

The Established and the Outsiders-Theorem Instead of “Racism”: A Figuration of Power Assymetrie

Hasret Elçin Kürşat Coşkun

Yeditepe University, Istanbul

Leibniz Universität, Hannover

97

Norbert Elias¹, a German sociologist, whose works have been

¹ Norbert Elias was born on 22 June 1897 in Breslau (today: Wrocław) in a family of Jewish descent. His father Hermann Elias, married with Sophie Elias managed a textile factory. After passing the abitur (High-School diploma) in 1915 he volunteered for the German army in World War I and was employed as a telegrapher. After suffering a nervous breakdown in 1917, he was declared unfit for service and was posted to Breslau as a medical official. In 1918 began Elias studying philosophy, psychology and medicine at the University of Breslau, in addition spending a term each at the universities of Heidelberg and Freiburg in 1919 and 1920. He quit medicine in 1919 after passing the preliminary examination (Physikum). During his Breslau years, until 1925, Elias was deeply involved in the German Zionist movement.

To finance his studies he took up in 1922 a job as the head of the export department in a local hardware factory. In 1924 he graduated with a doctoral dissertation in philosophy at the University of Breslau. In 1924 moved Elias to Heidelberg and resumed his studies of sociology. Alfred Weber accepted him as a candidate for a habilitation (Thesis for professorship).

In 1930 Elias chose to cancel this project and followed Karl Mannheim to become his assistant at the University of Frankfurt on the Main. He began his habilitation entitled “Der höfische Mensch” (“The Man of the Court”). His habilitation thesis was already submitted and his consuler was Mannheim, as in March 1933 Nazi rule in Germany began. After the Nazi take-over Mannheim’s Sociological Institute was forced to close and Elias’ habilitation procedure was cut. His habilitation thesis was first published in 1969 with the title “Die höfische Gesellschaft”.

In 1933, Elias fled to Paris and in 1935 to Great Britain, where he was later nationalized. Between 1954 and 1962 he worked as lecturer at the department of Sociology from University of Leicester. At that time his first enormous empirical study “Etablierte und Aussenseiter” was in progress. Before that, he worked for a long time in adult education and engaged himself in group therapy. From 1962 to 1964, Elias taught as Professor of Sociology at the University of Ghana. After his return to England he worked as

translated into over 30 languages, suggest to use the term “The Established and the Outsiders-Theorem” instead of the mainstream term “racism” to denote the universal relationship between the dominant “Whites” and the minorities of colored skin. While in the USA the figuration between the Whites and the Blacks has become the symbol for racism, some authors like Albert Memmi² analyzed the interdependence between the colonial French and the colonized Algerians.

But the bulk of literature about racism have originated naturally in a country where the race conflicts and tensions and the liberation movement of the victim group of racist suppressions and assaults, the black Americans, have been incomparably strong. Norbert Elias rejects

a private scholar. Since 1975 he moved to Amsterdam and spent much time as visiting professor in various German and Dutch universities (Aachen, Münster, Bielefeld). Only now and especially after the success of the pocket edition from “Über den Prozess der Zivilization” (1976) was his work in Germany appreciated and generally recognized. From 1978 to 1984 he worked at the Center for Interdisciplinary Research at the University of Bielefeld. Among others he was in the ZIF-Research Team of Philosophy and History.

The Reedited Collected Works of Norbert Elias

Elias N. *The Court Society* edited by Stephen Mennell. Dublin: UCD Press, 2006. // Elias N. *On the Process of Civilization* [note new title], edited by Stephen Mennell, Eric Dunning, Johan Goudsblom and Richard Kilminster. Dublin: UCD Press, 2012. // Elias N. and J. Scotson. *The Established and the Outsiders*, edited by Cas Wouters. Dublin: UCD Press, 2008. // Elias N. *What is Sociology?* Edited by Artur Bogner, Katie Liston and Stephen Mennell. Dublin: UCD Press, 2012. // Elias N. *The Loneliness of the Dying and Humana Conditio*, edited by Alan and Brigitte Scott. Dublin: UCD Press, 2009. // Elias N. *Quest for Excitement: Sport and Leisure in the Civilising Process*, by Norbert Elias and Eric Dunning, edited by Eric Dunning. Dublin: UCD Press, 2008. // Elias N. *Involvement and Detachment*, edited by Stephen Quilley. Dublin: UCD Press, 2007. // Elias N. *An Essay on Time*, edited by Steven Loyal and Stephen Mennell. Dublin: UCD Press, 2007. // Elias N. *The Society of Individuals*, edited by Robert van Krieken. Dublin: UCD Press, 2010 // Elias N. *Studies on the Germans* [note new title], edited by Stephen Mennell and Eric Dunning. Dublin: UCD Press, 2013. // Elias N. *Mozart, and Other Essays on Courtly Culture*, edited by Eric Baker and Stephen Mennell. Dublin: UCD Press, 2010. // Elias N. *The Symbol Theory*, edited by Richard Kilminster. Dublin: UCD Press, 2011.

