

The American Cultural Dialogue and Its Transmission

George and Louise Spindler *With*

Henry Trueba *and* : Melvin D. Williams

@ The Palmer Press

(A member of the Taylor & Francis Group) ! London. New York .Philadelphia

Chapter 1

Introduction

This book is about the culture of the United States of America from an anthropological perspective. Many interpreters of America feel that there are too many subgroups, too many varieties of opinion and lifestyles, too few common interests and experiences, and too little history in common for there to be any. American culture. In one sense this is bound to be true given the obvious diversity within the American scene. But still, we manage somehow to communicate with each other even if we are often in conflict. We have pursued common goals during historical periods that have become a part of our past and we strive for some common causes today. We have a creed which is often stated and often flouted -that we are all equal and that no one shall be disadvantaged by their race, creed, or color. We have great documents such as the Declaration of Independence and the American Constitution which layout in detail many of our ideals.

Perhaps what we have in common is a way of talking to each other about our common interests and our differences. We may express our commonalities as clearly in the framework of conflict as we do within the framework of cooperation. We are in a constant dialogue that can be " construed as a *cultural* dialogue. This dialogue has been going on for some time and about some of the same things, such as individual achievement and community, equality, conformity and difference, honesty and expediency, and success and failure.

We define *cultural dialogue* as culturally phrased expressions of meaning referent to pivotal concerns such as those just mentioned. These concerns are phrased as 'value orientations, but the dialogue expresses *oppositions* as well as agreements. The expressions occur in public speech it and behavior, in editorials, campaign speeches, classrooms, the mass media, churches and religious ideology, and so forth. They occur in private speech ~ and behavior as people accommodate and conflict with each other as spouses, friends, Partners, parents and children. The pivotal concerns and t

the agreements and conflicts centered around them are both *in* individuals and *between* persons as social actors in the situations provided them by their society. We have chosen to focus on only certain areas of the American cultural dialogue and much of the data on which our analysis is based has been elicited from college students, though we have drawn from our own experience in America, and that of others, as well.

This book is therefore about the American cultural dialogue rather than simply about American culture. The term 'American culture' implies a fixed, static, set of expectations, values, ways of thinking, and ways of behaving. Such a concept of culture does not even always work well for a relatively isolated, self-contained human community. We think of 'culture' as a *process*. It is what happens as people try to make sense of their own lives and sense of the behavior of other people with whom they have to deal. Cultural understandings make communication possible. Many of these understandings are understandings of difference.

To discuss further what culture or cultural dialogue is or is not would be futile at this point. Instead, it seems appropriate to anticipate what we think a book about the American cultural dialogue from an anthropological perspective should be about.

Themes

We propose that there are certain aspects of the American dialogue that have considerable continuity through the last 200 years or so. They emerged before the Revolutionary War and they have continued in changing but recognizable form through to the present. Identifying some of the most important promontories of that continuity will be one of our purposes.

At the same time it is clear that though there has been demonstrable continuity in the American process there is also change. In fact the dynamism of change, particularly technological change, is sometimes considered to be the dominant feature of an American culture. Americans are said to value change. A new broom sweeps clean' was a meaningful political slogan in the early twentieth century. Americans seem to have great faith that advances in technology will solve basic problems -some of which threaten our existence. We predicate our lives upon the notion that change will occur and that on the whole it will be for the better. Americans are said to be optimistic and future-orientated but even this orientation towards the future is undergoing change.

Conflict and diversity often seem more apparent than continuity. The American population is composed now of more than forty ethnic groups and a very wide diversity of religious identifications. There is also the diversity of small and large political, social and religious movements, regional diversity, social class diversity, and ideological diversity. Difference can always be a source of conflict and the American scene is full of conflict. And yet somehow this conflict does not result in the upheavals that have occurred elsewhere in the world. When Richard Nixon resigned the presidency on August 9, 1974, an event that certainly would have shaken most societies to the core, most of us hardly noticed the difference. The student riots and occupations of university buildings in the 1960s and 1970s did not threaten the continuity of our society or its government, nor did our ruling bodies react by killing hundreds of students. At times we actually seem to enjoy conflict and value diversity. At other times conflict and diversity are expressed in highly destructive terms. Nevertheless we manage a surprisingly high degree of communication in the midst of great diversity and wide-ranging conflict.

There is implied in our kind of diversity a working accommodation to it. Small groups of people in America, with some notable exceptions, do not seem to want to obliterate each other. After the election is over most of us accept the dictum of the people. We seem to expect youth to be deviant and express their deviance in hairstyles, costumes, music, and social behaviors that are in some degree irritating or challenging to adults. Yet we do very little about trying to eliminate those behaviors or to make youth conform. Foreign observers are amazed and intrigued by the diversity of the American scene and, despite our reputation as a violent society, our apparent tolerance for any difference that does not affect us personally.

All cultures must be transmitted to new generations if they are to survive. The American cultural dialogue is expressed in manifold forms, in the rhetoric of politics, in editorial diatribes, in the mass media, in advertising, in the symbols of wealth, power, poverty and dissidence. Our schools are an arena for our cultural dialogue and we will be particularly concerned with them and with how change, continuity, diversity, conflict, and accommodation are orchestrated in them.

These basic themes will be present in some form in our analysis of all of the topics we cover in this book. We can mention those topics now, with the understanding that we are merely pointing in the various directions we expect to go rather than providing a blueprint for exactly how things will work out.

Ethnic and Social Class Composition of American Society

Our first task will be to try to achieve some understanding of the ethnic and social diversity of American society. This is not easy to do because this composition is constantly changing and the labels that are used for census data do not always allow a very close approximation of the kind of reality in which we are interested. Nevertheless there are some things that we can say that will provide a backdrop for analysis of the American processes of cultural continuity, change, conflict and accommodation.

Core Mainstream Culture

The term 'mainstream' is used widely but carelessly. Who is mainstream? When we use this term are we talking about White Anglo-Saxon Protestants, or are we talking about people, irrespective of ethnic origins who practice in their daily lives some common cultural features? Are there subdivisions of the mainstream that are important? We are going to present some interpretations with which not everyone will agree. We will maintain that there are some core values that have been a part of the American dialogue since the beginning and that these have been carried on within a mainstream construction of American culture. We are also going to hypothesize that there is a subset of the mainstream that can be referred to as a referent ethnic class. This ethnic class, we propose, has historical roots and in fact has acquired its referent status due to this historical continuity.

Education as Cultural Transmission

The way any culture maintains itself is through education and the American culture is no exception. The problem is *what* culture is to be maintained? A look at our schools as they have been historically formed in America suggest that there is a high degree of mainstream conformity and historicity. The major function of education has been described by many analysts of the American scene as the major instrument of the 'melting pot'. The melting pot idea itself has become very suspect. Americans of different persuasions and ethnicities object to being 'melted down' to a conglomerate mass. What is surprising, however, about American society is that so many people do begin to act in 'predictable' American ways and acquire the instrumentalities for economic, social, political, and personal survival in our complex society. The schools are by no means altogether accountable and yet they *have* had an influence. Our analysis will be directed at what this influence is and how it has been accomplished.

