

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

The Idea of Justice in Luther's First Publication

HEINZ BLUHM

The Continuing Significance of Luther's Prefaces
to the New Testament

WERNER GEORG KUEMMEL

Reading Programs in Theology: An Overview
of Pastoral Care

HARRY G. COINER

Homiletics

Theological Observer

Book Review Articles

Book Review

Vol. XXXVII

October 1966

No. 9

BOOK REVIEW ARTICLES

CHRISTIAN BELIEFS AND ANTI-SEMITISM

A Round Table Review

I

Five hundred thousand dollars is a lot of money. When people spend this much for a careful research study, they are obviously sold on the importance and value of their effort. The Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith has invested this huge sum in a long-range study of anti-Semitism in the United States. *Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism* by Charles Y. Glock and Rodney Stark is the first fruits of this undertaking. Four more volumes are scheduled to appear in the *Patterns of American Prejudice* series.

The action on the part of the ADL was triggered by a violent outbreak of synagog defamations in Europe and the United States in 1960. With the memory of German atrocities still haunting them and despoiling their sleep, important segments of American Jewry swung into action to prevent by every possible means a similar barbaric slaughter in the United States. Recent violence in our land makes it increasingly difficult for us to say to American Jews, "It can't happen here."

Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism (New York: Harper & Row, 1966) was presented to 150 Christian theologians and educators in New York, May 22—23, 1966. The book has been the center of controversy since then, with critics attacking everything from its theological orientation to the type size in the many charts. The authors have defended the correctness of their method and the validity of their conclusions against all critics with reasonably convincing success. Glock is the sane and sober sociologist, while Stark is the impassioned crusader in the duo.

This journal is devoting a large amount of space to the book because of the general significance of the study and because of its special importance to American Lutheranism. The study maintains that the incidence of anti-Semitism is disturbingly high among Lu-

therans, especially among Lutherans of the Missouri Synod.

We have invited Glock and Stark to describe their controversial model and they have graciously obliged us. Martin E. Marty, associate editor of *The Christian Century*, raises some theological questions about the study. Ronald E. Johnstone, Director of the Concordia Seminary Research Center, examines the survey from the sociologist's point of view. The authors then reply briefly to their critics.

Marty and Johnstone provide excellent suggestions on how to put the study to most profitable use. Four observations may serve to summarize many of the comments the book has thus far provoked: (1) Anti-Semitism remains a serious problem in the United States, and the teaching and practice of many churches bears some kind of relationship (causal, supportive) to this ugly phenomenon; (2) The Christian churches ought to acknowledge their strong Jewish roots; (3) Christians must restudy the New Testament carefully and in its entirety to understand its message of appreciation, love, and concern for the fellow countrymen of Jesus and Paul; (4) Christians must continue to affirm the centrality and uniqueness of Jesus Christ as the world's Savior. Some Christians are beginning to urge the ending of all mission work among the Jews, but this is a point of view which lacks Biblical support. Others are saying that a recognition of the salvific character of modern Jewish faiths is essential if anti-Semitism is to be eliminated. But it is precisely the double love of the Christian — to God for His Son, and to his neighbor — that leads him to witness to Jesus Christ to all sorts and conditions of men at every opportunity. Discussions of the book will become terribly muddled if this antimission point of view is regularly stressed.

HERBERT T. MAYER

II

The idea that Christianity and anti-Semitism are historically linked is not likely to generate much debate. The evidence is widespread and firm that much of the anti-Semitism of the past was stimulated and sustained by Christian fervor and zeal. The study reported in *Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism* is directed essentially to finding out whether or not the link has been broken. Is there still a strong religious element in current anti-Semitism? Or, as some observers have suggested, are Christianity and the church more appropriately characterized now as important vehicles through which individuals are led to transcend latent feelings of prejudice?

