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ABSTRACT

This thesis primarily, and broadly, utilizes existing research, theory, and interpretations, regarding age, race, and gender-based discrimination and subordination, to promote the use of a specific approach to racism studies. Heavily relying on secondary sources, a more complete understanding of how to combat racism is sought. Within the thesis, an effort is made to challenge social scientists and policymakers to focus on the dynamics of economics, politics, and ideology (relative to minority group outcomes), to go beyond pro-con debates on the value of legislative and governmental interventions when examining socially created inequalities, and to seek to aggressively embrace the idea that interventions must simultaneously create areas of opportunity as well as mechanisms for overcoming socially created inequality.

Briefly reviewing the work of other critical theorists and seeking to apply critical theory and the comparative-historical approach to racism, sexism, and ageism in America, the researcher investigates the causes of racism, sexism, and ageism in America. An effort has been made to maintain and re-activate the original ideas and intents of the "classical" critical theorists as those ideas relate to existing social problems. Beginning with the physical basis (the basic commonality) of racism, sexism, and ageism in America, the researcher takes a critical theorist approach and a social change perspective to the study of racism, sexism, and ageism in America. Through use of the comparative-historical method, the researcher has sought to work towards demonstrating and explaining how the development of an integrated critical theory of racism, sexism, and ageism in America may be examined and why critical theory, a theory that is more open and unrestrained than that which is commonly associated with the Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School (this is explained within the thesis), and the comparative-historical method are so important for continuing sociological research today into these areas. Critical theory and the comparative-historical method aid in making the association between social power relationships and rational efforts on the part of American capitalists (to improve or maintain status in America's capitalistic system).
AN INTEGRATED STUDY OF RACISM, SEXISM, AND AGEISM IN AMERICA
Chapter I.
INTRODUCTION

Researching in America, as a democratic, capitalistic society, this integrated study (of racism, sexism, and ageism) investigates the causes of racism, sexism, and ageism in America. The conditions that tend to reduce systematic prejudice and discrimination in the form of racism, sexism, and ageism are also investigated. What recurrent answers are discovered?

The research intent is to focus specifically on racism, sexism, and ageism. Since the intent is to focus specifically on racism, sexism, and ageism, readers may respond that improvements and achievements now obviously enjoyed by blacks, women, and the elderly are ignored. The intent is not to disclaim improvements and achievements. Rather, those improvements and achievements are not specifically incorporated, recognized, or discussed because the research intent is to specifically focus on racism, sexism, and ageism and to begin to study the basic commonalities between them. The research intent is also to begin to more readily understand the occurrence and maintenance of racism, sexism, and ageism and to begin to critically analyze them. The thesis promotes the beginnings of a critical theory of racism, sexism, and ageism in America. No real solutions are provided
but the possibilities for successful interventions are discussed. Relying on secondary sources, the researcher's approach to critical theorizing is to focus on selected oppressive social arrangements and to critically analyze those social arrangements. With such a focus, positive arrangements and achievements will often be de-emphasized.

Capitalists as innovators serves as an orienting concept within the thesis. Prior to reaching discussions of capitalists as innovators, the perspective from which the researcher proceeds should be understood. An important focus is on rational efforts on the part of American capitalists to improve or maintain status in America's capitalistic system. Capitalists as innovators are individuals, acting singly or in groups, but acting socially. This is addressed in more detail within the thesis. Capitalism has been historically understood, from a Marxist perspective, as a system which is very unfair to underpaid (factory) workers and a system that is only interested in making money and in profit for owners, without caring about workers. It is, on the other hand, however, also now generally agreed that capitalism has changed since Marx's first use of the word and today capitalism is, from the perspective of some, a "fairer" system than it was in the 1800s and workers are now better paid and have better working conditions (Young Students Encyclopedia: 1977, s.v. "Capitalism"). This bettering of wages and of working conditions is agreed to be evident in spite of the fact that
social problems related to inequality and stratification do remain.

Conflict theory, the interactionist perspective, motivational and learning theories (relative to individuals and groups), and segmentation theory will all be used to underscore why wages and working conditions have improved and, also, why inequality, stratification, racism, sexism, and ageism have not been eliminated in our capitalistic system. The distinction between capitalism as being private ownership and communism as being government owned and operated businesses with government taking the profits is accepted within this thesis and will not be discussed. The research focus is on innovators within the capitalist system. Conceptually, innovators are not unique to capitalism.

This thesis promotes a certain theoretical perspective and a particular type of research method. The intent is to modernize our way of viewing race relations in America and to highlight the role of ideologies, of economic circumstances, and of moral order, which serve to constrain or limit the ideological transformations that will be allowed. The goals and purposes are both theoretical and programmatic. The intent is to provide fresh illuminations in the area of race relations in America as well as to create a synthesis of findings relative to racism, sexism, and ageism. The aim is to provide a framework for continuing research, and (for deeper insights into what is needed for continuing systematic
studies of American race relations) a re-adjustment, or re-alignment, of ideas on racism, sexism, and ageism.

The key variable in studying race relations in America is economic condition. Ideology (which includes the moral order), fits into and becomes an important part of the scenario in that economic conditions, politics (which includes the enactments of law), and ideology form a part of what Michael Mann would call a "multiple overlapping and intersecting power network" (Mann: 1986, p. 2). I have left out the military for purposes of this study. Mann's power network, however, does include the military. New or changed ideologies are accepted based on emergent possibilities and needs. This may be seen as an emergent norm/emergent need perspective which is more fully investigated in the latter sections of this thesis. Moore, Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy, said in his research that it is obvious that values change in response to "new circumstances" (Moore: 1967, p. 487). Considering the above, within this thesis, the interplay between economic condition, ideology, and moral order, how ideologies change, how economic conditions create the need for certain ideologies, and how particular ideologies come to be accepted will be emphasized and explored.

The intent is to demonstrate and highlight the fact that economic situations in a capitalistic system often initiate the ideologies that perpetuate discriminatory practices.
Emphasis is placed on the fact that ideologies serve to maintain on-going discrimination wherein a "vicious cycle" develops. Discrimination reinforces prejudice and prejudice leads to further discrimination. The investigative process of this thesis allows for a look at what measures and means are possibly needed to break into the cycle.

An attempt will be made herein to investigate what the next major "emancipatory" stage of change (especially relative to racism) might be. Major stages of change are to be understood, broadly, as major social transformations wherein mores, accepted political policies, accepted norms, and to use Allport's terminology, "the official morality" (Allport: 1958, p. vii) changes.

Critical theory is the theoretical framework for this research. Critical theory holds "the view that social theory must be critical of oppressive arrangements and propose emancipatory alternatives" (Turner: 1986, p. 132). Other alternative and relevant theoretical perspectives that have proven useful for racism studies are functionalism, conflict theory, exchange theory, labeling, and phenomenological sociology. Critical theory has an emancipatory theme (Turner: 1986, p. 184). With critical theory, the intent is to develop a theoretically informed program for freeing people from unnecessary domination (Turner: 1986, p. 185). Using critical theory as the theoretical framework for this research, the interest is in the ways people interact through mutually
shared conscious activity (see Turner: 1986, p. 187). Turner also provides a general overview of critical theory as presented in the works of prominent critical theorists.

Accepting Turner's observation (1986, p. 199) that "all critical theory is historical in the sense that it tries to analyze the long term development of oppressive arrangements in society" (Turner: 1986, p. 199), the research interest, herein, is a critical examination of certain selected social arrangements with the intent being to develop a theoretically informed program which provides (and furnishes) emancipatory alternatives to the situation. A review of the sources surveyed indicates that functionalism and conflict theory are the most widely adopted sociological theories used to explain racism, sexism, and ageism as well as to explain prejudice and discrimination. Although critical theory will guide this research, alternative relevant theories will frequently be discussed and are seen as relevant for the insights they provide. I will end this section with a summation of what critical theorists do.

The present research goal is to propose alternatives to racism, sexism, and ageism (with racism being of particular interest). The purpose of the study is to investigate racism, sexism, and ageism as oppressive arrangements and to propose emancipatory alternatives. Part of the work of a critical theorist is to use and investigate all available ideas, approaches, and theoretical perspectives and to use those
ideas, approaches, and theoretical perspectives, as appropriate. Alternative, relevant theories are necessary tools for understanding the interaction between the applicable units and variables as they apply to racism, sexism, and ageism, as well as prejudice, and discrimination. Alternative, relevant theories are necessary tools for understanding the interaction between the applicable units and variables as they apply to racism, sexism, and ageism, as well as prejudice, and discrimination. Alternative, relevant theories are useful for analyzing the phenomenon under study from different perspectives. A functionalist approach or perspective assists the researcher in understanding the functions of racism, sexism, and ageism. Examining the phenomenon from a conflict perspective enables the researcher to analyze the conflict between groups and to look at the consequences stemming from differences in values, resources, and/or social positions (Ritzer: 1988, p. 111). The other specified alternative, relevant theories are useful and appropriate in order to aid in the better understanding of the interaction between groups and individuals.

Functionalist investigates the function of the phenomenon under study. What need does the phenomenon meet for maintaining social order? A functional analysis begins with a "sheer description" of individual and group activities, assesses the meaning or mental or emotional significance of the activity for group members, seeks to discern the motives for conformity or for deviance among participants, and finally seeks to describe all consequences and central regularities in the system (Turner: 1986, pp. 94, 100).

Conflict theory, on the other hand, looks at conflict.
It looks at consequences stemming from differences in values, resources, and/or social positions. Turner's development and specification of a nine-stage process which leads to overt conflict may be seen as helpful in gaining an understanding of the conflict between groups and how to look at overt conflict. Turner's nine-stage process, as outlined by Ritzer (1988, p. 111), details what leads to overt conflict and the process is revealed thusly.

1. The social system is composed of a number of interdependent units.

2. There is an unequal distribution of scarce and valued resources among the units.

3. Those units not receiving a proportionate share of the resources begin to question the legitimacy of the system. (Turner's nine-stage process notes that this questioning is most likely to take place when people feel their aspirations for upward mobility are blocked, when there are insufficient channels for redressing grievances, and when people are deprived of rewards in a variety of sectors.)

4. Deprived people become aware that it is in their interests to alter the system of resource allocation.

5. Those who are deprived become emotionally aroused.

6. There are periodic, albeit often disorganized, outbursts of frustration.

7. Those involved in the conflict grow increasingly intense about it and more emotionally involved in it.

8. Increased efforts are made to organize the deprived groups involved in the conflicts.
9. Finally, open conflict of varying degrees of violence breaks out between the deprived and the privileged. The degree of violence is affected by such things as the ability of the conflict parties to define their true interests and the degree to which the system has mechanisms for handling, regularizing, and controlling conflict.

(Ritzer: 1988, p. 111)

Conflict theory is most useful as an explanatory tool when conflicts do arise and least useful when no overt conflict arises but unequal distribution of scarce and valued resources continues to exist. This deficiency of conflict theory is generally known and is often used as a criticism of conflict theory. When overt conflict fails to materialize, other theories and explanations may serve to provide important insights as to why the conflict parties could not or did not define their true interests and what mechanisms the system had for handling, regularizing, and controlling conflict.

Exchange theory looks at costs and rewards. It looks at exchange and exchange rates. It focuses on actors where the resources with which to bargain are at unequal levels. The Turner text, thusly, summarizes the tenets of exchange theory.

1. Those who need scarce and valued resources that others possess but who do not have equally valued and scarce resources to offer in return will be dependent upon those who control these resources.

2. Those who control valued resources have power over those who do not. That is,
the power of one actor over another is directly related to (a) the capacity of one actor to monopolize the valued resources needed by other actors and (b) the inability of those actors who need these resources to offer equally valued and scarce resources in return.

3. Those with power will press their advantage and will try to extract more resources from those dependent upon them in exchange for fewer (or the same level) of the resources that they control.

4. Those who press their advantage in this way will create conditions that encourage those who are dependent on them to (a) organize in ways that increase the value of their resources and, failing this, to (b) organize in ways that enable them to coerce those on whom they are dependent.

(Turner: 1986, pp. 229-230)

Labeling theory looks at the labeling of groups and individuals and the attending social processes. How labeling works is evident in Robert N. Butler's definition of ageism. "Ageism can be seen as a systematic stereotyping of and discrimination against people because they are old . . . (wherein) old people are categorized as senile, rigid in thought and manner, old-fashioned in morality and skills and (wherein) ageism allows the younger generation to see older people as different from themselves; thus (allowing the younger people) to subtly cease to identify with their elders as human beings" (Butler: 1989, p. 139). Labeling allows for
the systematic stereotyping of and discrimination against people based on some specified label. Once labeled, people are no longer allowed equal access to a range of behaviors, subtly cease to be identified as just people with a range of faults and attributes, weaknesses and capabilities, and individualistic differences, and are identified out of the specified label and responded to with reference to the label. Here, in line with a focus on racism, sexism, and ageism, I am mainly interested in the negative aspects of labeling wherein differences have taken on, specifically, a negative value.

Phenomenological sociology looks at consciousness and at the construction of social reality. Social definitions of a situation are seen as important for a full understanding of the phenomenon under study. Phenomenology applies to this study in that we are interested in social actors and in social actions and behaviors. As far as social action, an action is social "insofar as its subjective meaning takes account of the behavior of others and is thereby oriented in its course" (Weber: 1968, p. 4). With this study, we begin to focus on how social changes have occurred and do occur in America and how rational decision-making is done at the micro (individual) and macro (societal) levels. More emphasis is placed on macro level decision-making but micro level decision-making is also important.

The reader is reminded, here, that the above alternative, relevant theories are useful as tools for this research.
Herein, the various theories are merely touched upon. The whole point is to aid in a better focusing upon the concepts of racism, sexism, and ageism and to help in the provision of more precise orientating statements on the issues. The researcher proceeds from the assumption that part of the job of the critical theorist is to make use of all available theoretical, explanatory, descriptive, and/or predictive tools. In line with the above, this researcher understands the basic "job" of the critical theorist to be "(1) to account for and theorize about the underlying dynamics of society, (2) to avoid too much subjectivism (which means [to rely here on dictionary meanings] to avoid too much reliance on feelings, to avoid too much reliance on beliefs, to avoid too much intervention of personal thoughts, feelings, beliefs, opinions, and ideas, to assure that derived theories are not solely originating within or dependent on the mind of the individual rather than external objects, and to assure theories do not relate too much to reality as perceived by the mind as distinct from reality as independent of the mind), (3) to avoid superficial criticism of the oppressive arrangements, (4) to base their critique of the oppressive arrangements upon reasoned theoretical analysis, (5) to incorporate ideas obtained from many diverse theoretical approaches, and (6) to develop ideas which have emancipatory goals plus ideas that are empirically correct." This understanding on my part relative to the job of the critical theorist has come from a
reading of Turner's comments relative to the work of, and the "unarticulated questions" in, Habermas' efforts at critical theorizing (Turner: 1986, pp. 189, 190). The approach, herein, to critical theory rests in the observations of Stinchcombe (1968) who indicates that "(c)onstructing theories of social phenomena is done best by those who have a variety of theoretical strategies to try out" (Stinchcombe: 1968, p. 4). He says, "The crucial question to ask of a strategy is not whether it is true, but whether it is sometimes useful. . . . Some things are to be explained by personality dynamics, some things by their consequences, and some things by ecological causes. Some personality theories are true, some functional theories are true, and some ecological theories are true. Which kind is true of a particular phenomenon is a matter for investigation. . . ." (Stinchcombe: 1968, p. 4). My approach is deliberately eclectic. Assuming Stinchcombe's (Stinchcombe: 1968, p. 4) approach, I have been influenced by what he said the point of view of his book Constructing Social Theories (1968) was. "If one approach does not work for explaining a particular phenomenon, the theorist should try another. He ought to be trained to be so good at the various approaches that he is never at a loss for alternative explanations" (Stinchcombe: 1968, p. 4). My approach, to the use of critical theory, rests in my belief that utilization of the various approaches is inherent in critical theory and is required for critical analysis. I noted on page 7 that
functionalism and conflict theory are the most frequently adopted theories for explaining racism, sexism, and ageism. However, in order to fully investigate racism, sexism, and ageism for use in developing a critical theory, all approaches should be noted and considered for the insights they provide.

Reviewers of this thesis have observed that my approach to critical theory is somewhat different from that commonly associated with The Frankfurt School. First, a brief history of The Frankfurt School, using Friedman (1981) as a source,

The Frankfurt School was both an institution and a mode of thought. . . . [It] reached maturity in 1931 when Max Horkheimer became its director. During [the] time following Hitler's rise to power until 1950, the Institute's members [working in exile in the United States] developed a unique and powerful critique of modern life (Friedman: 1981, p. 13).

The Frankfurt School sought to investigate the relationship between what is real and the ideal, between philosophy and reality, between reality and reason, between philosophy and existence, and, particularly, as Friedman (1981) put it, "the relationship between reason and brutality" (Friedman: 1981, p. 14). The Frankfurt School, itself, was a response to the events of Auschwitz. Friedman notes that at Auschwitz, with the Nazis, we find the slaughter of "innocents" (Friedman: 1981, p. 15). "Only at Auschwitz—that is, only with the Nazis—did the slaughter of innocents become both an end in itself and a matter of detached,
reasoned, and authoritative state policy" (Friedman: 1981, p. 15). [Friedman describes himself as one who set out to "[explicate] the thought of the Frankfurt School and to [understand] the significance of that thought" (Friedman: 1981, p. 13). He indicates that "The Frankfurt School set itself [specifically] the task of defining the relationship between reason and brutality" (Friedman: 1981, p. 14).]


Along with Max Horkheimer, Herbert Marcuse, Friedrich Pollock and Leo Lowenthal, [Theodor Adorno (1903-1969)] was a major architect of the School's Critical Theory, which [as is generally known] in important ways both continued and subtly undermined the Hegelian Marxism of Lukacs and Korsch. As its name implied, Critical Theory drew far more sustenance from the tradition of critique in Marxism than from its competing scientific impulse. It understood and defended the debt Marxism owed to classical German philosophy even if it stressed the extent to which Marxism went beyond it (Jay: 1984, p. 16)

My approach to critical theorizing basically rests in ideas expressed by Jonathan H. Turner (1986). My approach "rests" there because the various sources I have referenced demonstrate and confirm that so much of "classical" critical theorizing began with an interdisciplinary perspective as well as with a recognition of the important roles of history, economic condition, philosophy and material conditions. Often, however, as the theory, or theories proceed (via the
critical theorists themselves and/or subsequent researchers), the theories demonstrate a tendency, often on the part of the forerunner critical theorist, to emphasize one or more phenomena over other competing phenomena wherein the theory becomes more and more limited in focus.

Tom Bottomore (1984) reaffirms in his conclusion, "A Critical Assessment of the Critics" (Bottomore: 1984, pp. 71-81), that the principal ideas and themes of the Frankfurt School have gone through different phases. He shows that the original aim of the Frankfurt Institute was to promote interdisciplinary research (Bottomore: 1984, p. 71) although "the range of its interests became in fact extremely limited" (Bottomore: 1984, p. 71). Bottomore goes on to recognize and explicate the consequences of The Frankfurt School limiting itself. History came to be largely ignored as well as economic analysis and economics coming to be largely ignored.

Briefly reviewing sources on critical theory and on the Frankfurt School, it seems that Marxist sociology as well as critical theory, neo-critical theory, et cetera have all largely been engaged in an on-going struggle to fully understand and situate the role of philosophy and reality, of material conditions and of ideals and ideas. The classical theorists have all recognized the overlapping nature of economics, politics, and ideology even though each came to stress the dominance of one concept over the other.

Jonathan Turner says,
In 1846, Marx and Engels completed *The German Ideology*. Much of this work is an attack on the "Young Hegelians," who were advocates of the German philosopher Georg Hegel, and is of little interest today. Yet, in this attack are certain basic ideas that, I feel, have served as the impetus behind "critical theory," or the view that social theory must be critical of oppressive arrangements and propose emancipatory alternatives. This theme exists, of course, in all of Marx's work, but it is in this first statement by Marx that the key elements of contemporary critical theory are most evident.

Marx criticized the Young Hegelians severely because he had once been one of them and was now making an irrevocable break with them. He saw the Hegelians as hopeless idealists, in the philosophical sense. That is, they saw the world as reflective of ideas, with the dynamics of social life revolving around consciousness and other cognitive processes by which "ideal essences" work their magic on humans. Marx saw this emphasis on the "reality of ideas" as nothing more than a conservative ideology that supports people's oppression by the material forces of their existence. His alternative was "to stand Hegel on his head," but in this early work, there is still an emphasis on the relation between consciousness and self-reflection, on the one hand, and social reality, on the other. This dualism becomes central to contemporary critical theory.

Marx saw humans as being unique by virtue of their conscious awareness of themselves and their situation. They are capable of self-reflection and, hence, assessment of their positions in society. Such consciousness arises out of people's daily existence and is not a realm of ideas that is somehow independent of the material world, as much German philosophy argued. For Marx, people produce their ideas and conceptions of the world in light of the social structures in which they are born, raised, and live (Turner: 1986, pp. 132-133).

... To meet [the] contingencies of life [such as eating, drinking, habitation, clothing, and other material things (Turner 1986), here, cites Marx and Engels' *The German Ideology*, p. 15)],
production is necessary, but as production satisfies one set of needs, new needs arise and encourage alterations in the ways that productive activity is organized. The elaboration of productive activity creates a division of labor, which in the end, is alienating because it increasingly deprives humans of their capacity to determine their productive activities. Moreover, as people work, they are exploited in ways that generate private property and capital for those who enslave them (Turner: 1986, p. 133).

... Marx argued that the capacity to use language, to think, and to analyze allows humans to alter their environment. People do not merely have to react to their material conditions in some mechanical way; they can also use their capacities for thought and reflection to construct new material conditions and corresponding social relations. Indeed, the course of history involved such processes as people actively restructured the material conditions of their existence. The goal of social theory, Marx implicitly argues, is to use humans' unique facility to expose those oppressive social relations and to propose alternatives. Marx's entire career was devoted to this goal; and it is this emancipatory aspect of Marx's thought that forms the foundation for critical theory (Turner: 1986, pp. 133, 134).

My approach to critical theory may be seen as more open than that which is commonly associated with the Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School but, in actuality, my research intent is to continue in the tradition of other "critical" theorists as they have looked at social realities, material conditions, and at ideas and ideals (and/or as they have sought to determine and propose emancipatory alternatives to existing situations). Earlier in this thesis I specified the
basic "job" of the critical theorist and the unarticulated questions in the work of Habermas (see pages 13, 14 of this thesis). I specifically noted the unarticulated questions in the work of Habermas, as noted by Turner, since Turner (1986), elaborating in the *The Structure of Sociological Theory* (1986), specifically recognized Habermas as "the most prominent critical theorist" (Turner: 1986, p. 138). I proceed with an attempt to address Habermas' unarticulated questions in my own work. My approach to critical theorizing may be seen as more open than the critical theory commonly associated with the Frankfurt School but it actually proceeds in a manner, I feel, to be consistent with the "spirit and intent" of authentic critical theorizing and with the initial formulations of the classical critical theorists.

