IN PRAISE OF CONFLICT AND ITS RESOLUTION *

Charles P. Loomis

Michigan State University

The extent to which opposing actors think of themselves as being dependent on and/or collaborative with one another is a crucial concern for the study of conflict and its resolution. Analysis of systemic linkages among collaborating and non-collaborating actors in conflict, and the relation of these to group boundaries in a given situation, furnish a means of relating conflict to change. Variables such as behavioral linkage, or interaction, and desired linkage, or liking of the citizens of Mexico and the United States for one another, across a mutual boundary are studied in this context with an effort to find out how to increase liking and decrease hostility. Also, the linkages of villagers, along with other factors including boundary maintenance, in rural India are examined to find out how to speed up change and modernization. A model or strategy for rapid modernization is presented, relating the results of the use of force to the "halo effect," or "fund of good will," common among victims of disaster after rescue and salvage work is carried out in communities.

THAT social action in which an actor or actors attempt, in the face of human opposition, to achieve one or more goals, I call conflict. The actors, whether rivals or foes, may be individuals or groups and the goals may be wealth, power, prestige and other values. Conflict is often thought of narrowly as bargaining or jockeying—the attempt to win some contest such as a game, a strike or a war. Less narrowly, almost all social action may be analyzed in terms of conflict. It is not so much an unhealthy state needing treatment as it is a common state of affairs, and it has been typed in various ways.

TYPES OF CONFLICT AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION

One type of conflict, marked by no mutual dependence among the parties, is what Schelling calls "pure conflict" of the zero-sum type.[1] From such an extreme, based upon full lack of give and take, conflicts range to the opposite limit of "pure collaboration," not unlike the non-zero-sum game in which players win or lose together. The

[1] Conflict as a pathological state, and conflict taken for granted, are the two main categories into which conflict theories fall, according to Thomas C. Schelling, *The Strategy of Conflict,* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1960. Both Sorokin's and Parsons' approaches fall into the second category, the former declaring that strife and antagonism are everywhere, and the latter observing that a particular species of conflict, that of class, is endemic. Pitirim A. Sorokin, *Society, Culture, and Personality: Their Structure and Dynamics,* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947, p. 131; Talcott Parsons, *Essays In Sociological Theory,* Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1940, p. 333. In the text, my occasional belittling of conflict theory is aimed at that which specializes in "pure conflict" as described by Schelling. Also, I agree with Georges Gurvitch, who states that "one of the grave errors of all varieties of dialectic elaborated up to the present is the tendency to reduce all dialectic operational procedures to one, namely, *antinomy,* that is, to *polarization of the contradictories.*" This holds for some conflict sociology. See Pitirim A. Sorokin's reference to this "Inflation and fetishism of antinomy" in *Sociological Theories of Today,* New York: Harper & Row, 1966, p. 468.

amount of give and take or mutual dependence determines the nature of the conflict, i.e., whether it is "pure conflict," "pure collaboration," or something in between.

These days many conflicts which seem grim enough to be "pure conflict," and which are often treated as though they were, upon study show quite a lot of give and take among the conflicting parties. The conflict between groups able to exchange nuclear destruction is no zero-sum game, for example, because rivals, and all others for that matter, may be partners in the common fate of death. The resolution of conflict I define as the process by which mutual dependence and/or collaboration of actors in conflict is, in their own thinking, increased. Viewed in this light, both conflict and its resolution will continue to engage sociologists.

Advisedly I say "continue to engage sociologists." Despite the claims of some sociologists, here and abroad, that they have only recently exhumed conflict after its premature burial at the hands of those they call functionalists, it is not hard to show that the corpus delicti is quite lacking in the demise. Upon returning from India last fall, I was surprised at the widespread notion among my advanced theory students that it was easy to sort out the moss-backs and the conservatives from our sociological ranks. All that you had to do was to look for such terms as "value consensus," "system," "equilibrium" etc.,—and the term, "functional" was, of course, a dead giveaway. But then it was equally easy to spot the liberals and radicals by their talk of "conflict," "zero-sum power" and "anti-functionalism."

Thinking that this graveyard hunt for conflict was not only bad sociology but a waste of time, I typed out a three-page single-spaced set of quotations on conflict and/or consensus from Cooley, Dahrendorf, Marx, Parsons and Sorokin. After each quotation, a paragraph or so in length, these five names appeared with instructions to check the name of the theorist most likely to have written the quotation and to draw a line through the name of the least likely author.[2] Almost all of the students thought

that a quotation from Parsons' Essays in Sociological Theory was by Dahrendorf. A few gave Marx credit for it. What I took from Marx's Capital and from works by Marx compiled by Bottomore and Rubel were most often thought of as from Parsons and almost never as from Marx. Parsons and Dahrendorf equally shared credit for Dahrendorf's pieces from Gesellschaft und Freiheit and Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society. Interested, I used the same device with advanced graduate groups on four other campuses with the same results. Marx's continuous use of the terms "system," "function" and "equilibrium" was as unexpected for these young sociologists as was Parsons' piece on the fire and backfire within society. If this proves anything, it might be: "Original sources are better than secondary sources, especially if the secondary sources are grinding an axe," or "You can't rely on white hats and black hats to sort the good guys from the bad." At any rate, the study of conflict has been with us for a long time and no major theorist has neglected it.

For the resolution of that form of conflict which I call "pure conflict," and for the analysis of conflict in general, I believe that two processes are crucial: systemic linkage and boundary maintenance.[3] I wish there

---

[2] Among the titles from which the quotations were drawn are: Talcott Parsons, op. cit., pp. 323 ff.; Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. 1, New York:

The Modern Library, 1906, pp. 390–391; Thomas B. Bottomore and Maximilien Rubel, ed., Karl Marx: Selected Writings, London: Pelican Press, 1961, p. 235; Ralf Dahrendorf, Gesellschaft und Freiheit, Munich: R. Piper, 1961, pp. 82–83; Ralf Dahrendorf, Class and Class Conflict, Stanford: University Press, 1959, pp. 209, 212, 221 and 226. The quotations from Sorokin were from Society, Culture and Personality, op. cit., pp. 99 ff.

[3] Charles P. Loomis, Social Systems: Essays On Their Persistence and Change, Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand, 1960; and Charles P. Loomis and Zona K. Loomis, Modern Social Theories, Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand, 1965. Systemic linkage may be defined as the process whereby one or more of the elements of at least two social systems is articulated in such a manner that the two systems in some ways and on some occasions may be viewed as a single unit. Boundary maintenance is the process whereby the identity of the social system is preserved and the characteristic interaction pattern maintained. As Edward H. Spicer, who first used the term "cultural linkage," has noted, the concept "systemic linkage," has advantages not found in the concept "cultural linkage." I concur with his judgment that the term, "culture" is too limiting for use in the

were time to discuss the reasons why these two processes must be made central to any dialectical or other analysis of conflict. I will use them in widely separated arenas: linkages and barriers between the United States and Mexico; linkages and boundary maintenace in the moderization of rural India; and finally, a conflict model or strategy for the modernization of the traditional societies of the world.