The theory which informed this study conceived that any remnant of a connection between Christian belief and anti-Semitism would be the result of a persistence among Christians to hold to a rigidly orthodox faith and to do so in what has been called particularistic terms. By orthodox faith is meant a literal interpretation of traditional Christian dogma as exemplified in unequivocal belief in the divinity of Christ, in the virgin birth, in Biblical miracles, in the devil, and the like; by particularism is meant a disposition to see Christian truth as the *only* religious truth; to conceive, for example, of a belief in Christ as the only path to salvation.

The theory did not suggest that orthodox belief, in and of itself, is sufficient to generate anti-Semitism. Neither did it suggest that anti-Semitism of a secular kind follows directly from orthodoxy when it is combined with particularism. The process is more complex than this and should it occur, it was conceived to proceed as follows.

To begin with, no assumptions were made before the study was undertaken about how many American Christians hold to a firmly orthodox faith. This was a question to be decided empirically. It was postulated at the outset, however, that orthodox Christians would be highly predisposed to be particularistic ones also. Orthodoxy and particularism need not necessarily go together. It is easy

to imagine an orthodox Hindu who would acknowledge the equal validity of the Christian faith. For reasons endemic to Christian history, however, it is more difficult to imagine a highly orthodox Christian believing that his truth is only one among a number of equally acceptable religious truths. As the first link in the causal chain, a high association was postulated between Christian orthodoxy and Christian particularism.

The second link, it was expected, would follow from the consequences of particularism. For the highly particularistic Christian, religious outsiders — members of other faiths and the irreligious — assume a special saliency and demand a forthright response. The religious outsider cannot simply be ignored. Initially, religious outsiders are likely to generate missionary zeal on the part of the particularistic Christian; a desire to win these "apostates" to the one true faith. When the call to conversion is rejected, however, the hostility latent in particularism is likely to be activated.

This hostility, according to the theory underlying the study, is capable of being directed against all adamant religious outsiders, whether they are of another faith or none at all. However, in America the Jews are the most visible religious outsiders. Moreover, from the perspective of the particularist, the Jews more than any other religious group have had the greatest opportunity to know about Christ and to accept him as Savior. Yet they have rejected him. Some particularistic Christians, it was suspected, might be capable of tolerating this ambiguity and be able to contain simmering feelings of hostility. For most, however, it was expected that the strain would be too much to bear. Consequently a strong association was hypothesized between particularism and specifically religious hostility toward Jews.

As to the nature of this hostility, it was expected, of course, that it would be manifested in a perception of the Jews as responsible for the crucifixion. However, most Christians, whether particularistic or not, it was felt, probably hold to this image. The difference lies in the interpretation given this view of history. In the eyes of the particu-

larist, it was hypothesized, the Jews *remain* guilty; the Jews provoked God's wrath by crucifying Jesus and have suffered under divine judgment ever since. Their tribulations will not cease until they extirpate their guilt by accepting salvation through Christ. Less orthodox and less particularistic Christians, on the other hand, might not be expected to draw this link between the ancient and the modern Jews and thus not be armed with religious predilections to discredit the Jews.

Orthodoxy, then, is likely to lead to particularism which in turn is likely to produce religious hostility towards the Jews. The last link in the postulated causal chain is secular anti-Semitism, and here it was expected that religious hostility toward Jews would spill over into a propensity to accept negative stereotypes of Jews and to feel hostile toward them on other than purely religious grounds.

A study was then planned to test this theory. First, 3,000 lengthy questionnaires, requiring on the average three hours to complete, were administered to a random sample of Protestant and Roman Catholic church members residing in four counties along the western side of San Francisco Bay. Second, the theoretical model was retested through 1,976 interviews collected from a national sample of the adult population of the country. In effect, the first data collection operation provided a means to test the theory in depth in one area of the country. The second was undertaken to check the generalizability of the findings for the country as a whole.

What did these studies find? In brief, the data from both studies provide strong confirmation of the theoretical model. As expected, orthodoxy is found to be highly associated with particularism. In turn, particularism is found to produce religious hostility toward the Jews. To be sure, nonparticularistic Christians are about as prone as particularistic ones to blame the Jews for the death of Jesus. The difference is that the particularists interpret this historical event invidiously and conceive of the modern Jews as still bearing the guilt for the presumed actions of their forebears.