Relying on a brief review of the works of prominent critical theorists and sources on Critical Theory, as a major theoretical perspective, it seems that critical theorists [beginning with Marx, proceeding to the Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School, and so on] have early recognized the interdependence of economics, material conditions, ideology, and politics, as well as their impact on conflict, change, and stability. This is so even as we note that each theorist emphasized (or de-emphasized) the dominance of one or more of the other concepts. Those early formulations are of interest. I am interested in the early formulations of the critical theorists as well as their initial, early recognitions that,
although one concept may dominate, it is, to rely, here, on Michael Mann's terminology, "a multiple overlapping and intersecting power network" (Mann: 1986, p. 2). Dominance of ideology does not preclude the existence, or the influence of, material conditions and vice versa as a powerful determinant of conflict, change, and stability. A dogmatic declaration of the dominance of one concept (over the others) to the point of no longer allowing for or recognizing the importance of the other concepts promotes a stagnating of the critical theory as well as of the process of critical theorizing. Recognizing the dominance of one concept over the others (for example, material conditions over ideology) does not preclude a continuing recognition of their continuing interdependence. A recognition of the continuing interdependence of military power, economics, politics, and ideologies, throughout history, assures the continuance of a dynamic critical theory. Discussing how one concept comes to dominate or when one concept dominates is beyond the scope of this thesis. For now, social structures are understood to be concretely situated in time and space (I, here, use Theda Skocpol's terms; see page 27 of this thesis). Understanding social structures to be concretely situated in time and space, it is the social scientist's "job" to discover the processes, the temporal sequences, and the patterns of change. [I, here, draw my ideas from Theda Skocpol (1984, p. 1)]

It should be noted that critical theory, with its
proposal of emancipatory alternatives, has a tendency to suggest concretely specifying emancipatory alternatives to oppressive social arrangements. Martin Jay (1984) indicates, however, that Adorno, one of the major founders of the Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School, "[refused] to spell out the utopian alternative to present-day society" (Jay: 1984, p. 20). Adorno was teaching and writing from the early 1930s through mid- to late 1960s. Acknowledging Adorno's refusal to "spell-out" utopian alternatives, I proceed from the perspective that critical theory with its aim to propose emancipatory alternatives frequently calls for a "spelling out" of, so-called, "utopian" alternatives. (Proposing alternatives does not, however, necessarily mean the proposals and alternatives will be successful or accepted.) As Jay (1984) puts it, Adorno justified his refusal to spell out the utopian alternatives "by reference to the Jewish prohibition on picturing God or paradise" (Jay: 1984, p. 20). According to Jay (1984), however, Adorno "nonetheless held to the belief in the possibility of achieving that utopia -- or more precisely put, in the value of such a belief, whether it be plausible or not" (Jay: 1984, p. 20). As I leave my discussion of critical theory, I see the need to stress that my critical theory seeks to understand the relationship between material conditions and the ideologies that allow for the subordination of certain segments of the society due to their race, sex, or age. My critical theory seeks to
investigate the role of ideology, economics, and politics. I also offer an explanation which "holds out" the promise for changing current oppressive arrangements.

The research method for this thesis is the comparative-historical method. The research, itself, may be seen as exploratory research. The researcher's main goal is to develop methods and conceptualizations that may be useful for more careful (from a futuristic perspective) studies and research. A current limitation or boundary of the findings of this research will be that it may be seen as applicable to age, race, and gender relations in American society only. In attempting to answer the questions that guide this research, it was deduced, through a general review of the literature on prejudice and discrimination, on social change, and on racism, that a comparative-historical study would most likely (at this point) yield required information and insights. The comparative-historical method is expected to yield the information needed to determine, and investigate, the causes and the dynamics of the phenomenon known as racism and for the development (later) of an integrated critical theory. Racism is understood by me as only one type of the several types of systematic prejudice and discrimination that may exist or come to be accepted within a given society. Racism, sexism, ageism, classism, and religious persecution are the five major types of prejudice seen, by me, as relevant to our time or relevant to the recent past. I am seeking to identify common
dimensions among the isms. Here, it should be noted that, when I think of dimensions, I am thinking of Earl Babbie's (1986) use of the word "concept" wherein researchers and observers are seeking to examine something that cannot be seen but is agreed to exist. The concept is used to capture the dimensions of the thing wherein it is agreed that such and such an instance would be an instance of the phenomenon and wherein the concept is utilized to capture the agreed upon dimensions of the thing. With racism, something that we cannot actually see but we agree exists, we must capture the many dimensions of it to be able to effectively study and analyze it and see what promotes its permanence or persistence and what promotes its change. I am looking at racism as a system that can be maintained or, in contrast, can be broken down. I am interested in how the system works and what allows for its maintenance. Sexism and ageism, for purposes of this integrated study, have been chosen somewhat arbitrarily. Notwithstanding this fact, their tendency to overlap in extreme cases of, or as the result of, social inequality makes their comparison valid. Their tendency to overlap is broadly demonstrated in the latter sections of this thesis.

Comparison is important to this research and will be discussed later within the thesis. Beginning with the basic commonality of racism, sexism, and ageism, I have been interested in determining the major determinants for the maintenance of isms and for change. I chose sexism as well as
ageism to compare with racism because I found, through reviewing the literature, that there was a seemingly growing awareness of the basic commonalities between racism, sexism, and ageism plus a historical (recently historical) awareness of the commonality between the various types of prejudices and persecutions based on them. (For one example, see Allport: 1958, p. xi; for other examples see Rothenberg (1988) and Butler (1989)). I purposely began with a general survey of recent college sociology textbooks to seek a general consensus regarding the interaction between prejudice and discrimination. Recognizing that there are various types of systematic prejudice and discrimination (see, especially, for example, Allport:1958, p. xi), I have come to decide that it is very important to fully understand the interaction between prejudice and discrimination if one is to study any ism (particularly racism) as a system.

From my understanding, the comparative side of the comparative-historical method compares "species," of things within and between types. The historical side of the comparative-historical method looks at temporal elements and the processes of time and a grounded sense of history is a necessary prerequisite for effectively doing the research. (See especially Gary G. Hamilton's essay on S. N. Eisenstadt in Skocpol: 1984, p. 85.) At this point, I will begin to attempt to show techniques and methods used by some comparative-historical sociologists and researchers.
Tocqueville's (1955) research involved re-reading well-known books which had made literary history in the time that he was interested in studying. It also involved studying records that, as he puts it, "while less known and rightly regarded as of minor importance, (were useful for throwing) light on the spirit of the age" (Tocqueville: 1955, p. viii). Here, I think, my use of extremely diverse sources and of some, perhaps, unscholarly works is somewhat justified as I attempt to gain insights into the "workings" of racism. Tocqueville was studying old regime France and seeking to determine causes of the revolution. Tocqueville did field research, researched public documents, investigated voiced opinions, researched into minutes of meetings and provincial assemblies, examined central administrative records, studied confidential records of the period, looked at registers, reviewed royal decrees and edicts, examined general literature, searched records of inquiry, studied works of experts, looked at orders enacted by Council, read records of judgments passed by courts, and read reports and circulars to and of Intendants (Tocqueville: 1955). [This overview of Tocqueville's methods reflects my noting and recording his methods and sources each time his methods of investigation were indicated and mentioned (within his book).]

As a comparative-historical sociologist, Theda Skocpol's methods included mainly the use of secondary sources and will, here, be elaborated upon but, first, I will note her comments
on historical sociology, in general.

According to Theda Skocpol (1984) historical sociological studies have the following characteristics.

* they ask questions about social structures or processes understood to be concretely situated in time and space

* they address processes over time, and take temporal sequences seriously in accounting for outcomes

* Most historical analyses attend to the interplay of meaningful actions and structural contexts, in order to make sense of the unfolding of unintended as well as intended outcomes in individual lives and social transformations

* historical sociological studies highlight the particular and varying features of specific kinds of social structures and patterns of change

(Skocpol: 1984, p. 1)

Skocpol indicates, that relative to her research on three revolutions (her unit of analysis being states/societies), the fact that the three revolutions had been extensively researched by historians and area specialists was to her "good fortune" (Skocpol: 1979: p. xiv). Further, she indicates that whereas a large existing literature may be, as she puts it, a "bane" for the specialist who hopes to make a new contribution based upon previously undiscovered or underexploited primary evidence, the comparative sociologist finds this an ideal situation (Skocpol: 1979, p.xiv). She says that broadly conceived, the comparative historical method or approach draws
evidence almost entirely from "secondary sources"—or journal-
article form by the relevant historical or culture-area
specialists (Skocpol:1979, p.xiv). She points out that the
comparativist has neither the time nor all of the appropriate
skills to do the primary research that necessarily
constitutes, in large amounts, the foundation upon which
comparative studies are built (Skocpol: 1979, p.xiv). She
then says, "Plainly, the work of the comparativist only
becomes possible after a large primary literature has been
built up by specialists. Only then can the comparativist hope
to find at least some material relevant to each topic that
must be investigated according to the dictates of the
comparative, explanatory argument that he or she is attempting
to develop" (Skocpol:1979, pp. xiv, xv). For Skocpol, the
comparative method involves searching out and systematically
surveying specialists' publications.

I will end this section by saying that I think that all
comparative-historical sociologists would tend to agree that
one must know and understand a great deal about the subject or
topic he or she has chosen to analyze and be able to pick the
essential traits that define the thing being studied. (See
especially Daniel Chirot's essay regarding the work of Marc
Bloch in Skocpol: 1984, p. 29. His comments tend to agree
with others discussing or promoting the comparative-historical
method.) I, personally, at this point, am trying to begin to
know and understand a great deal about the subject and trying
to begin to be able to pick out the essential traits of the thing being studied. For this reason, the research proceeds in an exploratory fashion.

I have chosen the comparative-historical method for this research because it provides a procedure for thoroughly investigating systematic prejudice and discrimination as evidenced, for purposes of this study, through racism, sexism, and ageism. The comparative-historical method provides a means for fully determining the applicable units, variables, and laws of interaction working. (The term "laws of interaction" comes from Dubin (1978)). Lastly, I have chosen this method because I feel that it best provides a method for pulling prior research findings together and examining the relevance of the different theories and perspectives.

Herein, relative to social change, I will especially use the ideas of Reinhard Bendix, another sociologist whose work falls within the purview of the comparative-historical sociologist (as cited in an essay by Dietrich Rueschemeyer in Skocpol (1984; pp. 129-169)) relative to conceptualizing the major determinants of social change. Those major determinants are material conditions, structures/struggles, economic and political interests, and ideas and ideals (Skocpol: 1984, p. 138).

You will find within this work a heavy reliance upon secondary sources. This is in line with Theda Skocpol's observation that the comparativist has neither the time nor
all of the appropriate skills to do the primary research that necessarily constitutes, in large amounts, the foundation upon which comparative studies are built (Skocpol: 1979, p. xiv; see Skocpol citation on page 28 of this thesis). I would constrain this statement in the follow way. A grounded sense of history is required to satisfactorily perform comparative-historical research (p. 25 of this thesis; Gary Hamilton's essay cited). Relying on secondary sources means relying on interpretations, even though those interpretations are generally accepted as part of our social reality. As the comparative-historian confronts social problems, as well as general understandings of the day, and seeks to critically analyze social problems, an awareness of the need to continually develop the appropriate skills necessary to do the primary research is aroused. Researching and analyzing the works of specialists in the field, becoming more and more adept at doing the primary research, and continually developing those primary research skills adds to the validity of the comparative-historical research.

It has been my intent to follow in the tradition of other comparative-historical sociologists who see themselves as drawing "crude maps" (see, for example, Moore: 1967, pp. xiv, xvii-xviii; though Moore does not say "crude" map. He, rather, said, "That comparative analysis is no substitute for detailed investigation of specific cases is obvious. Generalizations that are sound resemble a large-scale map of
an extended terrain, such as an airplane pilot might use in crossing a continent. Such maps are essential for certain purposes just as more detailed maps are necessary for others. No one seeking a preliminary orientation to the terrain wants to know the location of every house and footpath" (Moore: 1967, p. xiv)). For me, then, having once broken ground and set the course, once crude maps have been drawn, it is hoped that developers, following, will further refine the method, make the course more available and effective, will strengthen the foundation laid, and will add to the knowledge gained. For now, though, like Moore, my intent is to "sketch in very broad strokes the main findings in order to give the reader a preliminary map of the terrain we [should] explore together" (Moore: 1967, p. xiv; Moore says "will explore together").

This research is intended to be analytic. Multiple levels of analyses, as appropriate, will be involved. As I understand it, comparative-historical sociologists (often implicitly) look, of necessity, at conflict, to explain change, and at functionalism, to explain stability.
Chapter II.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter will attempt to investigate and discover what insights the literature provides relative to racism, sexism, and ageism in America and will briefly investigate the types of systematic prejudice and discrimination that have existed and do exist. I will begin with brief histories of racism, sexism, and ageism. This will be followed by a very broad overview of social inequality and divisions in America. With sexism, I will focus on the suffrage movement for women (in America) and then, somewhat, on the present situation relative to women's roles. With ageism, I will focus on the industrial needs of American society and how structural changes, combined with industrial and societal needs, have influenced the role of the aged. With blacks, I will give a brief overview of their history in America's capitalistic society.

According to Genovese, "Until recently American Marxists like many others viewed racism as simply a class question. They regarded discrimination as a "mask for privilege" -- a technique by which the ruling class exploits minorities and divides the working class. According to this view, capitalism generated slavery, and slavery generated racism; but the destruction of slavery did not end the economic exploitation
of black people that racism justified and perpetuated. It is true that slavery bred racism. No people can systematically enslave another for several hundred years without developing racism in some form" (Genovese: 1971, pp. 55, 56; Genovese says that the latter observation comes from C. R. Boxer). Genovese goes on to state that racial prejudice in the New World arose from a variety of sources; various subtle influences had already conditioned Europeans for their negative view of the black man long before the development of slavery in the western hemisphere (Genovese: 1971, p. 56). In the United States a peculiar combination of circumstances produced a peculiarly virulent and dangerous form of racism. The American colonists suffered from what appears to be special, historically conditioned Anglo-Saxon susceptibility to racial prejudice in extreme forms. Worse, population structure reinforced this tendency (Genovese: 1971, p. 56). The blacks and "coloreds" of the American South were a minority of the total population. It was not necessary to distinguish between the two--every man who was part black was (black)-- and it was not necessary to rely on slaves or free "coloreds" for much more than manual labor (Genovese: 1971, p. 57; This population structure is contrasted here, by Genovese, with the British West Indies where the blacks made up the overwhelming majority and the "colored (mixed)" necessarily constituted a middle class as well as a middle stratum). The circumstances that elsewhere set limits to racism ideology
were much weaker in the South than elsewhere (Genovese: 1971, p. 57). Slavery produced racism everywhere, but in the United States it was most "viciously racist" (Genovese: 1971, p. 57). For Genovese, American Marxists and Americans, in general, have failed to understand the roots of racism in America's long historical past and, thus, underestimate the depth of American racism. This, he says, causes the underestimation of the difficulty of destroying racist attitudes and institutions (Genovese: 1971, p. 57).

Black slave labor existed in Virginia as early as 1619, but black slaves were more expensive than white servants in the short run, and their foreignness in appearance, language, and general behavior offended the ethnocentric English. Almost all these early colonists preferred white laborers. In 1640 there were only 150 blacks reported in Virginia. The figure rose to 300 in 1650, 3000 in 1680, and 10,000 by 1704. During the latter third of the seventeenth century, the plantation economy was developing, and an acute need for cheap labor arose. A new type of labor known as "chattel slavery" gradually took shape. The laws on which the system was based came from English property law. Thus, blacks became property that could be bought and sold. They would serve their masters for life, and children automatically became the property of their masters. The only limits upon owners' treatment of slaves was their personal discretion.

Slavery ended in 1865, but the oppression of blacks did not cease. In the South, there were so-called "Jim Crow" laws that legalized discrimination against blacks in all institutional areas. There were also lynchings, and in many southern towns the Ku Klux Klan conducted terrorist raids. Blacks often lived in fear of aggression.

From 1880 to 1930 blacks often lived under very poor conditions. Rural southern blacks frequently had substandard diets inferior to those received under slavery, and infectious diseases spread more rapidly.
because of poor diet. Gonorrhea and syphilis became prevalent among blacks during this period, with many pregnancies ending in stillbirths.

In the 1920's federal legislation restricted immigration, and as a result factories lost their chief source of cheap labor. Recruiters sought southern blacks, and a migration of blacks from the South began. This migration stopped during the depression of the 1930's, but it resumed when industrialization revived with American involvement in World War II.

By 1970 the states outside the South had about half the black population. Blacks migrating to the North usually experienced extensive discrimination in educational and occupational opportunities, in the availability of housing, and in the use of public facilities.

In the late 1950's and early 1960's nonviolent demonstrations in the South protested discrimination against blacks. There were marches, pickets, and sit-ins at restaurants, on buses, and in other public facilities. During these years well-organized campaigns to register black voters occurred in southern states so that blacks would be able to use the political machinery to improve their living conditions. [Legislation is, herein, realized, as a vital link in instituting social change. It is also recognized, however, that changing goals, changing structural conditions, as well as changing ideologies all interact to demonstrate the need for legislation.]

Gradually and imperceptibly, at first, the tone of the protest efforts changed. Whites, who had taken a prominent role in much of the early protest activities, were told to devote themselves to eliminating racism in their own communities. Black protestors began to gain a sense of black culture and black consciousness began to appear. The rhetoric and style of the black protest movement lost its nonviolent character [According to Doob, my major source for this historical account, there has been no documented evidence that blacks initiated violence during any major protests].

The two most prominent black protest leaders of the 1960's--Malcolm X and Martin Luther King, Jr.--were assassinated. Other prominent blacks were killed, including a number of the most active, outspoken leaders of the militant Black Panther party. Large segments of the white public were terrified of blacks revolting, and so many
whites were willing to accept if not condone the killings of black leaders
(Doob: 1985, pp. 245-248).

Geschwender (1978) also points to white response to black uprisings.

The events of the 1950s, 60s, and 70s stimulated an increased interest in the study of racial stratification. People observed the civil rights movement of the fifties, the ghetto uprisings of the sixties, and the black nationalism of the seventies and wondered why all of this was happening. They demanded information on the actual nature of the black experience in America. If blacks were in fact unjustly deprived, then accurate knowledge could be used to formulate social policies designed to remedy the conditions. However, not all interest was motivated by an altruistic concern with black suffering. Many people were disturbed by the fact that black political activities disrupted the normal routine of their lives. They wished a return to "business as usual" with some assurance that their lives would not be disrupted in the future. Most were quite willing to eliminate black suffering if this could be done at a "reasonable cost." But their major concern was "racial peace," not racial justice. If alleviating black suffering were too expensive or too time-consuming or would not ensure a return to normalcy, then alternative routes to racial peace--e.g., repression--would be preferred (Geschwender: 1978, p. 2).

The only killing of a black leader that created widespread public sympathy among whites was the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., and King always advocated nonviolence in protest activity.

Blacks, today, have tended to live in segregated, crowded, low-quality housing. The fact that blacks are usually poorer than whites is one reason housing for blacks is relatively inferior. Other reasons also exist. Federal government housing policy distinctly supported
segregation until the 1960's, and it has taken a very limited role in opposing segregated housing since then. [I am reminded, here, of Allport (1958: pages v - vii). Allport pointed out, among other things, that, in this country, an integrated racial situation (in employment, in the armed services, and in schools) comes about most easily in response to a firmly enforced executive order. See further discussion of this on pages 64-66 of this thesis. The ease with which an integrated racial situation comes about might be questioned but the need to emphasize, investigate, and highlight the interplay between structural, social, economic, and political circumstances with legislation, "changing folkways," and firm enforcement remains, for me, critical to an adequate analysis of why discrimination and/or segregation continues and why integration fails to come about.]

Real-estate agents have often cooperated with neighborhood associations and banks to keep blacks and other minorities out of all-white residential areas. Sometimes, zoning restrictions exist, such as a minimum lot size, and in many cases local politicians will rigidly impose restrictions on blacks but relax them for whites. In addition, many blacks are reluctant to leave inner-city areas, not wanting to destroy community ties and feeling wary about possible hostile reactions from whites in a new neighborhood. As far as jobs, income, and education are concerned, improvements for blacks have occurred, but these must be kept in perspective. A gradual increase in the percentage of blacks in white-collar jobs has taken place, but blacks still dominate in the low-skill, low paid jobs. The fact that black income has remained about 60 percent of white income since 1966 [I, here, leave the 60 percent figure, unquestioned and untouched, as Doob reports it; Matusow (1984, p. 176) also provides a similar report and is, thus, supportive of Doob's findings; These and other sources underscore the (for my purposes) negative income situation of blacks; Matusow reports median family income for blacks was 52 percent that of whites in 1959, 54 percent in 1965, and 60 percent in 1968 (Matusow: 1984, pp. 119, 176)] serves as a reminder of that fact (the fact that blacks still dominate in the low-skill, low paid jobs).
As far as a history of gender inequality, I will focus mainly on the suffrage movement for women and on the present situation relative to women's roles. The suffrage movement gives important insights as to how social change came about for women and why. It fails, however, to give important insights as to why sexism continues. Other sources will be utilized to gain insights as to why women continue to be subjected and exposed to sexism. Through use of the women's suffrage movement and reviewing recent books on occupations and work, I have attempted to gain insights as to why the position of women continues as it does.

I have attempted to apply current collective behavior theory (on social movements) to the women's rights movements. Here, beginning with a model (devised in conjunction with reading various collective behavior and social-movement-type theoretical works), I have decided to focus on discovering collective patterns. The focus will be on the "cultural conflict or loss of confidence in the taken-for-granted basis of reality" (Turner and Killian: 1987, p. 78), keynoters (Turner and Killian: 1987), emergent norms (Turner and Killian: 1987), and the diffuse collectivity.

From reading Turner and Killian (1987), a social movement is herein seen as a group of people who are solidaristic, acting, and have gone beyond a vague awareness of common ground wherein they would constitute, for example, a crowd,
and have developed a conscious awareness of the specific object, objective, or issue of concern to all and now may be considered, for analytical purposes, a collectivity. The above given definition is seen as a summation of Turner and Killian's concept of a social movement. America's women's rights movement for the suffrage is a historically well-known social movement. The suffrage movements for women in Britain and in America somewhat intertwine. Accordingly, some of this historical account will also address the movement in Britain.

Susan Kingsley Kent in her Sex and Suffrage in Britain 1860-1914 (1987) indicates that The Women's Suffrage campaign (in Britain), as an organized movement, began in April 1866 when a petition drive to demand votes for women was started (Kent: 1987, p. 185). The women's suffrage movement, both in England and America may, however, be seen as dating from the 1840 World's Anti-Slavery Convention. It was held in London. The question of woman's right to speak, vote, and serve on committees, wherein several well-known women lecturers, speakers, and Abolitionists such as Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lady Byron, and America's Lucretia Mott had shown up in response to an open invitation to delegates from all Anti-Slavery organizations, precipitated a division in 1840 in the ranks of the American Anti-Slavery Society and it disturbed the peace of the World's Anti-Slavery Convention. (When the call for delegates to the convention had gone out, it was not considered that women might also respond.) The debates in
the Convention had the effect of rousing English minds to thoughts on the tyranny of sex, and American minds to the importance of some definite action towards woman's emancipation. Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady, together, agreed to hold a woman's rights convention on their return to America, as the men to whom they had just listened (in the Convention) had manifested, to Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady, their great need of some education on that question. Thus, a "missionary work" for the "emancipation" of women was then and there inaugurated. The women had not been allowed to speak in the convention (further details of the above may be found in Stanton: 1881, Vol. 1, pp. 53-62; this overview comes from Stanton: 1881, Vol. 1, pp. 53-62). The First Woman's Rights Convention was held in Seneca Falls, New York, July 19-20, 1848 (Stanton: 1881, Vol. 1, p. 63). As can be seen eight years had intervened.

