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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A clever fellow once got the idea that people drown because they are possessed by the idea of gravity. If they would get this notion out of their heads by seeing it as religious superstition, they would be completely safe from all danger of water. For his entire life he fought against the illusion of gravity while all the statistics gave him new and abundant evidence of its harmful effects.\(^1\)

-- Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

That clever kind of fellow is typical of the modern social scientist. Mistaking ideas for things, trading facts for values or values for facts, depending on the market's condition, and begging the security of publication and tenure, they have forgotten their fellow man. In a democratic society the gold rules. In the open society, criticism is stifled. In our society, the former slaves are seen as free.

Outside the ivory towers, the "politics of unreason" practices change; inside, the unreason of politics demands that controversy be stifled and the critics culled out. Once upon a time, it is written, men spoke their piece.

and, sometimes, drank their hemlock. History was viewed as a process and man could control his destiny. Qualitative differences were at least as important as quantitative. Nowadays, mass production has lowered both the cost and the value of even the intellectual. Creating the "good life" is seen as but the superstition of the unlettered.

The alchemist's touch is evident in the transmutation of the sociologist. Introducing an analysis of Durkheim's concept "anomie" and Marx's concept "alienation," John Horton writes:

One of the mysteries of contemporary American sociology is the disappearance of the sociologist. His respondents speak, the social system functions loudly, but he who gave respondents language and the social system life is obscured beneath a fog of editorial "we," "they," or "it." His magic rests not only on the clever use of language...but also on an elaborate mythology starring Max Weber as sociological hero...the sociological magician accepts and justifies...his division into professional scientist and political animal...He is only affirming what he does in theory in practice.²

Other people lack such refined super-egos. They are unhappy. They feel robbed. They act, perhaps voting for

a third party candidate, perhaps, in 1968, for George Wallace. This is historical fact.

The social critic accepts fact and attempts to understand it. He does this by examining the facts, and examining the historical body of theories. He finds those which most closely fit the facts he deals with. Out of such an analysis comes, implicitly or explicitly, prescriptions for public policy. Studying a third party movement, as I do, implicitly argues that the two party system is not adequately expressing the needs of at least a minority portion of the American public. Analysing that third party movement through the lenses of two critical theories (anomie and alienation) of the nineteenth century, those of Marx and Durkheim, as I do, implicitly judges that there might be something basically wrong with the American political system.

I believe that the moral crisis of our time has given sense to the idea that a new order, not yet clearly conceived, is in the making. Its origins can be traced, in part, to the third party candidacy of George Wallace in 1968, where a minority protested the absence of an authentic, equitable, and just basis on which to build its life. The idea has spread far, and in the cold realities of the
seventies, few have faith in government being "of, by, and for the people." The future is uncharted. Uncertainty perplexes all.
CHAPTER II
SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

Men make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past. The tradition of all the dead generations weighs like a nightmare on the brain of the living.3

--- Karl Marx

There exist a multitude of studies of the Wallace vote of 1968, all of which laboriously and in detail describe the individual and aggregate characteristics of the "Wallace voter" and the "Wallace precinct." These studies lend little in terms of analytic insight. Few begin with more than a slight empirical generalization which serves as theory; most depend exclusively verbal descriptions of the data for "the larger truths." Most might have best been left to the mice.

The studies are of some use in that they set the historical and descriptive stage for the more rigorous analysis to follow. They provide a fog of information upon which the generally accepted concepts and presumed salient factors of

modern social science can be projected. An approximate, though vague, understanding of modern election trends can be gained from them. Such is the survey of literature which follows.

The *American Political Science Review* exists as a document to the destruction of the original meanings of alienation and anomie. Once upon a time, as Horton pointed out, critics of society were seen as the more astute analysts. Now, the critical concepts themselves have been reduced to meaningless verbiage and scarcely significant statistical relationships.

First prize in the "Woodenness of Political Science Prose" contest should be awarded to Ada Finifter for her explication of "Dimensions of Political Alienation." She writes:

> The conversion of these general theoretical ideas into systematic and empirical theory requires further rigorous and comprehensive analyses of types of citizen support and the development of empirical indicators for this domain. The concept of alienation, which may be conceived as one end of a continuum whose opposite extreme is defined by the concepts of support or integration, offers a useful vantage point from which to pursue this goal. The long history of intellectual concern with alienation has resulted in a
literature rich in concepts and suggestive hypotheses which may provide a valuable perspective from which to develop an empirical theory relating citizen attitudes to the structures and processes of the political system.4

Somewhere in the various translations of Durkheim and Marx, the critical content of the theories was lost to Ms. Finifter. Offering the carrot of the operationalization of "rich concepts and suggestive hypotheses," she beats the horse dead with her leaden construction of alienation and anomie.

She does this by defining alienation in such a way that its critical content "holds constant."5 She understands that alienation refers both to the individual and society, and the relationship between them, but then, simply eliminates the analysis of society, contending that alienation is attitudinal6 rather than, as Marx argues, based on economic relationships, or as Durkheim argues of anomie, based on the binding capabilities of the society.

Magically transforming attitudinal measures into metric data, she identifies two clusters of feelings among the respondents, "political powerlessness" and "perceived

5Ibid., p. 390
6Ibid.
political normlessness."[7] Her alchemy continues, assigning metric values to nominal categories of social class, status, social cohesion and the geo-cultural environment of the respondents. Apparently misusing the techniques of multiple regression, Finifter accounts for or explains 50% of the variation of the political powerlessness dimension. Over half of the explanation is derived from a negative correlation with political participation, indicating that the less people participate in politics, the more powerless they feel with regard to politics. Half of the 18% of explained variation of the "Perceived Political Normlessness" is accounted for by a negative correlation with a measure of "Faith in People," a seemingly attitudinal and thus a dependent variable.[8] Political Science seems the subtle art of obscuring the obvious.

A safer route to take in the analysis of protest movements is that of Converse, et al., in their APSR article on the 1968 election. Quite perceptive in the analyses of the protest votes in the primaries and election of that year, their lack of explanatory theory, as opposed to iteration of

[7] Ibid., p. 397
[8] Ibid, p. 405
statistical relationships, leads them to sermonize student dissidents, rather than explain why so many people were so unhappy with the American political system.

They quite clearly demonstrate that the Wallace vote was a backlash vote, based on the issues of (mainly) a hawkish Vietnam posture, an anti-civil rights position, and strong feelings concerning the breakdown of law and order, and, in addition, was unrelated to party. Quite the reverse was true for the Humphrey and Nixon candidacies, as the following chart demonstrates:

Table 1

Correlations (gammas) Between Candidates and White Voters' Characteristics and Issue Positions For the South and the Non-South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NON-SOUTH</th>
<th></th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humphrey</td>
<td>Nixon</td>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>Humphrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the author's point out that while there was a high degree of issue saliency among Wallace voters, there was a quite low correlation between the Wallace voter and

---

any liberal or conservative ideology. (Gammas of .13 and .09 within and outside the South for white voters, respectively.) This indicates that the 1968 election, at least in terms of the Wallace vote, was a critical one in the sense that some new ideological coalition was being forged, quite different from the separate tracks laid during the New Deal.

