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American Journal of Sociology


Mary C. Waters
Harvard University

Mary R. Jackman believes that sociologists have been looking for hate in all the wrong places. She argues that relationships between dominant and subordinate groups in society are most often characterized by paternalism, not conflict—and that love is a far more potent instrument of social control than raw power or repression. In this brilliant, wide-ranging, and groundbreaking book she examines three case studies of intergroup relations in American society—race relations between blacks and whites, gender relations between women and men, and class relations between the poor and the rich. Skillfully blending a daunting literature review, a bold and new theoretical proposition, and empirical survey material on intergroup attitudes and behaviors, she builds a theory of intergroup relations that should define a research agenda for scholars in three separate areas of sociology for years to come. This is an impressive and important book that should be required reading for anyone interested in social stratification, social psychology, race relations, gender, and social theory.

Jackman defines paternalism as the combination of positive feelings for a group and discriminatory intentions toward that group. She argues that students of race, class, and gender relations have been led astray by the expectation that relations of exploitation between a dominant and subordinate group should be characterized by consistently negative feelings along with resentment and repressed or outright conflict. Instead, Jackman argues, members of dominant groups most often accomplish their exploitation through institutions and frequently feel no personal responsibility for or involvement in that exploitation. As a result, the individuals in the dominant group feel no hostility toward the subordinate group and often have warm feelings of affection and even inclusion toward them.

Jackman’s approach to this study is different and refreshing in a number of important ways. Rather than taking individual intergroup attitudes as the properties of individuals, she examines intergroup attitudes as the product of group positions and as political communications. Thus she is not concerned with why some whites are less opposed to blacks than others, but how whites as a whole react to blacks and how blacks as a whole react to whites. She also examines intergroup attitudes of both groups—instead of just focusing on how whites see blacks or how the working class sees the upper class, she asks the same questions and gives equal analysis to intergroup attitudes and beliefs of both dominant and subordinate groups. Perhaps most fruitful and unusual, however, is Jackman’s comparison within one theoretical frame of three different types of inequalities (those of gender, class, and race).

She argues that the most important variables affecting the attitudes
and behaviors that develop between groups are the degree of physical segregation and role segregation between groups. Physical separation makes paternalism and control through ideology more difficult because the lack of day-to-day close contact affords subordinate groups more opportunities to develop their own interpretations of their exploited positions. Role segregation allows individuals from different groups to be in very close proximity while the boundaries between groups stay sharply defined. Using data from a 1975 nationwide survey of Americans designed to explore these issues, Jackman shows that gender relations are characterized by the least amount of physical segregation, a high degree of role segregation, and a high degree of paternalism. Race relations are characterized by a great deal of physical separation, a moderate degree of role segregation, a lower amount of paternalism, and a higher amount of conflict. Even in conflict-ridden American race relations, Jackman shows that about 40% of whites exhibit paternalism, not hostility, toward blacks. Class relations fall between the extremes of gender and race, with a moderate amount of role and spatial segregation and a moderate amount of conflict and paternalism.

This is an ambitious book in that it attempts to redirect scholarly work in three different fields, it takes a novel methodological approach, and it proposes a new theory of intergroup relations. It might be a controversial book for those who do not accept the premise that Jackman takes as given, that exploitation is key to the relations between the classes, the sexes, and the races. (Most sociologists, I suspect, would have little trouble with such a premise.) It is above all a scholarly book, however, which persuaded me of a bold new approach, surveyed and synthesized a wide body of knowledge, and used new empirical material to support a theoretical advance. I hope other scholars will test these ideas with other data, in other societies, with other types of intergroup relations, and in other historical periods.


Robert D. Benford
University of Nebraska—Lincoln

For over two centuries, ordinary people, relatively powerless folk, have exercised a powerful influence on politics and society by acting collectively. There is, in other words, "power in movement." Under what conditions is this the case? Has the influence of social movements been "real" and enduring or illusory and ephemeral? Are there common patterns of power dynamics in the careers of movements? These are the central questions of Sidney Tarrow's extraordinary monograph, Power in Movement. While partial answers to these questions can be found in his earlier works and in the writings of others—most notably Charles