LINKAGES AND BOUNDARIES BETWEEN MEXICANS AND AMERICANS

A few years ago, co-workers and I undertook a study to enlarge our knowledge of linkage and rejection across a mutual border.[4] We chose the citizens of the United States and Mexico for our research target. From five universes, five modified probability samples of informants 21 years of age and over were drawn: the general public of the United States, rural persons in Michigan, the Spanish-speaking people of the Southwestern United States, rural Mexicans, and urban Mexicans. In Mexico, almost fifteen hundred

informants were interviewed; in the United States almost two thousand. I have pulled out from that study those parts most pertinent for the analysis of conflict and its resolution. Clearly, not all of the significant findings can be reported here.

Our general aim was to find out the extent to which people wanted to be, and actually were, engaged in collaborative and mutually dependent activities. We also wanted to find out about the sentiments associated with these activities. Our inquiry followed two main lines: *actual contacts* or linkages with people across the border, and *attitudes* which further or hinder linkages. Ten items brought forth information about actual contacts the informants had: visits to the other country, friends there, encounters in church, in other organizations, among relatives, among neighbors, among work associates, and second-hand contacts through a relative, close friend or spouse. Table 1 shows how the various indexes were combined. Taken together, these gave us *behavioral linkage*—actual, day-to-day, direct and indirect exposure to some members from, or in, the other country. Another 10 items sought out sentiments: should the leaders cooperate more, should the nations have closer connections, would the informant like to have some friends or more friends across the border, how would he rate the other nation, how would he rate its people, and finally, four Bogardus social distance scale items measuring the acceptability of these others as neighbors, as co-workers, as family members and as citizens. Compositely, this gave us *desired linkages*—how high or low were the attitudinal boundaries separating the two peoples; how strong were the links connecting them? As hypothesized (and reminiscent of Homans'[5] hypothesis on the relation of liking and interaction), the greater the behavioral linkage or interaction, the

study of linkages by social anthropologists and sociologists who must consider interaction as well as such cultural components as beliefs, norms and facilities. Systemic linkage, different from cultural linkage, not only permits but invites consideration of social interaction in status-roles and in relationships among equals in power as well as among subordinates and superordinates. Also, interaction among actors of equal prestige or rank as well as those of different rank are covered in systemic linkage. To call such interaction cultural linkage is to misuse the terms "cultural" and "culture." (From correspondence with Edward H. Spicer.) See the thinking on the subject of various theorists, and especially Marion J. Levy, Jr., in Charles P. Loomis and Zona K. Loomis, *op. cit.* Also Charles P. Loomis, *Social Systems, op. cit.,* under Edward H. Spicer in the index.

[4] Charles P. Loomis, Zona K. Loomis and Jeanne E. Gullahorn, *Linkages of Mexico and the United States,* East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station Research Bulletin 14, 1966. (Available upon request.) For additional analyses from the same study see also Jeanne E. Gullahorn and Charles P. Loomis, *A Comparison of Social Distance Attitudes in the United States and Mexico,* St. Louis, Missouri: Social Science Institute, Washington University, 1966. The first cited bulletin carries acknowledgments for financial support and for colleague contributions, but special recognition is due the Carnegie Corporation of New York for indispensable assistance.

[5] George C. Homans, *The Human Group,* New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1950, p. 111. See also Henry W. Riecken and George C. Homans, "Psychological Aspects of Social Structure," in Gardiner Lindzey, ed., *Handbook of Social Psychology,* Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley, 1954. John Madge criticizes this hypothesis as an "American belief" and suggests readings disproving it. See his *The Origins of Scientific Sociology,* New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961, pp. 521–522.

TABLE 1. SCHEMATIC PYRAMIDING OF INDEXES

		Big index	HUGE index
a_1	What is a wetback? *	Big A-Knowledge about Mexico/United States	
a_2	What states in the United States once belonged to Mexico?		
b_1	What Mexican/United States radio-television programs do you hear?	Big B-Mass media communication **	
b_2	What Mexican/United States magazines do you read?		
b_3	What Mexican/United States newspapers do you read?		
d_1	Have you any Mexican/American friends?	Big D-First-hand contact with Mexico-Mexicans, with United States-Americans	HUGE A—Actual contacts with Mexico/United States BEHAVIORAL LINKAGE
d_2	Have you ever been to Mexico/United States?		
e_1	Have you contacts in church with Spanish-speaking/North Americans?	Big E-Contact with Spanish-speaking, Mexicans/North Americans in interaction arenas	
e_2	Have you contacts in other formal groups with Spanish-speaking/North Americans?		
e_3	Have you any contacts among relatives with Spanish-speaking/North Americans?		
e_4	Have you any contacts among neighbors with Spanish-speaking/North Americans?		
e_5	Have you any contacts among work associates with Spanish-speaking/North Americans?		
f_1	Have you any contacts with Spanish-speaking/North Americans via relatives?	Big F-Second-hand contact with Mexico/United States	
f_2	Have you any contacts with Spanish-speaking/North Americans via close friends?		
f_3	Have you any contacts with Spanish-speaking/North Americans via your spouse?		
g_1	Our leaders should cooperate	Big G-Attitudes toward Mexico/United States and linkage with, as a nation	HUGE B—Attitudes toward Mexico/United States DESIRED LINKAGE
g_2	We should have closer connections		
g_3	Would consider moving to Mexico/United States		
g_4	Ladder rating Mexico/United States as a nation		
h_1	Desire to have more Mexican/United States friends	Big H-Attitude toward and linkage with Mexicans/North Americans as people	
h_2	Friendliness toward people of Mexico/United States		
i_1	Prefer not to have as neighbors, Mexicans/North Americans	Big I-Social distance from Mexico/United States	
i_2	Prefer not to have as co-workers, Mexicans/North Americans		
i_3	Prefer not to have as family members, Mexicans/North Americans		
i_4	Prefer not to have as citizens, Mexicans/North Americans		

* For tabulation of answers to these questions and other separate items below, see: Charles P. Loomis, Zona K. Loomis and Jeanne E. Gullahorn, *op. cit.* For coefficients indicating the relationship of this particular item to those below, see *ibid.*

** *Ibid.* Because mass media were infrequently used across the border, these items were not employed in the study below.

greater the desired linkage or liking.[6] Of course, we cannot single out specific "causes" behind the statistical correlations, although we know from our analyses that each of the two linkage scores were related to some items reminiscent of some of Stouffer's findings: [7] to educational attainment, size of place of residence, religion, sex and age. Closeness to the border, ethnicity, and self-identified social class were also important. By dichotomizing the samples on one variable or factor at a time, and calculating coefficients which had already been calculated for the whole samples, the possible effects of intervening variable influence was put before us. Table 2 illustrates this process. We concluded that the liking of Mexicans and North Americans for one another was positively correlated with their interaction with one another.