Unfortunately, when investigating the actual nature of the Wallace vote, Converse, et al's report becomes essentially anecdotal. They find that union members are more likely to vote for Wallace than non-union members, a finding at odds with my analysis of the same data to be reported further in the paper. They find, as I will report, that the Wallace voter is of lower occupational class, and less well educated. They do an extended analysis of the regional cast of the Wallace vote, finding, of course, that the Wallace vote was concentrated among those currently living or raised in the South. Finally, they find that Wallace had disproportionate strength among the young.11

While all these facts might seem interesting to the bibliophile, they do not explain the Wallace vote, since

---

10 Ibid., p. 1100
11 Ibid., pp. 1102-4
none of them are tied to any theory, in the correct meaning of the word. Had the authors examined participation of the Wallace voter in previous elections, as I do below, and used contemporary theorists such as Kornhauser and Schattsneider, they might have come to conclusions quite similar to the ones in this paper. Instead, they admonished the children to keep quiet, to conserve the status quo.

The political scientist Walter Dean Burnham suggests that the election of 1968 will, when viewed historically, appear as one of "critical realignment." By this he means that the New Deal Coalition forged in the Democratic Party has fallen apart. While, by definition, such a judgement cannot accurately be made for another two decades, the "increasingly visible social maladjustment" and the mobilization of a new third party indicate that such a theory applies.

Burnham argues that the Wallace movement is the harbin- ger of such change because: 1) it is not the product of a major party bolt; 2) it is a movement; and 3) it is of very

---

13Ibid.
large relative size. Using aggregate data analysis of Baltimore City, Maryland, and Delaware County, Pennsylvania (the southern suburbs of Philadelphia), Burnham presents strong evidence that such a phenomenon as "urban populism" exists.

Table 2
Correlates of the Wallace Vote (1968)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professionals</th>
<th>Clericals</th>
<th>Skilled Semi-Skld.</th>
<th>Foreign Stock</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delaware County</td>
<td>-.795</td>
<td>-.567</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>-.227</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>-.234</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>-.569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Wallace vote in Delaware County had high negative correlations with white-collar employment and high positive correlations with blue-collar employment. In Baltimore, the directions of the relationships are similar though not as strong. For both areas, there exists a weak relationship, of opposite directions, for ethnicity, though there is a marked negative correlations with the non-white population.

On an aggregate level of analysis, these findings show, in

---

14 Ibid., p. 143, (emphases in original).
15 Ibid., p. 145.
16 Ibid., p. 146.
17 Ibid., p. 153.
18 Ibid.
summary, that the Wallace vote was a blue-collar, white political movement that had little relationship to the degree of nativism.

Richard M. Scammon and Benjamin J. Wattenberg, in their less technical analysis of the past and future of American politics, divide issues into two categories: 1) the economic or "bread and butter" issues concerning the distribution of goods and services, and 2) the social, or "Greening of America" ones, concerning the propriety of certain kinds of public and private behavior. Max Weber might have termed these respectively class and status, while Burnham would call them the New Deal coalition and the "new realignment." Scammon and Wattenberg found that the Wallace voters are more likely to opt for the social issue than the economic, based on survey data. They sight the fact that the Wallace voter is more concerned with status ("keep the blacks out of the schools") than economic benefit ("accept federal money for schools"). The Humphrey voter, supporting the symbol of Roosevelt's coalition, is not so inclined.19

Of the most direct relevance to this study is James McEvoy III's study of the American right, the Goldwater vote and the Wallace vote. McEvoy explicitly relies on Kornhauser's *Politics of Mass Society*, which in turn relied on the work of Emile Durkheim, as well as Campbell, Converse, Miller and Stokes' *American Voter*, which has its theoretical roots in the work of Max Weber. Mass society theories, such as that of Kornhauser, view modern society as anomic, failing to provide the sufficiently strong fabric of moral codes necessary for the preservation of liberal democracy. Campbell, et al., assert support for third parties arises, especially in agrarian areas, out of "economic sensitivity, low political involvement and lack of integration into voluntary associations." Taking a shotgun approach to statistical manipulation, McEvoy presents a loose pattern of cross-tabulations which often seem to miss the points the theorists he uses would have made.

With regard to the marginal participant theory, McEvoy does not find a strong case. Most of the reason for this

---

21 Ibid.
conclusion is based on the inadequacy of the data at hand to indicate effectively true marginal participation, exempt from the influences of the Wallace candidacy. The data he does generate do not themselves demonstrate a compelling argument. In effect, he disconfirms the marginal participant theory as to the source of the Wallace movement.\textsuperscript{22}

He also disconfirms the hypothesis that the Wallace vote is based on a sense of status discrepancy, and demonstrates that there is almost no difference between the Nixon, Humphrey, Wallace and undecided voter.\textsuperscript{23} He does find a strong "working-class component" to the Wallace vote.\textsuperscript{24} There is a high degree of religious fundamentalism and a low rate of church attendance. Much of the fundamentalism may be associated with the heavily Southern complexion of the Wallace vote, though such an observation has little analytic strength. McEvoy's "religious portrait" of the Wallace voter is a "somewhat anomic orthodox Christian."\textsuperscript{25}

The literature on the Wallace vote does provide a general understanding of the common attributes of Wallace supporters.

\textsuperscript{22}Ibid., p. 126.
\textsuperscript{23}Ibid., p. 127.
\textsuperscript{24}Ibid., p. 129.
\textsuperscript{25}Ibid., p. 131.
They are, apparently, blue-collar, status-conscious people whose rate of participation in political and social groups is relatively low. These attributes are descriptive, and not analytic. They can be related to analytic theories of political discontent, but none of the authors, with the exception of McEvoy, attempted to do this. In order to explain anything, an analytic framework must be provided, and descriptive information must be provided with which to judge the utility of that framework. The remaining sections of this paper shall do this, adapting the analytic theories of Marx and Durkheim to historical fact of the 1968 Wallace vote.
On the one hand, the historical and human sciences are not, like the physico-chemical sciences, the study of a collection of facts external to men or a world upon which their action bears. On the contrary, they are the study of this action itself, of its structure, of the aspirations which enliven it and the changes it undergoes. On the other hand, since consciousness is only one real, but partial aspect of human activity, historical study does not have the right to limit itself to conscious phenomena; it must connect the conscious intentions of the actors of history to the objective meaning of their behaviour and actions.

-- Lucien Goldmann

The Wallace vote of 1968 is a form of collective behavior existing as an historical fact challenging the legitimacy of the social and political structure of the United States. The American Independent Party, under whose banner Wallace ran, was one of series of third party assaults on a two party political system that has survived in this country for over a century. In challenging the established convention of a two party system, it can be labelled as a social fact, since it is a collective object, and a critical social movement.

The sociologist John Horton implies that Marx's concept, "alienation," and Durkheim's concept, "anomie," are rubrics for critical social movements when he writes:

Alienation for Marx and anomie for Durkheim were metaphors for a radical attack on the dominant institutions and values of industrial societies... In the works of Marx and Durkheim, alienation and anomie critically and negatively describe states of social disorder.²⁷

The rise of an effective third party in American politics seems of great significance to a radical theoritician. It is the aim of this paper to demonstrate that these facts can be isomorphically related to "alienation" and "anomie."