This process — orthodoxy to particularism to religious hostility — culminates, also as

expected, in secular anti-Semitism. Almost inexorably, those caught up in this syndrome of religious ideology are led to a more general anti-Semitism. This is true whether anti-Semitism is defined in terms of negative stereotypes of Jews, or negative feelings towards them, or in terms of countenancing hostile acts towards them.

Religion-based anti-Semitism, the studies also find, is not a residue of the past to which only a handful of Christians cling. On the contrary, no less than one-fourth of American anti-Semitism is still attached primarily to religious sources. In terms of absolute numbers rather than percentages, this means that the anti-Semitism of at least 17.5 million Americans is rooted in their religious faith. Moreover, only 5 percent of Americans who are anti-Semitic are completely devoid of a religious basis for their prejudice.

Berkeley, Calif.

CHARLES Y. GLOCK
RODNEY STARK

III

Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism will no doubt lead a public life and a private life. The public life has already begun: seminars, conferences, releases, reviews, headlines have suggested some measure of its impact on the external life of religious denominations implicated as "anti-Semitic" in the study. Inevitably, in these headlines matters will become distorted. Perhaps because of such distortion not all will derive the benefit they should from the book.

As a document for the private life of American Christians, the Glock-Stark book could make a major contribution to self-analysis, self-understanding, repentance, and new life. That is, it should be examined without defensiveness by ministers in their studies, by laymen in their circles of discussion, by seminarians and professional theologians. There, away from the headlines, its vices and virtues can be sorted and separated; the vices can be discounted and the virtues can be employed.

A

The vices first. Like all human research, this is flawed; like all sociological studies,

this provides partial information at best; like all impassioned studies—and the authors' passion is evident here and there—some bias will reveal itself. Sociologists have already begun to debate the adequacy of the instruments the authors have used to determine scales of anti-Semitism. As a nonprofessional, I shall follow this debate with interest. As to the general sociological questions involved, I have little interest: should people use interviews and questionnaires to measure religious belief? Can one take a sample of the population and from that project an accurate picture of the whole? As far as some specific questions concerning the instrument are concerned, there should be broader interest. Most of this will center on one matter: were the Glock-Stark questions so "black and white" that people with theological subtlety and sophistication were given no chance to "look good"?

More important than these technical and professional questions, however, are those that deal with the authors' undertone and viewpoint. They are not subtle about the viewpoint; they state it explicitly and repeatedly. They posit a point, and their data confirm it: that Christian orthodoxy and Christian particularism when in close combination tend to produce ethnocentrism and xenophobia; in this instance, anti-Semitism is revealed in the combination. Why? They see it to be integrally related to Christian particularist orthodoxy; in a way, it is there in the Gospels and wedded to 20 centuries of Christian history. They are never quite *this* explicit, but they come close to saying that one can ultimately transcend anti-Semitism either by giving up orthodoxy or particularism or by seeing both transformed even at the expense of denial of some historical aspects of faith revealed in Scripture and reflected upon in the tradition.

Insofar as this is the burden of the Glock-Stark study, theologians would have a case against the authors. For one thing, while the New Testament (and especially the fourth gospel) has understandably unkind things to say against the enemies of Jesus and His followers, the burden of later anti-Semitism does not grow from these historical references

but from bad hermeneutics and bad exegesis. The New Testament is hard on the Romans too; but we do not run around tracking down curses on 20th-century Italian heirs of Pilate and nameless centurions. If the Lutheran, Baptist, Pentecostal, and other "conservative" laity spit back anti-Semitic comment when the interviewer comes by, this is in part the result of bad education and need not be blamed on the gospels.

Further, one must ask Glock-Stark what they have in mind to supplant orthodox particularism. Because liberal Christians have less sense of theological anti-Semitism (and, according to Glock-Stark, they seem to have less sense of theology in general), one could move toward liberal latitudinarianism. They seem to suggest that "the emerging religion of the species"—to use Jules Monnerot's phrase—or some other universalistic religion would fill the vacuum. I doubt it. Emerging universalistic religions tend to lack salvific and motivating power and they, too, tend to harden into in-group patterns. The authors overlook resources for overcoming anti-Semitism *in* Christian history and doctrine.