The school in America has been accused of being mainly an instrument of the mainstream middle class. We will attempt to see what this can mean and whether this orientation is accountable for the trouble in the schools. Are our schools so heavily culturally loaded with mainstream values that many ethnic groups and social classes find themselves in opposition to the culture promoted in them? Are there ways that we could bring more of the diverse elements of our society into a productive relationship with our economic and social institutions? Why are about 25 per cent of our youth dropping out of school before they acquire a high school diploma? Have we somehow decided to throwaway one-fourth of our coming generation? Are our schools designed for failure as much as for success?

Diversity

The notion of diversity keeps coming up in our discussion and will be a very important theme. We have already said that we will try to define that diversity and we have hinted at some of the conflict relationships between diverse elements. One of our major themes will be the conflicts and accommodations that occur between certain mainstream cultural elements and groups and nonmainstream elements and groups, or diversity and opposition. It is possible to think of American society as composed almost entirely of diverse groups in conflict with some hypothetical mainstream culture. If we define the mainstream population as White Anglo-Saxon Protestant and male-dominated, then most groups, including women and children as well as all ethnic groups that are not White Anglo-Saxon Protestant and male, are in some degree of diverse opposition to this mainstream culture. This is possibly carrying the matter too far but for the sake of argument we will present some support for this model of American society.

One particular element of American society that is usually left out of discussions of American culture is the Native American population. These were the people who were here before the rest of us came. They had well established and also very diverse cultures. There were at least some 375 different languages spoken in North America before the Europeans came and this linguistic diversity was matched by social and cultural diversity. Between most of

these cultures and the Euro-American culture that developed there were virtually unresolvable conflicts -political, economic, social, ideological, and cultural. In some ways the Native American conflicts and accommodations to the mainstream are an exemplification of the conflicts experienced by other diverse elements and the mainstream. We will therefore spend some time on this complex set of articulations and disarticulations .

We also forget easily that one of the major differences between American culture and European culture is the influence of Native American cultures upon the developing Euro-American society and culture. For example, some of the most distinctive elements of the American vocabulary are words derived from American Indian languages. A major part of our food supply comes from plants domesticated by American Indians (and corn is practically a national vegetable). Some of our concepts of masculinity, of the frontier, and a minority view of our relationship with nature, are heavily influenced by Native American conceptions. Black and Hispanic, as well as Asian influences on the making of America have been profound as well. We have recognized this by inviting Henry Trueba and Melvin Williams to write chapters on the Chicano and Black experience within the American cultural dialogue.

Hinterland Culture

In most treatments of American relationships the country as a whole is cast as though it were one big urban conglomerate or, historically, one vast rural society. We are going to develop a concept that we will term the 'hinterland' .This is a concept that is not exactly coterminous with ' rural' .There are hinterlanders living in the city, and there are many urbanites living in the country .The hinterland does tend to be more rural than urban and in one sense it can be thought of as those vast areas between our great metropolitan centers peopled by individuals who are there for a number of reasons, not the least of which is to escape the city. There has always been an intermigration between the city and the country in America, though most often in favor of the city. But recently there has been a sizeable migration of city dwellers to the country .What are they looking for? Are there hinterland values, ideologies, expectations, that are not only different from those most common in the city but in partial opposition to them? Do hippies and 'hillbillies' have something in common? Do yuppies and street people, particularly drug hustlers, have something in common? And what about the stubborn people for whom farming is not merely a way of life but for whom farming is life itself? Are there hard-pressed small town values that people try hard to maintain in the face of a flood of alternative views promoted by the mass media?

Movements in American Society

Movement is the keynote of American culture, but here we are thinking of socio-religious movements. Many of the most recent movements have been fundamentalist in character. Some commentators seem to think that fundamentalism is new in America. On, the contrary , fundamentalism is partly what American culture has been historically about. Many of the people who came to America, such as the Puritans, were fundamentalists. Whenever America has been in trouble fundamentalism has become rampant. We cannot possibly look at all of the dozens of the fundamentalist movements that have appeared so suddenly and so dynamically over the past twenty years or so but we will examine one or two of them. As we do so we will see that there is not so much deviation from some core values in American culture as one might think.

Future Shock

A special subset of the theme of cultural change has been made popular by a film titled '*Future Shock*' narrated by Orson Welles and derived from the book by Alvin Tomer of the same title. An examination of this film is instructive. Though it was cast in the mold of the late 1960s and early 1970s, it is valuable as a way of entering the American cultural dialogue. If one looks at it as a part of the dialogue and not necessarily an accurate forecast of the future, or even of the problems related to the future and to change, it can be very useful. In this film and in much of the American dialogue about change and the future since World War II there are certain concepts that appear and reappear. The 'age of anxiety', 'overchoice', 'prepackaged and plastic' , 'accelerated pace of change' , 'nothing is permanent anymore' , 'the move' , 'loss of the sense of belonging' , 'all relationships are temporary' , and 'the death of permanence' I these phrases and the images they evoke have become a part of our cultural self-concept.

The film shows dramatically and effectively changes that were occurring at the time the film was made and anticipates future changes. Since we have already arrived in a part of the film's future, we have some perspective that was not available when the film itself was made in 1972. The future with humanoids serving us behind the counter of

an airport, the installation of temporary body parts, the development of artificial intelligence, genetic engineering, a genetic race, is partly already here. A tired man gets up in the morning and plugs himself in for a little shock to get going. He plugs his female partner in to get her up as well. There is marriage between homosexuals. There are young people sleeping together on the beach for a one night stand. Computers seem to run everything.

The images center upon and communicate a sense of anxiety about choice and impermanence. The film and the questions it raises and the images it provides are worth considering because they are not entirely illusory. It is apparent that we are in the midst of rapid technological and social change and that the former sources of security in presumed stable family relationships and communities are threatened.

The question, however, is whether or not this sense of crisis and the anxiety about change and the loss of permanence are really very new on the American scene. When the westward movement was taking place there was little permanence for the people who made the move. The westward movement was in turn preceded by the migration of peoples from the old world to the new, and for them there was little permanence during the process of migration and adaptation. It may be that the permanence that the film and many discussions of this kind seem to assume we once had is an illusion. When Lloyd Warner went to study a 'Yankee city' he wrote as though he were dealing with established, permanent, 'old American' communities. A careful examination of the populations that he was actually working with makes it clear that he was not dealing with permanence but rather with a culture form that had been quickly adapted by newcomers.

We think of small towns in America as being filled with people who have been there for generations. There is very little in census data to indicate that that is true. In small towns of under 30,000 people, in the Mid-west, more than half of the population is of very short tenure, under ten years. There has always been change and impermanence in American society.

