles Silberman considers the moral role that the school has played and can play in prejudice reduction. News selection and news reporting affect prejudice and discrimination, as does employment of minority persons in the mass media, according to Dore Schary. The effect of changed hiring standards, training programs, and promotions in industry are examined by Howard J. Samuels.

In the concluding essay, the editors summarize the key problems faced by each institution and call attention to three requirements that these institutions must meet to begin alleviation of the existing situation: commitment to prejudice reduction, plans for institutional action, and resources to implement the plans.

Richard Hatcher, in the Epilogue, looks at the problem from the perspective of those in the ghetto and concludes that neither suppressive measures nor more antiriot laws will still the ghetto voices. Only profound changes in the social order can do this.

The volume brings together many ideas that are widely scattered in the literature. It will prove stimulating and useful to the student of prejudice and to the laymen involved with any of the institutional structures.

DOROTHY E. PITMAN
Georgia College at Milledgeville


This report, released by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders includes three separate studies: “Racial Attitudes in Fifteen American Cities,” by Angus Campbell and Howard Schuman; “Between White and Black—The Faces of American Institutions in the Ghetto,” by Peter H. Rossi, Richard Berk, David P. Boesel, Bettye K. Eidson, and W. Eugene Groves; and “Who Riots? A Study of Participation in the 1967 Riots,” by Robert M. Fogelson and Robert B. Hill. All three of these studies suffer the usual difficulties of survey research (in these instances the in-depth problem is compounded by the fact that the reports seem to have been thrown together and rushed—only the marginal data were used), yet this slim little volume sheds valuable light on a clouded issue. As Americans and sociologists we are frightened (if we have any sense) and uninformed about some things that social scientists should know. These things were given national attention in the Kerner report and the sociological imagination revealed some of its blind spots in our “I told you so” attitude as a profession. As a matter of fact, we had’t told them, so we should turn our attention to studies such as these and the problem of sociological analysis which they invite.

“Racial Attitudes in Fifteen American Cities” is a preliminary report of a survey of white and black attitudes toward, and perceptions of, one another (N = 5,000). Negroes want a positive cultural identity within a pluralistic society; younger but less well-educated Negroes tend to be militant and separatist but (keenly aware of discrimination and hostility), four out of five Negroes interviewed believe it possible to get ahead in spite of prejudice and discrimination.

Among whites, the principles of nondiscrimination are strong (“but not next door to me”); support for nondiscrimination in employment is overwhelming. Negroes report less adequate police protection in their neighborhood (a jejunee conclusion of the kind survey researchers get stuck with); Negroes are more critical of the efforts of government officials to solve urban problems, and of course, are more critical of the prices and quality of goods in neighborhood stores.

The critical question in this study is black and white views on the uses of violence. Negroes do not see the riots as criminal, but rather as protests against real grievances. One-third of the whites take a viewpoint similar to Negroes. Another one-third see a criminal or radical conspiracy at work, and the remainder have mixed views.

Black and white advocates of violence (riot and counterriot) range from 6 to 15 percent of Negroes (8 percent would join a riot). The percentage of whites with a propensity to engage in vigilante activity is 5 percent, young males and poor education characterizing both. It would be easy to dismiss this threat as the derring-do of young cocks. To offset this, there is the sober reminder that more than half of those Negroes who say that they will not join a riot sympathize with the importance and anger of the aims of those who do.

“Between Black and White,” perhaps the most significant of the three studies (and certainly the most sophisticated), dealt with the men and women who are our societal contacts with the ghetto; teachers, police, public welfare workers, store owners and managers, and those who run the political organizations and hire the ghetto’s residents. While aware of the enormity of city problems, their respondents’ views were “characterized as optimistic denials of the full seriousness of the position of urban Negroes in their cities . . .” (p. 73). They shared the sanguine view of social conditions with the whites of the first study discussed above, displacing the responsibility to the black militants. Police, merchants, and employers subscribed to this insanity—(reviewers can editorialize; the researchers’ language was more objec-