B

History and contemporary analysis seem to be on the authors' sides. Orthodox particularism has not produced a happy relation between Christians of the West and Jews. Lutherans least of all have much to show in their desire to escape charges of anti-Semitism (and I have no doubt that the "Lutheran" columns will interest most readers most because of the experience of Lutheran Germany and the Jews as climax of all histories of anti-Semitism).

Here is where the private life of the book should be important. Away from public polemics, from understandable defensiveness, and cautious (or enraged) replies, people should work in their studies with the details of Glock-Stark. What went wrong? What goes wrong? They reproduce (page 60) that horrendous line from Missouri Synod Sunday School literature, vintage 1955: "Give proof that the curse which the Jews called down upon their nation still rests on them and their children to this very day." That kind of bad

hermeneutics, bad exegesis, and good blasphemy has been purged from recent Lutheran literature. But it has been heard from the lips of innocent and well-meaning teachers for generations, and it dies slowly in the laity's memory. And, remind Glock-Stark (in reference to Hadden's studies of the clergy), the clergy attitudes until now have remained close to the laity's. Anyone with ears to hear will not lack evidence. Lutheran clergy locker-rooms, pastors' conferences, and lay gatherings are, whether thoughtlessly or thoughtfully, still regularly offensive in their references to the contemporary Jew.

The Glock-Stark study reveals that there are two types of anti-Semitism current in America. One is nontheological and personal; it belongs to the urbanized and liberal churches who have living contact with Jews. The other is theological and impersonal; it is the attitude and property of groups who have had less daily relationship to the Jew. It is important to separate and isolate the two. The first is probably more dangerous and detrimental in day-to-day affairs; the second is potentially more dangerous (as in Germany) in times of crisis. For if people are theologically serious, they have a profound root and base for their action. Then, when things heat up, we *are* in trouble.

As a consultant in late stages of the preparation of the manuscript, I found my suspicions about our church confirmed and felt that publication of the work might lead us to self-examination and change. We have (as in the instance of Bernhard Olson's study, *Faith and Prejudice*) revealed ourselves capable of renewal. It can happen again. Certainly, Lutherans need not be docile about the book: like all books save one, it demands and deserves intense criticism. After the criticism, I believe certain agenda items will remain for Lutherans.

1) If this study is in any way correct, what do we do to "look good" and to become good? Not, I would answer, "sign up for unorthodox universalism" but rather "open our orthodoxy and reorient our particularism."

2) We can work on a theology that relates to our actual views of universalism. Our con-

gregational missionary budgets do not reveal a church body that really is consistent in its particularism. Instead, we are selective. We condemn the Jew; our history reveals that we have done little in the past century to converse or communicate with him. Glock-Stark may serve to prod us to theological study and new understanding.

Chicago, Ill.

MARTIN E. MARTY

IV

Glock and Stark have set out to discover and trace the effects of Christian beliefs on anti-Semitic attitudes, beliefs, and action. They find that a number of Christian beliefs do produce a propensity toward anti-Semitism. For example, 17 percent of Protestant and 14 percent of Roman Catholic Christians believe that Jews are more likely than Christians to cheat in business; 16 percent of Protestant and 13 percent of Roman Catholic Christians feel that Jews believe they are better than other people. Further, the authors draw the following general conclusion from the data: "Far from being trivial, religious outlooks and religious images of the modern Jew [which are held by many Christians] seem to lie at the root of the anti-Semitism of millions of American adults." The data are clear and the responses representative enough to be able to say that certain features of Christian doctrine and belief do lead some adherents to hold negative views of Jews, not only along religious dimensions but along social ones as well.