Our attitude towards change and particularly technological change and its consequences is one of deep ambivalence. Americans look upon change as essentially desirable: 'You can't stop progress'. But at the same time we decry the upsetting results of radical technological change. We want some things to stay the same at the same time that we want improvement, progress, and development. Or we may think that we don't have enough technological change rather than too much. The problems of toxic waste, pollution of the atmosphere, the 'greenhouse effect', the deterioration of the Van Allen ozone belt, the paving over of fertile farmland that could be used to produce food rather than support new developments -all of these changes can presumably be ameliorated or their direction changed by a yet more advanced technology that lies in our immediate future.

Our attitude towards change and the reality of technological change seems to be accountable for the increasing attempts by Americans to return to an illusory permanence and security of the past. We have some evidence, that we will use later, that there has been a cycling of value orientations in the dialogue of American culture since World War II and that we are now, in 1990, in a currently rather fundamentalist and tradition-orientated phase of the cycle. Part of the dynamism of American culture seems to be created by the relationship between change, attitudes towards change, and the psychological consequences for individuals.

Americans, for example, are a very transient people. In the California schools where we have worked, more than half of the children in the elementary school have not resided in the school district for more than one year. Indeed, many have lived there for less than one year. Americans are constantly on the move. This is a major theme of the film *Future Shock*. Promotions, occupational changes, sometimes changes in fortune, dictate that the family pull up whatever roots it has put down and move once again to a new town and a new neighborhood. Much has been written about the trauma of such separations from one's community, particularly for children whose peer relationships are disturbed. These moves may not be as upsetting as they are sometimes portrayed, however, because Americans are able to replace friends, neighborhood networks, peer groups, and even, to some extent, identities when they arrive in a new community. The principle of 'replaceable parts' seems to be operating. If one moves into a new neighborhood very much like the old one, into a suburb of about the same status as the old one -perhaps even a little better -one finds the same kinds of people there. If children and youth go to about the same kinds of schools, drawing from about the same kinds of school districts as the ones that they left, they too will find friends quite similar to the ones they left behind, although sometimes it is more difficult for children than adults.

This transient quality of life does, however, have some consequences. One's commitments to other people are unlikely to be maintained at a deep level under these circumstances. If friendships can be replaced, then friendship may not mean as much as it did, or at least could. One's own identity can be marred by the casual attitudes of others and the lack of truly intimate relationships. We would expect also that one's interest in the maintenance of the community would shrink and there would be a tendency for more emphasis on one's own self-interest since no community is even semipermanent. The eternally transient quality of American life may therefore result in a kind of marginalization which is reflected in one's relationships with virtually all social institutions, groups, other individuals, and perhaps even work.

Some young people have opted for rural communes, a return to the farm, and, less dramatically, a refusal to move for purposes of promotion. Where it was unheard of a few years ago for an individual, particularly a male 'breadwinner', to refuse a promotion that would entail moving the family, today this is not so uncommon. Sometimes

flexible arrangements in breadwinning make it possible for a shift in responsibilities both domestic and economic to occur, that will allow the family to stay in one place for longer time -sometimes long enough to permit the children to grow up. This is very hard to support except with anecdotal evidence. In any event, the transient quality of American life seems to be a permanent feature of our times and one to which we all have to adapt.

In Prospect

No one book or anyone author or group of authors can possibly reduce the complexity of American culture to a single, systematic, simplified statement. We can only select for examination certain aspects of the dynamic relationships that constitute our ongoing culture. We have tried to simplify matters by focusing on the American dialogue, but many excursions will be made into other areas and relationships. These might not be the same things that other analysts would choose.

Notes

This chapter opens many topics that will be considered and annotated later. For now we refer to H. Tmeba, G. and L. Spindler, Eds. (1989), *What do Anthropologists Have to Say About Dropouts ?* A. J. Hallowell (1957) on the influence of American Indian cultures in American culture. Alvin Tomer (1970) *Future Shock* and the film by that title, and Uoyd Warner (1941). All references cited are listed under *References*, p. 171 ff.

Chapter 2

The Composition of American Society

Who is 'Ethnic' or 'Minority'?

Each year that we give our course ' Anthropological Perspectives on American Culture' we administer a 'pretest' .This pretest asks students on the first day of class to answer the following questions:

1. Is there an American culture? If the answer is 'yes' describe it briefly.
2. Are you a member of a minority group? Yes or no. What is a minority group?
3. Are you a member of an ethnic group? Yes or no. What is an ethnic group?
4. What core values of American culture do you feel that you personally hold?
5. Name eight minority groups currently in the United States.

The responses to this pretest will be described in this and the next chapter as we analyze the cultural distribution of characteristics in American society. For this chapter what is most relevant is the identification of respondents with minority status and their comprehension of minority groups in the United States.

About half of the respondents to question two indicate that they are not members of minority groups while the other half indicate that they are. This seems straight-forward enough except that when one examines the relationship between this response and presumed minority group membership the correlation is by no means perfect. About 25 per cent of those who indicate that they are members of minority groups are not, if we define mainstream as being Caucasian and native English speaking as many respondents do. Some Caucasian, native English speaking respondents regard that designation in itself as a designation of minority status. On the other hand, about one-third of students who would be defined as members

Chapter 3

American Mainstream Culture

Introduction

There are some ambiguities about mainstream culture that we are not going to be able to resolve effectively, but we can take some steps towards a better understanding of that culture and the difficulties in defining its loci. We still have not precisely defined who is included in mainstream. If we take a conventional view of the matter, we can define mainstream as simply European (including Anglo-Saxon) 'Protestant. This would include a little over half of the total American population. However, many persons of European Catholic ancestry would have every reason to resent being left out. If we include them we have a total of around 75 per cent of the population of the United States. But certainly persons who identify themselves as Jews could object to being left out of the mainstream since their habits and values seem to be those that we think of as characteristically American. If we add them we get a slight increase in the three-quarters majority. However other significant segments of the other so-called minorities, the Blacks, Hispanics, Asians and Native Americans must be included using these criteria. To the extent that individuals in these categories display behaviors and hold values or beliefs or maintain attitudes that we think of as being characteristically American they are certainly no less American than anyone from any of the other categories.

Taken from this point of view, the mainstream includes anyone who acts like a member of the mainstream, dominant American population and has the income to support this lifestyle. In some respects, this is the most workable and least invidious definition of mainstream and perhaps we should leave the matter there.

There are, however, some advantages in doing a further dissection of the mainstream population. We have no interest in trying to demonstrate the alleged superiority or inferiority of anyone, but we believe that there is a useful model that can be generated by further analysis. This model will be of relationships within the functioning totality of the American society.

Mainstream Cultural Values

A first useful step in this further analysis will be to identify the characteristic value orientations that we think of as mainstream. In our pretest, described in the previous chapter, respondents are asked to define the 'core' American values that they themselves hold. There are five major value orientations listed. They are: freedom of speech (and other forms of personal freedom); the rights of the individual (to be an individual and act in his or her own behalf); equality (as equality of opportunity and including sexual equality); the desirability of achievement attained by hard work (and the belief that anyone can achieve success if he or she works hard enough);- and social mobility (the assumption that anyone can improve social status because the social structure is open and hard work will get you there). 'Democracy', as a word, is rarely used but upon discussion it turns out that respondents think of those characteristic features listed as constituting democracy.