Both "alienation" and "anomie" are theoretical concepts. Neither is a social fact. The philosophers of science David and Judith Willer present their conception of the relationship between facts and theories, the "scientific view of science," schematically as follows:

²⁷Horton, op.cit.
### Table 3

**Schematic Relationship of Concepts to Facts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept A</th>
<th>Concept B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theoretical Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstraction-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observational Level</strong></td>
<td>Particular Observable A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concepts, such as "alienation" and "anomie" can be related to facts, such as the Wallace vote, through the process of abstraction. Scientific laws do not necessarily deal with phenomena of similar appearance, they deal with the relationship of abstractions to social facts. Anomie is not a thing; a vote for Wallace, or the percentage of votes Wallace got in a particular state is. A theory is a statement or statements about the commonality of sets of social facts.\(^{29}\)

The construction of theoretical statements is different from the collection of information about social facts. It is not dependent on any set of particular phenomena. In the Willers' words:


\(^{29}\)Ibid., p. 23.
Abstraction is...a matter of establishing an isomorphism between theoretical non-observables and empirical observables... The more similar the model and the empirical case are in all respects covered by the statement, the better the theory will explain...30

Theory and social facts are related through the human and psychically interior process of abstraction. Marx theorized that social discontent is related to the objective facts of the economic life of a particular class in industrial society. Durkheim theorized that social discontent was related to different social facts of a different class in industrial society. If the Wallace vote is one objective form of social discontent, then the utility of Marx's and/or Durkheim's theory is in how much of that social discontent their categories of social facts can explain. In more modern language, their theories are more powerful to the extent that they cannot be empirically disconfirmed.

To Marx, alienation rested on man's estrangement from his work life. To Durkheim, anomie arose from man's conflicting roles in modern society. Abstracting from

such theoretical statements, I shall develop testable hypotheses concerned with sets of contemporary social facts, categories of survey and aggregate data. In this way, anomie and alienation will be scientifically examined.

That both Marx's and Durkheim's writings are value laden, often explicitly so need not interfere with such intent. Scientific questions are not, "Should apples fall?" or, "Should atomic wastes poison?" They are, "Under what conditions do apples fall?," "How do atomic wastes poison?" and "What social facts are associated with critical social movements?" Alienation and nomie are conceptual or theoretical constructs embodying radical critiques of industrial society. Both condemn economic individualism and its rationalization in middle-class liberalism. To Durkheim, "anomie," and to Marx, "alienation," were endemic to their contemporary societies. 31 My task here is to demonstrate that the Wallace vote (a social fact) is related isomorphically to the critical concepts of "alienation" and "anomie."

31 Horton, op. cit., p. 286.
CHAPTER IV

ALIENATION

The writings of both Marx and Durkheim, as well as commentaries on their work, produce theoretical equivalences which implicitly contain empirical isomorphs. In the following explication of the theories, care is taken in producing those statements which make the most sense when confronting the realities of modern societies. The direction of the analysis will be such that sense can be made of the disturbances of the present.

Alienation is both a psychological state, a sociological condition, a statement concerning the relationship of the two and a theory of social structure and human nature.\textsuperscript{32} It is an abstract statement Marx formulated which explains social discontent and identifies the process of social recreation. It is designed to engender understanding of man as he lives, not as he is thought to live.

Marx saw alienation as having three moments, or parts:

1) that man was alienated from the product he produced,
2) that he was alienated from the production process itself, and

\textsuperscript{32} Joachim Israel, \textit{Alienation: From Marx to Modern Sociology}, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971), pp. 16-17.
3) that he was alienated from himself and his fellow men.33

Even within this abbreviated form, the importance Marx placed on labor as the source of the social definition of man is evident. To Marx, it is the division of labor which leads to his estrangement:

...as soon as the distribution of labor comes into being, each man has a particular, exclusive sphere of activity, which is forced upon him and which he cannot escape. He is a hunter, a fisherman, a shepherd, or a critical critic, and must remain so if he does not want to lose his means of livelihood; while in communist society, where nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity, but each can be accomplished in any branch he wished, society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for him to do one thing today and another tomorrow...34

Man being forced to produce commodities, "exchange values," rather than "use values," signals the alienating society.35 Of man alienated from his product, Marx wrote:

Labor...produces marvels for the rich but it produces privation for the worker. It produces palaces, but hovels for the worker. It produces beauty, but deformity for the worker.36

33Karl Marx, op. cit. (1967), pp. 292-293
34Ibid., pp. 424-425.
35Israel, op. cit., p. 44.
The worker sells his labor as a commodity, reifies a process into a thing, and in the selling separates himself from his products. They are no longer his. He can build a palace, to use Marx's example, but he cannot live in it.

In the second place, man is alienated from the process of production by selling his labor. It too is no longer his. The laborer is no more "at home" in the work place than one of the machines. Marx writes:

...the worker does not affirm himself in his work but denies himself, feels miserable and unhappy, develops no free physical and mental energy and mortifies his flesh and ruins his mind. The worker, therefore, feels at ease only outside work, and during work he is outside himself. He is at home when he is not working and when he is working he is not at home.37

Man thus becomes alienated from himself and from his fellow men. Because work is part of man's creative expression, and it is man's creativity which separates him from other species, selling one's work as a commodity transforms man into a kind of economically useful animal. His use of language is only an added, and sometimes unnecessary, feature with which he might work. To sell one's labor is to enslave

37Ibid., p. 292.
oneself, an act of self-alienation and self-objectification. Having objectified himself, man is no longer a humanly social being. As Marx writes:

A direct consequence of the alienation of man from his labor...is that man is alienated from other men...Every man regards other men according to the standards and relationships in which he finds himself placed as a worker.38

The total social environment, within which labor is treated as a commodity, is alienating.

Man becomes alienated from his species-being. Man, of all species, has the ability to consciously determine the patterns of his life. "Man" is defined as working man, creating man. Since the nature of man's creative work in industrial society, especially for the proletariat, is alienating, man becomes, in his work, alienated from his species being existence. He no longer controls the forms of his creative life. Marx writes:

Conscious life activity distinguishes man from the life activity of animals. Only for this reason is he a species being...

Alienated labor reverses the relationship

38Ibid., p. 295.
in that man, because he is a self-conscious being makes his life activity, his being, only a means for his existence.\textsuperscript{39}

In short, "For many sociologists and philosophers (Marx included) alienation is the same as reification: the act of transforming human properties... into... properties of things."\textsuperscript{40} At the core of Marx's theory is the conception of human nature as in the process of self-fulfillment, of becoming. Men are not things, but live as self-willing actors continually defining and redefining themselves as they interact with the world. To be alienated is to be imprisoned against change, untransformable, dead and inhuman.

