

# Concordia Theological Monthly

---

Volume 39

Article 19

---

3-1-1968

## Theological Observer

Richard Klann

*Concordia Seminary, St. Louis*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm>



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Klann, Richard (1968) "Theological Observer," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 39, Article 19.  
Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol39/iss1/19>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).



## THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER

A previous issue of this periodical devoted considerable space to a sociological study, *Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism*, by Charles Y. Glock and Rodney Stark (CTM, XXXVII [Oct. 1966], 597—605). In his introduction to the discussion Editor Herbert T. Mayer pointedly stressed the salvational uniqueness as well as the particularity of the cardinal assertions of the Christian Gospel.

We return to a discussion of some of the claims of this book because *Trans-action*, an important, widely read, scholarly periodical for "social science and modern society" included a severely critical review of the Glock-Stark "scientific investigation" (September 1967, pp. 76 f.). In his independent appraisal Walter R. Heinz of the department of sociology at the University of Munich, Germany, restates and amplifies some of the major criticisms made a year ago by Martin E. Marty and Ronald Johnstone in their discussion of the book in this journal. The non-professional reader will be struck by the severity of Mr. Heinz's strictures of the Glock-Stark study. In his independent analysis Heinz appears strongly to reinforce major implications of Ronald Johnstone's criticisms listed in the CTM discussion, which Glock and Stark rejected as "quibbles" on the "way to a negative judgment" of the book.

The orientation of the Heinz review may be seen in his initial paragraphs: (a) The Stark-Glock study was undertaken by the Survey Research Center at the University of California at Berkeley; (b) it was sponsored, that is, financially underwritten, by the Anti-Defamation League; (c) title and subtitle of the book, *Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism: A Scientific Investigation*, "indicate the author's approach: to establish the historically documented—nowadays mainly refuted—connection between the commitment

to Christian tenets and anti-Semitic attitudes by means of modern, value-free methods of data collection"; (d) while "the book presents many highly interesting results in respect to the actuality of prejudice among American Christians," (e) "it is, however, sometimes unsatisfactory in respect to the theoretical interpretation of the data."

Mr. Heinz summarizes the purpose of the book in the following words: "The authors' aim is to show that a causal chain links commitment to conservative Christian beliefs with anti-Semitism." The Glock-Stark "set of basic categories also describes the sequence of causation postulated: Orthodox beliefs are seen at the root of religious anti-Semitism which in turn is the breeding ground for rejection of the Jew on a secular level. Particularism designates a consequence of strong belief in the doctrines of one's own religious group; the conviction that one's own faith is the only legitimate one."

For the authors this means that "those who are ideologically committed to orthodox Christianity will be highly prone to a particularistic version, while those relatively uncommitted to this ideology will reject particularism." Heinz calls attention to one table which "conspicuously" shows that "one-third of the Protestants and one-fifth of the Catholics *without* bigotry nevertheless show anti-Semitic attitudes."

Toward the end of their book Glock and Stark offer their analysis of the explanatory value of their proposed model and "drastically" conclude: "The attitudes towards Jews of a fundamentalist with a Ph. D. degree were like those of other fundamentalists, not like those held by the majority of Ph. Ds."

Despite the Glock-Stark "frightening" empirical documentation, Heinz finds the findings unsatisfactory: "The study is a good example of the limited capacity of public



opinion data for a decisive test of a theory. . . . The data, however, are analyzed with rather unsensitive means. Instead of using scaling procedures to organize relevant items, the authors prefer summation indices. Instead of presenting measures of association between the elements of the proposed model—especially between bigotry and secular anti-Semitic attitudes—the authors leave the reader with percentage differences between extremes.”

“This observer [Heinz] computed the correlation (after dichotomizing the variables) for the important relationship between bigotry and anti-Jewish attitudes for the nationwide data. The resulting Pearson’s coefficient  $r$  was .26. It indicates only a moderate

positive connection between the religious complex of beliefs and anti-Semitism; in other words, the model developed by Glock and Stark explains only a relatively small amount of prejudice towards Jews among the members of churches in the U.S.A. . . . Granted that there is a strong fundamentalist trend in American Christianity, it seems unlikely that it leads—*qua* ideology—necessarily into anti-Semitism.”

We submit these judgments of the Glock-Stark investigation, written by a professional for this Washington University publication on whose Board of Advisory Editors the name of Charles Y. Glock is also listed, for the objective inspection of our readers.

RICHARD KLANN