Les Garner, Stepping Stones to Women's Liberty (1984), says that modern feminism, though hidden from history for so long, can be traced back to the seventeenth century and the advent of capitalism. An unequal power relationship between the sexes existed before the dawn of the new economic system but capitalism had a significant effect on the position of women. In particular, as the function of the family, as a self-sufficient economic unit, declined, capitalism devalued women's role in production. The growth of production and waged labour outside the home changed the interdependent

Garner goes on to note that this was neither a simple nor a uniform process, and it affected women in different ways. Working class women became burdened both by the new domestic ideology and by work outside the home. Bourgeois women, on the other hand, although materially satisfied were encouraged to adopt the role of the weak and helpless creature, lost without man and suited to no work other than pleasing him and raising his children (Garner: 1984, p. 1). Placed on a pedestal but bored by their idleness and dissatisfied by their new role, some middle class women began to articulate grievances (Garner: 1984, p. 1).

By 1900 the women's suffrage movement enjoyed mass support from thousands of supporters whose views ranged across the political spectrum from reformist to revolutionist and from one seeking acceptance in the bourgeois world to one
seeking another world altogether (Garner: 1984, pp. 5, 4, 2). A major reason for the support given to the women's suffrage movement was the imbalance between the ratio of the sexes. A surplus of women over men meant a decline in the opportunity of women to get married in an age where it was so important to be married (see Garner: 1984, p. 5). Another major factor was the inequality of the legal system and how it affected women. The law surrounding husband and wife was particularly unjust. It was the wife who suffered in cases of guardianship, intestacy, tax, divorce, and maintenance (Garner: 1984, p. 5). The following is seen to apply. Trevor Lloyd (1971), focusing on the suffrage, says that although the position of women had changed in so many ways between the middle of the 19th century and the end, the question of votes for women had hardly moved. Between 1870 and 1890 there was no change at all but in the 1890s there were the first hints of a revival of interest. When Wyoming became a state of the Union in 1890, after a struggle with Congress, the women kept their votes. This meant that women would vote for Congressmen and for President. Until then, women's votes in Wyoming had been the equivalent of unmarried English women's right to vote in municipal elections if they had the necessary property qualification (Lloyd: 1971, p. 39). In the 1890s three more states in the western USA joined Wyoming and enfranchised women (Lloyd: 1971, pp. 39, 40).

Conflict theory as well as functionalism and exchange
theory are applicable here. Conflict theory proves useful in examining areas of interdependence in the social system as well as unequal distribution of scarce and valued resources. In addition to economic advantage, two overlapping, scarce and valued resources are power and control. The conflict theorist would especially examine the deprivation of rewards to women and their growing awareness that it is in their best interests to alter the system of resource allocation. This conflict theory analysis refers back to the nine-stage process of conflict mentioned on pages 9 and 10 of this thesis. Functionalism also applies here. Functionalism applies as we note the "new domestic ideology" as accented by Garner (Garner: 1984, p. 1) and the subsequent, growth of the women's suffrage movement. What is (or was) the function of a frequently harsh division of labor and what is (or was) the function of well-defined roles between women and men? This will be more fully discussed (though briefly), via recent books on labor market organization, in later sections of this thesis. Lastly, as another alternative theory, exchange theory is useful for examining the dependence of those who do not have equally valued, and scarce, resources (for example, power, control, and wealth) on those who control those resources and how those dependent (groups or individuals) come to organize in ways to increase their bargaining power (through increasing their resources) or in order to coerce those in power or those on whom they are dependent. The
tenets of exchange theory as outlined by Turner (1986) are outlined on pages 10 and 11 of this thesis.

By 1900, women had a good chance of getting the vote in urbanized, industrialized countries, where they could get office jobs and where servants were becoming difficult to find. But there was one other factor to consider, and it probably explains why votes for women caused so much trouble and disturbance in England. In a new country, or in an old country when it undergoes great upheaval, change is relatively easy. Wyoming could give its women votes: it was giving its whole population votes for the first time. The other American states which gave women the vote in the 1890s were only just emerging from being territories and becoming states. By the beginning of the 20th century, women's suffrage was accepted as the modern thing to believe in; every new country wants to be modern; and so every new country was sympathetic to votes for women. It was in older, established countries that changes were harder (Lloyd: 1971, p. 43).

In England, the Pankhursts, Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst and her eldest daughter, knew that to make progress [relative to women's suffrage] they had to arouse public opinion and make people interested in the question of votes for women. They may have realized that this would arouse hostility, but hostility was more useful (according to Lloyd (1971)) than indifference. In October 1905 Mrs. Pankhurst's eldest daughter Christabel and Annie Kenney, a mill girl who belonged
to the Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU), started by Mrs. Pankhurst, were arrested and charged with trying to cause a disturbance at a political meeting in Manchester (Lloyd: 1971, p. 46). (According to E. Sylvia Pankhurst (The Suffragette (1911)), on October 10, 1903, Emmeline Pankhurst invited a number of women to meet at her home. That day, the Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU) was founded. Almost all the women who were present were working-women, Members of the Labor Movement, but it was decided from the first that the Union should be entirely independent of Class and Party. The phrase "Votes for Women" was adopted, for the first time in the history of the movement, as a watchword by the new Union (Pankhurst: 1911, p. 7)). Following the arrest, and subsequent charging, of Christabel Pankhurst and Annie Kenney with trying to cause a disturbance at a political meeting in Manchester, Christabel Pankhurst and Annie Kenney were found guilty and offered the choice of a small fine or imprisonment. They chose imprisonment. They, as they had wished, were noticed (Lloyd: 1971, p. 46). Some of the other things done to arouse public opinion and make people interested were a Miss New chained herself to the railings in Downing Street and started shouting "Votes for Women" while a Cabinet meeting was going on. Until the police brought a hacksaw to cut the chains she went on shouting, attracting so much attention that Mrs. Drummond, one of Mrs. Pankhurst's trusted lieutenants, was able to get into 10 Downing Street and shout "Votes for
Women" inside the Prime Minister's own home (Lloyd: 1971, p. 62). Miss Matters, of the Women's Freedom League, chartered a balloon and flew across London, dropping leaflets on the way. The flight made sure that nobody could forget about the suffragettes. Some women tried presenting a petition to Edward VII when he was going to open Parliament. The main point was to provide a public demonstration (Lloyd: 1971, p. 62).

In the beginning of 1906, the Pankhursts moved to London immediately following the general election where the Liberals won an enormous majority. The Pankhursts began preparing their campaign. They began by organizing a procession to the Prime Minister on Downing Street, starting from Queen Boadicca's statue on the Embankment. The Prime Minister, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, listened to them politely and said he approved of votes for women, but that his Cabinet was divided on the issue. The women then went away and held a large meeting in Trafalgar Square—they were already picking up the normal methods of agitation used by men, and were soon to go rather further. They began heckling Asquith, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, at his meeting because it was well-known that he was the center of the opposition in the Cabinet which the Prime Minister had mentioned (Lloyd: 1971, pp. 46, 49). The pestering of Asquith by members of the WSPU led to arrests. Annie Kenney rang at his doorbell long enough to be a nuisance, and another of the besiegers of his house
slapped a policeman in the face. The women were arrested, and again chose to go to prison rather than pay their fines (Lloyd: 1971, p. 49). Events that followed seemed to indicate that the WSPU had succeeded in arousing public opinion (Lloyd: 1971, p. 49). Going back to conflict theory (and particularly overt conflict), as discussed on p. 10 of this thesis (Ritzer: 1988, p. 111 was cited; see #9 of nine-stage overt conflict process), we know that the arousal of public opinion does not necessarily result in a resolution of the problem nor of the conflict parties fully achieving stated and/or desired ends. How well are the conflict parties able to articulate their true interests and what mechanisms does the "system" have for handling, regularizing, and controlling conflict? Also involved are what structural conditions exist and what political adjustments and re-alignments will be allowed or disallowed.

In England, as in the United States, votes for women could not be passed into law without affecting the rest of the political situation. In the United States, there was the question of prohibition, and the fear of everybody in the liquor trade that if women had the vote they would run the trade. There was also the fear on the part of the southern whites that if women got the vote it would be harder to keep a grip on the southern Negroes. In other words, according to Trevor Lloyd (1971), southerners knew that northern women were powerful and determined and were remarkably hard to persuade
that Negroes were getting a fair deal. Additionally, there was the point of view that whereas physical abuse could be used with Negro men, such as hitting them over the head or some other physical attack, to prevent them from voting, such tactics probably would not be quite so acceptable if performed on women (Lloyd: 1971, p. 59). In England, the difficulty was that only about two-thirds of the men in England had the vote: only a householder could be a voter, and men who lived with their parents, or who lived in ordinary rented rooms or flats did not have the right to vote. The effect of this situation was to make it less likely that women would get the vote (Lloyd: 1971, p. 59).

In England, in 1910, a deadlock appeared in national politics. Following this deadlock, another election about the House of Lords had to be held in December 10, and in this election Asquith (who was Campbell-Bannerman's successor after Campbell-Bannerman retired from the premiership) softened, relative to women's suffrage, enough to say that if the Liberals won the election they would produce a bill to widen the franchise. The more optimistic supporters of votes for women saw this as a virtual promise that they would get their way and that Asquith (who had been a formidable opponent) would withdraw as gracefully as he could. The election made little difference to the parties in the House of Commons, the Liberals remained in office, and early in 1911 the WSPU called off the campaign of agitation by violence. Peace and hope of
a reasonable settlement dawned in England, and Mrs. Pankhurst went to North America to tell the story of the struggle (Lloyd: 1971, p. 70, 53). But by November 1911, the situation in England, which had looked peaceful and likely to end quietly when Mrs. Pankhurst visited North America in 1911, had slipped out of control quite quickly. The first step came (November 1911) when Asquith announced that his government was just about to introduce a bill that would give votes to all adults, and he said that amendments to give votes to women would be discussed. If the Commons voted for them, the government would not make any difficulties. The differences between giving women the vote in a bill which was all their own and lumping them in with men started the whole struggle off again (Lloyd: 1971, p. 83).

Women in the United States were granted suffrage in 1920 and the women in Great Britain were granted the suffrage in 1928. The process involved cultural conflict combined with, to use Turner and Killian's words (Turner and Killian: 1987, p. 78), a loss of confidence in the taken-for-granted basis of reality plus structural strain, keynoting, and emergent norms which resulted in the formation of a diffuse collectivity. In this paper, the concepts of cultural conflict, loss of confidence in the taken-for-granted basis of reality, and structural strain are seen, singularly or in combination, as the initiating forces of the social movement (Turner and Killian: 1987). The main argument throughout this paper will
be that the birth and growth of a social movement can best be understood by a consideration of four key concepts (namely, cultural conflict, efficient, effective keynoters, emergent norms (which involves constraints to act in certain new ways), and the solidaristic, acting collectivity).

With ageism, I will focus on the industrial needs of American society and how this has influenced the role of the aged. It will just be intertwined with conceptualizations, definitions, and overviews given as we go through the rest of this review of the literature.

A review of the literature demonstrates a general recognition that systematic prejudice and discrimination may take many forms and many shapes. Writing in the 1950's, Gordon W. Allport noted

When we speak of prejudice we are likely to think of "race prejudice." This is an unfortunate association of ideas, for throughout history human prejudice has had little to do with race. The conception of race is recent, scarcely a century old. For the most part prejudice and persecution have rested on other grounds, often on religion. Until the recent past Jews have been persecuted chiefly for their religion, not for their race. Negroes were enslaved primarily because they were economic assets, but the rationale took a racial form.

Why did the race concept become so popular? For one thing, religion lost much of its zeal for proselytizing and therewith its value for designating group membership.

(Allport: 1958, p. xi)

Here, we may begin to see that the variable types of
systematic prejudice and discrimination operate at specific times and in specific places. We may also begin to see that any of the variable types may lose their significance and that variable types can and do lose their significance. This is important for this research in that we must be (fully) aware of the types of isms that exist and have existed, how social change came about, and, based upon gained insights, begin to more thoroughly investigate what situations and circumstances tend to effect further and/or new changes (to include successful social transformations).

No sources (journal articles or otherwise) have been located that take an integrated approach to ageism, racism, and sexism. I have gathered from my general research and investigation that racism, sexism, and ageism are often seen as parallel phenomena but too different in too many basic areas for their comparison. As one reviewer of this work has noted, the "basic problem is that key criteria for subordination are different." I hope to change this notion and establish that important key criteria are similar and that research and interventions can proceed based on their similarities. Sources such as Butler (1989) and Rothenberg (1988) have already, for me, proven useful in moving us in that direction.

A general review of the literature seems to indicate that the "major" types of systematic prejudice and discrimination are racism, sexism, ageism, classism, and religious
persecution. College textbooks sampled and reviewed for this study and Allport's comments cited within this paper would tend, among other sources, to support this indication. I will, however, limit my discussions to the three isms that I have chosen to focus on within this paper while only briefly mentioning all five of the major types at variable points.

I am interested in how racism, sexism, and ageism in America are defined and how the definition(s) of one relates to the definitions of the others. I am interested in the interrelated qualities of racism, sexism, and ageism and I am interested in how each relates (singularly and in combination) to systematic prejudice and discrimination and what causes increases and decreases of them all.

Some additional questions to be examined are under what conditions do the variable types of systematic prejudice and discrimination lose their significance. How do the variable types lose their significance? What role do structural, social, economic, and/or political conditions, singularly or in combination, play and when?

Robert N. Butler says that he originally defined ageism thus:

Ageism can be seen as a systematic stereotyping of and discrimination against people because they are old, [I cited this definition earlier to emphasize the workings of labeling theory] just as racism and sexism accomplish this with skin color and gender. Old people are categorized as senile, rigid in thought and manner, old-fashioned in morality and skills....Ageism allows the younger generation to see older people as different
from themselves; thus they subtly cease to identify with their elders as human beings

(Butler: 1989, p. 139).

Butler goes on to say that he "saw ageism manifested in a wide range of phenomena, on both individual and institutional levels—stereotypes and myths, outright disdain and dislike, simple subtle avoidance of contact, and discriminatory practices in housing, employment, and services of all kinds." He goes on to say that "(l)ately, (he had) seen a rising chorus of voices further criticizing the aged, suggesting that they have had too many advantages. These views (came) from powerful quarters: politicians, scientists, and philosophers." Butler points out, though, that "intergenerational conflict are not the views of the people at large." He says that "(n)ational polls and surveys reveal just the opposite, that persons of all ages wish to see older persons keep their entitlements or even have them expanded."

He asks, "In light of these surveys, which do not support intergenerational conflict but, rather, reaffirm the needs of older persons, how can we justify the continuation of the practice of ageism?" [At this point I would say that structural conditions have a major impact on the decrease or continuance of ageism. Further, economic and related conditions often "necessitate" the designation of in- and out-groups. I will attempt to investigate this further within this thesis.] Butler notes that the last decade has witnessed a steady improvement in the attitudes toward the aged and he
says that this is in part a consequence of general public education, increased media attention, the expansion of education in the community, colleges, and universities, and the continuing growth of gerontology as a field of study. He says, though, that on the other hand, the success is "uneven" (Butler: 1989, p. 139, 140). "Residual pockets of negativism toward the aged still exist, most occurring subtly, covertly, and even unconsciously. Like racism and sexism, ageism remains recalcitrant, even if below the surface" (Butler: 1989, p. 140). Butler's conclusion (among other conclusions) is that ageism will probably never totally disappear (Butler: 1989, p. 146).

Having just looked at the comments of Robert N. Butler, the originator of the term ageism, we will now look at what other sources have to say relative to ageism. Macionis (1989) points out that earlier chapters (in his text) had explained the importance of ideology in justifying social inequality and goes on to indicate that sociologists coined the term ageism [a term we know originated with Robert N. Butler] to refer to the belief that one age category is superior or inferior to another. The Macionis text indicates that in industrial societies, ageism tends to favor young adults and middle-aged people while subjecting both the very young and very old to social disadvantages (Macionis: 1989, p. 359). Like racism and sexism, ageism bases negative beliefs about categories of people on highly visible physical characteristics and, based
upon the belief that the individual or category of people are innately inferior, deem that members of that group deserve their social inferiority. Such people are expected to remain in their place and to allow others to make decisions that affect their lives (Macionis: 1989, p. 359). Ageism uses the alleged immaturity of adolescents and the senility of elderly people to justify denying them full human rights and social dignity. Contending that old people are not capable of being fully independent, younger people subject them to condescension, often talking down to them as if they were children. (Here, Macionis cites Kalish, 1979. See Kalish article in The Gerontologist, (August 1979: pp. 398-402)) Familiar negative stereotypes portray the elderly as helpless, confused, resistant to change, and generally unhappy. (Here, Macionis cites Butler, 1975 (Why Survive? Being Old in America)) Ageism makes unwarranted generalizations about an entire category of people, most of whom do not conform to the stereotypes (Macionis: 1989, p. 358).

Various sources reviewed point out the similarities and differences between sexism and racism (e.g., see Taylor, et al.: 1987, pp. 220-222). It is noted that "(t)he ideological justifications for sexism and racism are similar" (Taylor et al.: 1987, p. 221). Sexist and racist ideologies (both) allege inferiority of the victim and their suitability for subordinate roles in society. Such ideologies are frequently
put forward as scientific truths by influential 'scholars' (Taylor, et al: 1987, pp. 220-222), a point that should be remembered as we proceed.

It should be noted that race retains its importance mainly in the minds of people. Racism is the belief that races are very important and that people should be treated differently on the basis of race. Racial mythologies have developed, once in support of slavery, and in the nineteenth century in support of colonialism (Stewart and Glynn: 1985, p. 197; it should be noted here that Robert E. Park is commonly credited with originating the idea that race is a socially created phenomenon; see, especially, collective behavior sources for further insights into race as a socially created phenomenon and regarding the work of Robert E. Park).

One source began its chapter on racial and ethnic groups by saying, "Early in the twentieth century, W.E. B. Du Bois identified racism as the central problem of humanity in this century. The source notes that Du Bois's words may remain equally true in the twenty-first century, for humanity has made only limited progress in eradicating racism from various societies throughout the world" (Taylor, et al:1987, p. 179).

The authors go on to say that "(a)lthough a chapter in a textbook is not likely to contribute much to the elimination of racism, or what Du Bois called 'the color line,' perhaps a better awareness of related concepts, theories, and information will leave (one) better equipped to make such a
contribution" (Taylor: 1987, p. 179).

Racism, as compared to ageism or sexism, is defined in the textbooks and various sources as an ideology that links a group's physical characteristics with their psychological or intellectual superiority or inferiority. This general definition is usually credited to van den Berghe (1967).

Allport's (1954) particular definition of prejudice may also prove useful as we think of linkages of a group's physical characteristics with their psychological or intellectual superiority or inferiority.

The word 'prejudice', derived from the Latin noun 'praecjudicium,' has, like most words, undergone a change of meaning since classical times. There are three stages in the transformation.

(1) To the ancients, 'praecjudicium' meant a 'precedent'--a judgment based on previous decisions and experiences.

(2) Later, the term, in English, acquired the meaning of a judgment formed before due examination and consideration of the facts--a premature or hasty judgment.

(3) Finally the term acquired also its present emotional flavor of favorableness or unfavorableness that accompanies such a prior and unsupported judgment.

(Allport: 1954, p. 6)

Allport makes the following points to clearly define prejudice and to give complete "clarity," as he puts it, to his
definition of prejudice. Prejudice can be favorable or unfavorable, negative or positive. Biases can be pro or con. Allport further points out, however, that ethnic prejudice is mostly negative.

(Prejudice is) an avertive or hostile attitude toward a person who belongs to a group, simply because he belongs to that group, and is therefore presumed to have the objectionable qualities ascribed to the group

(Allport: 1954, p. 7)

(Prejudice is) an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group as a whole, or toward an individual because he is a member of that group

(Allport: 1954, p. 9).

These definitions capture what the various college textbooks and other sources indicate about systematic prejudice and discrimination, in general, whether based on race, sex, or age. Sources agree that prejudice is the perceptual element and discrimination is the behavioral element of systematic prejudice and discrimination. Prejudice and discrimination interact, though, to an almost, seemingly, unintelligible degree.

Prejudice and discrimination against certain groups cannot be accounted for by any single factor; the causes are many, complex, and interrelated (a fact upon which sources
tend to agree). Explanations for the existence of prejudice and discrimination can be classified into three broad categories: psychological, social, and cultural (Shepard: 1987, p. 261). Prejudice refers to attitudes. Discrimination refers to the unequal treatment of individuals based on their membership in some group or social category. Prejudice does not always result in discrimination, but it often does. Discrimination takes various forms, including avoiding social contact with members of a minority, excluding members from certain places of employment and neighborhoods, making physical attacks, and killing (Shepard: 1987, pp. 260, 261).

Prejudice is not easily reversible. As one source puts it, "(t)he fact that prejudice is not easily reversible distinguishes it from a misconception where someone supports an incorrect conclusion about a group but is willing, when confronted with facts, to change his/her opinion" (Doob: 1985, p. 235). The companion concept to prejudice is discrimination, which is the behavioral manifestation of prejudice. Discrimination is the behavior by which one group prevents or restricts another group's access to scarce resources. It is possible to analyze prejudice as an ideology (Doob: 1985, p. 235). Prejudice refers to an attitude, a feeling. Discrimination means unfair or unequal treatment of individuals or groups. It is an action or behavior based on an attitude (Popenoe: 1983, p. 302).

The important things to note, as we move to the next
sections, are that prejudice is most often viewed as an attitude and as an ideology. Ideologies are important. To focus on discrimination is to focus on behaviors. Structural conditions (e.g., economic conditions) impact ideologies and behaviors. Racism, sexism, and ageism are all types of systematic prejudice and discrimination based on some ascribed characteristic. Variable types of systematic prejudice and discrimination have changed plus can and do change. Racism is, relatively speaking, a recent phenomenon. Racism seems to be the most resilient in American society but religion (from a hemispheric perspective, which is beyond the scope of this paper) has possibly been a more resilient type of systematic prejudice and discrimination, more generally speaking. (When I say that racism is, relatively speaking, a recent phenomenon, I am, of course, referring back to Allport, referenced earlier, on p. 50 of this thesis. I mention religion because it is one of the possible types of prejudice within a society and, of course, as I have intimated before, the comparative-historical method entails comparing like types. In order to adequately discover and address common dimensions of the types, it is important to remember like types for possible later testing of derived hypotheses.)
Chapter III.

RACISM, SEXISM, AND AGEISM IN AMERICA

This thesis revolves around three basic concerns --- (1) the role of structural, social, economic, and political circumstances relative to racism, sexism, and ageism in America, (2) the need for the comparative-historical method for an adequate approach to the subject of racism, sexism, and ageism in America (wherein the comparative-historical method aids in making the necessary association between social power relationships and rational efforts on the part of American capitalists to achieve or maintain status in America's capitalistic system), and (3) the need for a "dynamic" critical theory of racism, sexism, and ageism in America. I will, as part of this analysis, investigate divisions in the workplace. Recent books have been reviewed. In the workplace, relative to sexism, the focus is on modern sexism and modern displays of sexism. With ageism, I rely upon earlier references within the thesis. Ageism is a product of an industrial society. Social changes in the society may reflect, and be an adjustment to, changes in the needs of an industrial society. Racism, sexism, and ageism are each examined as they have developed and continue in America's capitalistic system. College texts, in addition to the recent books aforementioned, have been reviewed on the subject.

In endeavoring to compare the three isms of interest
within this paper, I have begun with suggestions from Charles Tilly (1984) wherein guidance was found in his book entitled *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons*. With racism, my desire is to compare racism across time (in America) and against like types of prejudice and discrimination. Attempting to follow through with the techniques and ideas of Tilly, I have attempted to temporally compare racism in America. My goal is to begin to temporally contrast specific instances of racism as evidenced through the specific time periods of slavery, segregation, and now. Now is intended to capture our contemporary American situation wherein racial subordination and underclass status do exist. This temporal comparison of racism necessitates taking a historical look specifically at racism in America.