2 Memmi, A. (1965) *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, Beacon Press, University of Minnesota Press, 1990.

the expression “racism” because it directs the attention to the difference of skin color as the reason for the racist ideology. He argues that not the skin but the power differential between two groups is the fundamental cause for the marginalization and stigmatization of a minority group.³ Differences in physical appearance⁴ or in language makes the group more recognizable and therefore more prone to frequent discrimination, insults and offences but it is not the real cause of stigmatization.⁵ Other invisible stigmatized group members have a certain possibility to hide their group membership and escape from racist experiences; for example some occupational groups like prostitutes or hangmen.⁶ The superior group which has monopolized the power sources feels not only powerful but also better worthier and higher human value.

“Aristocracy” in Athens, upper class of slave-owning warriors, meant “rule of best”. Therefore the word “noble” has even today a double meaning of a high social rank and of a highly valued quality and morals, implicitly expressing that a social group of low standing has low human value. This is the normal self-image of groups who in terms of their power ratio are securely superior to other interdependent groups. ⁷This type of relationship can be found between social classes, men and women, Protestants in relation to Catholics, powerful states to small states of less developed nations, etc. So this theorem concentrates on the structural regularities, common structural unity of intergroup relationships with power ratio differences.

3 Elias N. and J. Scotson. *The Established and the Outsiders*, edited by Cas Wouters. Dublin: UCD Press, 2008.

4 Gergen, K.J. *The Significance of Skin Color in Human Relations*, *Daedalus* 96: 390-407, 1967.

5 Simpson, G.E. and J.M. Yinger. *Racial and Cultural Minorities*. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

6 Goffman, E. *Stigma*. New York: Simon & Schuster Inc., 1986.

7 A- Fey, W.F. and Omwake

B- Memmi, A. (1987) *Rassismus*, Frankfurt /M

“The more powerful groups look upon themselves as the ‘better’ people, as endowed with a kind of group charisma, with a specific virtue, shared by all its members and lacked by the others. But an even more interesting question is , how these established groups impose the belief in their own human superiority upon the less powerful upon the ‘outsiders’. How can they make the others feel ‘inferior’?”⁸

Marx explains the source of power of the dominant class by the monopolistic possession of means of production, others of weapons. But the figurational aspects, that means the socio-psychological characteristics of the interdependence between established and the outsiders are quite often ignored in the literature. Social exclusion-rejecting and forbidding contacts-by means of social control resulting from the group cohesion and collective identification within the powerful groups and consequently the monopolization of key positions at all levels and in institutions (in political parties, in communal sphere, bureaucracy or other institutions) is always a powerful weapon against the stigmatized group. Exclusion and stigmatization serve the superior group in maintaining their identity and group cohesion.⁹

One common feature of the established-outsider-figuration lies in the following pattern of attribution: The powerful group attributes outsiders as a whole the bad characteristic of their “worst” members, who are a minority in the outsider group, while the self- image of the established is built around the “best” members of their small number of the most worthy, highly respected and valued people. This distortion enables always to provide evidence to prove that the established group is “good” and the outsiders “bad”. So the powerful group can always

8 Elias N. and J. Scotson. *The Established and the Outsiders*, edited by Cas Wouters: 19. Dublin: UCD Press, 2008.

9 Kipnis, D.M. Changes in Self Concepts in Relation to Perceptions of Others, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 29: 449-465, 1961.

shame the outsiders by blaming them for the behavior and deeds of this minority section of the outsiders. That is, since the powerful possess the “power of definition”, they can blame the powerless for the behavior of their “worst” and “anomic” section. Germans define themselves as the “Volk of Mozart and Beethoven” but the Turks as “knife stabber”.¹⁰ Germans are industrious and productive workers but the idle, unemployed Turks live on social welfare pension (in reality only 8%). If we look at the image of Romans in the Turkey, they are all thieves and steel but the Turks have a high moral. Uncountable examples can be listed in this context.

