Prejudice arises out of certain sociological and environmental factors. "As civilisation advances, the chain of prejudices seems to grow rather than diminish" observes Dr. Mehta and proceeds to analyse the root causes that create prejudice in man, with special reference to India. The author says that a correct understanding of these is an essential preliminary to the solution of several of our problems.

Dr. B. H. Mehta is a member of the Faculty of the Tata Institute of Social Sciences.

The whole world has become a tragedy of group prejudices that result in conflict, preventing the ordinary man from living his normal span of life in happiness, contentment and creative action. India is no exception to the world phenomena, though each country is facing problems that are results of lack of right relationship pertaining to ideas, persons, communities and properties.

In India, several basic prejudices and consequent conflicts are self-evident, whilst others operate in narrower surroundings, or are for the time being latent. Communalism, provincialism, ideological difference, class conflict, cultural antagonism, prejudice between nation and nation, urban-rural conflicts, inter-community and inter-family prejudice and conflict based round leadership, organisation, parties and vested interests affect almost every citizen without exception.

The chain of prejudices and conflicts seems to grow rather than diminish as civilisation advances, communications widen, and educational facilities are extended to the entire population. Many of the ills, conflicts and problems of India were easily explained away in terms of our lack of freedom and many problems even originated in our political subjection.

The country is now free and independent. Yet it has to face problems both within and without. It is generally believed that problems are solved by action, that conflicts are resolved by aggression or conciliation, and prejudice is removed by education. However, very often actions create more problems and prejudice; aggression never pays the aggressor; conciliation unless it is based on a complete resolution of a problem, gives only a brief respite; and education of a mere objective and informative character leads to greater confusion and mental conflict.

The solution of human problems, therefore, requires a detailed understanding of the whole process of living. Prejudices require to be analysed and studied in terms of cause and reaction. Human beings are constantly making and breaking communities. Contact and interaction between individuals and groups lead to conflict and co-operation. Eventually there is a process of assimilation of separate and divided units. The assimilated groups again come into conflict with other assimilated groups, and fresh divisions take place.

It can be generally stated that anything that separates, segregates or divides, creates prejudice, or is the result of prejudice. The world, in order to escape conflict, prejudice and division needs to lend its weight to integration and cohesion of such a substantial character, that divisions become impossible. The term 'love' has been used by prophets, seers and other leaders of mankind as the only real binding force. Love can be defined 'as that which holds together.' But love fails where there is prejudice. Love becomes a meaningless feeling when there is no understanding. Mental understanding is easy, but understanding fails to stand the test of events and circumstances. When events happen that cannot be understood, they cause the usual chain of fear, prejudice, and separation.
In recent years, India has been making a continuous effort at peace and construction, followed by frustration and defeat. Communism has become bewildering. Everyone seems to condemn but at the same time practise provincialism. The conflict between Communism and Capitalism abroad, only creates confusion at home. The conflict between Pakistan and India is almost accepted as a permanent phenomenon, and as Pakistan is naturally accepted as always the guilty and the aggressive party, there is hardly anything to do to solve the problem except war. The conflict between Capital and Labour is built upon confirmed prejudices and convictions on both sides. Even the effort to eradicate drink is considered to be a mere conflict of prejudices.

The chief causes and sources of prejudice and conflict are (1) the relationship of man and communities to the physical environment, (2) the content of a people's history, (3) the nature of religious belief and forms of worship, (4) the contents of the economic life, (5) the nature of social organisation, (6) the nature and content of the culture of human groups, (7) the nature of mind and thought as it has become to be as a result of the life experience of the group and the individual. The above factors do not operate singly, but they act and react on each other, creating social forces that operate so powerfully in certain cases that it becomes difficult for man and human groups to work against prevailing social trends. The human personality is little developed, the complex pattern of human existence has made self-expression very difficult, and education is not a process which enables man to understand, interpret and work against prevailing group prejudices and react intelligently to social forces, but rather education is itself a part of prejudices and it is shaped within the cross-currents of the operating social forces. Under the circumstances, prejudices continue to multiply, are strengthened by life experiences, and become infectious with the extensive development of communications and means of thought expressions like the radio, the newspaper, the cinema, etc. The vastness of the world with which the individual is in contact today, the bewildering rapidity of events and the reactions to these events, and presence of leadership and other factors that prevent the individual to react individually and to determine the cause of his own life in terms of his personal life experiences, has led to the formation of the layers of stratified prejudices which are like prison walls within which the individual and groups carry on their blind attempts to escape from problems that today almost suffocate them.