Comparison of racism with sexism and ageism involves attempting to identify common properties among all instances of the phenomenon known as systematic prejudice and discrimination as evidenced through racism, sexism, and ageism. A complete *temporal* comparison is unnecessary. Racism, sexism, and ageism are each based on highly visible characteristics and are all instances of systematic prejudice and discrimination. Highly visible characteristics are their most basic commonality.

This thesis has come to rest upon and revolve around one key concept. The concept is "innovator." The relevancy of the innovator concept is that I rest my projected interventions (into racism) upon the role of innovators. The
projected role of innovators is based on findings put forth in this section.

Racism is an important concept in this paper. This is because basic comparisons in this paper revolve around that concept. The above two concepts (innovator and racism) are important for this integrated study of racism, sexism, and ageism, for my posited suggestions for intervention into racism, sexism, and ageism, and for demonstrating the commonality between racism, sexism, and ageism. In this chapter I will discuss the United States as a capitalistic society and will attempt the beginnings of an innovator thesis. Throughout, I will discuss the nature of isms and of prejudice and discrimination. With racism, sexism, and ageism, I am interested in capitalism and in innovation.

Before going into a complete listing of concept definitions, I would like to cite comments made by Gordon W. Allport relative to desegregation. The comments are drawn from the foreword of his 1958 edition of The Nature of Prejudice. (This foreword is only to be found in his 1958 edition.) As I compare racism, sexism, and ageism, the importance of legislation is acknowledged but I think it is important to think "historically" and remember what circumstances surrounded the enactments of legislation. Laws most often proceed from impinging circumstances wherein the institutionalization of certain behaviors has come to be seen as required and even necessary. In other words, laws often
come about and coincide with a compelling, urgent need for the system to formally establish rules of acceptable behavior. I return, here, to a conflict theory perspective and, specifically, number 9 (see pages 9 and 10 of this thesis) of Turner's nine-stage, referenced earlier, process.

Legislation is important but legislation is often just prompted by new circumstances. Initially, as I lead into this thesis, the focus should be on what Allport calls "changing folkways" and, "as the folkways change, people give their allegiance to the newer pattern," and on structural, social, economic, and political conditions. At this point, it is my intention to begin to look at emergent norms, collective patterns of change, and the institutionalization of new behaviors. Hopefully, throughout this paper and within this section the sources and materials highlighted serve to demonstrate the role of structural, social, economic, and political circumstances. Allport says,

Not long after (his) book was first printed the United States Supreme Court ruled, in May 1954, that segregation in the nation's public schools (was) unconstitutional. Its directive of May 1955 ordered that desegregation should be instituted "with all deliberate speed."

In this country, an integrated racial situation (in employment, in the armed services, in schools) comes about most easily in response to a firmly enforced executive order. Experience shows that most citizens accept a forthright fait accompli with little protest or disorder. (This is because, in part) integrationist policies are usually in line with their own
consciences (even though countering their prejudices). In part the swift change is accepted because opposing forces have no time to mobilize and launch a countermovement. As subsequent events have shown, the (delays gave) time for the formation of Citizens' Councils, for the crusades of agitators, and, worst of all, for fierce disagreement to arise among authorities occupying strategic roles in the hierarchy of law enforcement (school boards, mayors, district courts, legislatures, state governors, and Washington officials).

Now that a gradualist policy has been adopted, we may point to the desirability of starting integrated education with younger children. Young children are wholly free from racial bias and easily adjust to one another if brought together in the early elementary grades. [I think, to the contrary, that children often have acquired definite biases by the time they enter school although these biases, I would concede, are likely to be less developed and more pliable than those of their seniors.]

By the time (young people) reach high school (they) have formed their teenage cliques and resent the intrusion of strangers; they have taken on the prejudices of their elders; and, worst of all, the most stubborn complex in prejudice—the fear of miscegenation—is aroused.

The segregationist way of life has, of course, been weakening in the South, but to force legal acceleration upon the process compels lingering prejudices to fight a final battle for their self-preservation. Lest (it be thought) that segregation in the schools would in time naturally disappear without Court orders, we must (be reminded) that the trend toward desegregation during the past three decades has required a long array of constitutional decisions—pertaining to transportation facilities, voting, higher education, and other areas of citizens' rights. Legal prods are necessary.

We note that many border states and communities have achieved integrated schools with little inconvenience or disorder. (We also note that) even the more resistant areas seem reluctant to employ devices of violence or to argue openly for "white
supremacy." It is respectable to plead for "states' rights" but not for "keeping (Negroes) in their place." The mores are changing. Lynchings are now virtually unknown. Recent research shows that many people living in the Deep South are not at heart bigoted. Rather they tend to conform to an established folkway. As the folkway changes they will as readily give their allegiance to the newer pattern.

Recently I had the opportunity to study racial problems at first hand in South Africa. In that country governmental policies are solidly in favor of intensified segregation (apartheid). The official morality is thus (there) precisely opposite to the official morality of the United States (Allport: 1958, pp. v-vii; word "apartheid" italicized by Allport).

Racism is subordination based on race (see, for example, Genovese: 1974, p. 3). When we examine the sources I have used to reference the three phases of racism (slavery, segregation, and now), we are looking at subordination in society and/or in social interactions based on race. This is racism. We are looking at the subordination, of Negroes, coloreds, black, and Afro- or African-Americans. (Terms for blacks, as is well known, vary according to various time periods in American society.) Racism is the ideology contending that actual or alleged differences between different racial groups assert the superiority of one racial group (Doob: 1985, p. 235). Racism is defined as an ideology that links a group's physical characteristics with their psychological or intellectual superiority or inferiority.
(Shepard: 1967, p. 255; this is a common definition among sources and, as indicated earlier in this thesis, sources tend to cite van den Berghe (1967) for this definition).

Other concepts that relate to this paper are prejudice, discrimination, sexism, ageism, and ideology.

Prejudice is (often) a highly negative judgment toward a group which focuses on one or more negative characteristics that supposedly are uniformly shared by all group members. [Doob (1985:p. 235) leaves it as "is" a highly negative judgment. I, here, include "often" to acknowledge that prejudice can be favorable as well as unfavorable. Discussion of prejudice continues on the next page.] In general, prejudice is not easily reversible. The fact that prejudice is not easily reversible distinguishes it, as was stated in earlier sections of this paper, from a "misconception," where someone supports an incorrect conclusion about a group but is willing, when confronted with facts, to change their opinion (Doob: 1985, p. 235). Prejudice may be analyzed as an ideology (any "ism" is an ideology and operates as a system of beliefs and principles that presents an organized explanation or justification for a group's outlooks and behaviors) and as a system of beliefs and principles that presents an organized explanation of the justification for a group's outlooks and behavior (Doob: 1985, pp. 235, 264). As has been noted earlier (see page 57 of this thesis), the word "prejudice," derived from the Latin noun "praepudicium," has, like most
words, undergone a change of meaning since classical times. There are three stages in the transformation. (The three stages were cited on page 57 of this thesis.)

Prejudice can be favorable or unfavorable, negative or positive, pro or con. Ethnic prejudice, however, is mostly negative. In sum, according to Allport, prejudice is an avertive or hostile attitude toward a person who belongs to a group, simply because he (or she) belongs to that group, and is therefore presumed to have the objectionable qualities ascribed to the group (see Allport: 1954, pp. 6, 7). My focus is on the negative aspects. This "negative" focus is in line with my focus on racism, sexism, and ageism (as oppressive social arrangements).

The companion concept to prejudice is discrimination, which is the behavioral manifestation of prejudice. Discrimination is the behavior by which one group prevents or restricts another group's access to scarce resources. It is possible to analyze prejudice as an ideology (Doob: 1985, p. 235). For Doob, the prejudice and discrimination are often a one-two punch wherein the behavior directly follows the judgment. It is noted that in some situations prejudice and discrimination do not actually occur in tandem (Doob: 1985, p. 235). Prejudice refers to an attitude, a feeling. Discrimination means unfair or unequal treatment of individuals or groups. It is an action or behavior based on an attitude (Popenoe: 1983, p. 302).
Ageism is an ideology asserting the superiority of the young over the old (Doob: 1985, p. 272). "Ageism can be seen as a systematic stereotyping of and discrimination against people because they are old, just as racism and sexism accomplish this with skin color and gender. Old people are categorized as senile, rigid in thought and manner, old-fashioned in morality and skills . . . Ageism allows the younger generation to see older people as different from themselves; thus they subtly cease to identify with their elders as human beings" (Butler: 1989, p. 139; Butler "coined" the term ageism and, in the article that I have referenced, notes that this is how he originally defined it; in coining the concept ageism, he was the first to clearly conceptualize the commonality between age prejudice with racism and sexism).

In the field of sociology, the term ageism is now conceptualized as just referring to the belief that one age category is superior or inferior to another (in other words, it no longer just refers to the elderly; I, herein, focus on the elderly). Ideology justifies social inequality. Like racism and sexism, ageism bases negative beliefs about categories of people on highly visible physical characteristics and, based upon the belief that the individual or category of people are innately inferior, deem that members of that group deserve their social inferiority. In industrial societies, ageism tends to favor young adults and middle-aged people while subjecting both the very young and very old to
social disadvantages. Such people are expected to remain in their place and to allow others to make decisions that affect their lives (Macionis: 1989, p. 359). Ageism uses the alleged immaturity of adolescents and the senility of elderly people to justify denying them full human rights and social dignity (Macionis: 1989, p. 358; Macionis cites Kalish, 1979, pp. 398-402). Familiar negative stereotyping portray the elderly as helpless, confused, resistant to change, and generally unhappy (Macionis: 1989, p. 358; Macionis cites Butler: 1975). Ageism makes unwarranted generalizations about an entire category of people, most of whom do not conform to the stereotypes (Macionis: 1989, p. 358).

Sexism is subordination based on sex or gender. It involves systematic stereotyping. Sexism is the ideology contending that actual or alleged differences between persons of a different sex assert the superiority of one gender over the other. Physical characteristics are linked with psychological, intellectual, and physical superiority or inferiority. The ideology provides the link needed to act in certain ways toward the inferior gender.

Racism, sexism, and ageism are all rationalizations for political, economic, and social discrimination (Doob: 1985, pp. 235, 264, 272). An ideology is a belief system. Ideologies connect beliefs (and in the case of isms, these are negative beliefs) with other beliefs. In times of crisis, increasing competition, or conflict, ideologies may provide
the link needed to act in certain ways towards certain groups or group members (see especially Selznick and Steinberg: 1969, p. 20).

As was stated earlier in this section, the innovator concept is key to this paper. I rest my case (regarding the potential role of innovators) on three things (namely, capitalism, capitalistic tendencies in a capitalistic state, and the fact that capitalists can be seen as having a positive and a negative side). Capitalists, in general, seek to 1) ensure means by which they can make the system work to their profit, especially in periods of economic contraction, 2) seek to profitably exploit natural and human resources, and 3) seek to reduce costs while increasing total production (Wallerstein: 1980, pp. 19, 131, 136). For me, "capitalists as innovators" seek to do the same thing as do capitalists in general. However, there is a positive and a negative side to this. On the positive side, capitalists as innovators seek to ensure, through creative means, when threats against the system arise that the focus is not solely for personal profitability of the majority of the dominant strata to maintain their privileged position but for the profitability of the system or nation as a whole. Here, relative to positive interventions, I am thinking of some recent publications of various sociologists and economists regarding crises in our capitalistic system and problems of the underclass wherein, for me, a need for positive intervention
is demonstrated.

Note that the word "exploit" is retained in my positive perspective of capitalists as innovators. Exploit is retained in the positive model because exploit can mean "bold, unusual, daring deeds or acts; to make use of; and to turn to practical account even in the face of danger or great odds" (Barnhart: 1967). Exploit can also mean, though, to make unfair use of or to selfishly use for one's own advantage or achievement (Barnhart: 1967). With my innovator concept, I am interested in both the positive and negative sides of capitalists as innovators.

Capitalists as innovators are creative individuals, individually or collectively, with means, ability, and willingness to socially act to make changes (Sica: 1974, p. 84) and with means, ability, and willingness to socially act in pursuit of social change. [The literature that dominates the field of social change would, for me, seem to support Sica's thesis.] Usually, social change (or revolutions) often result from divisions in the ruling strata [over strategies for controlling the masses, strategies for the government of the people, methods for dealing with a failing or weakening economy, methods for strengthening or maintaining efficient political processes, and/or strategies for dealing with governmental crises].

Capitalists as innovators are members of the dominant strata. Boundary lines (of class) may overlap. For example,
we know that women, blacks, and other minorities may be members of the dominant ruling strata because of wealth, education, and/or family background. This is because the (dominant and/or ruling strata) category involves looking at means and/or ability which necessarily involves and includes wealth, resources, education, and/or connections.

Innovators are social actors. The idea of innovators includes a diverse range of personality types but especially those most likely to instigate or adopt alterations in social processes, structures, and/or values (Sica: 1974, p. viii; Sica bases his A Theory of Future Social Change on the role of innovators. I have drawn from his work relative to formulating and utilizing my innovator concept). My ideas on the role of innovators recognizes the importance of creative individuals (Sica: 1974, p. 76) and the interdependence of creators and cultures (Sica: 1974, p. 77). This is not "great-manism" (Sica: 1974, p. 78); rather, my ideas recognize the innovator's role while also realizing that "particular types of styles of purposive social change have been possible and effective only under certain historical conditions" (Sica: 1974, p. 78; emphasis mine; comparative-historical literature would tend to support this idea; studies in social change and of revolutions would also, I think, tend to support this thesis). Sica has a point when he notes that we have the option to focus on the rational or the irrational actions of people. Like him, I contend that it is most important to
focus on rational activities, and most importantly, as Sica puts it, on the possibilities for rational improvement of life when and if individuals care to attempt the improvement of life. That a person may continuously live a life of thoroughly nonlogical action is admitted; that many people actually do is unlikely (Sica: 1974, p. 63).

I think that this is important to note as we think of behaviors, ideologies, and social change and as we investigate prejudice and/or systematic prejudice and discrimination. The following, though from an unrelated source, relative to this research, is seen to apply.

Gene Burns, in an article entitled "The Politics of Ideology: The Papal Struggle with Liberalism" indicates that "(c)onstraints are to be understood as patterns of costs for actions; a person might choose to act against structural constraints but at a cost. Thus, if a certain action in a particular society will result in imprisonment, we can reliably predict that most people under most circumstances will avoid such action. But taking such action might be important enough to some persons that they are willing to suffer the costs. (This) conception of structure ultimately shares more characteristics with a Marxist view of structure than with an anthropological or linguistic view. . . (it differs, however) from the Marxist view in that structures need not be only material forces; patterns of costs can, e.g., emerge from the fact that most persons in a society are
socialized to disapprove of a certain type of action" (AJS: March, 1990; footnote #3, p. 1124).

I think this is important to note as we think of behaviors and ideologies. Most people attempt to act in ways that are socially approved, especially socially approved within the groups to which they belong. This, I think, is a sociologically accepted fact. This point is important to remember as we consider intervention into racism and/or any system of systematic prejudice and discrimination. What are the role models doing? Are they "innovative?" Those with money, time, resources, and connections (and possibly "political clout" are the ones to begin to encourage others to "deviate" from detrimental norms. ("Detrimental" is used, here, in the sense that we fail to fully utilize potential sources of natural and human resources.) This is positive deviance wherein the deviance is a departure from certain accepted though, often, societally detrimental, norms of behavior. As we continue and especially as we note ideologies (relative to prejudice and discrimination) we must realize that people are more than likely attempting to act in a rational, logical way to the situations and circumstances that arise.

Mann's (1986) work would tend to somewhat also support these ideas concerning innovators. Mann focuses on emerging possibilities. Mann notes that humans are social. Humans (individually and collectively) pursuing goals set up many
social networks. Social life generates emergent possibilities. These emergent possibilities would seem to be what allows for social change. These ideas of Michael Mann come from his *The Sources of Social Power* (1986). For Mann, tendencies toward a singular, "unitary network" derive from emergent need to institutionalize social relations. The need to organize and pressures to institutionalize social relations cause a merging into one or two dominant power networks. (For Michael Mann, the dominant power networks are ideology, economic, military, and political; see Mann (1986) pages 1 - 33 and especially pp. 14, 27, and 28.) Michael Mann's ideas are relevant, here, because of the demonstrated interaction of economic conditions, moral rationalizations, and ideology relevant to systematic prejudice and discrimination and relevant to racism, sexism, and ageism. His ideas are relevant to understanding what happens when goals change and/or emergent possibilities arise as goals (this includes new goals) are pursued.

When I attempt to focus on innovators, I am attempting to focus on capitalists as innovators who, acting individually or collectively are those with means, ability, and willingness who seize emergent opportunities, act as creators when emergent possibilities arise, and/or they innovate. They innovate when goals change; hopefully, act as positive innovators in our capitalist society; and, from a collective behavior perspective, lead by example. (My ideas regarding
the above collective behavior perspective, come, especially, from Turner and Killian (1987). Turner and Killian's model of collective behavior proceeds from an emergent norm perspective.)

Two things should be noted before I leave discussion of the innovator. First, the innovator concept, as used by Sica (I said earlier that I had drawn from his work in formulating my innovator concept and the role of innovators) is actually understood by me as making use of one of the five modes of adaptation which form part of Robert Merton's now well-known typology of deviance. For me, though, the innovator concept or the capitalist as innovator concept can be used to represent "positive deviance." My positive conception of capitalists as innovators would tend to refute or deny the following position found in Genovese (1971, p. 62). "The economy must be reorganized to permit the retraining of a whole people (blacks), under conditions of equality and in ways consistent with their own sense of dignity, even at the cost of a temporarily lower rate of growth. In other words, the competitive position of American capitalism in the world market must cease to be a matter of importance... American capitalism, then, cannot deal with the race question" (Genovese: 1971, p. 62). With my positive side of capitalists as innovators, I am saying that American capitalism can deal with the race question and, possibly, without reorganizing the economy. My thesis is that innovators are needed.
Professor Ito (my major advisor for this thesis) has noted that what we're finding in the nineties is that the economy is reorganizing anyway and, in good part, because the United States is no longer a closed market system. He has further pointed out that the nineties may continue to strain white/black relations precisely because capitalist survival may require decisions that indirectly hurt blacks (he says, probably more than women and the elderly). His comments will be considered as I continue to develop the innovator thesis.

Positive innovators see a situation and take action to intervene. Two "types" come to mind --- Dorothea Dix and Horace Mann. Dorothea Dix (b. April 4, 1802) was a social reformer and humanitarian whose "devotion to the welfare of the mentally ill led to widespread reforms in the U.S. and abroad." It was reported that "(i)n 1821 she opened a school for girls in Boston, where, until 1835, periods of intensive teaching were interrupted by periods of ill health. In 1841 she accepted a invitation to teach a Sunday school class in the East Cambridge (Mass.) jail. There the sight of mentally ill persons thrown into prison with criminals of both sexes disturbed her deeply. In the next 18 months she toured Massachusetts institutions where the mentally ill were confined. She revealed the shocking conditions she found in

---

1Naming these two is not meant to limit the possibilities as to the types of innovators who might intervene. Naming them, rather, is intended to help and assist in defining what I mean by innovators. I rely on encyclopaedic entries.
a report to the state legislature (1843). When improvements followed, she turned her attention to neighboring states and then to those of the West and South. She saw special hospitals for mental patients built in more than 15 states and in Canada and improved treatment practiced throughout the nation. Although her efforts to secure public lands for her cause failed, she aroused an interest in the problems of mental illness in Europe as well as the U.S." (Encyclopaedia Britannica Micropaedia: 1979, 15th ed., s.v. "Dix, Dorothea Lynde"). Interventions of this type take commitment, time, and resources.

Mann, Horace (born May 4, 1796) known as the "father of American public education," "was an educator whose proposals for reform constitute the basis of much modern public education. . . . Mann grew up amid poverty, hardship, and self-denial, but he gained admission to Brown University and graduated in 1819. Choosing law as a career, he was admitted to the Massachusetts bar in 1823. From 1827 to 1833 he served in the Massachusetts House of Representatives and from 1835 to 1837 in the state Senate. In 1837 Mann accepted the first secretaryship of the newly established state board of education. During his 11 years in the position, his message centred on the necessity of universal education sustained by an interested public and provided in nonsectarian schools by well-qualified professional teachers" (Encyclopaedia Britannica Micropaedia: 1979, 15th ed., s.v. "Mann, Horace").
What is of interest with Horace Mann's work is that from a position with very little actual legal "authority" [especially, to my knowledge, from the position of the first secretaryship] he helped in causing and bringing about major social changes. About Mann's work in the senate, which led into the secretaryship position, encyclopaedic entries indicate that "(s)omething of a dreamer, but a hardened pragmatist withal, Mann combined a lucrative legal practice with the labours of a legislator in the Massachusetts senate. There he supported a host of liberal causes, from more humane jails to religious freedom and better schools. To gather data on educational conditions in Massachusetts, Mann roved the entire commonwealth. He lectured and wrote reports, depicting his dire findings with unsparing candour. There were outcries against him, but when Mann resigned, after 12 years, he could take pride in a extraordinary achievement. During his incumbency, school appropriations almost doubled. Teachers were awarded larger wages; in return they were to render better service. To help them, Massachusetts established three state normal schools, the first in America. Supervision was made professional. The school year was extended. Public high schools were augmented. Finally, the common school, under the authority of the state, though still beset by difficulties, slowly became the rule" (Encyclopaedia Britannica Macropaedia: 1979, 15th ed., s.v., "Education, History of," p. 366). It should also be noted that when Mann left the senate to accept
the first secretaryship of the newly established state board of education, from the position of secretaryship he continued to influence public policy and assist in enacting social change.

As was stated earlier, comparing sexism and ageism, with racism, does not necessarily involve or necessitate searching for a complete historical parallel between the three isms. Such a comparison does necessitate a demonstration that key criterion for subordination in each instance are the same. This is in line with Tilly's (referenced earlier in this section) ideas and suggested approaches. He states, "Comparison serves to mainly bring out the special features of the pattern." (Tilly: 1984, p. 90; For further discussion of Tilly's individualizing, universalizing, encompassing, and variation finding comparisons refer to Tilly (1984) especially pp. 80 - 86 on "Ways of Seeing."

With the above referenced isms (namely, racism, sexism, and ageism), visibility is a key ingredient for "success" in maintaining the ism system. Being able to visibly distinguish members of the minority group from members of the majority group helps and serves to assist in designating members of the minority group for differential, negatively unequal treatment.

Earlier, I cited Doob (1985; pp. 245-248) for a historical overview of the black experience in America. For other sources regarding black conditions today also see Geschwender (1978; esp. pp. 196-219) and Massey (Sept., 1990).
It is noteworthy that Massey argues that racial segregation, specifically residential segregation, is crucial to explaining the emergence of the urban underclass during the 1970s and of the plight of the urban underclass today. Scarce resources seem to play an important role. Ideology is also important. It is important to remember that ideology serves to reinforce dominant position and interacts with economic and political realities which interact with social realities. Sources tend to agree that prejudice provides rationalities for denying competitive groups access to valued material and sociocultural resources since out-groups are viewed to be inferior, their claims for equal life chances appear unjustified (Fuchs and Case: 1989, p. 306, 307; also see Dinnerstein (1975); Levin (1975); and Geschwender (1978; especially p. 19). Here, we gain glimpses into the role of conflicts, ideologies, and existent structural conditions. Moral rules complete the relationship between ideologies and structural conditions.