There are also a number of other specific values that are listed by a significant number of respondents. They include: a belief in the efficacy of American technology and its ability to solve even the problems it creates; the desirability of a free market with no restraints placed upon it for any reasons except possibly those connected with environmental destruction; the value placed upon private business, closely related to the strong belief in the rights of the individual. Independence is frequently mentioned but seems to be subsumed by the value placed upon the individual and his or her rights. The individual has a right to be independent of constraints placed by higher authority but also to be independent economically. Respect for others is frequently listed," usually in a context of either individuality or equality. Surprisingly, competition is infrequently mentioned. When competition is mentioned it is within the context of individuality, freedom and equality.

It is interesting that there is no significant association between expression of the value orientations that we have listed and one's definition of one's self as a member of a minority or an ethnic group. There are some tendencies for male and female respondents to profile a little differently on respect for others, which females mention more frequently, and equality, particularly sexual equality, which females also mention more frequently.

It is a big leap, too big for sound social science, to ascribe value orientations expressed by a few hundred college-age respondents to the American population as a whole. We regard these tendencies as expressed here as only suggestive. We do, however have a much larger sample collected with a different technique that we will call a 'values projective technique'. We will discuss the results of the application of this technique to a much larger sample in this chapter as well.

The data that we have described point toward a values profile that is not too unexpected but is what we would expect on the basis of common knowledge of the American scene. It may constitute a unifying orientation for a population actually composed of quite divergent elements as it is entirely possible for people to agree upon certain prominent orientations of this kind which are ideological as well as cultural or personal, and at the same time diverge considerably from each other in many other areas of belief, attitude and habit. True to our notion of cultural dialogue, the agreement on these apparently core value orientations would be at the center of the dialogue. In a conversation, an

editorial, a public policy, a discussion of American history, and so forth, we would make the assumption that all who engage in the dialogue would ascribe, in general terms at least, to these value orientations. When an individual, out of political commitment or personal cynicism expresses a contrary position we tend to get agitated and defensive. If you do not think this is so, declare yourself in the next discussion that provides a relevant context as being against freedom of speech, rights of the individual, equality, particularly sexual equality, a work ethic and the possibility of attaining success.

This exercise has not helped us define the numerical proportions of the mainstream, but it has helped to define some cultural characteristics that we can think of as subsumed by this concept. We need, however, to take the analysis further.

Profiles and Trends in American Dialogue about Cultural Values

Towards the end of this chapter we will attempt to define more precisely some alternative definitions of 'mainstream' value orientations that seem significant in the American cultural dialogue. We will base our discussion in the following pages on a mass of data that we began to collect from Stanford University students in 1952 and have continued to collect each year through 1990; These data have been collected from all classes of undergraduates as well as all years of graduate students. We have also collected the same kind of data from students at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, University of California at Santa Barbara, the University of Alaska at Fairbanks, San Francisco University, and Sonoma State University. Interestingly enough, the data from these separate sources profile in much the same way. Of course we are drawing from a relatively narrow age range even though graduate students are included, but we are not selecting from as narrow a socioeconomic status range as might be suggested by the college or university status of the respondents. Nor are we eliminating minority group representatives because of the college or university sites. The sex ratio is slightly in favor of females since more of our respondents are in social science and education courses, but all departments and schools are represented. We also have samples from other parts of the country collected by other persons and from quite different regional and social economic distributions. Bernice McAlister has collected responses from individuals on the West Coast including high school and elementary school students, teachers, parents, and school board members. Samples of junior high school respondents and East Coast respondents not in school have been collected. Richard Navarro has collected a sample from students at Michigan State University. We cannot claim that any of these samples or the sample population in its totality are without socioeconomic, ideological, or cultural bias. However, the fact that there are no consistent differences between the distributions of these responses from these different samples lends credence to the notion that the samples do reflect a consistent and pervasive American dialogue.

It is also relevant that in previous researches by the American College Examination Board including 200,000 freshmen in 350 colleges, universities and junior colleges there is substantial evidence to indicate that the kinds of values and their distribution produced by the application of our values projection technique are indeed very widespread. It is particularly important for our purposes that minority students do not differentiate from 'Anglo' students in their responses. In fact, minority students tend to be more oriented to the presumed core values than are mainstream students.

The values projective technique is supplied at the end of this chapter. It consists of twenty-four open-ended sentences and a request for a paragraph describing the ideal American. You can administer it to yourself, to a friend, or to your students, if you are a teacher, or you could even use it for a parlor game. It is not a personality test so it is not as dangerous to play with as a Rorschach inkblot test or a Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory might be. The questions were initially produced in 1952 on the basis of writings by anthropologists about American culture. These sources are listed at the end of this book under References. These analyses exhibit a high degree of commonality; coming from quite different disciplinary persuasions and backgrounds of personal experience these anthropologists, concerned with American character and culture, seem to have arrived at about the same interpretations. From their interpretations, we formulated a number of open-ended sentences. When we administer the technique we ask respondents to complete the sentence with the first thing that comes to mind. Since the first thing that comes to mind is not always the statement that an individual would wish to stand by, we also given respondents an opportunity to argue with themselves after the technique has been completed. Surprisingly few respondents actually do so.

Most of the incomplete sentences in the technique center directly upon attributes defined in the listed anthropological interpretations such as 'all men are born _____', 'honesty is _____', 'the individual is _____', 'in order to be successful one has to _____' 'time is _____'. There are a number of other responses that are less directly related to these attributes such as 'artists are _____', 'intellectuals should _____', 'college professors should _____' and 'nudity is _____'. Responses to every one of the twenty-four incomplete sentences appear to be culturally patterned and seem to have a lot to do with a core configuration of values that we can describe as mainstream and American.

Constant Features

There are certain value orientations that have appeared consistently over the entire period of the administration of the technique. These constant features taken together would seem to constitute a core cultural configuration that constitutes the center of the American dialogue. Those features exhibiting the most continuity through time are: equality; honesty (as the best policy); the value of work coupled with clear goals; the significance of the self-reliant individual; and sociability -getting along well with others and being sensitive to their needs and appraisals. The incomplete sentences on the values projective techniques that have produced the most consistent results are (2) All men are born -, (4) Honesty is -, (5) Anyone can get to the top if they -, (9) The most successful people -, (14) What counts is what a person -, (15) It isn't a person's background that counts it's what -, (16) The individual is -, (18) In order to be successful one has to -, It isn't what one says that counts it is what one -, (22) Time is -, (23) There's no use crying -. Taking these sentences alone as a statement of the American core value configuration we can state the following: All men are born equal. Honesty is the best policy. Anyone can get to the top if they work hard enough. The most successful people worked hard to become so. It isn't a person's background that counts it is what he or she is or does. The individual is all-important, unique, and supreme. In order to be successful one has to work hard and keep trying. It isn't what one says that counts, it is what one really does. Time is of the essence and very precious. And there is no use crying over spilled milk (this is often recorded in the more archaic form 'spilt' milk). If phrased in a more literary form this could be regarded as a statement of the American credo.