The environment.—The extent of the physical environment is not determined by geographical maps and the various frontiers that have come into being in the course of history. Let us try to imagine the state of our own country some two to four thousand years ago. There must have been groups of people occupying the physical area. These groups were small communities. The communities had their economic life, their language and social organisation, their recreations and their cultural patterns. Did they have frontiers? If the frontiers were there, they were limited to the needs of the groups and thus the communities became tribes. The simple life of the community and tribe had its prejudices. Communities and tribes had their prejudices, differences and conflicts with their neighbours. There were aggressions, conquerors and conquests leading to the fusing of tribes and the expansion of physical boundaries. The world of the tribe gave way to kingdoms, were conquered, conquests created prejudices, and continuous shifting of physical boundaries.

Physical boundaries, political boundaries and natural barriers created national frontiers, became also frontiers of prejudice and
caused conflict, aggression and wars. There were times when natural and political boundaries were not identical. This phenomenon caused fear and insecurity. The natural boundaries of India are unique and are seas and mountains. These barriers can be crossed, but not with ease. There are natural fears and prejudices against those who are likely to even think of crossing these natural barriers.

Political frontiers have caused national patriotism. Patriotistic feelings are matters of great elation. They lead to love and creativeness. But patriotism can develop within each political frontier only. Consolidated patriotism becomes national prejudice against other competing and neighbourly patriotism. The clash of patriotism leads to war. National frontiers and patriotism are eventual barriers against world understanding. The community frontier is real, it is the limit of personal and group life experience. The national frontier is historically, emotionally and educationally developed. The mind further makes such a frontier sacrosanct and unalterable unless it is to mean an expansion, and a trespass against the frontiers of other nations. The political frontier has become the cause of prejudice and fear; it is an obstacle to the quick realisation of a World State.

History.—The history of nations is the story of shifting frontiers, deeds of leadership, and emphasised event. Stories of the struggle of communities in their small environment that are the little experiences of the human race are neither treasured nor remembered, and the fruits of these experiences do not remain to educate new generations in the art of living. Thus only the shifting, shrinking, widening frontiers; the ideas and deeds of the few, and experiences that are sensational, are remembered. Memory helps to create prejudices out of the pages of history. Memories of wars, conquests, destructions, dominations are powerful and full of the resentments and frustrations of a suffering people. They may cause righteous indignation. But when these become memory, then a vicious circle of suffering, hatred, struggle for the achievement of strength, aggression and reprisal begin, which release a chain of conflicts that last for centuries. The most harmful are the wounds that have healed, but whose memories remain in the pages of history and invite reprisal. If the world desires to live in peace, then the histories of many nations should be rewritten and the tragedies of the past should either be forgotten, or analysed to trace the cause, nature and consequence of improper relations between human groups.

Religion.—It is generally believed that India is a land of great religious tension and turmoil. The population is made up of several religious sects, the most important of which are the Hindus and the Muslims. The Christians too have become somewhat important, since theirs was the religion of the ruling class for the past hundred and fifty years.

From the religious point of view, India is the most ancient and the most important land. We have already spoken of the tribes and communities that must have lived in the vast continent. The so-called aborigines, that today number about 25 millions, are examples of such communities inhabiting the long belt of land stretching from the Arawalli Hills in the West, through Khandesh and C. P., Bihar, Orissa and Bengal into Assam and even Burma. Before the Vedic times, the ancestors of these aborigines had their own religious beliefs and worship of Nature, which summed up their Animism. The Vedas contain sufficient evidence of prejudices of these wise, ritualistic and philosophical people. At that time, the Dravidians too had a highly evolved Polytheism. The acceptance of the Atharwarwa
Veda, the total religious beliefs and worships of the masses, as one of the Vedas shows the understanding, tolerance and powers of assimilation of the early Aryans.

The Muslims came as outsiders, invaders—a political enemy who came for economic advantage and exploitation. The coming of the foreigner brought the Aiyans, the aborigines, and the Dravidians closer together, though fundamental prejudices may have remained amongst them. Any foreigner, who clashes with the religious beliefs and worships of a conquered people, would enforce his religious characteristics upon the conquered and would set in motion a chain of prejudices which are bound to develop as vital differences.