Sources such as Genovese (1971) and Skocpol (1984) plus sources such as Skocpol's *States and Social Revolutions* (1979) and Tocqueville's *The Old Regime and the French Revolution* (1955) (though these sources may seem quite unrelated to this research) have tended, for me, to suggest the importance of the comparative-historical method in studying race relations since race relations are so often intertwined with structural conditions and situations and so often involve the conflict between groups. The comparative-historical method allows the
researcher to begin to understand the diverse ways to examine and understand racism (temporally, spatially, against other like species, et cetera). See especially Genovese (1971, pp. 23-26) wherein he notes that research (in his case slavery) often quickly illustrates how psychology and anthropology must be considered, how interrelated the fields of history and social science must be, and how important hemispheric treatments are. The comparative side of the comparative-historical method compares "species," of things within and between types whereas the historical side of the comparative-historical method looks at temporal elements and at the processes of time. A grounded sense of history, as was noted earlier, is important (See especially Hamilton, in Skocpol:1984, p. 85). Also, for me, a macro or structural perspective is required. Further research should aid in the development of a grounded sense of history.

The source I initially find most useful for looking at America's history relative to blacks is Wallerstein's The Modern World-System II (1980). Wallerstein points out on a world-systems scale how slavery was profitable. Others demonstrate that slavery was profitable in America (e.g., Genovese: 1971). Was segregation also profitable and is the making of the underclass somehow profitable for the dominant ruling strata today? Here, I am merely asking how does racism, sexism, ageism, the making of the underclass, and other oppressive arrangements fit into the capitalistic system
Historically, slavery fit in the capitalist system in the following way. Slaveholders commanded and profited from the system of slavery (Genovese: 1974, p. xvi). Slavery rested on the principle of property in man—of one man's appropriation of another's person as well as of the fruits of his labor. By definition and in essence it was a system of class rule, in which some people lived off the labor of others (Genovese: 1974, p. 3). The slaveholders of the South increasingly resided on their plantations and by the end of the eighteenth century had become an entrenched ruling class (Genovese: 1974, p. 5). Throughout, slavery is seen as class exploitation (Genovese: 1974; see esp. p. 7).

Overseers on plantations with a planter in residence often found themselves no more than glorified drivers (Genovese: 1974, p. 13). Genovese notes that this found overseers in the middle. No "sensible" slaveholder wanted a man who could not maintain a certain level of morale among the slaves (Genovese: 1974, p. 15). Slaves, being able to appeal to their masters against cruel overseers, came to look down on the working white man, overseer or other, and up to his owner who grew to be in his eyes a superior being immensely removed above the common fate of mankind (Genovese: 1974, p. 21).

Regarding the law, the slaveholders faced an unusually complex problem since their regional power was embedded in a national system in which they had to share power with an
antagonistic northern bourgeoisie (Genovese: 1974, p. 26). The slaveholders as a socio-economic class shaped the legal system to their interests. But within that socio-economic class—the class as a whole—there were elements competing for power. Within that socio-economic class, a political center arose, consolidated itself, and assumed a commanding position during the 1850's. The most advanced fraction of the slaveholders—those who most clearly perceived the interests and needs of the class as a whole—steadily worked to make their class conscious of its nature, spirit, and destiny. In the process it created a world-view appropriate to a slaveholders' regime (Genovese: 1974, p. 27).

Slavery can be seen as having been profitable. To argue that slavery was profitable, I know, is not new. It is not difficult to find this argument. As a matter of fact, Gutman, in addressing Fogel and Engerman's *Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery* for it being "poor social history" (Gutman: 1975, p. 2), states, "It is not merely that slavery was profitable. Fogel and Engerman are not the first to argue that point, and few historians would dispute it" (Gutman: 1975, p. 5). My main reason, though, for investigating slavery's profitability and in highlighting it within this thesis is to suggest a need to recognize or investigate the "profitability" of having an underclass today. It is in understanding the "value" of having an underclass that we can begin to develop a critical theory, propose
emancipatory alternatives to the situation, and seek ways to convince decision-makers that there is more profitability and value in active interventions and in supporting and instituting emancipatory alternatives.

It has been pointed out to me (for critical purposes) that if the United States power elite wanted blacks to remain slaves it would have continued, that I should recall, for perspective that 10% of blacks are "underclass," and that the United States economy is far better off because fewer blacks are very poor. In response to such comments, it is important to note that, when I or the other theorists speak (or have spoken) of the profitability of an oppressive arrangement, we are referring to choices that are made on the part of the ruling elites. One must also remember that choices are made both at macro [institutional, societal, and large-scale] levels and at micro [individual and small-scale] levels. Choices are made within current ideological, political, and economic constraints. Referring back to the theoretical section of this thesis, we are also interested in examining the interdependence of social units [mainly, herein, from a conflict theory perspective], power relationships [from the conflict theory and exchange theory perspectives], labeling, and the social construction of reality [mainly, herein, from the perspective of phenomenological sociology]. At specific times, based on specific events and incidents, decisions are made (based on economic situations and industrial, societal
needs) which allow for or limit competition in the marketplace. Conscious decisions (influenced by political considerations) are made but the main focus, most often, at all levels, is on "profit making" and "advantage." Wallerstein's comments, relative to the elites, apply here. "When we examine necessary choices made by the overriding majority of the dominant privileged strata [speaking here, merely, to choice of labor] between the recurrent cost of slave labor, the availability and feasibility of using coerced cash-crop labor, and wage labor" (Wallerstein: 1980, pp. 19, 129, 131, 136, 148, 174). His comments help me in the current assessment but other sources also demonstrate why slavery was profitable. Dependent upon geography, product being produced, and economic profitability to be had, a given means of making the system work for a profit and of fully exploiting natural and human resources were sought. Slavery, especially in the South, was the answer. Slavery, at the time, was not seen as harming the whole or the nation or limiting expansion and profitability of the whole but, rather, southern plantation owners and other members of the dominant, ruling strata benefited and profited from slavery. Capitalists in the south using slaves, and capitalists in the north using wage laborers, were able to profit from the form of labor chosen or utilized and still keep America profiting. (Sources used tend to confirm this; I use Moore (1967) later in this paper to highlight this.)
Slavery was chosen as a labor system due to economic need for a people to be particularly exploited due to increased demand for labor and a shrinkage of labor supply. Geschwender gives the following reasons why blacks were chosen to be slaves. Blacks were selected because of their distinctive appearance (they could readily, and visibly, be singled out as a member of the exploited group), they were already labeled inferior, they were already the subject of discrimination, and their immigration was entirely involuntary. Aiding in this selection process was the fact that blacks had no recourse to former country of origin, communications could not affect flow of immigrants, there were no compulsions for those exploiting them to improve their conditions, and they were defenseless. The choice, concerning blacks as slaves, was consciously made within the limits set by external conditions and the desire to maximize profits (Geschwender: 1978, p. 122).

Barrington Moore (1967) entitled his chapter three "The American Civil War: The Last Capitalist Revolution" and subtitles the first section of that chapter "Plantation and Factory: An Inevitable Conflict?" Moore sees two capitalist civilizations (both within America) competing. He says, "The Civil War is commonly taken to mark a violent dividing point between the agrarian and industrial epochs in American history" (Moore: 1967, p. 112). The conclusion he comes to, though, is that "the American Civil War was the last revolutionary offensive on the part of what one may
legitimately call urban or bourgeois capitalist democracy" (Moore: 1967, p. 112). "Plantation slavery in the South, it is well to add right away, was not an economic fetter upon industrial capitalism. If anything, the reverse may have been true; it helped to promote American industrial growth in the early stages" (Moore: 1967, p. 112; emphasis mine). He intimates that the conflict came over commercial interests, over capitalist growth, over "clashing economies and systems" (Moore: 1967, pp. 113, 114). He says, "Essentially, we are asking whether the institutional requirements for operating a plantation economy based on slavery clashed seriously at any point with the corresponding requirements for operating a capitalist industrial system" (Moore: 1967, p. 114). He states that he assumes, "in principle at any rate, it is possible to discover what these requirements really were in the same objective sense that a biologist can discover for any living organism the conditions necessary for reproduction and survival, such as specific kinds of nourishment, amounts of moisture, and the like. It should also be clear that the requirements or structural imperatives for plantation slavery and early industrial capitalism extend far beyond economic arrangements as such and certainly into the area of political institutions" (Moore: 1967, p. 114). Cotton produced by slave labor played a decisive role in the growth not only of American capitalism but of English capitalism too. Capitalists had no objection to obtaining goods produced by
slavery as long as a profit could be made by working them up and reselling them. From a strictly economic standpoint, wage labor and plantation slavery contain as much of a potential for trading and complementary political relationships as for conflict (Moore: 1967, p. 114). At this point, provisionally, Moore states, the answer is "no" to the central question of whether or not structural imperatives are the reasons North and South had to fight (Moore: 1967, p. 114). He says, rather, that special historical circumstances had to be present in order to prevent agreement between an agrarian society based on unfree labor and a rising industrial capitalism (Moore: 1967, p. 114). The plantation operated by slavery, did not hold industrial capitalism back. Rather, it was an integral part of the (industrial capitalism) system and one of industrial capitalism's prime "motors" in the world at large (Moore: 1967, p. 116).

In Southern society, the plantation and slave owners were a small minority. With their families, the slaveholders numbered perhaps a quarter of the white population at the most. Even within this group only a small minority owned most of the slaves. The best land tended to gravitate into their hands as well as the substance of political control (Moore: 1967, pp. 116, 117; Moore cites Randall and Donald: 1961, p. 67 and Hacker: 1940, p. 288).

This plantation-owning elite shaded off gradually into farmers who worked the land with a few slaves, through large
numbers of small property owners without slaves, on down to the poor whites of the back country. The poor whites were outside of the market economy (Moore: 1967, p. 117; Moore cites North: 1961, p. 130). The more well-to-do farmers aspired to owning a few more Negroes and becoming plantation owners on a larger scale (Moore: 1967, p. 117). The smaller farmers in the South by and large accepted the political leadership of the big planters (Moore: 1967, p. 117). Moore's comment on this is that property owners in many situations follow the lead of big ones when there is no obvious alternative and when there is some chance of becoming a big property holder (Moore: 1967, p. 117).

When the Civil War arose, slavery was almost certainly not on the point of dying out for internal reasons (Moore: 1967, p. 117). If slavery were to disappear from American society, armed force would be necessary to make it disappear (Moore: 1967, p. 118). Relative to whether or not the system of plantation slavery generated serious frictions with the North, Moore says that the best evidence comes from the North (Moore: 1967, p. 118). Moore's intimation is that the system of slavery did not generate serious frictions with the North. He states that the importance of cotton, the fact that some Union states had slavery (and rejected a moderate government scheme aimed at emancipating their slaves, with compensation for the former owners), and the fact that plantation slavery was an integral part of industrial capitalism and one of the
prime movers of industrial capitalism in the world at large, point strongly toward the conclusion that slavery was economically profitable and did not generate serious frictions with the North (Moore: 1967, pp. 118, 116; Moore cites Randall and Donald: 1961, pp. 374, 375; Moore also cites Stampp: 1956, chap IX, and two economists Conrad and Meyer: 1958, pp. 95-130, esp. 97 to further substantiate his claim that slavery was profitable).

Moore goes on to add that any large state is full of conflicts of interests (Moore: 1967, p. 133). "Tugging and hauling and quarreling and grabbing, along with much injustice and repression, have been the ordinary lot of human societies throughout recorded history." Realizing this, Moore states that it is necessary to show that compromise was impossible in the nature of the situation (Moore: 1967, p. 133). He says the economic issues were probably negotiable (Moore: 1967, p. 134). The question is, still, "Why did the war happen? What was it about? (Moore: 1967, p. 134)." Moore says that the fundamental issues were economic ones (Moore: 1967, p. 134) but the ultimate causes of the war are to be found in the growth of different economic systems leading to different, but still capitalist, civilizations with incompatible stands on slavery (Moore: 1967, p. 141). He says that the war reflected the fact that the dominant classes in American society had split cleanly in two (Moore: 1967, p. 141).

Moore and Wallerstein have been cited in an attempt to
highlight the role of capitalism in the institution of slavery and later in ending slavery. Economic conditions "necessitated" moral rules and an ideological network for instituting and promoting slavery. Economic conditions, moral rules, and new ideologies allowed for its demise. It goes without saying, of course, that slavery is not unique to capitalism. I have cited Moore, Wallerstein, and the others to emphasize how slavery in a capitalistic system fits into the capitalistic system. Later sections of this thesis seek to investigate how segregation, subordination, and current divisions fit into the capitalist system.

**Labor Market Organization/Divisions in the Workplace**

To focus on sexism for this initial study I mainly dealt with four recent books that address labor market organization. A major focus is on divisions in the workplace. The idea of segmentation and segregation are especially of interest. And, societal influences on workplace realities are considered important. The reasons for my focusing on workplace divisions stems from my initial focus on the role of economics in "driving" systematic prejudice and discrimination and it is here that we also begin to see the complexity of the issues. The four books reviewed were Eichar's *Occupations and Class Consciousness in America* (1989), Epstein's *Deceptive Distinctions Sex, Gender, and the Social Order* (1988), Form's *Divided We Stand: Working Class Stratification in America*
(1985), and Jacobs' *Revolving Doors: Sex Segregation and Women's Careers* (1989). The theoretical perspectives of the authors have been compared and contrasted with the perspectives presented in recent college texts (mainly, "sociology of work" texts). The attempt to compare and contrast the books with college texts is intended to "frame" later discussions of what insights the books provide and what contribution the books make to a better understanding of what allows for continued maintenance of divisions (in general) in society and in the workplace.

There are several explanations of working class divisions in the United States. In general, the explanations for divisions in the workplace may be classified as due to segmentation, dual-labor market, socialization, social control, unionism effects, the effects of capitalism, and human capital. According to the Gordon and others text (1982), there are four major explanations of working class divisions in America (namely, post-industrial tendencies, social history, capitalism, and unionism effects). Post-industrial tendencies emphasize the importance of skills. Here, individuals see themselves as belonging first and foremost to respective status groups according to occupational and consumption achievements and, in this instance, divisions occur along the lines of occupational and consumption achievements. Another explanation (social history) concerns focusing on how divisions have historically developed. This
is best presented in the United States by the work of Herbert Gutman and his students wherein fragmentation (or segmentation) is a result of social history wherein strong forces have repeatedly fragmented emergent class consciousness among American workers. The third explanation (capitalism) refers to the dynamics of capitalism. And, lastly, the fourth explanation refers back to the effects of unionism. (See Gordon et al.: 1982, pp. 4-17.)

As a help in understanding (the continuance of) divisions in the workplace (and for explanations of divisions in the workplace), Pavalko (1988) discusses a dual labor-market. Dual labor-market explanations for occupational sex segregation follow the following lines. The argument is that women, in particular, are more likely to be hired into the secondary sector and the lower tier of the primary sector. (I realize some sociologists may refer to this sector as tertiary work because it involves providing services; I will continue, however, with Pavalko's definitions.) Women are more likely to be hired into the secondary sector and the lower tier of the primary sector because employers assume (an ideology) that women are less committed to their jobs and to a career than men, more likely than men to quit because of marriage or child-rearing responsibilities, and more likely to present problems of absenteeism because of family responsibilities.

The secondary sector (as opposed to the primary sector) refers to relatively poor paying jobs with less attractive
working conditions, few if any opportunities for career advancement, unstable, unpredictable, and insecure employment, and work rules that allow for fickle, unreasonable, changes plus unequal and harsh treatment of employees by supervisors (Pavalko: 1988, pp. 222, 223).

The lower tier of the primary sector mainly includes clerical, sales, and skilled craft occupations as opposed to the jobs with relatively high wages, good working conditions, opportunities for advancement, work rules emphasizing fair and equal treatment, and predictably stable, and secure employment such as professional, technical, managerial, and administrative occupations (Pavalko: 1988, pp. 222, 223).

Occupational sex segregation can be seen to emphasize differential socialization of males and females. Both families and schools are involved in socialization that has important occupational implications (Pavalko: 1988, pp. 226, 227). The Pavalko text notes that no single explanation can account for all of the sex segregation that exists in the labor force. They all make a contribution and they clearly interact in important ways. Differential socialization in families and schools produces sex-typed identities and conceptions of adult (especially occupational) roles. These contribute to differences in occupational choices, aspirations, goals, and educational decisions. Those choices and decisions in turn intersect with labor market sectors and employer preferences which culminate in sex segregation (see,
e.g., Pavalko: 1988, p. 227). Dual labor market theory looks less at segmentation or fragmentation than it does at division. Segmentation, in contrast to dual labor market theory, would tend to denote more of an idea of extensive unconnectedness, many parts, and broken off parts. Dual labor market would tend to look more at a split, as I understand it, between two parts. The splits can involve racial, ethnic, gender, generational, or religious splits. (I include religious splits in order to continue through with the major possibilities for societal splits.)

In comparison to the dual labor-market theory, labor market segmentation, suggests that there are (many) boundaries in the labor market. These boundaries are hard to cross over. Other things block the individual, other than potential or actual ability. Segmentation is due to social segmentation. The theory would tend to look at available choices, skill and opportunities for increasing skill, and the gaining of experience. Socialization experiences such as raising families and domestic responsibilities and the lack of opportunities for promotion and/or growth in wages due to economic class conflicts and racial antagonisms would be of interest. The results of racial and/or gender stratifications are of concern in segmentation theories. Segmentation may occur as a result of discrimination in education and educational opportunities and through social control systems. Social control systems may take the form of harassment and of
hindrances to access.

Sources consulted tend to demonstrate that it is generally agreed that labor in America is internally divided along many economic, political, and cultural dimensions. Source texts (Gordon et al. 1982: p. 2; Hearn 1988: pp. 85-101; Pavalko 1988: pp. 6-7, 31, 62-63, 221-231, 241-242; and Kanter and Stein 1979: pp. 134-160) confirm this. Some argue that the divisions can only be understood by tracing the character and effects of labor segmentation, of structural and qualitative differences in jobs and labor markets (e.g., see Gordon et al.: 1982, p. 2). When we are looking at segmentation, we are looking at competition in the workplace and the transmission of skills through the educational system (Gordon et al.: 1982, p. 3). With the above perspective, segmentation of labor serves to shape, fashion, and reproduce, according to Gordon et al., "materially based divisions" among United States workers (Gordon et al.: 1982, p. 3). Here, we may find reinforced the need for a critical theorist approach and the comparative-historical method for fully understanding divisions, in general, in America and to fully investigate racism, sexism, and ageism in America. Segregation and divisions in the workplace proceed from segregation in society and from reinforcing patterns. Discrimination proceeds from existing divisions and existing divisions reinforce what began the divisions.

Some theorists, looking at segmentation (I am emphasizing
segmentation since it seems to capture the sense of divisions in the workplace, in general), have noted the fragmentation or segmentation by noting that working people identify themselves primarily as blue-collar workers, youth, blacks, students, women, Southerners, Catholics, the poor, consumers, environmentalists, professionals, unionists, or office workers (Gordon et al.: 1982, p. 4) and not just as working people or workers. Segmentation, among others things, plays a major role in channeling the effects of past and present race and sex discrimination. Segmentation helps in reinforcing prejudice.

Epstein in her book, *Deceptive Distinctions*, one of the four recent books I mention and reviewed addressing labor market organization, posits the view that gender distinctions come from dichotomous thinking. Gender distinctions, in societies the world over, remain so uncompromising and "so intransigent" because it is convenient and, thus, becomes the preferred attribute to differentiate members of the human race as to the division of work and also the roles they are to play in social life (Epstein: 1988, p. 232, 233). Epstein's perspective seems to be that the divisions (between the sexes) have been historically developed and, today, the dynamics of capitalism and post-industrial tendencies would tend to reinforce what has developed historically and what happens on a daily basis starting with the first question asked of and by the parents of a newborn as to whether the newborn child is a
boy or a girl. The answer, from the perspective taken by Epstein sets the stage for role assignments, orientation for life, and exposure to controls that will order the child's activities (Epstein:1988, esp. p. 233).

Epstein, in writing the book, notes that she acknowledges an accumulating body of scholarship showing gender differences to be social constructions which also assume the "separatist" condition and the conceived gender differences as inevitable and even desirable. Epstein views this theoretical stance as "inaccurate." The part, for her, to be dismissed is the inevitability and the desirability of gender differences. She acknowledges and accepts that the differences are "social constructs" (Epstein: 1988, pp. xi, xii).

Epstein, in her book, approvingly cites John Stuart Mill (1869) who she indicates was a supporter of the equality of women and who understood that often the observed differences in behavior and the presumed differences in nature might just as well have been produced merely by circumstances as by any real differences (Epstein: 1988, p. 3). She states, though, that "there is no consensus among scholars, men or women, in anthropology, psychology, sociology, or sociobiology on the relative impact of culture or biology." Epstein concludes, however, from her twenty years (Epstein: 1988, p. xi) of research and study that social factors can account for most of the variation seen between men and women (Epstein:1988, p. 46, 71). Epstein emphasizes the role of people and institutions
as active agents in creating distinctions.

Epstein (1988) adds insights to the issues as to why the continuance of divisions in the workplace. For her the reason would be enforcement. "Enforcement accompanies persuasion (Epstein: 1988, p. 234)." Epstein also notes that there are secondary gains, rewards, and benefits to women from gender inequality. Some of these rewards are being placed on moral pedestals, being "removed from the risks as well as the rewards of competition in the world of affairs in which men labor," and promises (even though often unfulfilled) of security and protection (Epstein: 1988, 234, 239).

With Eichar, Occupations and Class Consciousness in America, the opinion seems to be held that social factors outside the workplace influence segmentation within the workplace. Accordingly, Eichar gives the impression that he holds the opinion that segmentation follows segregation and that social factors outside the workplace (capitalistic tendencies) promote segmentation within the workplace. His main focus is on alienation and self-direction among workers. Eichar notes that a less stringent, contemporary version of the (Marxian) argument does not so much regard alienation as a definitional feature of capitalist class structure, but still contends that alienation has come to characterize work in modern capitalistic societies. He notes that, adopting a perspective that stresses conflict and struggle, a number of recent writers portray the history of capitalists as a history
of capitalists attempting to wrest control over the labor process from workers. Eichar, here, cites Edwards (1979). He notes that Edwards writes of three phases by which capitalists have captured control over the workplace after significant struggle with workers, thus precluding the possibilities for self-directed work (Eichar: 1989, p. 32). Eichar says, thus, that to the extent that these theorists contend that alienation from the work process is complete in modern capitalist societies, either by definition or as end product of fundamental processes and struggles, their arguments must be rejected (Eichar: 1989, p. 33). Why must their arguments be rejected? Eichar, in rejecting the arguments, points to the fact that great variations in the dimensions comprising alienation and self-directed work do exist (Eichar: 1989, p. 33). Looking at the self-employed and the self-directed as well as at superiors and subordinates and at exploiters and the exploited, Eichar sees social-psychological influences, cultural and historical ideology, among other things as promoting individual response as opposed to collective protest (Eichar: 1989, p. 109). Eichar "attempts to examine the relationship between occupation and class by focusing on the impact of occupation on working class consciousness and political orientation" (Eichar: 1989, p. xi). He says early in his book that he is convinced of the argument that "class refers to something more than a group of occupations (Eichar: 1989, p. xi)." He is interested in both the conceptual and
the empirical relationship between class and occupation. His focus is on the impact of occupation on working class consciousness and political orientation (Eichar: 1989, p. xi).

Eichar's central question is "do certain job characteristics influence the class consciousness and political orientation of workers (Eichar: 1989, p. xii)?" He sees occupation and class as conceptually independent (Eichar: 1989, p. xii). The major distinction for class (from Eichar's perspective) is between stratification approaches and conflict approaches. The major distinction between occupation is between ranking approaches and classification approaches (For further discussion of this, see Eichar: 1989, p. xii.)