But what may we say about disliking? Take rejection as shown, for example, on the Bogardus social distance scale. The proportion of informants who report no contact with across-the-border nationals or their descendants, who say they do not want to have them as citizens, co-workers, neighbors or relatives by marriage, is twice as large as that for those who report linkage in one or more of the interaction arenas noted.[8] On both the receiving and giving ends of linkages, religious affiliation is important. More then half the Mexicans rejected both Protes-

tants and Jews in all the Bogardus scale status-roles. North Americans in the various samples were more tolerant, no more than one-third ever rejecting both Jews and Catholics for these status-roles. In all samples for the United States, Catholics have higher linkages manifest both in interaction with Mexicans and in liking for them than do Protestants. In Mexico, the few Protestants interviewed have higher interaction and liking scores for United States nationals than do Catholics. Atheists, agnostics and informants who reported themselves as having no religion, in both countries manifest relatively high desire for linkage or liking of the people across the border.

In the rapid sketch I am giving, which notes only the highlights of the study, one other group is noteworthy: the Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest who link the two societies and cultures. In index after index, their scores on scales measuring both behavioral and attitudinal linkage to people and culture on both sides of the border prove to be exceptional. Their exposure to both societies is so complete that regardless of formal education, their interaction and identification both with other United States nationals and with Mexicans is high. Careful study of the Spanish-speaking people of our Southwest tempts me to generalize as follows: A linking population completely immersed in more than one society, and partaking of the characteristics of all, can be an asset to a nation in creating and maintaining linkages, and in conflict resolution. The linking function of the Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest was so overwhelmingly demonstrated that it probably deserves a great deal more attention than it has been given in this respect. Systemic linkages among nations through other ethnic groups are potentials for both conflict generation and its resolution. In other research, I am attempting to evaluate the potential for conflict resolution of linkages of nations, societies and cultures by various international communities. Those groupings of scientists, scholars, artists and others whose beliefs, norms and other values transcend national boundaries may be the most powerful agents for conflict resolution in the future.

I wish there were more time to discuss the potential of education for conflict resolution.

---

[6] The indexes measuring this relationship for the rural Mexicans are insignificant, and may appear to be an exception to the generalization as stated. Actually, even though 13 percent of the respondents in the sample report having been to the United States, the first-hand contacts, with the exception of the 4 percent who report having friends there, were negligible in comparison with those of the urban Mexicans. Almost the only linkages with citizens of the United States reported by the rural Mexicans were second-hand and through relatives and close friends. Thus those rural Mexicans who reported having been in the United States appear to have had few contacts with others than Mexican co-workers and these appear not to be very dynamic links. Unfortunately, participation in the interaction arenas e_1 through e_5 (see Table 1) is not comparable in the Mexican and United States samples. The reader interested in the difference is referred to the first reference in Footnote 4. (In this see page 18.)

[7] Samuel A. Stouffer, *Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties,* New York: Doubleday, 1955.

[8] Jeanne E. Gullahorn and Charles P. Loomis, *op. cit.*

TABLE 2. RELATION OF BEHAVIORAL LINKAGE (HUGE A) WITH DESIRED LINKAGE (HUGE B), BY EDUCATION, AND RELATION OF DESIRED LINKAGE (HUGE B) WITH EDUCATION, BY DESIRED LINKAGE (HUGE B)*

BEHAVIORAL LINKAGE (HUGE A) WITH DESIRED LINKAGE (HUGE B)						DESIRED LINKAGE (HUGE B) WITH EDUCATION					
Control variables	Sample**	C	χ^2	d.f.	r	Control variables	Sample**	C	χ^2	d.f.	r
Whole Sample	1	.40	300.4	130	.27	Whole Sample	1	.27	123.2	70	.17
	2	.53	121.5	100	.33		2	.49	94.9	70	.26
	3	.68	90.9	65	.29		3	.58	52.5	40	−.03
	4	.37	177.1	120	.22		4	.39	198.9	80	.31
	5	.53	113.5	90	.08		5	.37	46.5	40	.20
EDUCATION											
Low Grades	1	.42	146.5	120	.23	HUGE B	1	.41	83.0	63	.22
	2	.63	92.3	70	.34	Low	2	.50	30.3	24	.19
United States 0–4	3	.69	67.8	60	.41	scores	3***	:	:	:	:
Mexico 0–2	4	.45	172.3	120	.16		4	.47	64.2	56	.20
	5	.55	115.5	90	.06		5	.45	27.0	15	.31
High	1	.45	211.2	130	.27	High	1	.38	190.4	91	.24
United States 5 and	2	.58	82.8	90	.29	scores	2	.55	94.0	70	.26
over	3	.78	46.0	44	.10		3	.71	106.9	104	.31
Mexico 3 and over	4	.43	95.8	120	.14		4	.45	224.8	96	.35
	5	.71	19.9	24	..		5	.38	30.0	32	.15

* See Footnote 4 for references containing statistical indices similar to those above for other variables in Table 1.
** Sample numbers refer to the following populations: 1=United States general public; 2=Rural Michigan; 3=Spanish-speaking Latinos of the Southwestern United States; 4=Urban Mexico; 5=Rural Mexico.
*** Less than 1 percent.

TABLE 3. EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF ADULT INFORMANTS IN FIVE MODIFIED PROBABILITY SAMPLES

| | United States | | | Mexico | |
| | General Public | Rural Michigan | Southwestern Spanish-speaking | | |
Level of Education				Urban	Rural
None	..	..	..	19.0	38.9
1–4 years	5.0	4.4	29.3	40.0	53.9
5–8 years	30.1	36.2	33.1	30.0	6.9
9–12 years	42.5	42.0	23.5	8.0	..
13 years and over	22.3	17.4	12.7	2.0	..
Don't know, no response	0.1	..	1.4	1.0	0.3
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of respondents	1,528	306	105	1,126	288

Educational attainment is more highly and negatively correlated with boundary maintenance, as measured by the Bogardus social distance scores, and more positively correlated with desire for linkage or liking in Mexico than in the United States. If our aim is to resolve conflict between the two countries and among groups, these findings indicate that inputs into education in Mexico will bring higher yields than similar inputs in the United States. On the other hand, we found educational attainment to be more closely and negatively correlated with measures of authoritarianism in the United States than it is in Mexico.