The aggressive and dominating self-assertion of Islam, and its forthright condemnation of other religions is well-known. This lack of understanding of the true nature of religion led Islam into serious conflict even with the Christian world. Both Islam and Christianity may be called a particular type of organised religion with fixed notions about God, a prophet who is renowned, a Holy Book, definite notions of salvation and the spiritual life, an organised church, and a congregation which created a religious community, which cut across its past social and political patterns.

Hinduism is not a religion in the sense in which Christianity, Islam and Zoroastrianism are. Hinduism, like other religions, is animistic in its foundation, and has evolved into a great polytheism from which the notion of a supreme deity has evolved. The concept of Brahma, the concept of one God, and even the belief in no God are permitted in the various philosophies of Hinduism. Indeed Hinduism has never failed even to welcome, revere and worship the Gods of others, as the Vedic Aryans had accepted the great animistic spirit of the Atharwa Veda as worthy of man's worship.

Amongst the great prophets of Hinduism are Buddha, Mahavir, Sankaracharya, Ramnuja, Guru Nanak, and others upto Mahatma Gandhi. If Hinduism can be called a religion, then it is the only fortunate one whose stream of spiritual life was constantly fed and enriched by teachers whose philosophies reached perhaps the highest summits of man's interpretation of the life divine.

A religion which knew many prophets naturally will have few prejudices about prophets of other religions, and Indian history is a testimony of the reverence, regard and even love that made Guru Nanak approach Islam with understanding or which led a great son of Bengal to create the Brahma-Samaj to weave the true teachings of Christ into the great mosaic of Hindu spiritual thought and philosophy.

Hinduism with its many great and noble prophets, not only draws its truth and wisdom from Holly Books like the Ramayana, the Bhagavad Gita, the Grantha Sahib and others, but has the rich treasure of the Vedas, the Upanishads, and the spiritual experiences of men like Vivekananda, Swami Rama Tirtha and Mahatma Gandhi to continue the eternal search for Truth. And have not Hindu teachers and scholars explained with anxious desire the pages of the Quoran and the Bible, and admired and appreciated the truths they contained? And this love of Truth, the thirst for spiritual knowledge, and the exploitation of philosophy have not been reserved for a few great and good men, but even the humblest masses and the Kabir Panthis in the working class have showed their veneration for all that is sacred in other religions.

Hindus, through the ages have sought their salvation in many ways. The Gnyan Marga, the Path of Karmayoga, the Bhakti Marga, Shakti Worship—all these lead to the Holy Grail, and in the search for the ultimate and the Eternal, no prejudice or narrowness even
existed to condemn the path that was trodden by another Bhakta.

The Hindu, in the course of history, has worshipped in hypoethral shrines open to the sky; sometimes there was only the holy altar marked by stone, the 'deri' was a little temple hardly 24 inches high whilst temples grew in size, importance and divine significance according to the economic level, mental understanding and interpretation of spiritual values by the worshippers. Except when prejudices of others awakened their emotional wrath, the Hindu has never desecrated the Holy Shrine of another, be it a mosque or church; and the Parsi Fire Temples that have preserved the sacredness of the Holy Fire of a people for one thousand and three hundred years is a testimony to the Hindu's lack of prejudice, great tolerance, and feeling of reverence for anything that may be sacred to others.

Hindu churches have never created congregation in the Muslim or the Christian sense. With rare exceptions, the Hindus have not exploited others politically and economically for their own gain. If Hinduism had played the role in Indian Feudalism, that the Christian church played in Europe, the history of India would have been different.

The writer of the article is not a Hindu. To a sociologist religion merely appears to be an important phenomenon that results from the mind's reactions to the environment, and man's spiritual insecurity. Prejudice there must be in religion, but prejudices act and react on each other. If other religions sought to interpret Hinduism without understanding, if then prejudices created fear and contempt for aggression in the most sacred aspect of human existence, and if these created prejudices, they can be easily understood. There have been religious conflicts, aggression and prejudices the world over, The history of many a nation is strewn with blood because of religious prejudice. Organised religions, quite apart from the teachings of great prophets, sometimes played ignoble roles in the political and economic life of countries. Fortunately the days of worst religious strife are over. If religious strifes exist today, they are mere pretence and intended to cover up the underlying political and economic motives. If there are religious prejudices in the world, the history of Hinduism shows how Dharma can exist without the narrow conflicts of blind dogma. The conflicts, in India between religions, or between sects within Hinduism, are not due to religious prejudices but to economic and political conflicts.