A key to understanding the concept of alienation is in understanding history as process. Horton writes:

The critical content of alienation and anomie is sociological in the sense that Marx and Durkheim examine relationships between individuals and the collectivities which are the products of their activity... Neither sociologist studied man outside of the subject-object (man-society) relationship.\textsuperscript{41}

\textsuperscript{39}Ibid., p. 294.
\textsuperscript{41}Horton, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 288.
For Marx and Hegel, man creates his world and creates himself through work. This process of self-creation, the dialectic of history, is an assertion that change is one of the more important aspects of life. The Danish sociologist Israel writes that Marx adopted the concept of self-creation from Hegel and then quotes Marx as writing:

The outstanding thing in Hegel's **Phenomenology** is that Hegel grasps the self creation of man as a process... and that he, therefore grasps the nature of **labor**, and conceives objective man (true, because real man) as the result of his **own labor**. 42

Critical social movements, such as the Wallace vote is asserted to be, are transforming political events. Being a third party movement, notable for its impermanence, it might represent an expression of the alienation of certain aspects of society. Were Marx's theory to be useful in explaining the Wallace vote, social facts such as poverty, working class status, union membership and unemployment, all associated with the "alienation" syndrome, would associate strongly with that vote.

---

42 Israel, *op. cit.*, p. 37.
For the theoretical moments of alienation there can be hypothesized observable conditions which present themselves as isomorphs. These all have to do with the separation of man from his labor, in connection with the view of man as working man, separation of man from his society. Jail is one form of separation; homicide is another measure of anti-social behavior. Poverty, blue collar class, and lower participation in politics are other attributes of individuals and societies which would be associated with alienation. If they are also associated with the Wallace vote, then that the Wallace vote can be considered to be an expression of alienation.
Durkheim conceives of the general ills of industrial society as being "anomic." He writes:

If anomy never appeared...in intermittent spurts and acute crisis, it might cause the suicide rate to vary from time to time, but it would be a constant, regular factor. In one sphere of social life, however, -- the sphere of trade and industry -- it is actually in a chronic state. For a whole century, economic progress has mainly consisted in freeing industrial relations from all regulation.43

Durkheim developed the conception of anomie to explain differentials in the suicide rate among occupational and religious groups. He investigated suicide as a social fact, not a moral cause. He attempted to find other social facts which were related to suicide rates. That cluster which he developed, and scientifically demonstrated to have important bearing on suicide rates, he abstractly described as "anomic" conditions. In his other work, he assigned much of the quite obvious ills of late nineteenth century industrialism to that same theoretical construct.

In particular, anomie is the absence of strong social bonds. It is when society is disturbed by some:

painful crisis... abrupt transformations, economic disasters,...and other forms of uncertainty.44

It is when "declassification has occurred,...when the standard according to which needs were regulated"45 that a society becomes anomic.

The limits are unknown between the possible and the impossible, what is just and unjust, legitimate claims and those that are immoderate... At the very moment when traditional rules have lost their authority... the state of anomie is thus further heightened by passions being less disciplined.46

Durkheim sees the moral binding forces of society as being the solution to the problem of anomie. If men have clearly defined roles which limit their passions, they will not become discontent with their lot. Men must receive sets of limits "from an authority which they respect, to which they yield spontaneously... society alone can play this moderating role... It alone has the power necessary to stipulate law."47

44 Ibid., p. 252.
45 Ibid.
46 Ibid., p. 253
47 Ibid., pp. 248-249.
In short, anomie represents a pathological state of the economy, in which each individual wars with the others, and a pathological state of society, in which the individual is insufficiently regulated by society. Anomie springs from, in the words of the English political philosopher Steven Lukes:

a lack of collective forces at certain points in society; that is, of groups established for the regulation of social life.\footnote{Steven Lukes, "Alienation and Anomie," in Laslett and Runciman, \textit{Politics, Philosophy and Society, third series} (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1967), pp. 138-139.}

While Marx's solution to the problem of alienation is that the workers seize control of the state, Durkheim's is the opposite. He would have the state itself sponsor independent secondary interest groups which he calls corporations. Their purpose is, on the one hand, to counterbalance the monopoly of force generated by the state, and on the other hand, to link the individual to the state in the most efficient and complete manner. With regard to the problem of anomy, Durkheim writes:

(The individual) must not be curbed and monopolized by the secondary interest groups. There must therefore exist above these...secondary authorities, some overall authority which makes the
law for them all...The only means of averting collective particularism and all it involves for the individual is to have a special agency with the duty of representing the overall collectivity...It is soley because, in holding its constituent societies in check, it (the state) prevents them from exerting the repressive influences over individuals they would otherwise exert... It will be argued, might not the State in turn become despotic? Undoubtedly, providing there was nothing to overcome that tendency... The State, in our large scale societies, is so removed from individual interests that it cannot take into account the special or local and other conditions which exist...These small groups do not have this drawback. They are close enough to the things that provide their raison d'etre to be able to adapt their actions exactly and they surround the individuals closely enough to shape them in their own image. The inference to be drawn from this comment however is simply that if collective force, the State, is to be the liberator of the individual, it has itself need of some counterbalance, it must be restrained by other collective forces, that is, by... secondary groups...49

Such is Durkheim's view of the general nature of the un-anomic society.

Political parties form a special set of secondary groups within the single authority of political society or the state. Durkheim writes:

We should then define the political society as one formed by the coming together of a rather large number of secondary groups, subject to one authority which is not itself subject to any other authority so constituted.50

The state is, he writes, "that special organ...distinguished from the other special representations by (its) higher degree of consciousness and reflection.51

The individual gains social and political rights only through the state. Durkheim would not:

postulate that the rights of the individual are inherent, (but) admit that the institutions of these rights is in fact precisely the task of the State.52

History seems indeed to prove that the State was not created to prevent the individual from being disturbed in the exercise of his natural rights...rather it is the State which creates and organizes and makes a reality of these rights.53

Durkheim begins his discussion of political parties by pointing out that:

The state, in our large societies, is so removed from individual interests that it cannot take into account the special or local or other conditions in which they exist.54

50 Ibid., p. 45.
51 Ibid., p. 50.
52 Ibid., p. 57.
53 Ibid., p. 60.
54 Ibid., p. 63.
Intermediate organizations should be set up which, he writes: "must be normal organs of the social body... and remain constantly in operation." These organizations would best take the form of corporations, i.e., political parties, or be based on regional forms of political organization, the equivalent of our towns, counties and states. To Durkheim, the degree of anomie would be lessened if power were returned to local political organizations, and if political parties effectively channeled the grievances of the people. He writes:

Our political malaise thus has the same origin as the social malaise we are suffering from (anomy). It too is due to the lack of secondary organizations interrelated between the state and the rest of society.

The sociologist John Horton writes:

Considered outside any particular historical context, anomie refers to the problems of social control in a social system. Cultural constraints are ineffective: values are conflicting or absent, goals are not adjusted to opportunity structures or vice versa, or individuals are not adequately socialized to cultural directives. Whatever the particular meanings, anomie is a social state of normlessness or anarchy; the concept always focuses on the relationship between individuals and the constraining forces of social control.
Social facts abstracted from the theoretical statement of anomie are somewhat different than those abstracted from the concept "alienation." A decline in political participation is one, a decline in secondary group membership another, suicide rates a third and level of education, measuring the length of time of socialization in a formal structure a fourth. Simply a relatively lower level of the above sorts of observable phenomena might be sufficient to indicate a particular individual and/or society as anomic. If such is true of the Wallace vote, then it might be also termed an expression of anomie.
CHAPTER VI

MARX AND DURKHEIM COMPARED

John Horton makes clear the difference between the two theories:

Classical definitions of anomie and alienation contain different ideologies; they are counter-concepts with different directives for action; they describe essentially the same behavior and discontents, but from polar opposite perspectives, which look for different causes and call for different remedies.59

Central to this is an understanding of their conceptions of the complexities of the division of labor in modern society. In comparing the two theories, their opposite perspectives will become more clear.