Prejudice is not an individual phenomenon; it must be perceived and analyzed at the level of intergroup relationships: It is a phenomenon of the relationship between two groups.

“The center piece of that figuration is an uneven balance of power and the tensions inherent in it One group can effectively stigmatize another only as long as it is well established in positions of power from which the stigmatized group is excluded”.¹¹

A counter stigmatization of the outsiders, their retaliation, is only then possible when the power disparities diminish like the Black Movement in the USA. The group charisma the powerful group attributes to itself and the group disgrace attributed by them to the outsiders are complementary. The emotional barrier to close contact between the two groups set up and internalized in this power inequality continues even if the objective conditions change as the case India demonstrates. The caste-system is abolished by legislation but the social contact between unequal castes is still taboo according to social norms.

10 Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Sozialordnung, ISG-Befragung. Ausländerfeindlichkeit, 1990

11 Elias N. and J. Scotson. The Established and the Outsiders, edited by Cas Wouters: 20. Dublin: UCD Press, 2008.

“The closing of ranks among the established certainly has the social function of preserving the group’s power superiority. At the same time, the avoidance of any closer contact with the members of the outsider group has all the emotional characteristics of one what has learned in another context to call “the fear of pollution”. As outsiders are felt to be anomic, close contact with them threatens a member of an established group with “anomic infection”.¹²

The outsiders cannot strike back because they have internalized the humiliation and shame attributed by the powerful, because they cannot come up to the norms set by the powerful; let it be standard of living, physical appearance, etc. Where the power differential is great outsider groups measure themselves with the yardstick of their oppressors.¹³ One common feature of established-outsider figurations is the reproach against the outsiders that they are anomic: The established regard them as untrustworthy, undisciplined and lawless. But the symptoms of the human inferiority as defined by the established and attributed to the outsiders which serve as the proof for their own superiority are created by the very conditions of outsider position, humiliation, deprivation and oppression. Poverty is one such symptom; uncleanliness attached to the outsiders is another one.¹⁴ Outcast children are more prone to aggressiveness, in a sense they actualize the stereotype, attributed to them. And the fear of contact with the outsiders would contaminate refers to the contamination with anomy and dirt. In England “the great unwashed” attributed to the lower classes in 1830, especially to industry workers, is a historical illustration of this common reproach against the outsiders.¹⁵ The Turkish children and youngsters in Germany are

12 Ibid, 22

13 Memmi, A. *Rassismus*, Frankfurt /M: 1987.

14 Pettigrew, T.F. *A Profile of Negro American*. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand, 1964.

15 A- Pastore, N.A. Note on Changing toward Liked and Disliked Persons, *Journal of Social Psychology* 52: 173-175, 1960.

B- Thompson, E.P., *The Making of the English Working Class*. Victor Gollancz Ltd. 1980

considered to be aggressive and undisciplined. The treatment as outcasts actually creates this very deviant role because their hostility against the majority group leads them to take revenge by exercising the very things for which they are blamed by the German society. Give a group a bad name; it is likely that they live up to it.

Youngsters of marginal groups are said to be less disciplined and self-controlled. The biggest part of this blame is only a prejudice and the universal “blame of anomie” as we have already noted: Cognitive psychology teaches us that we more frequently notice the “bad behavior” of persons against whom we have prejudice and remember it longer. In cases when this attribution does have a bit of truth the cause lies exactly in the established-outsider-figuration: The socialization of children entails two mechanisms:

- 1) Sanctions of the adults if they break the rules and norms,
- 2) Reward for abiding by the rules of conduct and behavioral norms

The second pattern of behavior brings them inclusion and participation on the resources of the society such as education, achieving status and high positions, professions and a high standard of living as adults. That means compensation for limiting their freedom of action and enduring restraints-first outer constraints and later internalized self-restraints. At the end of wavering or renunciation is satisfaction in other realms of life. But exactly this compensation and reward are lacking in case of children of outsiders. They know that they won’t succeed no matter how hard they try and struggle to be included and to participate on the benefits of social inclusion. So why should they accept the constraints, rules and renunciation?

If the economic aspects of established-outsider conflict are dominant it is an indicator for the, a greater imbalance of power. Otherwise non-

economic aspects of tensions and conflicts become more recognizable. Struggle for the satisfaction of other human needs like for status, for social respect, for social contacts etc. replace the struggle for sheer existence and stilling hunger.