Economics.—The history of man is a struggle for survival and competition for profit. Even the economic life of the small self-sufficient community was perhaps not free from the conflict that arose due to natural inequality of skill and prowess, and the desire to promote personal and family ends. Such conflicts lead to prejudice. It is problematical if the long history of the hunter, the fisherman and the cultivator, projecting into the first chapters of land possession, property and feudalism, moving into the insecure life of the nomad with his cattle wealth, passing into the commerce and travel minded age of trade and discovery and culminating in a most complex, speedy, extensive, industrial life of machine and electricity of the present century, can be said to create prejudice. The misdeeds of selfish men, communities and nations have produced consequences which lie at the root of most human ills, conflicts and suspicions. The origin and spread of slavery in one form or another, the art of exploitation of the many by the few, organised systems of social injustice and unequal opportunities, the crafty statecraft of autocracy and oligarchy,—all these have created patterns of human behaviour that have produced fears, antago-
nisms, suspicions and prejudices that demand complete and radical changes in the socio-economic structure of states and societies. These fears, antagonisms and prejudices have crystallised into hatred and organised rivalries that aim at the capture of power, the destruction of oligarchic authority, and the creation of a millennium. All these have created local, national and international organisations, associations, institutions and movements that work against each other, creating powerful prejudices, fears and antagonisms, using all the paraphernalia of modern publicity to hypnotise and deceive man.

The development of communications, the creation of tremendous energy for production, the development of chemistry and the discovery of synthetic materials have widened the gulf between competing economic groups. Science and technical progress has outstripped man's social, political and psychological development. The present crisis of civilisation, needing the control of the very forces man himself has created, brings him to the verge of a precipice. Natural barriers are unable to withstand the tremendous force that is generated by a world economy. The unchartered and erratic evolution of Capitalism with its implied inequalities and injustice, the ruthlessness and violence of Imperialism, the basic antagonism and ideology created by Socialism of one type or another, and the unscrupulous exploitation of science for the benefit of militarism has produced a world situation which is bound to baffle a less developed, and upto now subjugated country like India. The bewildering strength of cold realities can be prevented if old prejudices do not stand in the way, if the impossibility of absolute national sovereignty is realised, and the possibility of planned co-operation for a world economy is explored to the fullest extent.

So far as India is concerned, capitalism has not taken deep roots here; we are not so tragically industrialised that we are faced with deep economic crisis; and our class antagonisms, hatreds and prejudices are not so keen or acute as in the industrialised West. The new economy of India needs to be coolly planned after determining sound philosophical foundations. Man does not attain happiness by multiplying his wants, piling up gadgets, and mechanising the free processes of routine life. Extensive industrialisation, unbridled growth of urbanism, centralisation of economic development and political authority, are the several ways to create complicated socio-economic structures that hold within themselves the seeds of eternal conflict, prejudice and antagonism.

Let human life be simplified, evolve powerful communities that will live co-operatively, decentralise society, liquidate and decentralise unwieldy industrial areas, industrialise rationally, keeping alive the basic arts and skills of man and a new pattern of economic society can be created without urban-rural competition, basic class conflicts, or unbearable inequalities of concentrated wealth. Even a partial elimination of prejudices is not possible till man attains economic maturity and evolves a sane system of production and a balanced understanding based on true values of what he calls 'standards of living'.

The presence of a hierarchy of standards of living creates room for powerful prejudices. The poor, the middle class and the rich, all have their respective prejudices. A rational levelling of life in happy and creative communities, greater equality of opportunity, and the maximum scope for the expression of skill, art and talent in the economic life of man will give to India a new glory. She will be a proper lesson to the West with its insane lust for profit and industrialisation, excessive development of power, mechanism of life, production of an endless mass of cheap goods and gadgets, creating leisure in the midst of a moral vacuum, and
eventually creating a culture of gadgets and gold that lacks the true dignity of men and a stamp of the spirit of his race.

Society.—Indian society and Indian social institutions are products of long history. Besides, they are products of assimilation of innumerable parties and racial types. In the course of this assimilation, Hindu society may have lost a good deal of charm, dignity and pride of attainment that we have noticed in our reference to Hindu religion and philosophy.

The early communities of India were organised in terms of blood relationship. They were fairly large endogamous groups, occupying tribal territories, speaking their own dialects. They were descended from a common ancestor and cherished the memories of their history and the animistic spirits and gods they worshipped as they carried on their struggle for existence as hunters, fishermen or primitive cultivators. They developed their distinctive cultural patterns, as their dialect developed and their arts and crafts flourished in the environments in which they lived.