It is important to remember that we are thinking of these value orientations as being a pan, not the totality, of the American dialogue. When we say that they are a part of the American dialogue, we mean that we talk about them, sometimes explicitly as in arguing for public works or political positions or implicitly as we enter in discussions assuming that values of this kind are held by the others with whom we are in conversation.

In the political campaigns for the presidency in 1952, Edward Steele examined in great detail *all* of the campaign speeches by Dwight D. Eisenhower and Adlai Stevenson. These two men were presumably quite opposed to each other. Stevenson represented the liberal (from some points of view, quite radical left) and Eisenhower the conservative (from some points of view, quite radical right) positions then current on the American ideological and political scene. The value orientations explicitly expressed by both Stevenson and Eisenhower were virtually identical. Both of the candidates used the very points that we have presented as the basis for value oriented statements in their campaign speeches. They even made them at about the same times so that one would, presumably, not be left behind the other. As far as the American public is concerned it had no choice between value orientations. Whatever differences the two candidates were able to express were expressed with these value orientations as a consensus. This is precisely what we mean by an American cultural dialogue. Whether there is conflict or agreement, these value orientations are pivots around which the dialogue occurs.

The dialogue consists of the pivotal value orientations *and* the oppositions to them. Every one of the incomplete sentences also evokes negative or oppositional responses. The opposition to 'The individual is all- important', for example, includes 'The individual is nothing by himself (or herself)'; 'The individual is important only as a member of a group (or , society, community)'. 'In order to be *successful* one has to work hard (or unceasingly, energetically, etc.)', is opposed with 'know the right people', 'step on others', '*look* out for number one'.

Oppositions are not only between persons of differing orientations but within individuals. They may operate at an intellectual *level* but often appear to constitute emotionally laden issues and affect personal adjustment. Oppositions also appear to be reflected in *cycles* of change over time in our sample, and they are reflected in longer range changes in the history of our country .

The nature of culture, as the anthropological structuralists maintain, is that meanings are possible because there are oppositions. Clean is only understandable in contrast to dirty, dark to white, good to bad, positive to negative. If God is dead in some quarters it is because we have done away with the devil. If oppositions are that essential to meaning, and the actions we take in the framework of meaning, it is inevitable that the pivotal value orientations we are analyzing contain and evoke oppositions. The meaning of the positive response to anyone of the incomplete sentences must be understood in order to produce a negative response, an opposition.

Changes in Value Orientations

There are some value orientations that were strong in 1952 that have undergone considerable change over the more than three decades that data have been collected using this technique.

For example, in 1952 through about 1964 the major response to incomplete sentence twelve, 'the future is', was 'exciting', 'challenging', 'hopeful', 'a time of opportunity'. The sentence completions were overwhelmingly optimistic and optimism about the future was considered by the anthropological writers on American culture of that time and previously as being a salient and consistent American cultural characteristic.

Today there are two kinds of response to this incomplete sentence that were not there in significant numbers in 1952 to 1964. They are: (1) 'the future is before us', or 'The future is unknown'. These responses are non-committal. They acknowledge that the future is coming but they refrain from either a positive and optimistic or negative appraisal of its characteristics. (2) A negative, pessimistic response: 'The future is threatening'; 'The future is uncertain'; 'The future is ending'. Frequently, as respondents elaborate their response they define the future as uncertain because of the possibilities of nuclear war or the terminal pollution of our living environment. The optimism of the earlier period has eroded. The optimistic view of the future is, however, still a significant category. About 40 per cent of all who respond fall in this category. In the 1950s and early 1960s it was closer to 80 per cent.

It is important to realize that the dialogue itself is still about the future in this particular instance, but the content of the dialogue has changed to suit the circumstances of life in America and on our globe during the most recent decades. There has been a slight increase in the number of optimistic responses since 1987 but it is too short a time and too small a sample to make assertive statements about another possible change.

Another important change has occurred with respect to attitudes about and values concerning nonconformity. In the earlier period (1952-1964) the third sentence, 'artists are', was completed by a minority of about 25 per cent as 'artists are queer', 'artists are jerks', 'artists are eccentric', 'artists are nuts', 'artists are effeminate'. This category of response has virtually disappeared from samples since 1966. Artists are now considered to be 'unique', 'creative', 'productive', 'individuals'. Artists may be considered within the traditional framework of American values as deviant because they are not primarily engaged with material and economic production. Being an artist seemed to many people to be a kind of 'copout' from the necessary and major work of our society. This attitude, which was held by a significant minority of respondents in the college age population that we sampled, seems to have virtually disappeared. This is only one index, to be sure, of a much more complex development, but it is suggestive. Perhaps attitudes towards nonconforming behaviors and individuals have become more tolerant and open during the most recent decades.

The same comments can be made about the open ended sentence 'Intellectuals should'. In the earlier period about 30 per cent of the respondents saw intellectuals in very undesirable terms: 'Intellectuals should drop dead'; 'Intellectuals should keep it under cover'; 'Intellectuals should keep their mouths shut'. There is a high degree of consistency between the statement about artists and about intellectuals. Both may be regarded as deviant within the American cultural scene and perhaps for the same reasons. Both artists and intellectuals have stepped out of the mainstream orientation towards economic and material production. An intellectual point of view is often considered introspective, withdrawn, or noninvolved.

There is also the suspicion that intellectuals can cause trouble because they challenge existing assumptions and turn the heads of their students, if they happen to be teachers, in potentially dangerous directions. One can find examples of this orientation in the mass media such as tabloids which from time to time publish 'news' items about the pernicious influences of liberal college professors upon American youth.

Perhaps most important as a contribution to the negative appraisal of intellectuals is the notion that intellectuals set themselves not only apart but regard themselves as superior to others. Americans tend to be suspicious of anyone who does not profess equality, meaning (in America) sameness and nonexceptionability. Political candidates try hard to convince us, all that they are just regular fellows by using poor language, donning work uniforms (or at least hard hats) and shaking hands with, and hugging almost anybody that seems to be willing to offer their hands or bodies for such contact. If one is an expert about anything in America, it is best to express humility and emphasize basic human commonness. The reduction of this negative category in the college age population would seem to suggest some loosening up of previous orientations and reactions to some forms of nonconformity.