A reader of these last sentences put on the margin of the manuscript, "What does this mean?" I gave the following provisional and over-simplified answer: "Suppose we have the wherewithal to do what it takes to add two years to the schooling of every student just ready to drop out of school, in both countries. In Mexico, we would reduce prejudice and increase liking for the across-the-border people more than we would in the United States. However, we would decrease authoritarianism more in the United States." Since few of us sociologists are rich, and most of us are educators, I am sure most of you will welcome our finding that educational attainment, when compared with another variable, taxable income, is more closely related to measures of liking for across-the-border people and to measures of tolerance generally.

A few aspects of the United States-Mexican study not mentioned above, or only briefly so, are particularly convergent with some of the items in the Indian study to

which I am about to turn. I mention these for the sake of transition as well as for their intrinsic interest. The person with some education, as contrasted with the one with little or no education, saw himself as welcoming new experiences and ready for a stimulating life. He wanted a job which would let him do things differently from time to time, he was willing to leave his present home place to better his life chances, and he was hopeful about the future.[9] Women, on the whole,

[9] These generalizations are supported by various unpublished data from the study. For instance, a Likert scale item was included. This was stated as follows: "I like the kind of work that lets me do things about the same way from one week to the next." The code ranged from strongly agreeing, coded as 1, to strongly disagreeing, coded as 5. For the United States general public, the rural Michigan, and the urban Mexican samples, the product moment correlation coefficients measuring the relationship between the response to this statement and the number of school grades completed are respectively: 0.35, 0.34, and 0.12. Relevant chi-square scores and pertinent degrees of freedom are as follows: 44.7, 12 d.f.; 10.5, 12 d.f.; and 37.4, 16 d.f. Respondents were also asked: "Have you considered moving from this town (or county if the area was rural; if in Mexico, cuidad o población)? The product moment correlations coefficients measuring the relation between the responses on this item (no coded as 1, and yes coded as 2) and school grades completed, were, respectively, for the above samples: 0.23, 0.15, and 0.16. Chi-square measures and pertinent degrees of freedom were: 82.3, 3 d.f.; 7.5, 3 d.f.; and 35.7, 4 d.f. It appears as if education and "itchy feet" go together.

Using the self-anchorage scale, informants were told: "Now at the *top* of the ladder stands a person who *wants to do new things* all of the time. He wants life to be exciting and always changing, although this may make life quite troublesome. At the *bottom* stands a person who wants a *very steady* and *unchanging* life. On which step of the

showed greater social distance and less de-
sired linkage than did men, and also had
fewer behavioral linkages. Women emerge
again as the bearers of traditional culture.
Is it a general *function* (note my courage in
using this term) for women to maintain
boundaries? [10]

LINKAGES, BOUNDARIES AND MODERNIZATION
IN RURAL INDIA

Now I switch from the United States-
Mexican border to India. My colleagues,
Satish Arora, Prodipto Roy, Lalit K. Sen,
and I, at the Indian National Institute of
Community Development in Hyderabad,
were directed by the government of India
to find out what we could about agents of
change in India's rural villages.[11] The study

is unlike that just reported for Mexico and
the United States, but there are similarities.

In the Indian study, we wanted to find out
about villagers' interest in, knowledge of and
actual adoption of the following: chemical
fertilizer; improved seeds and better tools;
vaccination for smallpox, typhoid and chol-
era; and birth control.[12] We generated quite
a number of hypotheses concerning innova-
tion, early adoption and social change as
they are related to systemic linkage, bound-
ary maintenance and other variables.

For the study, 364 villages were chosen
by modified probability sampling procedures.
Within the villages in which persons 21 years
of age and over were interviewed, the sample
is made up of two main segments. One com-
prises 5800 adults, of whom there were some
3400 males and some 2400 females, drawn
within the villages on a random basis.[13] The
second main segment was made up of influ-
entials, and I draw your attention to the way
in which they were selected. The elected
president of the village Panchayat was al-
ways included. From sociometric choices
made by the randomly selected informants,
three influentials other than the president
of the village Panchayat were selected for
study, namely, the best farmer, the most im-
portant person, and an implementor of group

---

ladder do you stand *now?*" The more schooling
the informant had, the more highly he placed him-
self on the "change ladder," as revealed by the
following scores (reported in the same sequence as
above)—correlation coefficients: 0.12, 0.11, and
0.21; chi-squares with pertinent degrees of freedom:
124.7, 30 d.f.; 44.0, 30 d.f. and 114.1, 40 d.f. In one
version of the manuscript the following was in-
cluded, as based upon the next item to be re-
ported: "Apparently the notion that revolutionaries
may be intellectuals has some support in the fol-
lowing findings." The self-anchoring ladder was
again used to procure this conclusion. "Now, at the
top of the ladder stands a person who has *very
much influence* over people at work, with neigh-
bors, friends and people of that sort. At the *bottom*
of the ladder is a person with *little* or *no influence*
over others. What step of the ladder do you think
you stand on *right now?* What step would you say
you stood on *five years ago* in amount of influence
you had? What step do you think you will stand
on *five years from now?*" Most conclusive are an-
swers to the last question. Product moment cor-
relation coefficients between ladder placement five
years from now and educational attainment for
samples given, respectively, as above are as fol-
lows—correlation coefficients: 0.11, 0.16 and 0.23;
chi-squares with pertinent degrees of freedom are:
150.1, 30 d.f.; 59.5, 30 d.f.; and 104.3, 40 d.f.

[10] Thomas F. Pettigrew, "Personality and Socio-
cultural Factors in Intergroup Attitudes: A Cross-
National Comparison," *Journal of Conflict Resolu-
tion,* 2 (March, 1958), pp. 29–42. See also references
in footnote 4 above.

[11] See Charles P. Loomis, "Change in Rural India
as Related to Social Power and Sex," *Behavioural
Sciences and Community Development,* 1 (March,
1967), pp. 1–28. During the period the study was
initiated and brought to the stage in which influ-
entials and randomly chosen populations could be
compared, I was working at the Institute as con-
sultant from 1964 to 1966 by arrangement of the

Ford Foundation. I made the above report at the
request of Dr. George Jacob, Dean of the National
Institute of Community Development, from mar-
ginals taken from the tabulation sheets by clerks.
Further correlation analysis and data, both un-
published and that appearing here, has been done
under the direction of Dr. Lalit K. Sen. He should
be credited, along with Dr. Prodipto Roy for the
data upon which much of this preliminary report
is based.