Durkheim specifically argues against the Marxist notion of alienation. Social discord is not due to men having only become extensions of machines. He also points out that:

The division of labor does not produce those consequences because of necessity of its own nature, but only in exceptional and abnormal circumstances...
The division of labor presumes that the worker, far from being hemmed in by his

59Ibid.
collaborators, but...feels he is serving something.60

What the individual workmen feels he is serving would, for Durkheim, be the collective conscience, as represented by the state. While Durkheim's theory of anomie is a critical one, it is not critical of the possibilities of the state providing moral guidance. Nowhere is found the Marxist notion of the withering away of the state.

Marx, on the other hand, claimed that it was the division of labor itself which was alienating. Marx's criticisms of externally demanded occupational roles is central to his argument that industrial society is alienating. If society were so structured that men might only need to fish in the afternoon, hunt in the morning, etc., and did not have to work for money, then society would not be alienating.

Both theorists were socialists. They envisioned socialism as the political, economic and social system which would alleviate the ills of society. Yet the two had two quite different socialist programs. In the differences between their socialisms, the differences between the two theoretical concepts will be further clarified.

Durkheim's solution to the problem of anomie is to establish corporations, associations based on occupation. It is because of this that he supported the ideas of Saint-Simon and syndicalism. Marx criticized the Saint-Simonians for being utopians, lacking a sense of the historical development of the revolutionary class. Eventually, Marx writes, the utopian socialists:

are compelled to appeal to the feelings and the purses of the bourgesois...differing from (reactionary conservative socialists) only by more systematic pedantry, and by their fanatical and superstitious beliefs in the miraculous effects of their social science.

...the proletariat...offers to them the spectacle of a class without any historical initiative or any independent political movement.

Marx criticized Saint-Simon, and his supporters, feeling that they misunderstood the "motor of history" and were too willing to accept the current state of affairs with cosmetic changes instead of proletarian revolution -- a revolution both necessary and inevitable.

The American sociologist Alvin Gouldner, in prefacing Durkheim's work Socialism, writes:

63 Ibid., p. 40.
To Durkheim...the basic features of the new society were already in existence...that is, modern industrialism with its rational methods and increasing division of labor. Consequently, (his) problem was to develop a new moral order consistent with it, so that it might remain stable and develop in an orderly manner. (His) central task was not defined as producing social change so much as facilitating a natural tendency toward social order... (He) saw modern society as young and immature, as insufficiently developed industrialism...In contrast, of course, Marx -- who had retained the Saint-Simonian emphasis on social class and class conflict -- did not regard modern society as an adolescent industrialism but as a senile capitalism which...needed to be buried. Marx believed that change would not be smooth and orderly, and that therefore modern society possessed deep instabilities natural and normal to it.64

The conflict between Marx's and Durkheim's theories is further illuminated in the comparison of their own statements. In commenting on Marx's work, Durkheim writes:

Socialism...is entirely oriented toward the future...It is an ideal. It concerns itself much less with what is or was than what ought to be.65

Durkheim considered Marx's Capital to be, "the strongest work -- the most systematic, the richest in ideas" yet failing in the face of the impossibility, to Durkheim, of marshalling

64Alvin Gouldner, in Durkheim (1967), op. cit., pp. 20-23.
65Ibid., p. 39.
the data with which to prove the necessity of socialism.\textsuperscript{66}

Marx and Engels, on the other hand, write:

\begin{quote}
Communism is for us not a \textit{state of affairs} which is to be established, an \textit{ideal} to which reality (will) have to adjust itself. We call communism the real movement which abolishes the present state of things.\textsuperscript{67}
\end{quote}

As a result, Durkheim's work as a sociologist closely resembles that of the modern social scientist. In fact, he was one of the early practitioners of emperical sociology. Durkheim's conservatism leads him to describe the future good society with the structures of the present. The system itself is not at fault. It is the efficient operation of the system that is in question. Marx, on the other hand, looked for the destruction of the system as it exists. Durkheim provides much explication which is easily operationalized. Marx created greater difficulties for the kind of descriptive sociological methods today in vogue.

Support for the theory of alienation lies less in the analysis of class structure, systemic discontent and work life than with the extent to which Marxists have succeeded in replacing the old social systems, and their ideas, with

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{66}Ibid., pp. 40-41.
\item \textsuperscript{67}Marx and Engels, \textit{op. cit.}, (1967), p. 426.
\end{itemize}
new, more socially just ones. For this reason, much of his writing on alienation seems vague when compared to Durkheim's on anomie.

The difference between the theorists pales when compared the approaches of most contemporary social theorists. While Durkheim wrote of the rules to be followed, and Marx those broken, both men wrote of politics and society because of what they saw as wrong in it. Both are ideological critiques of industrial society. Both anomie and alienation, as the British philosopher Steven Lukes writes, are similar in that they deal with:

1) the state of society

2) a state of mind

3) the relationship between both of them, and

4) a presupposition of the natural, right and possible relationship between them.68

Both Marx and Durkheim examine the relationship between the object and the subject of the social realm, and do this within an evaluative and prescriptive theory of politics.

Both theorists developed empirical methods with which to understand their contemporary societies. Both focused on

68Lukes, op. cit., p. 140.
the division of labor as the source, in Marx's case, or the cure, in Durkheim's, of the ills of society.

Lukes writes that:

Whereas... anomic man is the unregulated man who needs rules to live by, limits to his desires,... alienated man is a man in the grip of the system...69

The classical definitions of anomie and alienation rest on opposed descriptions of the same social discontent.70 This paper is an analysis of one instance of contemporary social discontent, the Wallace vote. By demonstrating that the Wallace vote is observable anomie and/or alienation, the values of the theorists might fruitfully be applied toward practical attempts at the solution to present day ills.

69Ibid.
70Horton, op. cit., p. 297.
CHAPTER VII

THE FACTS

Unless you have investigated a problem, you will be deprived the right to speak on it. Isn't that too harsh? Not in the least. When you have not probed into a problem... and know nothing of its essentials, whatever you say will undoubtedly be nonsense. Talking nonsense solves no problems...

It won't do!
It won't do!
You must investigate!
You must not talk nonsense! 71

A framework for the scientific understanding and an explication of Marx's and Durkheim's theories has been presented. That this framework is accurate depends on the rigor of the analytic logic expressed on the abstract level. If the logic is correct on the abstract level, and the hypotheses well formed and supporting on the observational level, then the statement that the Wallace vote was a form of alienation and/or anomie cannot be considered incorrect. Again, following the Willers', the above statements appear schematically as:

Table 4

Application of Schematic Relation of Concepts to Facts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Relation to Facts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anomie</td>
<td>fracturing of social web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alienation</td>
<td>cause for revolution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

abstract level

theory

observational level

Wallace vote  Survey and aggregate data (hypotheses)

The task now is the construction and testing of hypotheses at the observational level.