Closely related to the changes that we have noted there is another that does not seem particularly important. 'Nudity is -' in the earlier period was responded to by a sizable minority as 'obscene', 'vulgar', or, in one form or another as 'immoral'. There are currently two major responses to this question. One is that nudity is 'beautiful', 'free', 'exciting', 'fun' and so on -all positive and a majority female response. The other major response type is context-oriented: 'Nudity is o.k. with the right people'; 'Nudity is sometimes embarrassing'; 'Nudity is all right in its place'. There is, in fact, another response category of some significance and that is a humorous one: 'Nudity is cold in a winter climate'; 'Nudity is a good way to get bitten by insects'.

The point here is that again there seems to have been the development of a more tolerant attitude, this time not towards nonconformity so much as towards a moral position. Certainly canons of respectability have shifted considerably of late. Bathing costumes for young females seem to have gone so far as they can without divesting one's self of them entirely. Nude scenes are included in movies and now even appear occasionally on television. There are legitimate nude beaches around most coastal urban centers. We seem to have been developing more tolerance and a more relativistic cultural attitude towards behaviors that would have been considered to be nonconforming and even immoral at an earlier time by a significant minority of respondents.

Another very important area of change has been in respect to the connection between work, success and achievement. In the earlier period, anyone could get to the top if he or she tried, or worked hard enough, and he most

successful people worked hard to become so, and certainly one had to work hard in order to become successful. Although such responses still dominate there is an increasing cynicism about this connection. During some years as many as 50 per cent of the respondents express deep cynicism about this relationship: 'Anyone can get to the top if he or she cheats or steps on people'; 'The most successful people arrive there on the backs of others'. This 'cynical' opposition has always been in the dialogue but is expressed more frequently of late.

There is another trend connected with this pivotal area that is not primarily cynical. There seems to have been a shift from a concern with work and success in its external form to the development of inner resources and peace and even happiness within one's self: 'In order to be successful one has to be at peace with one's self'; 'The most successful people know themselves'.

There was a time during the late 1960s and early 1970s when even the famed American individualism was being challenged. Although the dominant response from the beginning of the administration of the technique to the present has been that the individual has been important, or even 'sacred' or 'supreme', there has always been a minority that regard the individual essentially as a member of the community: 'The individual is important only as a member of the community or of the group'. This response category waned during the 1980s.

In fact the most recent change in the distribution of responses to the values projective technique as a whole has been in what can be described as a conservative direction. Work, success, achievement, and individualism are stated in ways very similar to the 1952 sample. During the period 1965 to approximately 1974 there was a strong movement towards less emphasis upon success and its linkage with hard work, less emphasis on the individual, and more interest in self development, more concern for other people and their needs, a more relativistic conception of order and morality, less certainty that the time-honored formula of work to get ahead will be successful and more suspicion of authority, than there is at the present time.

However this cycling back to a more conservative cultural position does not place the present generation of respondents in the framework of the same values profile as in 1952 to 1964. Though there has been a lessening of the trends just noted and a relative emphasis on the earlier formulas, it is true that the present generation of respondents is more tolerant of nonconformity, more interested in self development, more concerned for other people and their needs, more relativistic, than the 1952 to 1964 respondents were.

The inclusion of tolerance and relativism, self development, concern for others, is particularly clear in the paragraphs about the 'ideal American'. This ideal person should have 'clear goals', 'determination', be willing to 'work hard' in the attainment of goals, be 'intelligent', and 'competent', but also exhibit 'concern for others', including those less fortunate. He or she should be 'sensitive' to others' needs, and exhibit a 'caring' nature. He or she should also have an inner 'peace and happiness', 'know oneself', and know 'who they are'.

It appears that these kind of value orientations, dominant in the 1960s and 1970s, have been retained but coupled with a return to the work and success ethic. These values have always been present in the American dialogue and are accentuated or recede with the times. Philanthropy, altruism, and concern for others less fortunate than oneself have been American habits of the mind since pre-Revolutionary times.

These 'cycles' seem to be the nature of cultural change in a dynamic society like ours. We can expect cyclic changes and some of the cycle will take us back to a previous position, but in the transition from one position to another the attributes picked up on the way through time become a part of the whole dialogue. It is, then, a matter of relative emphasis upon certain value orientations, certain aspects of the dialogue at different times. Presumably these different emphases are responses to the real conditions of life during these times. Value orientations and the dialogue about them are never fixed. They must be considered to be adaptations that make it possible for people to make sense out of their environment, and each other, and maintain motivation. In short, those features exhibiting the most continuity through time are: equality; honesty as the best policy; the value of work coupled with clear goals; the significance of the self-reliant individual; and getting along well with others and being sensitive to their needs and appraisals. Those features exhibiting the greatest shift in meaning and value are: optimism about the future; tolerance of nonconformity; and the value of material success.

The changes in response modalities over time exhibit a trend that can be described as progressively less traditional, if we take the statement of cultural ideology furnished above as our starting point. The changes have been in the following directions: more tolerance for nonconformity, more interest in self development than rugged individualism, more concern for people and their needs, a more relativistic conception of order and morality, less certainty that the philosophy 'work to get ahead' will indeed work at all, and more suspicion of authority.

In the late 1970s and 1980s there has been a swing back towards the traditional formula. Work, success, achievement and individualism as stated in the samples between 1979 and the present do exhibit similarities to the 1952-1964 samples. However it does appear that certain attributes such as a more relativistic attitude, more tolerance toward nonconformity and more interest in inner and self development have been incorporated in the profile. Though less emphasized at present than in the period between 1965 and 1974, they appear to be a constant part of the dialogue.

Our discussion has helped us to understand a little better the qualitative features of the mainstream American dialogue and the pivotal value areas that it centers around, but it has not permitted us to be more specific about the size

or composition of mainstream populations. We will try to consider this in the next section as we attempt to define mainstream further and call attention to a concept that we will call 'referent ethn .class' . This is going to be difficult for one of the features of the American system is that there are relatively few acknowledged boundaries between groups of people based upon culturally patterned behaviors.

The Referent Ethnicclass

Figure 3.1 locates mainstream America in the European Protestant, 'non- ethnic' categories and further specifies the mainstream to be composed of the lower-middle and upper-middle socioeconomic classes. This is a narrow definition of mainstream. As we have pointed out, the cultural distribution of mainstream characteristics extends far beyond the Protestant, North European, Anglo-Saxon middle class. In the broadest sense of the term, mainstream America is constituted of all persons irrespective of ethnicity or religion or social class who exhibit mainstream cultural characteristics. However, for the purposes of our analysis at the moment we will define mainstream as the chart defines it.

We need to make a further limitation meaningful and that is the designation of a referent ethnicclass. This ethnicclass consists of pan of the)onion marked mainstream on the chart above and that pan is the upper- middle social class of the European, 'nonethnic' , Protestant category .Our lrgument here is that this upper-middle segment of the historically defined American cultural mainstream is the 'reference' by which people have measured their success, achievement, and essentially, their 'mainstream- less' .This referent ethnicclass is that population in the United States of America that has disproportionately furnished the personnel for positions of power and influence in our society.