[12] Details concerning the construction of these
and other indexes in this section will be found in
Charles P. Loomis and Lalit K. Sen, "Social and
Cultural Change in Rural India," in Carle C. Zim-
merman and Richard E. DuWors, eds., *Sociology
of the Underdeveloped Peoples,* (forthcoming)
volume in honor of Carl C. Taylor. Should the
reader need details included in the above before
it is published, a mimeographed copy will be sent
by the senior author upon request.

[13] For a description of sampling procedures see
Lalit K. Sen and Prodipto Roy, *Awareness of Com-
munity Development in Village India,* Hyderabad,
India: National Institute of Community Develop-
ment, 1966. The interviewing was carried out in
the spring of 1966, beginning in April, and was
completed in July for all states except Nagaland,
Jammu and Kashmir.

TABLE 4. SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF INFLUENTIALS AND OF THE RANDOM SAMPLES
OF MALES AND OF FEMALES (ALL-INDIA DISTRIBUTION)

| | | Random Samples | |
Characteristics	Influentials (Percent)	Males (Percent)	Females (Percent)
Brahmins or high-caste non-Brahmins	55.4	34.2	35.6
Finished middle school or more	33.6	10.5	3.3
Finished primary school	28.9	18.0	8.1
Illiterates	23.7	60.5	84.5
Cultivators	87.2	74.3	57.2
Agricultural laborers	0.9	10.0	15.1
Have seen a movie	75.2	54.0	37.8
Read newspapers	53.5	20.0	5.7
Listen to radio	75.6	57.5	46.0
Number of respondents	1,414	3,375	2,435

action. Table 4 describes the social characteristics of the sample.

As hypothesized, these influentials had adopted and were adopting many more of the practices under study than the informants in the randomly chosen sample. This is indicated by Table 5. They were much more actively linked with official change agents, they were much more cosmopolitan and more Gesellschaft-like or rational. By all measures, they were modernizing more rapidly. Table 6 compares linkages of the influentials with those of the randomly chosen sample. Thus, whereas three-fourths of the influentials had adopted chemical fertilizer on their farms, less than one-half of the randomly chosen males had done so. For other practices, the same pattern prevailed, with influentials reporting themselves as the most frequent adopters, randomly chosen females as the least frequent, and randomly chosen males in between. Take vaccination for typhoid and cholera, for example. Sixty-six percent of the influentials, forty-four percent of the randomly chosen females and fifty-one percent of the randomly chosen

TABLE 5. MODERNIZATION OF RURAL INDIA: PERCENTAGES * OF RESPONDENTS WHO ADOPTED
IMPROVED AGRICULTURAL, HEALTH AND BIRTH CONTROL PRACTICES
(ALL-INDIA DISTRIBUTION)

| | | Random Samples | |
Improved Practices	Influentials (Percent)	Males (Percent)	Females (Percent)
Chemical fertilizer	76.4	43.2	36.0
Improved seed	67.5	31.5	25.4
Insecticides	58.2	25.4	23.8
Improved plough	41.1	15.2	11.3
Smallpox vaccination	85.5	78.7	73.6
TABC**	66.3	51.1	44.4
Family planning***	10.1	4.5	3.2
Number of respondents	1,414	3,375	2,435

* Percentages which fall in the following categories for each of the practices are available: (1) Have heard, was interested, have tried and used (or adopted). (These are the figures above.) (2) Heard, interested and tried only. (3) Heard and interested only. (4) Heard only. (5) Not heard. (6) No answer. See Charles P. Loomis, "Change in Rural India," op. cit.

** Typhoid and cholera vaccination.

*** For those who gave answers to the following question: "If you knew of a simple harmless method of not having more children than you want, would you approve or disapprove of its "use?" The percentages of those answering in the affirmative for influentials, males and females, respectively, were 66.0, 50.4 and 44.9. Negative answers were 21.1, 26.1 and 21.7. The remaining informants were classified as "Don't know" or "No answer." For this question, the coding 0=disapprove and 1=approve constitutes the index for approval of birth control. (See Table 7.)

TABLE 6. LINKAGES OF INDIAN VILLAGERS TO MODERNIZING STATUS-ROLES: PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS WHO SPOKE MORE THAN 10 TIMES WITH OFFICERS AND AGENTS (ALL-INDIA DISTRIBUTION)

| | | Random Samples | |
Officers and Agents	Influentials (Percent)	Males (Percent)	Females (Percent)
Block development officer	30.0	5.6	2.0
Agricultural extension officer	25.7	4.3	0.7
Co-operative extension officer	20.1	2.9	0.6
Village level worker*	61.2	25.7	10.9
Block doctor**	20.2	6.5	6.5
Number of respondents	1,414	3,375	2,435

* The percentages respectively of influentials, males and females who report "knowing" the Village Level Worker are 92.5, 63.2 and 38.1. The percentages who report "liking" the VLW are as follows: 84.2, 54.5 and 30.0.

** Percentages who respectively report as in the footnote above for the Block doctor are as follows: 56.9, 35.6 and 24.3 for "knowing" and 47.3, 29.1 and 19.2 for "liking".

males reported having adopted it. For birth control, the percentages of those who adopted were lower—ten, three and four, respectively.

The paradox of the traditional thriving right alongside the modern was common. For example, while over half of the randomly chosen informants believe that evil spirits cause disease, and an even larger fraction would go to a religious leader or to a temple for treatment if they got smallpox, three-fourths had either themselves been vaccinated or reported that members of their families had been vaccinated.[14] The proportions of the three categories of informants who claim to have adopted various practices is given in Table 5.

India's real search, however, is not to find out how many arms are vaccinated, nor how many fields are fertilized. The search, like yours and mine, is for the dynamics of change. Important as were the economic variables [15] such as agricultural income, amount

[14] See the following two forthcoming monographs: Charles P. Loomis and Zona K. Loomis, *Religion as a Facilitating or Inhibiting Factor in Social and Economic Change,* Bombay, India: Manaktala and Sons; and Charles P. Loomis, *Marxist Sociology and Ideology in Relation to Indian Materialism,* Bombay, India: Manaktala and Sons. For additional references see: Charles P. Loomis and Shirly Boettger, "Social Psychological and Cultural Aspects of the Nurse-Patient Relationship in India," Hyderabad, India: College of Nursing, Osmania University, 1966 (Mimeographed). Also see social science contributions to *The Gazetteer of India,* Vol. 1, Nasik, India: Government of India Press, 1965.

[15] See Footnote 12 above.

of land cultivated, tenure status and productivity, they could not account for the large differences between the influentials and the randomly chosen. Neither were these economic variables effective predictors of specific changes in health and family planning. Table 7 shows the product moment correlation coefficients indicating relations discussed here and below.