Computations were performed using both the time sharing and batch processing inputs of the University of Massachusetts research computer. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences was used for much of the data, with the help of John Fenton's Chi Square program, Stanton Green's program of Kendall's partial tau computational formula, and, in some cases, a pocket electronic calculator.

Levels of Analysis

There are, it seems, three levels of political analysis: the individual, the group and the systemic. The first deals with actual people, rather than mere facts, and thus, while relatively weak in terms of scientific study, is strong in expressing the human dilemma of politics. However, most
modern studies concentrate on the latter two, in an effort to achieve a scientific validity to the findings developed from depersonalized and objective data. Surveys of voters enable an appreciation of the differences between random assortments of responses and statistically meaningful groupings. Systemic, aggregate analysis allows mathematical models of political systems to be constructed.

The Individual

My impression of the actual Wallace voter, as opposed to the one constructed through survey research or aggregate analysis, depends on my knowing a person who did, or at least claims to have, voted for George Wallace in 1968. While no intersubjective or scientific generalizations must be accepted from my perceptions of this very real person, that I share my knowledge of this person will enlighten the reader as to the humanistic values, or lack thereof, which impinge on any analysis of that quite large protest movement of 1968.

Joe voted for Wallace when he was about twenty years old. He had been in the Marine Corps for less than six months and was awaiting shipment to Viet-nam, when his commanding officer
strongly suggested that all servicemen vote in the election. Joe voted for Wallace because "at least he (Wallace) seemed to be saying something." It was apparently not out of ideological feeling except in the most general sense. Joe was in the Marines. After attending a military academy and The Citadel, he worked in a factory, spending every other weekend in the drunk tank. I first met him just after he had been released from jail on a "driving to endanger" charge in the Fall of 1973.

He is now trying to straighten himself out; he's on the wagon and thinking of the future. He has no use for society's conventions, unless they reward him, sees the law as something to be avoided, and in general would rather go fishing. He graduated from a large state university in June of 1974, largely because the GI Bill was better than work, and his native wit and accomplished charm enabled him to do well in his courses. He correctly understands the limited immediate worth, in occupational terms, of the degree he received but knows, as few of his teachers know, how much more enjoyable it is to attend school than to work for a living.

He seems torn between an appreciation for life as a beautiful process and emotions of violence. He says he sees "facism on the horizon." In the practice of his life
he will do "women's work" if it needs doing, and expects women to reciprocate. He set up a dirt farm, subsistence type, in an isolated part of the country.

He has little day to day contact with blacks in his life, but has had in the past, in the service. The isolation from racial minorities in his daily life allows him the more culturally and institutionally acceptable racism that is endemic to America. Yet, in knowing him, I get the feeling that he is, at heart, no more a racist than a male chauvanist. Discounting bar-room conversation, he seems to deal with people on an individual basis.

He has a greater capacity for understanding and communicating the existential quandaries of life than many political scientists I know. He has a keen sense of humor which focuses on the absurd. He can appreciate different sorts of people on their own terms. I like him.

Still, he is an American, and a Wallace voter.

The Group

Surveys are collections of facts about individuals. Analysis of survey data is the abstract clustering of attributes of the individuals, creating groups such as "the Wallace voter" or "the electoral non-participant." Such is this group
analysis, using John Fenton's condensation of the University of Michigan Survey Research Center's survey during the 1968 election. The summary statistics were computed by Fenton's Chi Square program, by the SPSS, or by hand.

Neither Durkheim nor Marx wrote of an immigrant nation with a substantial racial minority. Modern America is in these two instances, and more, quite different from the early industrial societies of Europe. If Wallace voters are native whites, then they, as a group, will be more similar to the society of early industrial Europe than the full SRC sample. European society, at the time, was white and almost exclusively nativist. The methodological intent here is similar to that of Converse, et al., when they controlled for region. Everyone knows that the Wallace candidacy sprang from the South. Converse, et al. controlled for region, and found little difference. The contention here is that Marx and Durkheim could have explained the Wallace vote in part because of the similarities of the societies considered.

Everyone knows that only whites voted for Wallace, and some suspect that the Wallace voters were predominantly native. Anomie and alienation are appropriate concepts for the study of the Wallace vote if the population they were used to describe is all the more similar to that portion of
the American population under study. In fact it is, as demonstrated in Table 5, and in further elaborations of the data, the sample universe will be limited to native, white voters.

Table 5

The Racial and Ethnic Character of the Wallace Voter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Native White</th>
<th>Non-Native White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey/Nixon</td>
<td>607 (67.0%)</td>
<td>299 (33.0%)</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>102 (88.7%)</td>
<td>13 (11.3%)</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>709 (69.4%)</td>
<td>312 (30.6%)</td>
<td>1,021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 23.440, probability level = less than .001

Cramer's V = .152    Gamma = - .589

If the Wallace vote is a symptom of the alienation in contemporary society, then Wallace voters are more likely to be blue collar workers than white collar, professional or farm workers. In fact, this turns out to be true of the Wallace voters, as the following table demonstrates, supporting the assertion that the Wallace vote is an expression of alienation.
Table 6

Wallace Voters Are More Likely to be Proletarian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Farm</th>
<th>White Collar</th>
<th>Blue Collar</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey/Nixon</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(93.3%)</td>
<td>(91.7%)</td>
<td>(87.2%)</td>
<td>(79.1%)</td>
<td>(85.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.7%)</td>
<td>(8.3%)</td>
<td>(12.8%)</td>
<td>(20.9%)</td>
<td>(14.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 12.718, probability level = .0058

Cramer's V = .164    Gamma = .372

A measure of the extent to which people are alienated from other persons, and from their society, is the greater degree of unemployment, and the lesser extent of membership in trade unions. Using the SRC survey data no statement can be made about such hypotheses since the probability of chi square was not sufficiently large or small, indicating how likely the observed relationship is to occur by chance. In this case, controlling for ethnicity did lower the probability of chi square, but not to the generally accepted .05 level.

Another measure of the extent of alienation from society is lower participation in elections. If the Wallace voters are more alienated from society, then it is less likely that they
would have voted in the previous presidential election, assuming they were legally qualified. This assertion is supported by the data, which indicates, in Table 7, that the Wallace voter is half as likely to have voted in 1964 as the Nixon/Humphrey voter.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Voted</th>
<th>Didn't Vote</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey/Nixon</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(87.2%)</td>
<td>(73.7%)</td>
<td>(86.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.8%)</td>
<td>(26.3%)</td>
<td>(13.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 5.567, probability level = .017

Cramer's V = .094 Gamma = .418

In summary, the Wallace vote was a blue collar vote and Wallace supporters were less likely to have participated in the previous election. Nothing statistically significant can be said of the Wallace voter and union membership or unemployment. In a somewhat limited way, at this level of analysis, the Wallace vote can be seen as an expression of alienation.