All dominant orientations to occupation and class insist that a class structure is distinct from an occupational structure (Eichar: 1989, p. 1). For Eichar the conceptual integrity of class is linked to some formulation of who controls the means of production and who does not (Eichar: 1989, p. 10). Occupation, on the other hand, refers to classifications of jobs or work roles wherein work roles can refer to activity that is used to earn a livelihood or any activity that produces something of value for other people (with the latter definition of work being intended to include the activities of, for example, housewives) (Eichar: 1989, pp. 10-17).

I find Eichar's perspective contributive to understanding the overall "picture" of what promotes divisions
in the workplace. Eichar would tend to see the reason why the working class is unable to overcome divisions as due to the operation of the cross-pressures of socialization and motivation (Eichar: 1989, p. 111), individualistic tendencies promoted by the capitalist ideology (Eichar: 1989, p. 107), and "learning in relation to issues of workplace control within a wider context of meaning" (Eichar: 1989, 107). Individualistic tendencies inherent in capitalism perpetuate divisions. Self-directed workers tend to become less alienated and alienated workers desire greater control, autonomy, and self-direction. Achievement of self-direction leads to conservatism and less of an inclination towards class consciousness. (See especially pp. 103-112 of Eichar: 1989).

Eichar's work gives additional insights into the role of capitalism in promoting individualistic tendencies. It also gives insights into why the trend is normally towards conservatism. Individuals able to "see" themselves as potentially in reach of the "American Dream" have no interest in liberalism, revolts, social reform, or "social movements," if their own participation (in the movements) is seen as potentially hindering or eliminating their own successes.

Some writers, Eichar says, point to alienated workers as the most class conscious and others point to occupants of the new, skilled occupations, such as technicians and engineers (Eichar: 1989, p. xi), which is termed in his book as being the current conceptualization of the new working class.
Eichar presents findings that the experience of occupational self-direction and alienation affect the class consciousness and political orientation of workers (Eichar: 1989, p. 102). He further notes that he finds support for two competing theses. Workers who are occupationally self-directed (new working class) will be more class conscious and politically radical. Workers who are alienated will be more class conscious and politically radical (Eichar: 1989, pp. 50-53, 102). Both may be explained as capitalistic tendencies. In other words, workers who are occupationally self-directed may be seen as coming to see themselves as a class when they perceive that it is only through perceived collective power, action, and interests that they can maintain their socio-economic class, power, and class position and see themselves as a group needing to politically protect their interests (thus, their tendency to become more class conscious and politically radical). (My notes, here, are influenced by Genovese (1974). Also see pages 84-85 of this thesis where I referenced Genovese somewhat in this regard; Additionally see Genovese (1974), especially 26, 27)).

Alienated workers come to see themselves as a class when they perceive that their needs as a group are not being met and see a need to politically act as a group to have their needs met. All of this actually comes from a conflict theory perspective. The idea that workers who are occupationally self-directed (new working class) will be more class conscious
and politically radical (Eichar: 1989, p. 55 last two sentences and pp. 102, 103) and the idea that workers who are alienated will be more class conscious and politically radical (Eichar: 1989, pp. 57-101, 102) both may be explained as resulting from capitalistic tendencies and explained from a conflict theory perspective. In other words, workers who are occupationally self-directed may be seen as coming to see themselves as a class when they perceive that it is only through perceived collective power, action, and interests that they can maintain their socio-economic class, power, and class position and/or see themselves as a group needing to politically protect their interests (thus, their tendency to become more class conscious and politically radical). Genovese discussed how ruling classes arose and grew in "dialectical response" to other classes in society and how classes come to be transformed from a class-in-itself to a class-for-itself (Genovese: 1974, pp. 26, 27). Alienated workers, as opposed to a group seeking to maintain (class) position, come to see themselves as a class when they perceive that their needs as a group are not being met and see a need to politically act as a group to have their needs met.

Eichar notes that opposing theories and predictions that emerge are often limited by the accepted range of conceptualization and concomitant means of operationalizing key concepts (Eichar: 1989, p. xi). In fact, Eichar notes, it may be that the internal limitations (of the theories)
contribute to the opposing predictions (Eichar: 1989, p. xi). With his approach, he seeks to overcome the limitations and seeks to understand any apparent contradictions. All dominant orientations to occupation and class insist that a class structure is distinct from an occupational structure (Eichar: 1989, p. 1). For Eichar the conceptual integrity of class is linked to some formulation of who controls the means of production and who does not (Eichar: 1989, p. 10). Occupation, on the other hand, refers to classifications of jobs or work roles wherein work roles can refer to activity that is used to earn a livelihood or any activity that produces something of value for other people (with the latter definition of work being intended to include the activities of, for example, housewives) (Eichar: 1989, pp. 10-17).

I will, later, return to Eichar's work but, for now, to conclude discussions of Eichar's book, I will quote (portions of) the concluding sections of his book. First, I will address his findings relative to the two competing theses and, then, I will address his final conclusions.

The past two chapters have presented findings demonstrating that the experience of occupational self-direction and alienation affect the class consciousness and political orientation of workers. . . . The operation of the alienation thesis is straightforward. Employing a motivation model of the impact of occupational self-direction, it predicts that the nonrewards nature of alienating work promotes an overall radicalism that directly manifests itself in attitudes ranging from a liberal self-identification, through a working or lower-middle class identification, down to beliefs that workers should have greater input into the
work process.

The dynamics of the new working class thesis, which invokes a learning generalization model, are slightly more complicated. . . . The prediction is that self-directed workers, who experience a good measure of control over their work environments, generalize this experience to a desire to gain greater input into the decision-making processes of the enterprise. In other words, the experience of occupational control should translate into desires for class control. . . . Self directed work does not directly translate into a working class identity or a liberal political orientation. Instead, the implicit logic is that the desire for greater input in work-related decisions (i.e., class control) should lead to the realization that major changes would be required for this desire to become an accomplished fact. This realization, in turn, should produce an identification with the working class, positive feelings about unions, and so forth. (Eichar: 1989, pp. 102, 103)

I believe the findings reported are best viewed as a manifestation of the relationship between occupation and class. More particularly, they are the result of the disparate social-psychological influences of a particular set of job conditions on the class consciousness and political orientation of workers in the United States. As such, these findings demonstrate the usefulness of bringing the advances that have occurred in the field of job characteristic theory to the study of political outcomes by providing some further insight into the politics of the working class.

The results, however, warrant only moderate enthusiasm. First, while real effects were shown for occupational self-direction and alienation, they were never so great as to make a tremendous difference in the proportion of variance explained in the regression models. These were somewhat small for the variables analyzed, no doubt partly because of the inherent difficulties involved in the measurement of attitudes. But it is probably fair to say that, to a certain extent, job characteristics represent only a few of a number of causal factors that, taken
together, do not explain very much variation in the class consciousness and political orientation of workers. Second, a number of methodological problems have been encountered that restrict the ability to generalize the findings. There is, for example, the subjective nature of the data used as indicators of job dimensions, and the loss of variation that results from the estimation techniques used. . . . Nevertheless, I believe that my results suggest that further efforts to improve the quality of data regarding job characteristics, so that they can be employed without reservation in future, will be worthwhile.

(Eichar: 1989, pp. 111,112)

Jacobs (1989), *Revolving Doors: Sex Segregation and Women's Careers*, wonders why women do women's work (Jacobs: 1989, p. 1). As with the Epstein book (see earlier reference), Jacobs is interested in gender and sex distinctions (and sex segregation) in the workplace. His book investigates the way women's careers intersect with the sexual division of labor in the workplace and he looks at gender tracking (Jacobs: 1989, p. 2). Jacobs sees the maintenance of a sexual division of labor through mechanisms of social control. (The earliest stage of social control is socialization.) But, social control continues well beyond early socialization, involving the educational system, the decisions and behavior of employees and employers in the labor market, and the influences of family and friends throughout life (Jacobs: 1989, p. 8). The central thesis of Jacobs' book, as is also stated in the introduction of his book, is that the maintenance of sex segregation depends on a lifelong system of social control. In other words, while sex-role
socialization is important, since it instills values and goals, it is inadequate by itself to maintain the system of sex segregation. Sex role socialization can be viewed as a system of social control for the early years, necessary but not sufficient to account for the persistence of occupational sex segregation (Jacobs: 1989, pp. 8, 9). Jacobs notes that even for those men and women who attend college, social control continues during higher education. Although many consider the educational system to be the realm of universalism, the paramount social institution in our society for promoting opportunities for all and in spite of the fact that declines in sex segregation in higher education have surpassed those in the labor force, important gender differences persist in America's colleges. Men and women pursue different majors and informal social control plays a prominent role on campus (Jacobs: 1989, p. 9). Jacobs' conclusion is that sex roles are subject to continual, systematic, but imperfect control throughout life. Individuals move, but the systems remain segregated, owing to the cumulative force of social pressures (Jacobs: 1989, p. 10).

Jacobs, like Epstein, notes that the sexual division of labor is a social construct (p. 17). The work performed by men and women reflects the cultural definition of roles more than biological necessity (Jacobs: 1989, p. 17). For Jacobs, cross-national comparisons of the work done by men and women
provide evidence for this argument (Jacobs: 1989, p. 17). Jacobs takes a social control perspective to sex-segregation in the workplace. He notes a weak link between aspirations and jobs, wonders if the pattern is more a result of changing values or restricted opportunity, and notes the need to more closely examine why the (dramatic) movement of women out of (here, we see his revolving door perspective) male-dominanted occupations (Jacobs: 1989, p. 188, 189). Jacobs, having specifically stated what he thinks are the reasons why the working class (as far as sex segregation) is unable to overcome their divisions, argues "for the usefulness of a social control perspective in understanding both stability and change in the sex segregation of occupations. The processes that reinforce sex segregation continue to operate throughout life" (Jacobs: 1989, p. 185). Even when women obtain high levels of education, informal mechanisms [operating in society exist and] are relied upon to keep them in traditional female roles. (See, especially, Jacobs: 1989, pp. 191, 192.)

Form (1985), _Divided We Stand_, says that he was criticized by several colleagues in print and through letters written to him after his 1973 published findings on how auto workers in four countries varied in the extent of their industrialization. The criticisms indicated that he was wrong to suggest that industrialization might increasingly divide the working class (Form: 1985, p. xiii). The criticisms and his conclusions from writing the book that the
more industrialized the country, the less cohesive is its working class prompted the current book (Form: 1985, p. xvii). Following this, he saw "clearly (that the internal structure of the working class merited deeper study...sociological literature is rich in theories of class formation, but no theory sufficiently explains the failure of the American working class to become a cohesive status group and party (Form: 1985, pp. xiii, xiv). He was aware that the idea that the working class would become more internally stratified over time was contrary to both Marxist and other sociological traditions (Form: 1985, p. xvii). Based on the above situations, he made the decisions to investigate how the contemporary American working class is divided (Form: 1985, p. xvii).

In Form's view, classes in industrial societies are composed of occupational groups that share common career and generational mobility patterns (Form, cites Weber (1978)). The actual occupations which comprise the classes must be empirically determined (Form: 1985, p. 4). Sociologists often disagree on who to include in the working class (Form: 1985, p. 20). Form approvingly references Tilly (1978, 1981), calling Tilly's approach useful. Tilly's approach, Form says, emphasizes that class formation must be studied historically in terms of collective actions taken by workers in response to specific factory and community crises (Form: 1985, p. 262). Form says his approach, though not historical, moves in a path
similar to that suggested by Tilly. He examined major parts of the working class for the amount and type of interaction they had with each other and found evidence of considerable segmentation (Form: 1985, pp. 262, 263). The working class is split by income, union membership, skill, industry, ethnicity, race, sex, and region (Form: 1985, p. 19). He notes that at this stage of American history, it appears that the working class is more divided than organized. It makes more sense, therefore, to focus on its divisions and to probe their magnitude rather than search for the hoped for underlying unity (Form: 1985, p. 22). He thinks that the American labor force, the part of the working class that is subject to social organization, will remain divided even though parts of it will gain political influence (Form: 1985, p. 263). Form posits the view that where the splits now exist (along ethnic, gender, and racial lines, for example) divisions will remain but ethnic, women's, and class organization may move in parallel directions to improve the lot of the entire working class (Form: 1985, pp. 266, 267). Form would see that differences in the culture remain as workers move into the workplace. Labor market organization merely enhances and reinforces divisions. Occupational groups are influenced by generational mobility patterns and social "splits" that occur in the culture or in society.

Overall, these books complement one another and give insightful views as to why workplace divisions have developed
and why they persist. Their stances coincide. Societal influences can be seen to continually shape workplace realities. Whether looking at the working class, in general, or at generational divisions or at divisions based on gender, social influences, history, and capitalistic tendencies at the societal (macro) and at the individual (micro) level play important roles.

To expound on perspectives, Eichar seems to hold the perspective (this, for me, is his implicit perspective) that capitalism promotes the continuance of divisions in the workplace. Class consciousness, as well as political radicalism, is promoted by specific perceptions of strategies needed to both individually and collectively "profit."

Form seems to promote the perspective that divisions continue due to historically determined developments. In other words, a reading of his book tends to suggest that he is taking a historically determined interactionist perspective and sees that, through interaction, groups become unified based on income, union membership, skill, industry, region, ethnicity and/or race. For Form, divisions in the workplace continue because segments become united due to interaction but the segments remain divided. The segments do not interact, see no need to interact, and perhaps see it to their disadvantage to interact.

Jacobs promotes, as I see it, the perspective that divisions are the result of the organizational structure of
social life (a functionalist approach). Gender divisions remain in the workplace due to the existing (societal) role expectations. Compliance with societal role expectations is assured through socialization as well as through social control. As I see it, Jacobs' perspective is a Parsonian perspective (namely, he is focusing on the latency function -- socialization and social control --- of Parson's cybernetic hierarchy of control) (see Turner: 1986, pp. 62-86, especially p. 73 for a further discussion of this).

Epstein, with her perspective that gender divisions, impacted by the dynamics of capitalism, post-industrial tendencies, and the organizational structure of social life (which includes life cycle role assignments and differing social controls for men and women, which have historically developed) is also seen by me as promoting a functionalist perspective towards divisions in the workplace in that divisions continue due to socially constructed, historically determined "needs" within the society. The books agree and their stances coincide with materials presented in sociology classes and class texts in that societal influences can be seen to continually influence, as well as shape, workplace realities. Each of the books suggest a need for a historical approach to divisions in the workplace. [I know that some sociologists see historical sociology as atheoretical. This will not (herein) be addressed.]

Taking a historical perspective and using the major
theoretical paradigms (namely, functionalism, conflict theory, and the interactionist approach), important insights may be gained. Importantly, the interactionist, functionalist, and conflict paradigms are not mutually exclusive (Babbie: 1986, pp. 38, 39) and "each casts a somewhat different light (as well as shadow) on social life" (Babbie: 1986, pp. 38, 39; Babbie included the "as well as shadow" in parentheses). Thus, the historical or historicist paradigm allows for a better analysis of the phenomenon under study (namely, divisions in the workplace as well as in society). The authors' respective propositional (if-then) statements (Eichar, Jacobs, Form, and Epstein, to include others I have addressed herein) may be summarized as societal influences shape workplace realities. Divisions are historically determined. Tasks assigned, who competes with whom, and who interacts with whom is determined by the economy and the needs of the society and social history.

These books demonstrate that divisions in the workplace remain challenging from an investigative standpoint and that a synthesis of the perspectives is probably needed in order to understand and attempt to combat problems originating from the divisions. Especially helpful for me was the fact that the issues were formulated in such a way as to provide very useful insights into the issues, a demonstration of the theoretical and methodological tangles, and the prevailing controversies. Their insights, collectively, highlight, for those wishing to
debate the issues and/or critically analyze the problem of divisions that a broad agenda is needed to address and understand the dynamics. As far as "why is the working class unable to overcome racial, religious, ethnic, and/or gender divisions?," I think many authors, like other social scientists researching the matter, are still attempting a concise answer to that question.

As far as the perspectives taken by the authors, they attempt to address certain aspects of the issues under concern, realizing that they are working within a specific boundary or framework. I think this just goes along with common research practices (often within the limitations of funds and time) to specify boundaries and to focus only on certain aspects of a problem or situation and to clearly explain that aspect. Epstein, Jacobs, Eichar, and Form (and others) accomplish what they intend as far as adding insights.

For discussion of boundaries (of theories), I have referenced Dubin (1978; especially chapter six). In this sense, Epstein does not miss or ignore anything by her perspective since she attempts to acknowledge the role of culture and biology and of social and natural occurrences. Acknowledging her biases, especially for equality (see Epstein: 1988, p. xii), Epstein attempts to objectively assess available research. She emphasizes the role of people and institutions as active agents in creating distinctions. For Epstein (1988) the reason for the continuance of divisions in
the workplace would be enforcement in the form of social controls. "Enforcement accompanies persuasion" (Epstein: 1988, p. 234). As stated earlier, Epstein also noted that there are secondary gains, rewards, and benefits to women from gender inequality. And, as stated before, some of these rewards are being place on moral pedestals, being "removed from the risks as well as the rewards of competition in the world of affairs in which men labor," and promises (even though often unfulfilled) of security and protection (Epstein: 1988, 234, 239).

Form would see that differences in the culture remain as workers move into the workplace. Labor market organization merely enhances and reinforces divisions. Occupational groups are influenced by generational mobility patterns and social "splits" that occur in the culture or in society. Based on what he is interested in, Form merely gives another perspective on divisions in the workplace.

Eichar would tend to see the reason why the working class is unable to overcome divisions as due to the operation of the cross-pressures of socialization and motivation (Eichar: 1989, p. 111), individualistic tendencies promoted by the capitalist ideology (Eichar: 1989, p. 107), and "learning in relation to issues of workplace control within a wider context of meaning" (Eichar: 1989, p. 107). As Eichar puts it, current divisions in the workplace exist and continue due to "cross-pressures" between socializing and motivating influences. It seems that
the individualistic tendencies inherent in capitalism perpetuate divisions. Self-directed workers tend to become less alienated and alienated workers desire greater control, autonomy, and self-direction. Achievement of self-direction leads to conservatism and less of an inclination towards class consciousness. (See especially pp. 103-112 of Eichar: 1989). Eichar's approach (for me) serves to remove the confusions away from apparent contradictions in findings. His work gives additional insights into the role of capitalism in promoting individualistic tendencies. His look at "cross-pressures" and his perspective that individualistic tendencies promoted by the capitalistic system may be seen as explaining both sides of the issue, though not actually clearing up the issue, does provide necessary insights.

Jacobs argues "for the usefulness of a social control perspective in understanding both stability and change in the sex segregation of occupations. The processes that reinforce sex segregation continue to operate throughout life" (Jacobs: 1989, p. 185). Even when women obtain high levels of education, informal mechanisms (operating in society) are relied upon to keep them in traditional female roles (see Jacobs: 1989, especially, pp. 191, 192).

The books tend to reinforce the idea that social factors, structural conditions, to include economic conditions, and capitalistic tendencies, plus ideologies, provide reasons for stratification for divisions, and for discrimination. Their
works reinforce what I have gathered from other sources reviewed. All sides of the picture are needed to fully understand issues. Plenty of time, money, and willingness, are needed to study all aspects of divisions in the workplace. These authors particularly analyze and attempt to study divisions in the workplace (though not necessarily explicitly stated) through uses of functionalism, conflict theory, and the interactionist perspectives. All help in explaining the issues but none are mutually exclusive, as stated before, and as such the functionalist, conflict, and interactionist perspectives are all involved, at least as far as theoretical reasons for continued divisions.

The method used to study racism, sexism, and ageism, in order not to miss or ignore anything, must encompass the interactions, the conflicts, the functions of the phenomenon, capitalism, social history, unionism effects, and the needs of industrial society in order to, as Form might, conceivably, say, "bring light into the black box." Reference is made here to Form's review of the Eichar book. The Form review is reprinted (in its entirety) in my "Conclusions" chapter.

The books reviewed provide helpful supplementary reading for those initially interested in investigating the issue of divisions in the workplace (and in society) and why divisions continue. As noted earlier (the Gordon text was initially cited), theorists have noted that workers (in America) identify themselves primarily as blue-collar workers, youth,
blacks, students, women, Southerners, et cetera. As such, dealing with the problem of divisions in the workplace as well as in society, apparently, must involve dealing with the overlap between categories and with individualistic tendencies promoted by capitalism. These books help in providing a better understanding of the many causal factors involved. The idea is reinforced that social factors, structural conditions, to include economic conditions, and capitalistic tendencies plus ideologies provide reasons for stratification, for divisions, and for discrimination. Stratification and divisions lead to discriminations and barriers. Perpetuated ideologies grow out of observed real differences wherein differences that are socially constructed are reinforced. With sex segregation, the divisions that occur are often a result of limited access and limited opportunities stemming from social stratification and divisions. This has also been true with the aged. Some might want to emphasize that this was "in the past." We continue to find this to be true with blacks.

In the Kanter and Stein book (1979), I noted that many successful career women rely heavily on technical knowledge, competence, and expertise to create their successes (Kanter and Stein: 1979, p. 134). I also noted that youth, inexperience, new-hire status, regional variations, cross-cultural communication, and "rarity" should all be considered factors affecting and effecting problems in the workplace
(Kanter and Stein: 1979, pp. 158-160), and by extension, divisions. Here, a question to be answered is "what promises to be the best remedy to the problem(s)?" Form (1985) attempts to answer that question. His answer is that where splits now exist, along ethnic, gender, and racial lines, divisions will remain but ethnic, women's and class organization may move in parallel directions to improve the lot of the entire working class (Form: 1985, pp. 266, 267). Apparently, from certain perspectives, overcoming divisions (in society) will not so much come from class consciousness wherein the workers see themselves as them against the capitalists as much as workers, in general, working hard to create their successes, retaining individualistic tendencies, serving as role models to those who would follow their lead, and workers in their divided groups working towards betterment of their own groups but wherein bettering the group serves to potentially improve the lot of all. Apparently, the how and the why for Form is through unions, through interactions that promote unity among the segments, through activism on behalf of the "class" or group, and role modeling. With this idea of role modeling, I have intimated from Form's work that (from an interactionist paradigm, as summarized, for me, by Babbie (1986: pp. 38, 39)) that ethnic and racial groups and organizations working to improve (or improving) the lot of, for example, women and minorities will serve as role models for those desiring to improve the lot of their own group.
Focusing on labor market organization helps in understanding divisions in the workplace, as well as in society. Prejudice and discrimination against certain groups cannot be accounted for by any single factor; the causes are many, complex, and interrelated.

In the past, capitalist innovators (see especially the works of Moore (1967), Wallerstein (1980), and Genovese (1974), adapting to changing circumstances, have devised ways to continue making a profit. Today, (for me) what is needed is capitalists as innovators (on the positive side) who will demonstrate to the majority of the dominant, more powerful ruling strata that social change at a particular time (now), and without social disruption, is necessary and more "profitable" for the economic system and for the nation. Of course, I realize that a more indepth historical study of race relations in America from this perspective is necessary to demonstrate and establish this. For real social change in the area of racism to occur today (and when I say "real," here, I am speaking of the kind enacted with the Civil War and the kind brought about with the Civil Rights Movement), innovators, will need to use their creative capacities, acting out of key roles.