Among the best predictors of the general quality of being an innovator or early adopter of the usages I have discussed is the index score informants made on an informal knowledge test. This knowledge index is based on answers to questions on such matters as the official language of India, the year Indian independence was achieved, and the identity of national leaders in India, China and Pakistan.[16] Since 85 and 61 percent, respectively, of the randomly chosen females and males were illiterate, this index serves as a substitute for educational attainment. Positively and significantly correlated with this knowledge index was an index of aspiration for education. This was built from questions put to find out the amount of education wanted for children and grandchildren, the amount believed possible to get, and the occupations wanted for them. Another high predictor of whether a villager in India is an innovator or adopter is the strength of his linkage with extension workers and agents such as professional health and agricultural specialists, lesser trained

[16] *Ibid.*

TABLE 7. MATRIX OF PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS [1] BETWEEN SCORES ON INDEXES OF ADOPTION OF MODERN PRACTICES IN AGRICULTURE, HEALTH AND FAMILY PLANNING AND INDEXES ON OTHER SOCIAL, CULTURAL AND ECONOMIC VARIABLES IN 364 VILLAGES (ALL-INDIA DISTRIBUTION)

Indexes for Adoption of Modern Practices in A=Agriculture; B=Health; C=Birth Control; D=Approval of Birth Control

Random Sample

Indexes	INFLUENTIALS (N=1414×1/5)				MALES (N=3375×1/10)				FEMALES (N=2435×1/10)			
	A***	B***	C***	D***	A***	B***	C***	D***	A***	B***	C***	D***
SOCIO-CULTURAL												
Educational aspiration	.26**	.27**	.28**	.10	.31**	.16**	.28**	.13*	.28**	.14*	.31**	.14*
Extension contacts	.49**	.33**	.38**	.31**	.44**	.12*	.31**	.21**	.26**	.19**	.29**	.10
Knowledge	.56**	.38**	.51**	.34**	.42**	.19**	.47**	.26**	.24**	.06	.30**	.20**
Social participation	.39**	.07	.24**	.26**	.35**	.17**	.33**	.17**	.23**	.11	.20**	.03
Sacred-secular	−.23**	−.20**	−.15*	−.12*	−.08	−.16**	−.16**	−.04	−.10	−.008	−.07	−.01
Empathy	.24**	.10	.26**	.20**	.27**	.02	.29**	.09	.11	−.04	.26**	.12
Film exposure	.19**	.19**	.32**	.19**	.25**	.14*	.27**	.22**	.27**	.17**	.30**	.04
Radio contact	.36**	.32**	.31**	.27**	.33**	.22**	.38**	.23**	.09	.04	.28**	.16*
Urban contact (cosmopolite)	.02	.05	.12*	.05	.16**	.07	.16**	.10	.05	.12*	.20**	.13*
Age	−.06	−.14*	−.09	−.02	−.01	.01	−.05	−.11	−.11	.02	.09	−.09
Educational attainment†	.28**	.12*	.04	.13	.09	.18**	.13*	.16*	.07	.10	−.03	.04
ECONOMIC												
Land cultivated	.39**	.21**	.13*	.12*	.42**	.01	.11	.19**	.37**	.03	.11	.22**
Tenure status	.26**	.01	.08	.06	.36**	−.11	.09	.13	.32**	−.04	.06	.21**
Productivity index	.40**	.16**	.19**	.09	.50**	−.01	.13*	.07	.29**	.09	.10	.15*
Agricultural income	.42**	.30**	.29**	.15*	.40**	.07	.21**	.13*	.44**	.10	.20**	.00

[1] Calculated for this address and for further collaborative usage by Lalit K. Sen, who with Prodipto Roy, Satish Arora and the present author, all now or at one time members of the National Institute of Community Development, Hyderabad, India, are conducting the study on national awareness of community development.

* Statistically significant at the P<.05.

** Statistically significant at the P<.01.

*** A=Agriculture; B=Health; C=Family planning (birth control); and D=Approval of birth control. The coefficients under D measure biserial correlations because approval of family planning was measured on a dichotomous scale.

† Note the amount of illiteracy and other data on educational attainment in Table 4.

village level workers, elected local officials, and others. (Data on this form of linkage are summarized in Table 6. For measures of relationships see Table 7.)

A sacred-secular, or *Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft,* scale was built from answers to the following questions: (1) Can evil spirits cause disease? (2) Have you ever made a sacrifice to prevent sickness? (3) What do you do when someone gets smallpox? (4) Should Harijans (formerly called untouchables) be allowed to draw water from all wells in the village? (5) Should Harijan children and other children take meals together in schools? (6) Who do you think is superior, a village Brahmin who is illiterate, or a Harijan who has a college degree? As hypothesized, the sacred, or *Gemeinschaft,* scores on this scale are generally, with a few exceptions, both negatively and significantly correlated with scores on adoption of modern practices. This relationship held most significantly for influentials. (Table 7.)

We also built up an empathy scale from answers to questions of villagers about what they would do in such status-roles as President of the village Panchayat, District Collector and Minister of Community Development.[17] The scores for empathy were positively and significantly correlated with the adoption scores for birth control and agricultural practices in the three samples.

The last group of indexes which I shall mention are certainly not the least important for modernization. They had to do with exposure to mass media such as movies and radio. The correlation coefficients measuring the relationships between frequency with which villagers had been exposed to either of these media and adoption scores were all positive and, in most instances, significant at the 0.01 level.

In summary, we may state that in the

---

[17] For many pertinent references, see the item noted in footnote 12. There such studies are listed as Daniel Lerner, *The Passing of Traditional Society,* Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958; and Alex Inkeles, "The Modernization of Man," in Myron Weiner, ed., *Modernization,* New York: Basic Books, 1966. So far as the last question is concerned, the Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation was abolished and its activities for the most part placed under the Ministry of Food and Agriculture some time after the field work for the study was completed.

process of modernization in India, as in desired linkage between Mexico and the United States, education, contact with mass media, behavioral linkages and economic factors are important. However, what if the aim is to speed up modernization in rural India, or to increase the desire for linkage between Mexico and the United States, without great conflict? The studies show that the value system of the people, as reflected in the *Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft* scale in India and in the religious beliefs in both settings, at least under *voluntary conditions* could not be ignored by any realistic change agent. It is important to make this point here since I discuss *non-voluntary conditions* which involve great conflict in the last section of my paper.

USE OF FORCE TO QUICKEN MODERNIZATION

Each developing country has had its share of able and conscientious leaders, often young Turks, who hope to modernize their societies on a time scale even shorter than that for Russia under communism. They pose the question: "If nations such as Israel and some Communist countries can leapfrog to modern nationhood, why can't we?" And I pose the question: "Can means be designed for modernizing without the accompaniment of great suffering and the iron grip of the military or the tough grasp of the Communists or any others bent upon longtime control and prolongation of unmitigated conflict?"