Such communities were independent and inter-dependent. They had their conflicts, and in face of danger, they developed forms of co-operation that led sometimes to fusions and assimilated patterns of culture. Almost all primitive communities were strictly endogamous. Whilst marriage was a free and transient unit, a violation of tribal endogamy meant even death. Thus they maintained their distinctive existence, and the same kind of distinctive existence continue even to this day. Primitive endogamy does not seem to be the result of prejudice against 'stranger groups'. Marriage amongst the known was desirable and selection was preferable within the sufficiently wide circle of the whole tribe.

With the growth of economic inequalities within the endogamous communities, the social organisation took a different turn. The laws of endogamy and exogamy continued to exist, but the institution of marriage developed by custom, religion and law came to determine marriage relationship according to wealth, land possession, privileges, and social prestige. When communities evolve on the basis of these new marriage groupings, prejudice was bound to arise, and these became worse as property possessing groups became more and more exclusive.

These developments are not peculiar to Hindu society alone, and Muslims, Christians and others have sought to prevent intermarriage in regional communities on grounds of religious taboo and legal political disabilities, based on economic considerations.

The march of world history, the growth of nations, the development of communications, and technical progress brought about by science, the spread of education, the birth of political consciousness and many other factors have made impossible the existence of small, endogamous, exclusive groups living behind their thick walls of social prejudice.

In the course of history, small communities are not found to continue their solitary existence. Even before the Aryan invasion, the Dravidians in the South had evolved more complicated patterns of village communities. It is now generally accepted that the caste system originated with the Dravidians. Not only their social life was organised, but they had economic organisations. Economic organisation very often cuts across social organisation, and the single community with its blood clans is vivisected into competing economic groups.

It is very important to note how, why and under what circumstances different communities come together, and what is the consequence of this coming together. Two community groups, living in two different environments, come together in physical contact. Mental contact as we now have at the
present day due to developed communications, was probably not so evident in the past. The first contacts lead to interaction. When two strange groups meet, there is fear, suspicion and a desire to maintain the individuality of each group. Where competition for survival is evident, or where there is an effort for domination, or where there is a design on the women of one community by another, the first inter-action leads to conflict and war. These conflicts create prejudices, and prejudices continue to multiply even after the conflict is resolved. If the conflict is resolved by conquest, it is but natural that prejudice and psychological antagonism should develop. And these embrace every aspect of the mutual life including religion, language, economic life, social system, and cultural patterns.

India, like China, has known and experienced this process of contact and conflict for centuries. Not only did large regional groups come into conflict with their neighbours, but there was a series of incursions into the country by people and races who came from unknown and distant lands with motives of conquest and in search of survival and peace.

Let us carefully note the chief of these. The aboriginal bolt, with the race often called Kaularian, had tribal cultures. The Dravidians too are found well settled in their homelands in the south and on the eastern coast. In the early days, there were incursions from the north west; these included the Vedic Aryans and successive waves of Aryan communities including the Rajputs. Then came the Muslims, the Tartars and the Moghuls. There were incursions and intermingling from the eastern borders too, from Tibet, Burma and China. The Bengalee group developed its distinct character. From across the seas, from the west coast particularly entered the Portuguese, French and English.

Each wave of migration and conquest brought a new people with their own history, language, religion, economic experience and motives, social organisation and system of Government, cultural pattern, educational system, arts, crafts and philosophies. The conflict that followed are well-known to all students of history. It was not merely a contact of armies and kings, the intrigues of ministers and aristocracies but there was a coming together, a contact, invisible conflicts, fears, loves and hatreds and understandings between different groups of people.

The sociologist is aware of the manner in which assimilation, the most important of all sociological processes, takes place. Assimilation is easy after contact has taken place, painful or peaceful, if there is receptivity. Assimilation is difficult if there is resistance.

When two different groups from different environments meet in a common region, where one is an outsider and an intruder, the group with a dominant culture, more powerful in arms, and possessing the means to impose authority succeeds to dominate, suppress and claim the submission of the conquered group. The apparent advantages sought after are political domination and economic exploitation. The effect is resistance; the result is prejudice. And when conflict is apparently over, the conquest is believed to be complete and reconciliation is effected; but resistance really continues if the conquered group had strong characteristics in terms of its own religious beliefs and economic, social and cultural patterns. It is also possible for two different groups to meet without apparent conflict or war. When this happens the dominant group may seek to impose its patterns peacefully. Thus there is receptivity and not resistance. The meeting groups evolve a common political pattern and achieve economic co-operation.