That Wallace voters are less likely to have participated in previous elections, as demonstrated above, indicates the Wallace movement might as well be called an expression of anomie.
as alienation. White collar and blue collar workers are more likely to be anomic, according to Durkheim, and, if the Wallace vote is an expression of anomie, higher proportions of them should vote for him than Nixon and Humphrey. This is the case, as shown in Table 8. Wallace support is twice as prevalent among white and blue collar workers as among professionals and farmers.

Table 8

Professionals and Farmers Are Less Likely to Vote for Wallace than White and Blue Collar Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professionals and Farmers</th>
<th>White and Blue Collar</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey/Nixon</td>
<td>119 (93.0%)</td>
<td>286 (83.1%)</td>
<td>405 (85.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>9 (7.0%)</td>
<td>58 (16.9%)</td>
<td>67 (14.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>128 (100%)</td>
<td>344 (100%)</td>
<td>472 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 7.164, probability level = less than .01

Cramer's $V = .123$    Gamma = .457

Extent of education can be used as a measure of participation in secondary groups, since those who have gone to school longer have participated in organized group activities that much more extensively. If Durkheim's theory applies, the better educated are less likely to have voted for Wallace. Table 9 shows that this hypothesis is supported by the data.
Table 9

**Education and the Wallace Vote**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educated for</th>
<th>Humphrey/Nixon</th>
<th>Wallace</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-11 Years</td>
<td>159 (78.7%)</td>
<td>43 (21.3%)</td>
<td>202 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+ Years</td>
<td>448 (88.4%)</td>
<td>59 (11.6%)</td>
<td>507 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>607 (85.6%)</td>
<td>102 (14.4%)</td>
<td>709 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 10.15, probability level = less than .01

Cramer's V = .120    Gamma =-.345

Another form of secondary group membership is religion. Durkheim found that the suicide rate, and thus anomie, was lower among Catholics than among Protestants. Catholics, as reported below, are less likely to have voted for Wallace. In addition, people who attend church less frequently are both more likely to be anomic, and, as it turns out, more likely to vote for Wallace.

Table 10

**Religion and the Wallace Vote**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Catholics</th>
<th>Protestants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey/Nixon</td>
<td>219 (92.8%)</td>
<td>635 (87.3%)</td>
<td>854 (88.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>17 (7.2%)</td>
<td>92 (12.7%)</td>
<td>109 (11.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>236 (100%)</td>
<td>727 (100%)</td>
<td>963 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 5.275, probability level = .02057

Cramer's V = .074    Gamma = .302
Table 11

Wallace Voters and Frequency of Church Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attend Church Services</th>
<th>Humphrey/Nixon</th>
<th>Wallace</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regularly Often</td>
<td>351 (88.9%)</td>
<td>44 (11.1%)</td>
<td>395 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>244 (61.3%)</td>
<td>56 (18.7%)</td>
<td>300 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 7.843, probability level = .00541

Cramer's V = .106  Gamma = .293

In summary, Wallace voters are more likely to be white and blue collar workers, less well educated, protestant and less likely to attend church on a regular basis. Each of these was hypothesized as an indicator of anomie. While the actual strength of the relationships are relatively weak, the direction in which they occur supports the hypothesis. At the group study level of the data available,
the Wallace vote seems to be better described as an expression of anomie than alienation. A differently designed survey instrument, more sensitive to the theoretical considerations of this paper might have yielded more robust results.

The Polity

Survey data, as was used in the previous section of this paper, has both its power and its limitations as a technique of social analysis. While it is certainly more scientific than impressionistic studies of individuals, as was done in the first section of this paper, its very design often precludes dealing with questions other scientists might want to propose. If the survey is measuring what it claims to be, then the analyst must design his own instrument. Aggregate data compilation is by far less expensive, and thus within the financial range of students outside the chosen circle of grant supported research. In addition, when dealing with social theorists of a century ago, who were ignorant of the distinctions implicit within ecological analysis, aggregate data is the more appropriate mode. Not only can I, the researcher, frame my hypotheses as I like, and find the data with which to operationalize them, but I can describe what Marx and Durkheim were back
then, political societies. The strongest faith in the scientific validity of the data presented might well be reserved for the following sections of this paper for these reasons.

Furthermore, since the data are metric and not nominal, more powerful statistical tools can be employed in the analysis. In the following sections of the paper, parametric and non-parametric analysis of the fifty states of the Union will be employed in achieving an understanding of the commonalities associated with the degree of strength of the Wallace vote in the fifty political systems which comprise the United States.

The data used in the following sections came from three sources. The Wallace vote figure, by state, came from Richard Scammon's compilation, *America Votes*. Participation rates were derived from that work and the *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, as was all other information with the exception of the homicide and suicide data. These latter two were taken from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's *Vital Statistics*. 
I operationalized Marx's concept of alienation as a higher per cent blue collar work force, higher per cent below the poverty income level, a lower per cent of non-agricultural workers who were union members, and a lower per cent for the white collar work force. All of these indicators describe aspects of the work life situation. Per cent blue collar is a measure of the size of the proletariat; poverty level is a measure the immiseration. Union membership is a measure of the extent to which men are not alienated from the production process itself. A large white collar work force is a measure of the non-proletarian nature of the work force.

In addition, I used per capita incarceration and per capita homicide figures in an attempt to measure the extent to which men were "alienated from each other." I reasoned that both these social facts were aspects of the level "unfreedom" in society. For all of the indicators I was able, using Kendall's Tau, to control separately for race and nativity.72

As Table 12 shows, the directions of the relationships were as predicted, some with quite substantial correlations.

---

72 The formula is \( \tau_{xy.z} = \frac{\tau_{xy} - (\tau_{xyz} \times \tau_{xz})}{(1-\tau_{xy})^2 (1-\tau_{xz})^2} \) and appears in Maurice G. Kendall, *Rank Correlation Methods*, (New York: Hafner, 1962), p. 121.
Homicide, jail and poverty rates are highly correlated with the Wallace vote. Controlling for race and nativity reduced the relationship between the vote and union membership to almost zero, and neither had substantial effect on the relationship between jail and the vote. Controlling for race reduced the strength of the relationship between the vote and homicides, while controlling for nativism eliminated the impact of the poverty indicator.

Table 12

Correlation Between the Wallace Vote and Alienation Indicators (Kendall's Tau)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Wallace Vote</th>
<th>% White</th>
<th>% Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicides</td>
<td>.6337</td>
<td>.3847</td>
<td>.6173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail</td>
<td>.4814</td>
<td>.4017</td>
<td>.4180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>.4028</td>
<td>.3517</td>
<td>.0903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar</td>
<td>.2210</td>
<td>.1627</td>
<td>.1122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>-.1868</td>
<td>-.2524</td>
<td>.0423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Membership</td>
<td>-.1761</td>
<td>-.0660</td>
<td>-.0327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>-.5617</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.5874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Native</td>
<td>.6151</td>
<td>.6930</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The high correlations exhibited by homicide and incarceration rates indicate that many Wallace voters were responding to a very real relative lack of law and order in their societies. Not only were there relatively more people getting killed, but there were more people in jail. In addition, the blame might easily be put on the non-whites, since the relationship between the per cent white and the homicide rate is -.6898. Considering these facts, the racism of the Wallace campaign becomes, if not right, then reasonable. The hawkish mood of the Wallace candidacy, and the support it engendered, can be understood in terms of the jingoist feelings of largely nativist constituencies, as evidenced by the correlation of .6151 between the Wallace vote and the per cent native born.