In general, the perpetuation or the decline of racism (or, perhaps, of ageism or of sexism) has been or is impacted by economic situations, politics, the pursuit of economic gain, and the push for limiting competition in the
marketplace. (See e.g. Macionis text (1989, esp. p. 359), Moore (1967), Genovese (1974), and Wallerstein (1980)). My position is that we need innovators today to effect social change, innovators, who will 1) demonstrate how to eliminate racism, 2) work towards eliminating racism, and 3) **effectively** demonstrate that racism must be eliminated. My use of the word innovators focuses on individuals acting individually or collectively but acting socially and having resources to act. To eliminate racism, it will take dealing with economic conditions while also dealing with ideological considerations. Agreeing with Sica (1974), that the civil rights movement is completely "dead," dead in the sense that I no longer see it as meeting the definition of a social movement (a definition given earlier in this paper), I also agree, with him, that what is needed now is hard work, thrift, investment, the study of economics, media access, et cetera (see Sica: 1974, p. 126).

Robert N. Butler (1989), I think, would agree, with Sica's solutions, since it was Robert N. Butler who first recognized the commonality between racism and sexism and, based on what he posited to enact structural changes relative to the aged, he, perhaps, would agree that such things are also needed to enact structural changes relative to racism. I acknowledge that the aging of the population, changing structural conditions, and decreasing numbers of young workers has aided in changes relative to the aged. This does not,
however, contradict my overall thesis. My overall thesis is that economic (structural) conditions initiate ideologies. Politics determine the range of changes. Incorporating Mann's (1986) idea of "power networks" but, here, addressing his idea solely to America, I would say, based on the social change literature I have reviewed, source materials highlighting the dynamics of capitalism, and insights gained about racism, sexism, and ageism, that group changes (or improvements), as opposed to individual successes, are most often accomplished through the interplay between economics, ideology, and politics. Here, I incorporate three of Michael Mann's (1986) "overlapping and intersecting power networks" mentioned earlier in this thesis. Group changes come about most often through capitalistic innovators, and interventions, in a capitalistic society.

Robert N. Butler, says that he finds that knowledge is the most basic intervention (for ageism) as it serves, as he puts it, as "antidote" to numerous erroneous but widely held beliefs (Butler: 1989, p. 138). We know that he means knowledge both for the minority group members and for the majority group members and this knowledge is both at the practical and at the academic level (and that legislation is included). In addition to knowledge, Butler also discusses several other points. He states that legislation, such as the Age Discrimination in Employment Act and various other protections, including entitlements and long-term care, are
antidotes (remedies) for ageism (Butler: 1989, p. 147). We know, too, that, for racism, government protections are also often crucial (see, for example, Allport: 1958, especially his foreword and my previous comments in this thesis).

Some other remedies for ageism that Butler discusses are from a continuing intervention perspective. I, here, discuss Butler's antidotes and remedies, for ageism, as a prelude to my later discussions of possible (similar) interventions into racism. Some of the interventions that Butler (1989) briefly discusses are support for older people's sense of mastery, provision of specially designed self-help books, and the recognition of older people both as constituting an important market and as potential contributors to the productive capacity of the society. His aim is to challenge policymakers, practitioners, scientists, and members of the medical profession, and the public at large to intervene in the problem of old age (Butler: 1989, p. 138). Butler points out that it is within our power to intervene in social, cultural, economic, and personal environments, influencing individual lives as well as those of older persons (Butler: 1989, p. 139). I would say, recognizing the commonality between ageism, sexism, and racism that, perhaps, his interventions would apply just as well to racism. Further research is needed to determine this.

My current perspective is (based on previous social changes with blacks, women, and the elderly and based on
continuing conditions) that economic conditions come first but ideologies must be considered and dealt with (on multiple levels). As Genovese says, and I cited this earlier, "Until recently American Marxists like many others viewed racism as simply a class question. They regarded discrimination as a "mask for privilege"—a technique by which the ruling class exploits minorities and divides the working class. According to this view, capitalism generated slavery, and slavery generated racism; but the destruction of slavery did not end the economic exploitation of black people that racism justified and perpetuated. It is true that slavery bred racism. No people can systematically enslave another for several hundred years without developing racism in some form" (Genovese: 1971, pp. 55, 56; Again, as was noted earlier in this thesis, Genovese credits the latter observation to C.R. Boxer). The circumstances that elsewhere set limits to racist ideology were much weaker in the South than elsewhere (Genovese: 1971, p. 57). Slavery produced racism everywhere, but in the United States it was, according to Genovese, most "viciously racist" (Genovese: 1971, p. 57). For Genovese, American Marxists and Americans, in general, have failed to understand the roots of racism in America's long historical past and, thus, underestimate the depth of American racism. This, he says, causes the underestimation of the difficulty of destroying racist attitudes and institutions (Genovese: 1971, p. 57).
Racism will have to be dealt with on multiple levels. Ideologies as well as structural conditions must be dealt with. Innovators will have to creatively act to enact some "cross-cutting" interventions [see the Robert N. Butler (1989) article referenced earlier in this thesis] while also considering economic situations and conditions. Interveners (innovators enacting interventions) need resources. Racism will need to be dealt with on multiple levels because of the "vicious cycle" of racism. Interveners need to work from the knowledge that discrimination caused deficiencies and discrimination reinforces prejudice and that interventions must break into the "vicious cycle."

Before ending this section, I would like to note the following. The importance of the ideas of the major, classical sociological theorists [namely, Marx, Durkheim, and Weber] to prejudice and discrimination research is acknowledged. As we know, Marx focused on historical materialism as he focused on societal conditions. Durkheim was interested in moral rules and how "(m)oral rules develop in society, and are integrally bound up with the conditions of social life pertaining in a given time and place" (Giddens: 1971, p. 73). An interest inherent to Durkheim's above stated interest is (as expressed by Anthony Giddens commenting on Durkheim's early work) is how changing forms of society effect transformations in the character of moral norms (Giddens: 1971, p. 73).
Weber's focus, on the other hand, may be summed up, I think, by referring to what Giddens (1971) has to say about Weber's early work. Giddens says, "Weber's early work on Roman history... shows an early awareness of the complicated nature of the relationship between economic structures and other aspects of social organisations, and more especially, a conviction that all forms of crude economic determinism must be rejected" (Giddens: 1971, p. 121). We must remember, too, that Weber did not believe in the laws of class struggles. Rather, according to Guenther Roth, Weber saw people struggle most of the time under created laws and within established organizations. People act as they do because of belief in authority, enforcement by staffs, a calculus of self-interest, and a good dose of habit (Weber: 1968, p. xxix; these comments are to be found in the introduction by Guenther Roth).

The work of all three theorists (Marx, Durkheim, and Weber), mentioned above, are important to prejudice and discrimination research and for fully understanding the importance of ideologies, material conditions, the role of moral rules in society, and politics. [Also see such sources as Genovese: 1971, especially pages 23-52, regarding the importance of ideologies and material conditions.] Investigating alternatives to the current situations of systematic prejudice and discrimination based on ascribed status will involve looking at economic conditions and the ideologies that promote unequal treatments while looking for
possible alternatives to the situation.

I have tried to stress throughout that economic conditions "drive" those seen as different or inferior out of the competition. There is much overlap between classism and other divisional mechanisms. Economic conditions drive those seen as different or inferior out of the competition or allow for their acceptance into the competition.

Isms are all rationalizations for political and social, as well as, economic discrimination. The key criterion to focus upon, in our capitalistic system, are economic conditions (developed or, in some cases, developing), moral rules, and ideological rationalizations. Eradicating racism must include a recognition that crisis structural conditions and/or increasing competition and conflict lead to restrictions of access to scarce resources. Highly visible characteristics of the "inferior" one(s) aids in perpetuation of restrictions. Moral justifications and ideologies develop that serve to guide behaviors and then comes the vicious cycle. Ideologies serve to maintain on-going discrimination. The vicious cycle has begun. Discrimination reinforces prejudice. Prejudice leads to further discrimination. Discrimination reinforces prejudice and so forth. Interventions (active interventions) should and must break into the cycle. To understand social change in America, one must understand and have a knowledge of politics and economics. Politics [strategies for achieving or maintaining
control (of the government)] include the enactments of laws and the extent to which people feel compelled and/or are physically compelled to behave in certain, sometimes new, ways because of the law. History allows for the observance of any patterns relative to social change. Structural conditions and economics initiate and drive situations that call for changes. Ideology and politics shape and limit the changes.
Chapter IV.
SOCIAL CHANGE AND OPPRESSIVE ARRANGEMENTS

My assessment, thus far, is that some sort of instrumental rationality always guides social change. Instrumental rationality is shaped by economics, ideology, and politics. Thus, the analysis of power and of change must focus on the rational efforts of humans as they seek to take advantage of emergent possibilities and to meet emergent or on-going needs. Focusing on the rational involves an on-going awareness of the role of emergent norms prompted by emergent needs and the need to institutionalize certain behaviors.2

2My thoughts, regarding the rationality of human behaviors, have been supported through the use of such sources as Sica (1974), the Gene Burns article (AJS: March, 1990), and, especially, Michael Mann's The Sources of Social Power Vol. 1 (1986). My views on the rational efforts of humans are somewhat at odds, though, with the initial views expressed in a recent book by G. William Domhoff, The Power Elite and the State (1990), who says that "(h)uman beings are best characterized by a restless discontent that is irrational, not rational" (Domhoff: 1990, p. 5). I mention Domhoff's stance since I have referenced his book in addition to Matusow's book (The Unraveling of America (1984)) for a better understanding of how policy is made in America and how social change has occurred. My focus has been, though, on rational decision-making. I find Domhoff's book most useful as a reference in his conclusion where he states, "The need is for a materialist theory of power . . . . Classes and class conflict, along with protest and social disruption, have to be taken seriously to understand power in America" (Domhoff: 1990, p. 282). In other words, extending Domhoff's words, the saying "men and measures" are important considerations when looking at social change. This idea is emphasized in Matusow's book, The Unraveling of America (1984)).
In introducing Matusow's book (The Unraveling of America), Henry Steele Commager and Richard B. Morris, editors for The Unraveling of America, indicate in the introduction that it is the special virtue of the book that its assessment of the Kennedy-Johnson presidencies never permits the reader to lose sight of the impact of both men and measures on American society (Matusow: 1984, p. ix). This is important to remember as we consider the importance of legislation, ideologies, and structural conditions. As Matusow, the author of The Unraveling of America, at one point puts it, relative to juvenile delinquency, "the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act funded an obscure program that was irrelevant to markets and bent on reforming powerful institutions. This program foreshadowed--indeed, inspired--the radical aspects of the later War on Poverty" (Matusow: 1984, p. 107).

According to Matusow, before the government undertook a War on Poverty, a constituency both aggrieved and vocal had first to demand it. In the spring of 1963 the civil rights movement took on mass dimensions, creating that constituency overnight. Median family income for blacks was 52 percent that of whites in 1959, 54 percent in 1965, and 60 percent in 1968 (Matusow: 1984, pp. 119, 176). Migrating rapidly northward, the movement provided ghetto blacks with a vehicle for protesting not only discrimination but unemployment and low wages. That spring, black demonstrations took on ominous,
even violent overtones in Philadelphia, St. Louis, Chicago, and other big cities. That summer, national attention focused on the March on Washington, which turned out nearly 250,000 Americans, most of them black, to demand jobs as well as freedom. The War on Poverty began, in short, because the civil rights movement was educating whites to the realities of black deprivation and because deprived blacks were mute no longer (Matusow: 1984, pp. 119, 120). We should remember and note the often critical importance of the arousal of public opinion to aid in getting and/or achieving social changes. We have already previously noted, however, that whether or not changes actually occur and the extent of changes are impacted by structural conditions, the articulation of conflict parties' interests, and political maneuverings.

After reading Matusow (1984) and other sources (see for example my notes on Bendix's determinants of social change, mentioned on page 29 of this thesis), my determination is that any analysis of social change in America requires looking at knowledge, bureaucracy, and money (Matusow: 1984) and that key determinants to investigate are economics, ideology, and politics (which, again, is constrained by the moral order). Politics, of course, are merely the strategies used to maintain control of the government. Rational social change of an instrumental nature requires knowledge of the situation, leadership, an effective ideology, plus money and resources. Also see Skocpol (1979), Moore (1966), and Tocqueville (1955)
which have all aided in my perspective on the determinants of social change.

Near the end of the first paragraph of the methods and research design section of this thesis, I mentioned the tendency of racism, sexism, and ageism to often overlap. This is especially in cases of persistent and extreme social inequality, deprivation, and poverty. The following underscores the need to understand and examine racism, sexism, and ageism not only as separate phenomena but also as overlapping categories. I refer to Atchley (1988). Atchley begins by discussing the aged but ends with a discussion of social inequality, in general.

The positive-negative nature of aging is further reflected in the fact that aging is both a social problem and a great achievement. For a sizable minority of older Americans, the system does not work. They have difficulty securing an adequate income, are discriminated against at work and in social programs, lack adequate health care, and need better housing and transportation. That these problems recur regularly represents a significant social problem. Yet, the majority of older Americans do not encounter such problems. They are in good health, have modest but adequate retirement pensions, own their own homes, drive their own cars, and need little in the way of social services. Believing that all of the aged are needy or that all of them are self-sufficient is a pitfall to be avoided. Both types of people exist! The fact that most of the elderly do not need assistance makes it possible to do something for those who do (Atchley: 1988, p. 5; emphases reflect Atchley's emphasis in the text).

Most older Americans have adequate incomes, yet 15 percent of the total older population is living in poverty, and as many as 40 percent of the elderly in some
minority categories are in poverty. The key to financial adequacy in retirement is having several sources of income in addition to Social Security. The great variation within the older population on nearly every population characteristic represents a challenge to planners and policy makers (Atchley: 1988, p. 46).

A large proportion of the social inequality in the United States rests on categorical assumptions---ageism, racism, and sexism---that are at least as much a result of our system for linking people with jobs as they are a justification for it (Atchley: 1988, p. 288).

Atchley summarizes his Chapter 14 on "Social Inequality" thus:

Social class influences aging by influencing the attitudes, beliefs, and values people use to make life-course choices and by influencing life-course opportunities, particularly in terms of education and jobs. People whose social class backgrounds lead to middle-class jobs or higher approach aging with much greater resources---knowledge, good health, adequate retirement income---compared to the working class and the poor. The positive picture of individual aging... is primarily middle class because most older Americans are middle class... Any of the problematic aspects of aging are concentrated among the working class and the poor.

Racial discrimination has concentrated black Americans disproportionately in low-paying jobs and in substandard housing, and this applies more to older blacks than to blacks in general.3

3William Julius Wilson's, The Declining Significance of Race, which is a study of race and class in the American experience states that "(s)ince the progressive movement of the more educated blacks into the higher-paying middle-class jobs is being experienced primarily by the younger segments of the population, the income discrepancies between black and white workers is basically a reflection of differences in seniority" (Wilson: 1978, pp. ix and xi); Wilson's study, like other sources referenced for this thesis, merely serve to emphasize the complexity of the issues. Income discrepancies may (perhaps, often) reflect gender, class, educational, and
Of the categories of people who experience discrimination in American society, women experience the greatest injustice. Women who opt to be housewives are quite vulnerable economically to the breakup of their marriages via divorce or widowhood. Those who are employed are concentrated in "women's work," which tends to be low-paying and not covered by private pensions. As a result, retirement incomes of women are only about 55 percent as high as those for men.

Multiple jeopardy increases the probability of having poor health and inadequate income. Being a woman is the greatest disadvantage, followed by having less than high school education (being working class) and by being black. . . . (Atchley: 1988, pp. 288-289)

The above adds empirical reference to social inequality in America, aids in demonstrating the validity of integrating a study of racism, sexism, and ageism, highlights existent needs, and focuses on some problem situations in America today. Regarding social change (past, present, or future), when we are looking at collective action, keynoters, emergent norms, and collectivities are of interest (see Turner and Killian: 1987 for use of these terms). I will re-focus on social movements. For definitional purposes, a social movement is herein seen as a group of people who are solidaristic, "acting," and have gone beyond a vague awareness of common ground and have developed a conscious awareness of the specific object, objective, or issue of concern to all and now may be considered, for analytical purposes, a

other influences. All must be considered for a complete analysis.
collectivity.

As far as social movements, blacks, women, and the aged in America have all experienced some type of social movements on their behalfs. Turner and Killian's definition of a social movement is a collectivity acting with some continuity to promote or resist a change in the society or group of which it is a part. As a collectivity, a movement is a group with indefinite and shifting membership and with leadership whose position is determined more by the informal response of adherents than by formal procedures for legitimizing authority (Turner and Killian: 1987, p. 223). Economic situations (along with political adjustments and re-adjustments) are seen, by me, as the most important concept for initiating, driving, and/or ending the collective behavior process.

For Turner and Killian, the essential characteristics of a social movement are that behavior does not remain individual and governing objectives and plans of action do not remain individual (Turner and Killian: 1987, pp. 223, 224). Relative to social change, Turner and Killian have pointed out two points that must be understood. First, changes at the more specific levels can usually be made without disturbing the more general levels, but changes at the more general levels always require that changes be made at all of the more specific levels. Second, where malfunctions cannot be rectified at the level where they occur, the solution requires changes at a more general level followed by implementing
changes at more specific levels (Turner and Killian: 1987, pp. 238-239).

For Turner and Killian, it should be remembered, that even with structural strain and an appropriate generalized belief, collective behavior will not occur unless background conditions are suitable and unless conditions are "structurally conducive" to the development of collective behavior. Furthermore, there must be a "precipitating incident" or incidents, and people must be "mobilized for action" in the name of the generalized belief. The developing collective behavior must also cope effectively with "social control" efforts taken by authorities against the collective behavior (Turner and Killian: 1987, pp. 238-239; the stages given in Turner and Killian are derived, to a great extent, from Smelser's Value-Added Approach).

Turner and Killian (1987) say that essential to the understanding of social movements is the understanding of movement ideology and goals, and the emergent sense of an obligatory mission. In line with this, to explain collective behavior (and/or, in this case, social movements), Turner and Killian go on to say that we must explain the three distinctive features of collective behavior. The three distinctive features of collective behavior are the occurrence of a disposition to transcend, bypass, or subvert established institutional patterns and structures (extra-institutionalism), the translation of perceptions, feelings,
and ideas into action, and action that takes place collectively rather than singly (Turner and Killian: 1987, p. 241).

Critical to extra-institutionalism, defined as the occurrence of a disposition to transcend, bypass, or subvert established institutional patterns and structures (Turner and Killian: 1987, p. 241), is the justification and coordination derived from emergent norms. Turner and Killian (1987, pp. 7, 8) define extra-institutionalism as the formation of new norms in response to new definitions of the situation and in response to redefinitions of right and wrong. In this sense, the formation of extra-institutions or new institutions involves the formation of institutions that support emergent norms wherein the emergent norms specify both behavior and conceptions of the situation that guide and justify extra-institutional action. Emergent norms range from the merely permissive to the obligatory. Social movements are complex and enduring phenomena in contrast to simple and transitory forms of collective behavior. Hence their emergent norms emphasize the obligatory nature of the movement's mission, and their normative conceptions of the situation are elaborated into ideologies and goal hierarchies. Complementing the emergent normative sense of justification and obligation in fostering the translation of perceptions, feelings, and ideas into action is a sense of feasibility and timeliness. Feasibility includes a sense that it is possible to correct
the unjust situations; impressions of the kind of support and opposition that will be encountered from all quarters, including the state and other "establishment" agencies; the facilities or resources needed for carrying out the action and dealing with opposition; and the ability of the potential actors to carry out the action successfully. Timeliness involves the urgency of the situation and the symbolic appropriateness of the occasion, as well as the sense that feasibility is greater now than it has been, or than it will be in the future (Turner and Killian: 1987, p. 241).

Because the objectives of social movements, in contrast to other forms of collective behavior, are to bring about lasting social change, the sense that it is possible to correct the situation necessarily involves at least some rudimentary image of a workable set of alternative arrangements. Anticipations of support and opposition incorporate confidence that significant latent support exists that can be mobilized as the campaign progresses. Similarly, much more concrete and reliable facilities and resources are required, and a constituency that can supply a continuous flow of dedicated movement adherents. Because collective behavior in a social movement must be sustained for months or years, the sense of feasibility and timeliness is more extensively and continuously tested and revised as the enterprise progresses than is true for other forms of collective behavior, and there is more opportunity for calculation and
planning. Images of workable alternative arrangements for correcting the unjust situation are subjected to searching public critique and the test of public credibility. Unrealistic assumptions about forthcoming support and opposition are exposed by the course of events. The objective adequacy of resources and the displayed capabilities of movement adherents intrude on the world of fantasy and wishful thinking [Drawn from Turner and Killian (1987), pp. 241-242]. This occurs as the movement achieves notable successes and disappointing setbacks. Because social movements are sustained rather than transitory, they require stable organization and leadership and stable constituencies from which adherents can be constantly recruited and replaced (Turner and Killian: 1987, pp. 241-242). As stated earlier, I accept Sica's observations, cited earlier in this thesis, that the civil rights movement, to date, is "dead." Knowing about social movements and investigating their course is useful, however, for this study. I accept Sica's observation that the civil rights movement on behalf of blacks is dead in that it is not seen as currently fitting the Turner and Killian definition just outlined as well as the social movements previously referenced and depicted within this thesis.

A major reason for the support given to the women's suffrage movement was the imbalance between the ratio of the sexes. A surplus of women over men meant a decline in the
opportunity of women to get married in an age where it was so important to get a man and/or get married. Another major factor was the inequality of the legal system and how it affected women. The law surrounding husband and wife was particularly unjust. It was the wife who suffered in cases of guardianship, intestacy, tax, divorce, and maintenance (Garner: 1984, p. 5). It will be recalled that Trevor Lloyd (1971) reported that although the position of women had changed in so many ways between the middle of the 19th century and the end of the 19th century, the question of votes for women had hardly moved. Between 1870 and 1890 there was no change at all but in the 1890s there were the first hints of a revival of interest. When Wyoming became a state of the Union in 1890, after a struggle with Congress, the women kept their votes. This meant that women would vote for Congressmen and for President. In the 1890s three more states in the western USA joined Wyoming and enfrancised women (Lloyd: 1971, pp. 39, 40). By 1900, women had a good chance of getting the vote in urbanized, industrialized countries, where they could get office jobs and where servants were becoming difficult to find. But there was one other factor to consider. As was previously cited, in a new country, or in an an old country when it undergoes great upheaval, change is relatively easy. Wyoming could give its women votes: it was giving its whole population votes for the first time (Lloyd: 1971, p. 43). The other American states which gave women the vote in the 1890's
were only just emerging from being territories and becoming states. By the beginning of the 20th century, women's suffrage was accepted as the modern thing to believe in; every new country wants to be modern; and so every new country was sympathetic to votes for women. It was in older, established countries that changes were harder (Lloyd: 1971, p. 43).

The whole point of this chapter has been to begin to explore the role of economic conditions and how economic conditions (at the macro and at the micro levels) impact social change. Turner's nine-stage process leading to overt conflict (Ritzer: 1988, p. 111; also see pages 9 and 10 of this thesis) offers, for consideration, the fact that we first find interdependent units and unequal distribution of scarce and valued resources among the units as a prior (even continuing) condition. We find, though, that one of the reasons for those not receiving a proportionate share of the resources beginning to question the legitimacy of the system is actual deprivation of rewards in a variety of sectors. We must remember that deprived people often receive "rewards" for, and in, their "deprived" positions. Structural changes may, however, cause deprivation of the rewards previously expected, received, and/or promised.

The next stages of the overt conflict process (the ones following stage 3; see pages 9 and 10 of this thesis) help to explain the outcomes of the actual or potential overt conflict. It should also be remembered that "(t)he degree of
violence [or any violence] is affected by such things as the ability of the conflict parties to define their true interests and the degree to which the system has mechanisms for handling, regularizing, and controlling conflict" (see Ritzer: 1988, p. 111; pages 9 and 10 of this thesis, number 9 of Turner's nine-stage overt conflict process). It is also known that the things affecting the degree of violence are themselves affected by structural conditions, politics, economics, and ideologies (to name, here, the main variables featured within this thesis) as well as middle-class interveners and leadership (provided to the oppressed group).