If one looks at the basic make-up of early capitalism (and capitalism is a form which has accompanied modernity with a very high frequency), one finds, much as Max Weber did, that devotion to beliefs and ends which was a common trait of the Calvinists, the Methodists, the Baptists and the Pietists. Rationality, yes, but also a very great drive to build the Kingdom of God on earth. If one looks at the ingredients of rapid-change under Communism (and here, as with capitalism, I am using the ideology because it is now an accompaniment of modernity), one finds here, too, devotion to a cause and commitment to the idea of Utopia. In short, conflict theory, which is Marxism in action, is very different from "pure conflict theory of the zero-sum type." This latter type is

often nothing but a *Gesellschaft-like* orientation which relies only on such action as haggling in the market place, striking, blackmailing, threatening, extorting and warring, and has little of the positive for which both the Puritans and the Communists have been willing to make very great sacrifices.[18] Norms such as "cross my heart and hope to die" are included in conflict theory of this narrow sort, but only as they are part of bargaining: "How much is true, how much is bluff; how much can I bluff without being caught?" Such an orientation as "pure conflict," everywhere the chief thrust of power holders, is not enough to make the "Communist-Puritan" burn the midnight oil in his office in Russia, China, North Vietnam or Cuba— nor, for that matter, is it enough to make the Puritan offspring in the United States remain at high levels of commitment. It does not give to social action "something that is a combination of love, belief and country," [19] by which Dayan pictured the Israelis as they fought in the June, 1967, conflict.

I am not out to belittle "pure conflict" theory, as described by Schelling, and conflict theorists, but I am trying to provide an adequate vehicle for that commitment beyond the self, the family—the particularistic relationships needed for rapid modernization. I want, also, to link this with an interaction atmosphere which prevents the alienation of the individual. Such a concern is far from new. Durkheim sought it in the *conscience collective,* through the work group. Communist societies get it through the secular religion of the Party and the home country. The Puritans had their Church. If there is one important flaw to be noted in "pure conflict" theory, in my opinion, it is its failure to take into account the need men have for that kind of important team effort which makes them want to be together and work together. Now what can sociology do to make sure this need is taken into account? In answering this question, I shall try to relate two things which have worried me a lot—fast and cruel modernization in certain traditional societies, and disasters studied by sociologists here and abroad.

Various studies of disaster—which combines force, though not always from human sources, and sentiment—show that at a certain point after a social organization has been stricken, there develops a level of integration and communication of sentiment unknown to members before. It has been called the "halo effect" and usually occurs at a predictable stage in the sequence of events after the intense rescue and salvage activities. Members who, in pre-disaster days, were relatively isolated and insulated from each other, come out of their shells, take part in a meaningful enterprise, cooperate in rescue work, help to rebuild, and find in the work that they have an increased understanding of and liking for one another. A fund of good will is begotten.[20] During this period, actors communicate sentiments which produce community or system morale, making the community an end in and of itself. Perhaps some would say that a therapeutic community emerges. It is related to—perhaps the same thing as—expressive ceremonies and ritual following arduous task endeavor, development of various ideologies following such persecution and struggle as that of the Mormons in their trek West, the recent founding and development of Israel climaxing the Diaspora and the Zionist movement, and what the late Howard P. Becker, in his presidential address, called the normative reaction to normlessness.

Revolutionaries, skilled in the use of violence and disruption, bring havoc to existing social systems, but chaos, of course, is not the aim. One aim is the relief at having order restored, the euphoria which comes from weathering a crisis with companions, the blessed peace that comes from a predictable pattern, even though it be a *new* pattern. In short, I hypothesize that revolutionaries use disruption precisely to create the halo effect, or fund of good will, for one another which they can share as insiders— insiders since, having produced it, they were there when the disaster occurred and since they were there in every one of the sequential steps which built up to a "we" feeling of an intensity never known before by many members of the target system. Often the re-

---

[18] See footnote 1 above.

[19] *Life*, Special Issue, 1967, p. 11.

[20] For Robin M. Williams' early use of the concept "fund of good will," see Charles P. Loomis and Zona K. Loomis, *Modern Social Theories, op. cit.*, p. 577, fn. 77.

integration is on a larger system basis than that known before disruption and violence were applied. This permits the amassing of facilities and the rebuilding of the power structure. Usually only a few people—often those with vested interests, who typically resist the change—know what is going on, and, typically, these figures are removed by techniques perfected by the change agents. As the reintegrated system emerges, and its members are buoyed up by the halo effect of sentiment with its Gemeinschaft-like relationships, the Party and the nation remain actively linked with the change target. Even as the halo effect and fund of good will recedes, the change agent may be viewed as the hope of the future. The change agent has, by this time, gathered quite a bit of social capital, and the stage of denial of reciprocity and manipulation of rewards may begin. It is hypothesized that this design for change requires that a certain amount of ambiguity and control be kept by the change agent to forestall the growth of vested interests in either old or new patterns. Remnants of conflict, often called "the terror," must continue. It is essential to note that during the period of the halo effect, and perhaps just before and after it, ascriptive pluralities such as the family lose in influence while Party and nation gain.

What I have just outlined is not new. Many have observed the function of disruption in Communist take-overs and attempted take-overs, and I, at least, and no doubt others, have noted the parallel between the social effect of such an activity and that which so often accompanies natural disaster.[21] Here I wish to go a step further and suggest a use of both natural and man-made disaster. Both natural disaster and man-made disruption can be used by change agents, not on the caprices of chance, but in a purposeful, planned manner. Every day there are disasters such as riots, famines,

earthquakes, tornadoes, and war, in traditional societies to which non-Communist countries such as the United States make huge inputs for rapid reconstruction, usually of the status quo. What if we sociologists stood ready with effective plans and procedures by which the situation (including the halo stage) after each such disaster could be used to turn familism and localism toward national and world issues—stood ready to help the leaders of the traditional society change it into a modern society? Does this seem far-fetched? In the traditional and developing countries around Israel, does anyone claim that their disaster of June, 1967, will slow down their efforts to modernize? Does anyone claim that we don't know who will be on the inside and a part of the Muslim community there—the Americans or the Russians? Much closer to home, though farther removed in time—in 1901 to be exact—we had the spectacle of Galveston adopting the new city commission form of government and subsequently introducing other changes, at least, in part, because of the great flood there.