None of the major issues of the Wallace campaign indicated that states with poorer populations, and states with higher percentages of blue collar workers, would evidence a higher Wallace vote. Such is the heart of a Marxist argument, that class position and material wealth are the sources of political discontent. The high positive correlation between nativism and poverty (.5491) indicates
that is the native American political cultures which are the poorer, perhaps a source for some bitterness. Race may in fact be a secondary issue, since the relationship between the Wallace vote and poverty is relatively unaffected when controlled for race. Even the blue collar correlation maintains some of its relatively weak association with the Wallace vote when the influence of either race of nativity is controlled. The Marxist analysis of the Wallace vote as an expression of alienation is supported by the data.

If the eleven states of the old confederacy are not included in the computations, the relationship between the Wallace vote and jail goes up slightly to .5010, the relationship with the homicide rate remains the same (.4939). The strength of all the other relationships drops: % native to .5118, % white to -.3667, % poor to .1010, % blue collar to .0190, and % white collar to .0162. Analytically, fifty states are fifty states, and it is bad methodology to drop cases in order that the facts fit the theory. It makes even less sense to drop cases in order that the facts not fit the theory, when the theory itself is impartial to the regional differences in the United States, and the end result is only to weaken the support for the theory, not actually contra-
dicting the theory's predictions.

A Durkheimian argument does not fare so well. Participation in elections, median education and union membership all correlate negatively, as an anomie analysis would predict. But suicide itself, the study of which Durkheim derived his conception of anomie, has virtually no correlation. When either race or nativity is controlled for, union membership has little correlation with the Wallace vote. Both also reduced the strength of the relationship between the Wallace vote and median education, while only race had such an effect on the correlation with electoral participation.

Table 13
Correlation Between the Wallace Vote and Anomie Indicators (Kendall's Tau)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Wallace Vote</th>
<th>% White</th>
<th>% Native</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>-.3998</td>
<td>-.1820</td>
<td>-.3260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Education</td>
<td>-.3675</td>
<td>-.2313</td>
<td>-.2150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Membership</td>
<td>-.1761</td>
<td>-.0660</td>
<td>-.0327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>-.0630</td>
<td>.0730</td>
<td>-.0707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>-.5617</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.5874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Native</td>
<td>.6151</td>
<td>.6930</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These data indicate that Wallace's campaign issues of local control (for) and pointy-headed intellectuals (against) did not fall on deaf ears. Those who lived in societies where political participation was low and where median education was also low were likely to live in societies which gave a large vote to George Wallace. Percent white and relative participation in elections correlate strongly and positively (.4661). This indicates that the racial troubles in the United States are symptomatic of a lower participation in political life, and that the problems of both the South and the urban areas are not to be seen only in terms of race. The negative correlation between participation and nativeness indicates that the more nativistic societies are practicing less well the relatively American concept of participative democracy. Furthermore, it is the less nativist states which seem to be the better educated (-.3414).

The findings support an argument E. E. Schattschneider formulated in his critique of the reality of American democracy. He wrote that the non-participant:
problem is serious because the forty million (non-participants) are the soft underbelly of the system. The segment of the population which is convinced that the system is loaded against them is the most likely point of subversion. This is the sickness of democracy.73

The George Wallace candidacy tapped some of this reservoir of ill will that so worried Schattschneider.

As the following tables demonstrate, these relationships hold up when product moment correlations are used. Controlling for both race and ethnicity, the per cent poor can account for almost 30% of the variation in the Wallace vote. The next most powerful alienation indicator, incarceration, can account for slightly more than 13% of the variation when similarly controlled, while median education can account for almost 20% when controlled.

Table 14

Pearsonian and Partial R's for the Wallace Vote and Alienation Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Wallace Vote</th>
<th>% White</th>
<th>% Native</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Poor</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 15

Pearsonian and Partial R's for the Wallace Vote and Anomie Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Wallace Vote</th>
<th>% White</th>
<th>% Native</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Education</td>
<td>-.716</td>
<td>-.651</td>
<td>-.553</td>
<td>-.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>-.620</td>
<td>-.342</td>
<td>-.484</td>
<td>-.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>-.416</td>
<td>-.487</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>-.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Member</td>
<td>-.370</td>
<td>-.344</td>
<td>-.241</td>
<td>-.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>-.220</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>-.331</td>
<td>-.216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An extension of product moment correlation is multiple regression analysis, in which contributory weights are assigned to a set of independent variables toward accounting the variation of the dependent variables. Using alienation indicators as the independent variables, over 77% of the variation in the Wallace vote can be accounted for using four of the variables, as shown in Table 16.
Table 16

Multiple Regression Analysis of Wallace Vote Using Alienation Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Poor</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>1.590</td>
<td>.5410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>1207.99</td>
<td>.3143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.2965</td>
<td>.1199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>50.90</td>
<td>.1047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here again the influence by crime, poverty and class position on the Wallace vote is clearly seen.

A substantial, though smaller, amount of the variation is accounted for by the anomie indicators. 62.3% of the variation can be associated with variation in two: participation (11%) and median education (51.3%). These two, along with jail, incarceration and poverty, explain most of the variation in the Wallace vote when uncontrolled for race or nativity. As will be discussed below, there are some fairly straight-forward implications in these findings.
CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

Joe is confused. He moved back to the country, after graduating, but that was as much because there wasn't much else to do. In its way, his life is a microcosm of the larger uncertainties and contradictions rampant in American political life today.

He can do nothing about the fact that he is white, nor can he do anything about the fact that he is a native American of native stock. Racialism and ethnic clustering are to him universal dilemmas that have little particular and practical application to his life. Much of the reason for this, though, is he chooses to live in white society, or go off into the hills, and not engage in the struggles in which the Third World people are engaged. The universal contradictions of differences due to race and lineage have little particular application to his life because he chooses not to deal with them.

He must deal, however, with parole, his class, his participation in the political system and his education. He was a Marine in Viet-nam, has been called on to kill
other men, and certainly is skilled in at least that trade. Such concerns have universal application to all men, but they have particular application to Joe's. How and when will he enter the work force, if at all? What will he do with his education? Will he continue to vote? Will he stay out of jail? Will he have to kill other men again? Far fetched alternatives to most political scientists' lives are these, but quite real to Joe's.

These are the same aspects that members of such groups as the Symbionese Liberation Army must deal with in their lives; that Arab guerillas do in theirs, and that virtually every modern revolutionary movement in its adolescence has had to consider. Seen in this light, the Wallace vote and its correlates take on the attributes of the seeds of revolution. What the figures indicate is that the major discontent with American politics normally practiced, as expressed by the Wallace vote, has its roots in the same sort of systemic troubles from which revolutions are made. The continued strength of George Wallace, and the rise of the peculiar inflationary recession, indicate that the problems of American society have not yet been solved. If Mr. Vanilla keeps pushing his buttons, and all those
new Democrats in the House of Representatives merely offer more of the same, tough times are certainly ahead. Is further research really necessary?
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