However, the issue has been clouded by the authors' attempts to do two things simultaneously: (1) Find religious sources for anti-Semitism, and (2) explore differences among Christian denominations. Further, these attempts have been without adequate control for the effects of other factors such as education, income, past contacts, and the like. The result is that although we are convinced there are religious factors conducive to and involved in anti-Semitism, there are a number of serious weaknesses in the reporting and analysis, though the raw data themselves are sound. In fact, we are highly im-

pressed with the care exercised in selecting the sample, the relatively high response rate achieved, and the general quality of the questionnaire. However, the problems are primarily ones of reporting and analysis. We shall now outline a number of these weaknesses and inadequacies.

1) Unnecessarily invidious comparisons of denominations are made throughout the book. Although the authors point out that orthodoxy, for example, is strongly related or correlated with denomination (members of some denominations are much more "orthodox" than others), and although the stated concern in the study is with religious, rather than denominational, sources of anti-Semitism, the authors repeatedly use a denominational continuum as the independent variable in presenting the data. This procedure would be valid and helpful if the study were focused on denominational differences, if the authors were careful to control for factors such as social status in presenting the denominational data, and if the points where denominational differences are not in evidence were pointed out with equal clarity. However, the central emphasis of the study is on predicting anti-Semitism from several indexes that combine a score of variables of a religious nature. This procedure renders the earlier comparisons of denominations irrelevant. Regrettably, the authors highlight denominational differences on a number of anti-Semitic beliefs when the conservative end of the denominational continuum is put in a negative light, but do not point out the fact that at other points there are no denominational differences (cf. Table 45). Although for the members of "conservative" denominations (The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod, Southern Baptists, and the Sects) to cry "foul" could sound like pure defensiveness, our criticism is simply that the treatment of denominational differences with adequate controls for other relevant and intervening variables is not complete enough.

2) The presentation of the data is inadequate. Only rarely do the authors present the total distributions of responses to a given question. In fact, often only about half of

the sample is accounted for in most tables. We have to ask in each instance: "How did the others respond?" In particular, we are given no indication of how many respondents did not answer a given question or begged off expressing a definite opinion. If this number is high, the validity of the conclusions could be seriously affected.

The incomplete presentation of data becomes especially apparent in Chapter 11. (Note Table 64, p. 177, in particular.) The total number of Protestants is only 1,136, whereas the sample included 2,326. There is no indication of what happened to the remaining 1,190 except the footnote on page 126 that says the Index of Anti-Semitic Beliefs includes only those persons who responded to all six items. But an attrition rate of 50 percent in constructing an index and subsequently drawing conclusions based on the entire sample is extremely high and makes the conclusion hazardous. In fact we feel uneasy about the validity of the index because of this practice.

This tactic of presenting only part of the data becomes even more serious when we note that nowhere do the authors indicate the statistical tests used or what the results of such tests were. With incomplete tables the reader is unable to test for statistical significance of differences in the data for himself. The incomplete presentation of the data becomes a tactical mistake because the reader is unable to convince himself that the conclusions are valid.

We must admit being bothered by these omissions further when we note that a large body of data has not been presented at all. We refer to questions 65, 81, 86, 111, 124, 125, and especially to 77, which reads: "I tend to distrust a person who does not believe in Jesus." We submit that if essentially the same proportions of Christians agree with this statement as agree with the statement that "The Jews can never be forgiven for what they did to Jesus until they accept Him as the true Savior," then the latter question measures nothing distinctly anti-Semitic.

3) Some of the questions are of doubtful value. For example, the authors make quite

a point of the fact that those accepting the statement cited above that the Jews cannot be forgiven until they accept Jesus Christ as Savior are at that point subscribing to the view of collective Jewish guilt for the crucifixion of Christ. We submit that the question is inadequate because it has two points of emphasis. One is the concept of collective guilt, the other is the necessity of accepting Christ as Savior. It is therefore in reality a "Do you still beat your wife?" question. A person who is convinced that a Jew must accept Christ as Savior in order to attain eternal salvation simply cannot answer the question as stated. At best he must gloss over the collective guilt aspect, emphasize the necessity of faith in Christ, and in the process appear to be subscribing to the view of collective Jewish guilt.