Various foundations, as well as the United States government, have experimented with what may be called the "one-shot" investment of funds, exceptional personnel and facilities for the creation of exceptional result demonstrations in the form of pilot communities—which we hope will be imitated— as against the same expenditures spread widely over many communities. I have studied several such communities built by the Federal government in its effort to demonstrate means of fighting poverty during the Great Depression, another form of disaster.[22] On a larger scale, Japan and Israel are examples of what I suggest would be created in some one or a few points in the traditional world. Puerto Rico might have been such a demonstration for Latin America, and the Philippines for Asia, had the United States governmental outlays for de-

[21] The basic ideas for the presentation were first published by the author in "Systemic Linkage of El Cerrito," *Rural Sociology*, 24 (March, 1959), pp. 54–57 and "Tentative Types of Directed Social Change Involving Systemic Linkage," *Rural Sociology*, 24 (December, 1959), pp. 383–391. Since then, it has appeared in a number of readers. See also Charles P. Loomis, *Social Systems, op. cit.*, Essay 3.

[22] Charles P. Loomis, *Studies of Rural Social Organizations in the United States, Latin America and Germany*, Ann Arbor, Michigan: Edwards Brothers, Inc., East Lansing, Michigan State College Book Store, 1945, Chs. 1, 3, 4, 18, and 19. See also Charles P. Loomis, *Studies in Applied and Theoretical Social Science*, East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State College Press, 1950, Ch. 17.

velopment, relief and rehabilitation been adequately and strategically planned.

Of course, sociological strategy must be used so that these developments will be imitated, and here is where the *praise for conflict* comes in. If the resources and personnel which made Israel had instead been spread throughout the Muslim countries bordering her, perhaps the conflict in that area would have been lessened, but would the urge among these countries to modernize be so great? I think not. As one works in traditional non-Communist societies in Asia, Latin America and Africa, one is impressed with the lack of impact huge outlays of facilities and personnel have had and are having. Results seem puny when compared with those in societies which are leap-frogging ahead.

Within our own country, we might think of setting up a pilot city. Why does not the Federal government offer funds and resources on a competitive basis to the *one* city which would agree to make the most changes and effort toward bringing social justice and freedom from poverty to its citizens? The demonstration could be located in *the one* city most willing and able to make the great changes necessary. As sociologists we know such changes would bring crises and conflict. These would be used in leap-frogging ahead. The idea that every state politician must take home some plums or bacon, or whatever you want to call it, might be ignored this one time in the interests of humanity. Such a demonstration would be highly visible. Right away some industries suffering from unstable conditions might want to move there. Since a chief aim of this demonstration would be ideal race relations, many Negroes might be expected to go there.

Why should not *any* group whose members face a hostile environment have a chance to organize a model society for itself? The Amish and other plain people retain their enclaves, the *religieuses* their cloisters, and the Jews hewed Israel out of a desert. Why should not such Negroes as those among the black-power group who truly believe that they are forever barred from attaining social justice in the United States have the chance, if they desire it, to organize a model society much as Israel has

done? Finding the place would be difficult, to be sure. But to say that it is impossible might be overstating the case.

I don't know so much about Africa but my work in South America always comes to my mind as I think of the territorial aspects of model societies organized for the dual aim of relieving human distress and showing the way to others. At the end of World War II, service with the Mission of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees to the Andean Countries took me into the remotest parts of Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia, and brought me into contact with the highest governmental officials of these countries.[23] I heard several offers to accept many of the millions of refugees who were at that time in defeated Nazi Germany. The fertile, relatively unsettled parts of the inner or eastern rim of the Andes, and the attractive climate and land, had already led some Germans, Poles and others to attempt to build communities there. All the wherewithal for life is there—some of the richest soil in the world, carrying mahogany trees so large that jungle roads pass through their trunks. Also, as elsewhere, I can promise that conflict, pioneer crises, and latter-day disasters will not be wanting—to usher in the integrating "halo effect" for commitment and morale for those who have what it takes to build a new life. I remember an isolated Polish colony, located at Marcapata in Southern Peru in one of the remote border valleys of the Andes, which failed to withstand a crisis. Gold was discovered in a neighboring river valley and the manner in which the agricultural settlement went to pieces reminds me of the collective behavior in American gold rushes. Clearly Marcapata had not yet come by that which holds societies and communities together. I doubt that discovery of gold in or near Israel, nor that gold close to the early Puritan communities of New England, would have made such a cave-in of morale and integration as happened in that small Andean settlement. The other Euro-

---

[23] *Ibid.*, ch. 15. See also Charles P. Loomis, ed., *Turrialba—Social Systems and the Introduction of Change,* Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1953, and Charles P. Loomis and J. Allan Beegle, *Rural Sociology—Strategy of Change,* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1957.

pean colonies which I visited in those jungle regions of the Andean border valleys, such as Oxapampa and Satipo, had developed more of that value consensus so belittled by some conflict sociologists. Much which conflict sociology has to offer in planning leap-frog modernization of traditional societies, or building modern demonstration communities in the wilderness, will be needed. Apparently, however, what holds societies together cannot be ignored in planning these societies and communities.

It should be noted that this ideal settlement—some might call it a second Israel—is only for those who cannot come to terms with the United States after that point is reached where all that can be done has been done to bring social justice. I can, therefore, here stop talk of this project—as a proposed demonstration of the modern among traditional societies—because it is, hopefully, unnecessary.[24] Should sociologists—either those

---

[24] At the time of oral presentation of the paper in San Francisco, news media played up the previous three paragraphs, but scarcely mentioned the remainder of the address. (See *Newsweek,* September 11, 1967, pp. 24–25.) Negro reaction to the different news reports has varied. As a result of the publicity, several groups of Negroes interested in the idea as a means of bringing progress to Latin America have been in contact with me. So the

who are alienated or those who are too starry-eyed for our pedestrian world here—want to establish a second Israel in the eastern border valleys of the Andes I'll be glad to join. If I do not meet the requirements for membership, I'll offer my services as a consultant. I have many pregnant ideas on how to use conflict and crisis so that halo would flow. Then we shall resolve conflict as well as eliminate alienation. If there be conflict sociologists in the group who wish to negate the negation, that we shall do likewise.

---

question arises, how many Americans would be interested in leaving their home land?

The informants for the studies cited in footnote 4 were asked the following question, "Can you imagine that conditions could get to a point that you would consider moving to another country?" Field interviews with the informants in the United States general public—who, as stated above, constituted a modified probability sample of persons 21 years of age and over—were made during and immediately before and after the march on Washington, D.C., in 1963. It may be significant that 77.5 percent of the 169 Negroes and 85.4 percent of the 1293 whites answering the question said, "No." Those who answered, "Yes," were asked, "Would you consider moving to Mexico?" Of the 169 Negroes, 8.9 percent answered, "Yes," as compared with 6.5 percent of the 1,293 whites. These findings scarcely herald a great exodus from the "affluent society" by either race, to Mexico or anywhere else.