The investigation has been brief but the point has been to highlight the dynamics of social change and oppressive arrangements. We must, for sound critical analysis, recognize the dual and reciprocal influence of structural changes (Wilson: 1978, p. 3; Wilson points to structural changes in the economy) and the influence of political changes in the state. The recognition of the dual and reciprocal influences are imperative for sound critical analysis. Wilson in his book, The Declining Significance of Race (1978), attempts "to show how race relations have been shaped as much by important economic changes as by important political changes" (Wilson: 1978, p. 3). He went on to indicate that "(i)ndeed, it would not be possible to understand fully the subtle and manifest changes in race relations in the modern industrial period without recognizing the dual and often
reciprocal influence of structural changes in the economy and political changes in the state" (Wilson: 1978, p. 3).
The Matusow text indicates that after Selma, there were those like Moynihan [reference, here, is to Daniel Patrick Moynihan of the "Moynihan Report"] who said that the civil rights movement had finished its work, that artificial racial barriers to equal opportunity had been successfully razed, that the need now was less to push harder for civil rights than to lift Negroes out of poverty or enhance their racial pride or strengthen their families. But this view missed the point (Matusow: 1984, p. 198). North and South, racial discrimination not only persisted, it remained the fundamental problem of black Americans. As in the South, so in the North—the first task of the civil rights movement was to tear down the walls. Less flagrant than in the South but no less vicious and even harder to reach, northern discrimination took three mutually enforcing forms. Segregated housing led to segregated schools, and these together handicapped lower-class black workers in a job market increasingly located in the white suburbs and requiring quality education. Plus, the job market inflicted a discrimination all its own (Matusow: 1984, p. 198). This, I think, is important to remember. Within this paper, it has been shown that economic situations often "initiate," so to speak, the ideologies that perpetuate discriminatory practices. From that point, the ideologies
serve to maintain on-going discrimination. What follows is the discrimination reinforcing prejudice and the prejudice leading to further discrimination.

It has been said that "Liberals once promised to manage the economy, solve the race problem, reduce poverty, and keep the peace" (Matusow: 1984, p. 395). My integrated theory of determinants of racism, sexism, and ageism are economical conditions, a need to regulate competition in the marketplace, and the needs of an industrial society. Specific programs and measures for reducing racism, sexism, and ageism need to be developed based on knowledge of the situation, knowledge of the bureaucratic institutions that have to be dealt with, and based on available money and resources. This thesis has been an attempt, through an integrated study of racism, sexism, and ageism, to understand what might help in eradicating racism in America. As far as social movements, the birth and growth of a social movement can best be understood by a consideration of cultural conflict, keynoters, emergent norms, and the collectivity. It is understood that the basic condition out of which collective behavior usually arises is an anomic situation combined with unusual, precipitating conditions or events (see especially Turner and Killian: 1987, p. 78; use of the concept "anomic situation" makes use of Durkheim's now well-known sociological concept relative to his research on suicide).

Domhoff has a subheading in his book "Disruption and
Power" (Domhoff: 1990, p. 260). He says, "Given the power structure of the Democratic party, the veto power of the conservative coalition in Congress, and, the overall power of the internationalist segment of the capitalist class, the primary task is not to explain the return of conservatism. Instead, the real problem is to explain how a basically conservative business-dominated country without strong unions or a social democratic party could generate some liberal legislation and wage increases between 1965 and 1974 in the first place" (Domhoff: 1990, p. 260). Domhoff's answer is social disruption, whether violent or nonviolent, and tight labor markets (Domhoff: 1990, pp. 260-264). With this research, I choose, however, not to focus on "power elites," as Domhoff and others have done or would do. I prefer to focus on capitalists, in general. If it is only the "power elites" we focus on, then, like Domhoff says social disruption may be seen as essential, though not sufficient (Domhoff: 1990, p. 261), for challenging the American power structures (a power structure Domhoff sees as not being moved by kindness or argument) (Domhoff: 1990, p. 262). I prefer to focus on capitalists, in general, wherein we recognize the role of government, groups, and individuals. When I speak of capitalists, in general, I am speaking of those (and all) who favor the capitalist system. Here, it is necessary to specify the "dimensions" of a capitalist. "Dimensions" is a term that, as has been noted earlier in this thesis, has been
derived from Babbie (1986). Focusing on capitalists, in general, begins with conceptualizing capitalists as those who first accept the ideology. Within that ideology, the focus should be on resources, on commitments, on unitary groups, on "keynoters" (Turner and Killian: 1987), on structural conditions, on emergent norms, needs, and possibilities. As far as social movements, Turner and Killian (1987) [especially pages 253-255], also discuss the potential life cycle of social movements and of the contingencies impinging upon social movement progression through "life" stages. I prefer to focus on capitalists, in general, because it is with such a focus that we can focus on innovative strategies, that we can begin to see ways to develop and incorporate strategies, and that we can also more fully incorporate the potential impact of individuals as well as of governments and groups.

Beyond the physically common attributes of racism, sexism, and ageism, societal needs in a capitalistic system prompt the designation of certain individuals or groups to be selected based on highly visible characteristics for subordination and for differential, unequal treatment. Societal needs within the capitalistic system determine the duration and the type of the subordination for those individuals and groups so selected. I do not feel that this, in and of itself, is a new insight since such sources as Dinnerstein's Ethnic Americans A History of Immigration and Assimilation (1975) tend, for me, to somewhat also suggest
this idea. My main purpose for demonstrating the commonality of racism, sexism, and ageism, as I attempted to show early in this thesis, was to set the stage for researchers seeing the feasibility (and benefits) of comparing racism, sexism, and ageism.

Just as comparative-historical sociologists have previously (with varying degrees of success) compared revolutions, states, societies, and systems, I wish to see such an approach taken to research in the area of prejudice and discrimination. The first necessity is to strip away any notion that racism, sexism, and ageism cannot fruitfully be compared, to seek to determine the proper unit of analysis for future research, and to seek to determine common intervention strategies. Tentatively, the proper unit of analysis for future research [taking my cue from Theda Skocpol (1979) (she chose the state and the strength and structure of the state as her unit of analysis)] is economic condition. Having chosen economic condition as the proper unit of analysis for this particular research, next, utilizing two of Michael Mann's four dominant power networks (it will be recalled that I chose to leave off the military for purposes of this research), I see ideology and politics as the dependent variables (see pages 5, 75, and 76 of this thesis for my reference to Michael Mann's dominant power networks). Lastly, based on the causes of continuing subordination, I have attempted to demonstrate the common requirement today for a "top-down" as well as
simultaneous self-help-type interventive approaches.

For now, as we think of "elite" intervention, interventions are made by those who have money, resources, willingness, and/or time to act as capitalist innovators. Keeping the above in mind, as far as past examples of elite innovation leading to change, with women (I refer back, for now, to those who led the women's suffrage movements), it was middle class and working class women. With blacks, it was political and/or economical situations that allowed for those with time, money, willingness, and resources to provide leadership for social change. With the elderly, it has been researchers such as Robert N. Butler (1989) plus the growth of such a field as social gerontology which allowed for research findings to be carried into the political arena and, through such methods, research findings were allowed to help in causing or bringing about social change.

Capitalistic tendencies promote divisions, segmentation, and individualistic tendencies, as well as political radicalism, under certain (or a particular set of) conditions. Capitalistic tendencies also promote class consciousness and unity. Several sources have tended to support this idea (esp. Eichar (1989) and Genovese (1971; 1974)). Social change comes about through collective action. The collective action may take the form of social movements from below and/or the form of politics from above. The politics are capitalistic strategies which may be in response to a failing or
contracting economy, in response to mass discontent which has come to require adjustments and realignments on the part of elites in order that capitalism may continue to operate more efficiently [here, I somewhat derive my thoughts from the Matusow book wherein it is shown that with Keynesian economics we found the government and governmental agents and agencies acting with the intent of causing capitalism to operate more efficiently (it being governmental intervention intended to "regulate" capitalism (Matusow: 1984, pp. 109, 42, and 119)], and/or in response to ideological splits between the ruling elites wherein political differences can no longer be settled through peaceful and/or private negotiations.

As was indicated earlier, the current trend seems to be towards groups and individuals acting in parallel ways to gain political influence and unitary segments working to improve their own position and somewhat inadvertently improving the lot of other segments of the working class. But as has been very briefly shown, some groups are being left behind, an underclass has developed and might be seen as growing, and the results of social inequality promotes social problems of its own. In our capitalistic system, politics play an important role in social change. The individualistic tendencies promoted by the capitalistic system promote groups as well as individuals to move in ways to promote individual profit and in ways to promote group profit when it is perceived that this is the best course and when possibilities emerge that allow
for such moves. Within the capitalist system, social change is an adapting process to economic conditions and to emergent needs and possibilities.

I do not currently see critical theory as, of necessity, linking with innovators. Rather, critical theory is seen as just a method used to determine the most feasible and/or plausible sources from which emancipatory proposals and/or alternatives to oppressive social arrangements might come. However, critical theory, at this point, links with innovators in that innovators have been seen by me at this point, through my present research, as the most probable source for providing effective interventions into the problem of today's racism in America. Robert N. Butler (1989), Robert C. Atchley (1988), the Doob text (1985), and Matusow (1984), and others I have cited within this thesis, demonstrate that in each group there are those that are well off and there are segments of the population that need help. As far as polarization, I have attempted to demonstrate, through citing the sources, that awareness has to be raised in order to demonstrate the political soundness of intervening on behalf of the disadvantaged. Polarization is only overcome through changed perceptions of the situations. Previous discussions (herein) of the development of class consciousness preliminarily investigate this. With privatization versus interest for others, I refer back to the development of class consciousness. In the capitalistic system, interest for
others, especially at the macro level is, in great part, influenced by political considerations. At the macro level, certain economic conditions demonstrate and/or allow for the political soundness of taking interest in and for others.

The development of an adequate critical theory and an adequate use of the comparative-historical method means much work is left to be done. That does not, however, preclude providing an end product with this work. Most sources selected have demonstrated, thus far, that capitalism generates individualistic tendencies, individualistic tendencies lose prominence when group action is deemed most feasible to achieve common goals, and capitalism serves to determine what roles and groups will be valued (or de-valued) in society. De-valued groups can most efficiently have their needs met (in the capitalistic system) by updating skills, creating their own successes, and through collective action with success and opportunities often being dependent upon structural conditions.

Robert E. Park originated the idea that race is a socially created phenomenon. Jacobs and Epstein (referenced in earlier sections (of this thesis)) noted that the sexual division of labor is a social construct. Previous sources noted that in industrial societies the social inferiority of the very young and of the very old is also a socially constructed phenomenon. Throughout, I have tried to demonstrate the social construction of racism, sexism, and
ageism. My derived thesis is that critical examination of racism requires a synthesis of relevant theoretical approaches and it also requires the comparative-historical method. Interventions (at this point) into racism require legislation as well as money, active enforcements of legislation, as well as dedicated social reformers and humanitarians. My derived thesis focuses on the macro level structural and cultural levels and on the value of the comparative-historical method.

Dedicated social reformers and humanitarians are needed because dealing with the embeddedness of racism today, dealing with historically determined outcomes, and dealing with persistent racist ideologies must include combatting the problem at the macro as well as at the micro levels. Combatting the problem at these levels includes making use of Robert N. Butler-type strategies (referenced earlier in this thesis) such as, for example, self-help, knowledge, legislation and other protections, which includes entitlements. Also needed are support for minority group's sense of mastery, specially designed self-help books, as well as specific acknowledgements of the potential of minority group members to the productive capacity of society. Dedicated social reformers and humanitarians, exemplified in types such as Dorothea Dix and Horace Mann, are also needed because the next stage of social change [working towards eradicating racism] will only come about through social reformers and humanitarians making changes through proposals for reforms,
social intervention, educating the public of the issues, actively working towards achieving a legislative voice, and actively influencing public attitudes and opinions. The work of types such as Horace Mann and of Dorothea Dix, how unions have historically been formed in this country, and corporate responses to the threat of unions influence this assessment. In other words, individual and group strategies aimed at making social change or, on the reverse, at reducing social change have all influenced my final assessment of the situation and how the next major stage (relative to social change and the black situation) might be effected. Here, the focus is on how social change could be fostered both through formal, as well as informal, "innovator" channels as well as being fostered in a style and manner consistent with the suggested strategies of Robert N. Butler (1989) cited in this thesis.

Critical theory is a method used to determine and then propose emancipatory alternatives. Referring back to Theda Skocpol's observations that historical sociological studies "ask questions about social structures or processes understood to be concretely situated in time and space" (see page 27 of this thesis) and understanding the explanatory/predictive power of the major theories and approaches, I suggest that, to help in eradicating today's racism, today's social structures and processes must be thoroughly studied and acted upon as a phenomenon concretely situated in time and space impacted by
history, ideology, politics, and economic conditions. Here, the focus is on critical theory as a perspective which sensitizes the theorist to ways to join the sympathetic elements in the major institutions with interests sounded by the variously aggrieved [such as the elderly, blacks, and women].

I conclude by referencing two book reviews (in their entirety) in order that the reader might more readily assess my assessments. These book reviews further aid in underscoring the issues that are involved in performing a critical analysis of divisions, of sexism (or racism or ageism), and of what influences class consciousness.


The origin and stability of occupational sex segregation have long interested social scientists. Jerry Jacobs's *Revolving Doors: Sex Segregation and Women's Careers* is a noteworthy contribution to the spirited and occasionally heated debates in this field. The book carefully considers three major theories of occupational sex segregation--socialization, human capital, and labor-market segmentation models--and refutes key aspects of each.

Mindful of the substantial and persistent nature of occupational sex segregation, Jacobs began his research assuming women face major barriers to mobility between female and male occupations. Interestingly, he found that there is in fact a considerable amount of mobility among female-dominated, sex-neutral, and male-dominated occupations. And therein lies the central paradox Jacobs tackles--How can the aggregate structure of occupational sex segregation change so little when individual mobility between male- and female-dominated occupations is so common?
Jacobs answers this question by stepping back from the individual moments of mobility to propose a lifelong system of social control that shapes and limits women's opportunities. He outlines three primary social contexts where gender tracking occurs—early socialization differentially shapes occupational aspirations, discrimination in higher education leads to differences in selection of college majors, and a system of social control (e.g., discrimination in access [and] harassment) produces sex-typical occupational choices in the workplace. Because no single factor such as early socialization is sufficient to reproduce extant levels of sex segregation, Jacobs's contribution is to point out how alternative perspectives neglect handicaps women face at each stage in their lives.

Jacobs distinguishes his social-control model from its close relative, the cumulative-disadvantages perspective. The latter model posits that sex segregation results from the accumulation of disadvantages women face throughout their lives. According to this perspective, handicaps originating from sex differences in socialization are compounded by disadvantages emerging in educational institutions and the labor market. It predicts increasing segregation over the lifetime as disadvantages accumulate. According to this logic, it follows that, as women age, they should continually leave, and also be less likely to enter, male-dominated occupations. Using longitudinal data from several data sets (e.g., the National Longitudinal Surveys, Current Population Surveys), Jacobs counters these predictions (and similar ones for occupational aspirations and choice of college major). He finds that sex segregation does not increase over the life cycle and considerable mobility exists among male-dominated, sex-neutral, and female-dominated occupations. These substantial flows into and out of male and female occupations (and, similarly, sex-typed aspirations and college majors) lead Jacobs to his "revolving doors" metaphor. The metaphor is an apt one because, although women move into male occupations, they also move out in almost equal numbers (for every 11 women breaking into traditionally male occupations, 10 leave).

[From Roos' view], the cumulative-disadvantages and social-control models are not as incompatible as Jacobs portrays them and could, in
fact, coexist to a greater extent than he [Jacobs] envisions. Examples of disadvantages that are certainly cumulative come to mind readily. To the extent young women are socialized away from high school math and science courses, they reduce their subsequent choice of college majors, which in turn restricts their later employment opportunities. Few women lacking high school math and science courses are able to choose careers as physicians or engineers. Thus some decisions do in fact have more permanent consequences than others.

Jacobs's revolving-door thesis has important implications for policy. The kind of revolving-door mobility Jacobs describes certainly does not imply equal opportunity. The fact that women move out of male occupations almost as frequently as they move in leads to a rather slow process of integration, and, as recent research by others shows, even that integration is partially nominal. The revolving doors of mobility should lead policymakers to focus on two issues--access and retention in male-dominated occupations. Policies to ensure women's access to the full range of occupations and policies directed toward their retention would be, given Jacobs's findings, the two points where intervention would be most effective in reducing sex segregation in the workplace (Roos, in AJES: March, 1990, pp. 1315, 1316).

William Form's book review of Eichar's Occupations and Class Consciousness in America (1989) reports

Eichar's book explores a novel idea: the effect of immediate job characteristics on working-class consciousness and political orientations. Occupations and Class Consciousness in America is elegantly written, modest in its claims, and balanced in data presentation. Yet the introduction is needlessly long (half of the text), and the main findings could have been compressed into two journal articles.

After reviewing the general literature on class, occupations, and job dimensions, Eichar concludes that Marx's conception of class is the best, that occupational definitions do not permit
examining the relationship of occupations to class, and that researchers do not have a clear theoretical rationale for classifying jobs. However, since job characteristics do influence class and political attitudes, they can be used to examine the relation of occupations to class and politics. The most promising lead for this is provided by Melvin Kohn and his colleagues who demonstrated that occupational self-direction (OSD), independent of socialization and personality, affects many personal and social aspects of workers' lives. Since low OSD correlates highly with subjective alienation, Eichar concludes that OSD and alienation form polar elements of a single scale.

Moreover, OSD, class, and authority, as forms of power, are distinct and related: economic control depends on class, control over labor depends on organizational position, and control over work (OSD) depends on job conditions. Thus, Marxists err in considering control over the labor process as a function of class. In Eichar's general model, the economy and government interact to affect technology, industry, and unions; they, in turn, affect work organization and job characteristics that affect socialization and psychological states such as class as well as political attitudes and behavior.

. . . . Accepting Eichar's conclusions depends on accepting his definitions: the working class represents all employees; class consciousness consists of workers' attitudes on how much say workers should have on controlling the work situation and how much effort unions should place on job control. It is not surprising that the highly skilled want more job control and more activist unions; that is, they are more class conscious. These findings support the new working-class thesis. Since no job dimension correlated negatively to class consciousness, the alienation or incongruence theses are not supported. Thus, high OSD increases both class consciousness and job satisfaction, while low OSD (high alienation) reduces class consciousness and job satisfaction.

Since this work-level scenario contains anomalies, Eichar explores different components of class consciousness with the richer data that NES provided on class consciousness and politics. They show that alienated workers identify with
the working or lower-middle class, endorse unions, support government guarantee of jobs, identify themselves as politically liberal, are more dissatisfied with their jobs, and vote less frequently. Conversely, high OSD workers are more politically conservative. Eichar concludes that these data support the alienation thesis. Since the QES data support the new working-class thesis and the NES data the alienation thesis. Eichar reconciled the seemingly inconsistent findings by embracing Michael Mann's division of the working class into traditional and new working-class sectors. The former is stronger on workplace class consciousness while the latter is stronger on societal class consciousness. To conclude, job-characteristics theory may better explain working-class attitudes than E. O. Wright's contradictory class-location theory or J. Low-Beer's work-experience and prior-socialization theory.

This work ends perhaps where it should have begun. Most of Eichar's findings will not surprise scholars of work and stratification. Since he includes almost all workers in the working class, heterogeneity of attitudes should have been expected, as several theorists of working-class segmentation have long recognized. Then the research task would have been to compare systematically the explanatory power of these segmentation theories. Moreover, Eichar's arbitrary definitions lead to anomalous findings. Thus, equating the desire for job control with class consciousness obviously yields "inconsistent" findings. Equating alienation with low OSD seals off fruitful questions. Defining the working class as all employees, but accepting NES's eight classes to determine class identification forces Eichar to resort to strained explanations. Ignoring the class consciousness of nonemployed women limits the generalizability of the explanations. Failure to include more behavioral items leads me to question the significance of the findings. To be sure, Eichar explores an important question of how work influences class consciousness, but his limited data and research design fail to bring much light into the black box.

(Form, in *AJS*, May, 1990, pp. 1594-1596).
Eichar does, however, for me, add to the current body of knowledge to the extent that his book added (for purposes of the present thesis) insights into why divisions remain (especially in the workplace). With the Eichar research, high OSD (occupational self-direction) and high alienation, both, lead to class consciousness and to political radicalism. The point that both high OSD and high alienation lead to class consciousness and to political radicalism are the important points in Eichar's work (a point I referenced on pages 104-108 of this thesis). Such a situation demonstrates the need to understand and address the two competing theses. From Eichar's perspective (as I understand it), the competing theses, if both true, demonstrate a need to understand the dynamics and the politics that would cause such a phenomenon to exist. In sum, apparently, both high OSD and high alienation may lead to identification with a particular group and a perception of a need to act, in unity, on behalf of the group. Such a situation, as Eichar demonstrates, indicates why fragmentation among workers exists, and continues to exist, especially in America. This situation tends to promote, at given times, racism, sexism, and ageism. Segments may become unitary under a particular set of conditions but do not necessarily become inclined to become unified with other segments. (See pages 107-109 of this thesis for citations of sections of Eichar's book.)

Social change relative to contemporary American race
relations should be investigated through a consideration of economic conditions, prevailing (and changing) ideologies, moral order, and politics. In other words, when examining systematic prejudice and discrimination, one should be a student of emergent needs and emergent possibilities, within the culture or society. There is a need to emphasize the fact that people’s behavior is usually designed to try to ensure approval and validation from others in the groups to which they belong. Thus, discrimination can be reduced without attitude change by encouraging group norms that define such behavior as unacceptable" (Hess et al.: 1988, p. 250; I have added emphasis). This is important to remember. The usefulness of this research relates to interventions (into certain social problems). This thesis has sought to determine why certain segments of the population are systematically subjected to racism, sexism, and ageism. The thesis has also endeavored to begin to emphasize what reduces systematic prejudice and discrimination.

Researching in the context of American society, as a democratic, capitalistic society, the thesis has taken the form of an integrated study of racism, sexism, and ageism in America. Investigating the causes, the researcher has sought to determine and investigate recurrent answers. Admittedly, the researcher has relied upon secondary sources for historical accounts and for descriptions of the current situations but this is in line with the comparative-historical
method. The researcher has sought to work towards demonstrating and explaining how the development of an integrated critical theory of racism, sexism, and ageism in America may be examined and why classical critical theory and the comparative-historical method are so important today for continuing sociological analysis. The use of critical theory and the comparative-historical method aid in making the association between social power relationships and rational efforts on the part of American capitalists to improve or maintain status in America's capitalistic system. Relative to research into, and a critical theory analysis of, racism, sexism, and ageism in America, the focus should be on the interdependence of material conditions, ideologies, and politics. To lose sight of the interdependence of material conditions, ideologies, and politics is to lose sight of the essentials of critical theorizing. Critical theory seeks to critically analyze oppressive social arrangements. Here, the response may be to ask "Who is to say when an arrangement is oppressive?" or to ask, "When is an arrangement oppressive?". My approach has been to select and review racism, sexism, and ageism. They have been selected because their existence as well as their oppressive nature have already been agreed upon. What has not been totally agreed upon is their similarity, their dimensions, methods of intervention, and the essentials of critical theorizing. This thesis is intended to serve as an aid in our reaching such a consensus.
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