4) Closely allied to the issue of question construction is the interpretation placed on the responses to them. Here the authors over-extend themselves at a number of points. Two examples will suffice. One statement reads: "Among themselves, Jews think Christians are ignorant for believing Christ was the Son of God." The answers lead the authors to conclude: "Thus, for many Christians, modern Jews are not only seen as still guilty for the crucifixion of Christ, but as actively hostile to followers of Jesus." The conclusion seems to represent a considerable stretching of the evidence.

On page 112 the authors state: "Thus, a majority of Christians are convinced that Jews hold powerful economic positions in society, and a substantial minority see Jews as behaving unethically in pursuit of material gain. Not only are Jews wealthy, they cheat and connive." The authors overstate the data. Table 42 shows that 17 percent of Protestants and 14 percent of Roman Catholics agree with the statements that ascribe unethical business behavior to Jews. These proportions do not seem on the face of it to be a "substantial minority." Undoubtedly, however, the authors were including the additional 19 and 21 percent of Protestants and Roman Catholics respectively who agree "somewhat" with the statements. We could agree that 36 and 35 percent are "substantial minorities."

However, to combine a straightforward "yes" response with a qualified "somewhat" and conclude that the people in these combined categories say "Not only are Jews wealthy, they cheat and connive," is to misinterpret and overstate the views of those respondents who said the statement was "somewhat true." Undoubtedly many of these respondents were trying to say that *some* Jews are unethical in business. By definition they are not saying that Jews as a total category of people "cheat and connive." So to overstate the data is neither to advance our knowledge nor to improve relations of Jews and Christians or their perceptions of one another.

5) The authors' analyses and conclusions are ultimately dependent on a number of indexes (dogmatism, particularism, libertarianism, anti-Semitic beliefs, religious bigotry, etc.). Most of them are well constructed and aid our understanding of the issues at hand. However, the most crucial one — the index on which most of the ultimate conclusions are based — is a summary index called the Index of Religious Bigotry. This index is the most dubious of all. The index is composed of four other indexes — orthodoxy, particularism, libertarianism, and religious hostility toward Jews, plus the acceptance of the view that Jews were responsible for the crucifixion. The index does not measure or capsule religious bigotry per se. It only measures "Christian opposed-to-Jews bigotry."

Our greatest objection to the Religious Bigotry Index is that it includes the following item: "Jews want to remain different from other people, and yet they are touchy if people notice these differences." We are not convinced that to agree with that statement is evidence of anti-Semitism. To the extent that this is true of Jews, Christians cannot be censured for recognizing fact. This question of whether a given statement about Jews represents fact or fiction is an important one and relevant at many points in the study. The authors must assume that the statements the questions ascribe to Jews are not in fact characteristic of Jews, otherwise they could not interpret agreement with a statement as signifying anti-Semitism. However, nowhere do the authors present evidence that estab-

lishes that this or that description of Jews is contrary to fact. It may be true, for example, that "Jews want to remain different from other people"; or that "Jews like to be with other Jews"; or that "Jewish boys were less likely than Christian boys to volunteer for service in the armed forces during the last war." We are given no empirical evidence one way or the other.

6) The authors should have given more attention to the crucial procedure of controlling for other possibly relevant factors. The authors make much of denominational differences, but nowhere control for the class differences represented by denominations. Even more serious is the manner of controlling for other potentially relevant factors in Chapter 11. Here only the Religious Bigotry Index is used as the independent variable. To do an adequate job of controlling, some of the specific subindexes as well as individual variables should have been related to the dependent variable of anti-Semitic beliefs while controlling for education, income, sex, and so on.

We have gone into some fairly extensive detail in pointing out inadequacies, inaccuracies, and questionable procedures in the reporting and organizing of the data in this study not because of defensiveness or a desire to refute the authors' conclusions, but solely because the analysis and reporting of the data includes an unusually high number of inadequacies. In fact, we have pointed some of these out with considerable initial hesitancy. Our hesitancy centered on the fact that the sample and its method of selection was sound, as well as the fact that there is undoubtedly anti-Semitism within Christian churches that is somehow related to Christian beliefs. In fact, our concern over the analysis is that because of inadequate presentation and overstatement there is great risk that the baby will be thrown out with its bath.