Whatever may have been the conflicts within the many and varied groups that
make up Hindu society, they are found to assimilate the basic philosophical concepts that help to create integration. This integration, though least apparent, is very real in terms of basic cultural patterns that have evolved in the course of hundreds of years of history. These cultural patterns include the day-to-day details of human life, including language, food, habits, dress, architectural concepts, recreation, arts, celebrations, the details of economic life, and the elements of social life including ceremonies and marriage customs. Culture evolves regionally and is very much a product of proximity. Differences, however fundamental, cannot prevent the continuous blending and intermingling of life patterns of individuals, families and small communities brought close to each other in the immediate environment. Within the regional community, receptivity prevails and resistance is broken down.

Assimilation is brought about by living together. Living together implies a continuous process of sharing group experience. Religious differences, class barriers, social exclusiveness, mental conflicts—all these seem to disappear as human beings share the day-to-day struggles and joys, face together the problems of life, and learn to appreciate and understand each other's point of view. The worst conflicts in recent years have proved the above statement time and again. But this process of 'living together' is mentioned here in the sense in which tribes and communities lived together. The cities and urban mores produced individualism, intellectual life bred isolation. Modern conflicts and prejudices are primarily the creation of the urban middle and upper classes who used prejudices and fostered differences in order to maintain their class privileges and bolster up their political authority. The middle and upper classes provide that 'leadership' which creates 'prejudice patterns', emphasises the differences in thought, ideas, beliefs, customs and behaviour, and creates fears and defence mechanisms, that eventually lead to aggression and conflicts. They point out the advantages of individualism and the importance of maintaining group superiorities to continue to enjoy economic advantages. Thus they give shape, form, substance, colour and importance to prejudice.

The way to end prejudice is to yield and be receptive to the forces of assimilation. The consciousness of separation and individualism are barriers created by the human mind, disturbing the process of assimilation that is ever present in all human societies. Co-operation fosters assimilation. The practice of co-operation is easy and natural in regional community groups as against artificial communities that owe their allegiance to religious beliefs and class privileges. In the end assimilation always prevails, and worst conflicts lead to complete reconciliation and assimilation after suffering the consequences of physical and psychological warfare.

This brief article attempts to analyse the causes of prejudice and the process of its elimination. Understanding leads to the disintegration of prejudice. In the modern world, the greatest creator of prejudice is the desire for economic gain. Religion and nationalism are the tools used to foster prejudice, create competition, emphasise individualism and maintain power through aggression. The forms and substance of prejudices are the products of leadership. The masses are the tools by which leaders attain their objects of group, class and national domination. True culture is synthetic and develops integrated patterns. Leadership, by an artful analysis and misinterpretation of culture, succeeds in emphasising differences, eventually creating prejudices and conflicts.

The world is, therefore, in need of right leadership that will seek to organise integrated and harmonious communities, living together
in their day-to-day co-operative economic activities. Such communities without creating political frontiers, will successfully create larger and larger communities, federating or evolving into a World State. The weapons of prejudice—property, organised idea patterns, nationalism, and organised religion—will have to be ultimately discarded in the interest of World Peace and Human Happiness.
Social scientists have also identified some common social factors that may contribute to the presence of prejudice and discrimination:

Socialization. Many prejudices seem to be passed along from parents to children.

Economic benefits. Social studies have confirmed that prejudice especially rises when groups are in direct competition for jobs. This may help to explain why prejudice increases dramatically during times of economic and social stress.

Authoritarian personality. In response to early socialization, some people are especially prone to stereotypical thinking and projection based on unconscious fears. Prejudice as Group Position: Microfoundations of a Sociological Approach to Racism and Race Relations. Lawrence D. Bobo*. Harvard University. This research integrates and elaborates the basic premises of Blumer’s group position theory of prejudice. It does so in order to make explicit, more fully integrated, and empirically pliable the theoretical foundations of a sociological analysis of the nature of racial prejudice. In so doing, the research identifies important areas of agreement between Gordon Allport’s approach to prejudice and that of Blumer. Blumer neither provided a full synthetic Social-psychological explanations of prejudice emphasize authoritarian personalities and frustration, while sociological explanations emphasize social learning and group threat. Education and region of residence are related to racial prejudice among whites; prejudice is higher among whites with lower levels of formal education and among whites living in the South.