It is difficult to decide whether to include the 'upper classes' in the mainstream referent ethnicclass. Certainly the argument can be made that the largest concentration of powerful individuals and families in America is In the upper class segments. We draw the line at the upper limits of the upper-middle class on the basis that the upper class persons in America are in some ways out of the dialogue of achievement, individualism, the ethic of hard work, competition and sociability that we ascribe to the referent ethnicclass and mainstream. This does not deny the possibility that many upper class individuals may act like referent ethnicclass persons should. The lame may be said of Catholics and Jews as well. They are excluded for historical reasons. The referent ethnicclass in America has its beginnings in colonial America, where about 60 per cent of the colonists were Anglo- Sa:xons.

This ethnicclass has supplied about 75 per cent of all members of the House of Representatives. The proportion grows larger in the Senate. The majority of all college and university presidents have been derived from this ethnicclass. The higher ranks of executives in all major corporations have largely been filled by members of this ethnicclass. The boards of trustees of major American universities, the executive and advisory boards of major corporations, have been derived from this ethnicclass (with, of course, some exceptions). Until 1985 the Chase-Manhattan Bank executive board had no members who were not of this ethnicclass. At that time a prominent Italian Catholic banker became a member for the first time in history .

This ethnicclass has not only dominated the positions of power and influence in mainstream institutions but this domination has been largely male. In the narrowest sense of the term we can define the mainstream center as referent and male dominated -an ethnicclass constituted of a minority of European, 'nonethnic' , Protestants. In this restricted sense there is a ruling class in America; one could almost say 'caste' .It is historically defined and of long standing. It emerged in pre-Revolutionary times and has maintained its position into the present. There is no question that this power position has eroded somewhat of late.

There are positions of power and influence occupied by members of every social class and every kind of ethnicity. Furthermore, women have made significant movement into such positions. Though this is certainly true, it does not seem that the central positions in the most important contexts have been usurped by a large number of individuals representing other than the referent ethnicclass.

Nevertheless, there is movement and change. For the first time in American history a Black, Jesse Jackson, made a significant move in 1988 toward candidacy for the highest office of the US and the ethnicity of the Democratic candidate, Michael Dukakis, was not that of the referent ethnicclass either, though his behaviors are. The President of the United States elected in 1988, George Bush, is a very solid representative of the referent ethnicclass. It is interesting also, that women seemed to be making significant moves into the politics of power with the candidacy of Geraldine Ferraro for Vice President in 1984. In the election of 1988, however, women were not particularly visible in the higher echelons of politics. One needs only to look at the composition of the personnel con stage' to see that this is true. We seem, as usual, to be moving in several directions at once. This may be one of the most important strengths and possibly one of the weaknesses of the American way of doing things.

Drawing upon the previous discussions of social class, ethnicity, values, and dialogue, we will attempt construction of a central model for cultural relations in America. This model places the referent ethnicclass culture at the center of the mainstream and arranges all other groups in America in relationship to it. In the interest of clarity only a few segments of the total population are represented. The diagram of this model (Figure 3.2) is not intended as a statement of precise measurement of any kind. Rather, it presents an idea. It is a statement of presumed relationships between and among groups that constitute significant segments of the American population. The rest of this chapter is an explanation of these relationships.

We have defined the mainstream cultural dialogue in America by reference to pivotal value orientations and the referent ethnicclass as a subset of the total mainstream population. For the purposes of our model we defined 'mainstream' as consisting of all North European, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant middle class groups and populations. This is not intended as a denial of the mainstream quality of life for representatives of any other group. It does, however, define a 'center', historically derived, with which all groups are in some degree of accord or conflict, including White Catholics and Jews.

The model conveys the idea that all groups in America participate in the American cultural dialogue and that at the same time a very critical aspect of that dialogue is conflict. The intermediation of this conflict, the accommodation of groups with various origins and various cultural orientations is central to the American cultural dialogue.

Cultural Attributes

The model that we are developing is highly schematic and we have said that it is not intended to be a statement of measured values with any quantitative implications. However, to make our discussion sensible, we need to state the salient cultural features of the mainstream and referent ethnoculture. We have tried, in our discussion of value orientations, to paint the picture with broad strokes.

The mainstream cultural value orientations include an emphasis upon the individual and individualism, upon personal achievement and success gained by hard work, equality of opportunity, the value of honesty (as an expedient best policy), a belief in the openness of the American socioeconomic structure that can be penetrated by personal commitment and hard work, a belief in progress, a persistent belief in the future as a time of promise and positive developments (an orientation that has been, as we pointed out, eroded of late), and a sociable, get-along-well-with-others orientation.

In general terms these are the value orientations towards which individuals tend to move during their accommodation to the center of the American cultural dialogue. Whether this means assimilation or not is moot. Though there is considerable rejection of the notion of the 'melting pot' concept, it is undeniable that as ethnic groups become more and more successful at attaining the rewards available through mainstream instrumentalities, they also tend to be culturally assimilated. Mother tongues are lost or decline in use and significance, and clothing styles, personal demeanor, possessions such as homes or other personal property all change in recognizable directions. In a society where as many as 60,000,000 people may be looking at the same television program at the same time, it would be unlikely to be otherwise. There are other influences that are more divisive, such as schools, that we will discuss in Chapter 5.

Nevertheless, individuals may retain significant identities, habits, and ways of thinking that are certainly not mainstream while simultaneously succeeding in adopting mainstream instrumentalities to their own purposes. Our experience with Native American populations has convinced us that various forms of biculturalism are quite workable and, for many persons, may constitute viable adaptations to the need to 'get along' in America at the same time that ethnic pride dictates a retention of self-orientation within one's culture of origin.

The referent ethnicclass we define as a variant of the mainstream culture. This class is where success becomes driven, where status striving is a dominant fact of life, where the career focus is particularly strong. There are other attributes such as a generalized urban expediency, a disdain for non-affluence and a taste for the mode, (for what is 'trendy') that are apparent in varying degrees and expressed in various ways by subgroups within the referent population. There are of course also regional variations, variations by age and by locale. Uniformity is not, in any American population, an outstanding feature.

In general we can say that the referent ethnicclass is an urban professional and business population, college educated, and increasingly characterized in the younger age groups by double incomes. The family style of this young group is characterized by the acronyms, YUPPIES, OINKS and OIOKS (OINKS are double income no kids and OIOKS are double income one kid). This is also a population with a very high divorce rate. The stress engendered by high speed urban business and professional lives within two career families and little to hold the couple together constitutes prime conditions for such a high divorce rate. Among the Stanford 'non-ethnic' respondents to the values

projective technique's first statement 'I wish my parents had _____', the sentence completions take two major forms: 'I wish my parents had more money', and 'I wish my parents had stayed together' or 'resolved their differences'.