In conclusion we must say that despite many criticisms and reservations this book is worth reading. It contains valuable data for people from all Christian denominations once they lose their defensiveness in the face of invidious comparisons based on theological differences, which need not reflect differ-

ences in the incidence of anti-Semitism. It is worth reading because there is no doubt that some anti-Semitism exists in Christian churches. Unfortunately the authors have done themselves, their sponsors, and us a distinct disservice by overstatement, by withholding data, and by giving insufficient opportunity for controlling variables which affect the relationships they discovered between Christian beliefs and anti-Semitism.

St. Louis, Mo. RONALD JOHNSTONE

V

We are grateful to the editor for the opportunity to comment briefly on the observations which Drs. Marty and Johnstone have made about our book.

There is little with which we would take issue in Dr. Marty's comments. By and large, he brings out the dilemmas which the book poses for thoughtful Christians, and we can only hope that his call for contemplation and action will be heeded seriously. We have not, as Marty suggests, overlooked the potential of Christian faith to be a resource for overcoming anti-Semitism (see pages 35 and 212, for example). Our concern is not with the existence of the potential but with whether and how it might be realized.

With respect to Dr. Johnstone's comments, we cannot in brief compass reply in detail to all of the points he seeks to make. Primarily we shall have to rely on what we consider the good possibility that the careful and thoughtful reader will not be persuaded by these reservations and that, more so than Johnstone, other readers will be able to distinguish the forest from the trees.

Dr. Johnstone, in our judgment, quibbles his way to a negative judgment of the book. Our concern is that the quibbles, by and large, are either in error or misleading. To illustrate first the errors, we would note, contrary to Johnstone's assertions, (1) that the discussion in the text of Table 35 *does* point out the absence of denominational differences; (2) that the problem of missing cases *is* discussed in more than a footnote (see Appendix B); and (3) that the Religious Bigotry Index does *not* include the item,

"Jews want to remain different from other people. . . ."

As to Johnstone's being misleading, here again we can only be illustrative if we are to be brief, but consider the following:

1) Understandably, he is concerned because the data on denominational comparisons nearly always reveal the members of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod in a negative light. However, probably inadvertently he puts himself in the position of approving of the fact that most Missouri Lutherans are anti-Semitic (for example) if it can be argued that their anti-Semitism does not stem from their denomination. We are sure that he does not mean to take this position, but his call for controls is tantamount to this.

We did not control in the way he suggests (e.g., control for social class or for orthodoxy), because we did not use denomination as an independent variable (although Johnstone thinks we did). We reported denominational distributions on various items for their descriptive interest alone. Denominations are real social units, and consequently they are of legitimate descriptive interest. Furthermore, we remain convinced that Missouri Lutherans, as well as the members of other denominations, would want to know where they stand.

2) It is precisely because we recognized the danger of a single question being inappropriately worded that we consistently avoided relying on a single question to test

any of our propositions. We do not agree that the questions to which Johnstone takes exception were inappropriately worded. If they were, however, it would still not invalidate the thrust of our evidence unless it could be shown that all or a majority of our questions were faulty.

3) It is not that we may have overestimated the amount of anti-Semitism on which we may be faulted. On the contrary, the chances are that we have underestimated the phenomenon. Anti-Semitism in our society is not generally socially acceptable. That we found as many people as we did willing to acknowledge their anti-Semitism seems to us the significant point, not that we may have overestimated it.

4) It would have burdened the presentation unduly and unnecessarily to have presented the total distribution to all questions. Where it was not patently clear what the alternative responses were, we did present the full range. Again, a point which Johnstone fails to note.

5) Finally, we could very easily have introduced statistical tests, for the power of our results are so strong that they would be significant using the most rigid statistical criteria. However, we felt that this would be misleading. Existing tests, contrary to what Johnstone implies, are inapplicable to our data, and consequently, we did not use them.

Berkeley, Calif. CHARLES Y. GLOCK
RODNEY STARK