There are other dimensions of referent culture, shared widely among upper-middle class persons irrespective of ethnicity, that fall under the heading *style*. Speech, humor, courtesies, clothing, possessions of all kinds, home and particularly interior decoration, schools attended (and that children attend, as well as colleges planned), interpersonal contacts, travel and cross-cultural experience, reading, television viewing, and particularly self-presentation, that are acquired as one moves into mainstream class status. They are not the American cultural dialogue. They are expressions of some parts of it, but they are criteria for recognition and acceptance. These stylistic features are difficult to 'pick up' and people aspirant to referent- equivalent mainstream status are often marginalized because they have not fully mastered them. This marginalization is usually subtle, covert, and frustrating. It is not necessarily linked to ethnicity, for Whites, even WASP Whites, encounter the criteria and get marginalized, as they rise economically.

The groups shown in the diagram (3.2) in the field surrounding mainstream and referent culture are in a two way relationship to that culture. They are making moves, as individuals, into mainstream cultural patterns and mainstream socioeconomic status at the same time that elements of mainstream culture are continually moving out towards them through the mass media, through personal contact, and even the packaging of goods that they use. The diffusion of cultural elements, including elements of style, move in the other direction as well. Every ethnic group in America has contributed or is contributing to the composition of mainstream culture. Black expressions, mannerisms, attitudes, music, images of poverty, feelings of guilt and anxiety, have profoundly affected the American dialogue and to a significant extent, mainstream culture. We have already spoken of the Native American influence. The Asian influence is growing; foods, clothing styles, decoration, even styles of management, are influencing the mainstream and are very much a part of the dialogue. The Hispanic influence is strong, particularly in the West and Southwest, again, in foods and clothing, language, expressions, some aspects of interpersonal relations, and also in architectural styles. It would be a mistake, however, to regard the mainstream and referent ethnic class as a deep cultural mix of elements from each of the major, long-standing ethnic groups in America. From the inside of the designated mainstream, and particularly the referent ethnic class, the elements accepted seem relatively superficial, the base culture seems very 'Anglo', and many people seem interested in keeping it that way. If this were not so there would be little conflict in the dialogue.

The traditional groupings of each of the minority populations retain the greatest degree of separation and distance. In some cases they may do so by an intentional exclusion of mainstream cultural attributes. The same may be said of the minority referent ethnic class, though here what is being excluded are certain (not all) cultural elements and patterns perceived as 'ethnic' or 'lower class'. But no group in America, no matter how exclusive or reclusive, is entirely outside of the American cultural dialogue.

The Hutterites and the Amish are classic examples of an exclusionary adaptation. The Hutterites are a population of some 20,000 persons who came to this country seeking refuge from religious persecution in the nineteenth century. They have retained a communal living orientation and many attributes of the culture that they came to this country with from Europe. They make strenuous efforts to keep what they regard as undesirable aspects of contemporary North American culture out of their communes. The Amish are somewhat similar in that they, like the Hutterites, are Anabaptists (against infant baptism). They do not live in communes but on family farms scattered over the countryside. The Amish also exclude what they think of as undesirable mainstream characteristics. Both the Hutterites and the Amish try hard to remain separate and do so by excluding cultural features from the mainstream.

In a related way the traditional Menominee Indians described in Chapter 6 make an explicit effort to maintain their traditional culture. I even in some cases to learn or relearn it so that they can carry it on. They also try to remain separate but are not as strict about rejecting or excluding mainstream cultural features. In contemporary United States society the most traditional elements within minorities retain their character by self-conscious manipulation of symbols and boundaries.

There are always a number of individuals who are somewhere in between the traditional elements of their group and those groups and individuals who have moved further into a mainstream framework. They may be subject to social, economic, and personal problems characteristic of populations who are in the process of accommodation or rejection of any cultural form. And finally, in every minority population, there are a significant number of individuals who have, in effect, become 'mainstreamers'.

There are some 'problem' groups in our diagram such as women, homosexuals, hippies and other counter culturalists, and any other group or population that is nominally a part of the mainstream population and possibly even of the referent subculture but which in some specific way is either disenfranchised or rejected or has purposely set up some cultural distance between themselves and the mainstream referent center. If we carry the analysis far enough we would find ourselves left with a small core of male, adult Protestant middle class persons from who everybody else would be in some degree divergent and in conflict. Though this would be an extreme interpretation of our model it is not illogical.

Whatever the specifics of the relations between the various groups in the field surrounding mainstream culture and the referent subculture, or whatever the specific composition of the groups may be, the complex processes of conflict, accommodation and cultural diffusion that are denoted by the model constitute the key to the American dialogue.

Notes :Changing profiles of value orientations derived from responses to the Spindler Values Projective Technique are reported in Spindler (1955), (1977), and in Spindler and Spindler (1983). Bernice McAllister (1967) and Richard Navarro (personal communication) report responses collected in other areas. Barbara Nay (1974) analyzed value-oriented responses in the Spindler and other samples. The American College Examination Board profiles are reported in Spindler (1977). Writings by anthropologists about American culture that served as a basis for constructing the Values Projective Technique (in 1952) are: Geoffrey Gorer (1948), Clyde Kluckhohn (1949), Florence Kluckhohn (1950), Mead (1943), Powdermaker (1950), Bateson, in Ruesch and Bateson (1951), Riesman (1950), Spindler (1948), Warner (1941). Edward Steele (1957) analyzes the value orientations projected by Dwight Eisenhower and Adlai Stevenson in the 1952 U.S. presidential campaign. The terms 'value' and 'value orientation' are used in our discussion despite the archaic quality they are ascribed by some analysts. Though our emphasis is upon pivotal concerns around which the American dialogue appears to be centered, these concerns subsume value components -attributes about which there is positive or negative affect. The concept 'Referent Ethniclass' as defined by Louise Bay Waters' unpublished paper (1976), is drawn from related materials in Anderson (1970), Parker (1972), Gordon (1964). The comments on referent ethniclass dominance in business and professional life are from Anderson (1970). Class style is semi-facetiously described by Fussell (1983). John Hostetler and Gertrudde Huntington describe the Amish (1976) and the Hutterites (1980).

Values Projective Technique

Complete the sentence with the first thing that comes to mind, no matter what it is.

1. I wish my parents had _____.
2. All men are born _____.
3. Artists are _____.
4. Honesty is _____.
5. Anyone can get to the top if they _____.
6. Intellectuals should _____.
7. If I had a son I would want him to _____.
8. College professors should _____.
9. The most successful people _____.
10. Wealthy people should _____.
11. Everyone should want to _____.
12. The future is _____.
13. I wish I had _____.
14. What counts is what a person _____.
14. It isn't a person's background that counts, it is what.
15. It isn't a person's background that counts, it is what _____.
16. The individual is _____.
17. Nudity is _____.
18. In order to be successful one has to _____.
19. French night clubs are _____.
20. The standard of living of the laboring classes should _____.
21. It isn't what one says that counts, it is what one _____.
22. Time is _____.
23. There's no use crying _____.
24. Popular people are _____.

Describe in one short paragraph *your* conception of the ideal American.

Copyright -Ethnographics, Box 38, Calistoga, CA 94515 Source: G. and L. Spindler