In other words, the power source and advantages which are monopolized by the established group can be economic or material but the less pronounced the unequal distribution of advantages at the economic level, the more non-economic aspects of tensions and conflicts gain an importance. The outsiders suffer from inferiority of power and status,¹⁶ from deprivation of psychological needs such as deprivation of value, of meaning, of social acceptance and respect. The balance of power struggle between the established and the outsider which is always the fundament of such a figuration is then concentrated on the satisfaction of other human requirement than achieving a subsistence level.

The collective opinion of a group which has monopolized the power resources regulates the way of feeling and thinking of its members because the rewarding access to these resources including the participation on the group charisma depends on the status and ranking of a member and this in turn depends on the compliance with the group norms and opinion. This is one of the major reasons why individuals in the established group do not act or speak counter to the group opinion. Otherwise the lowering of a group member's ranking within the internal status order, loss of power and access to resources are unavoidable. A member's self-image and self-respect are linked to what other members think of him. Researches in Germany have shown that even those who don't necessarily share the stereotypes and prejudices of other group

16 A- Fey, W.F. Acceptance by Others and Its Relation to Acceptance of Self and Others:

A Revaluation, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 50: 274-276, 1955.

B- Fey, W.F. Correlates of Certain Subjective Attitudes towards Self and Others, *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 13: 44-49, 1957.

members, for example of German workers in a beer pub at a table, don't have the courage not to participate in nasty and hostile jokes about Turks.¹⁷ In other words, cohesive groups are able to exercise a high degree of control upon its members so that they don't break the taboo of personal contact to stigmatized group members. Then the penalty for group deviance is the loss of power and status in the established group, therefore less access to resources. Their self-image, self-respect, self-love and the participation on group's charisma, on superior human value diminish.

One major contribution of Norbert Elias to the theories of power was his finding in a community study that the duration of living in one place can also be a source of power and superiority. The established community develops an internal organization and cohesion, common habits, a value system and rules of conduct as well as emotional ties between the members and to the community as a collective which manifests itself in the usage of "we". Such a group cohesion and organization is always a source of power the newcomers to this place lack: These have met each other recently, have neither a strong we-identity nor a communal organization or mutually accepted values and norms; they are totally loose, disintegrated as a group without any group cohesion. This asymmetrical power relation between the established and the newcomers can very well be applied to the outsider role of refugees and other migrant groups everywhere. Actually the outsiders in this community investigation were inner refugees who had escaped from the German air force attacks and bombs thrown to London during the II. World War.

Newcomers become a factor of disturbance for the established

17 Hettlage-Varjas, A. Die Entstehung des Fremdenhass in Unserer Gesellschaft, We-gezum Menschen : 42, 8. 1990.

way of life of the¹⁸ community and a threat for the powerbase of the established. They are considered as an attack to the self-attributed group charisma of the community based on the as superior and unique considered system of values and norms, that is against the we- image and we-ideal of the superiors. The key positions in the community, for example the leading roles in caritative institutions, clubs, recreation groups etc. are distributed among the established group. The sole existence of people -the newcomers- who violate the rules of conduct and belief system because they don't know these becomes a threat: The violaters as negative examples could weaken the restraints exercised by the community upon its (deviant) members. These outer restraints are internalized by the self-controlled members. We know from psychology that any threat to the control of super-ego over alter-ego causes anxiety.¹⁹ So any example or behavior which is contrary to the group norms could weaken both the self-restraint of people and the control of the community over its members. This is the real cause for the severe rejection and stigmatization of the newcomers, also avoiding any private contact of the community members to the as anomic considered group of newcomers in order to prevent from "contamination". Stigmatization is then a counter attack because the newcomers are considered to be a threat both to their power superiority, higher human value symbolized in their special way of life and uphold values. That the American white authors connected to the establishment spoke of "Negros" as "lusting for a taste of power" is a good example for this mechanism.²⁰

18 Flanagan, J.T. The German in American Fiction, In Ander, O.F. (ed.), In the Trek of the Immigrants: Essays Presented to Carl Wittke. Rock Island, III.: Augustana College Library, 1964.

19 Gordon R. Stereotypy of Imagery and Belief as an Ego Defence, British Journal of Psychology, Monograph Supplement, No. 34, 1962.

20 A- Pettigrew, T.F. A Profile of Negro American. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand, 1964

B- Horowitz E.L. The Development of Attitude toward the Negro, Archives of

Reactions to Stigmatization

To permanently experience discrimination and stigmatization must be considered a socialization condition with severe personality formation defects. Growing up as a member of an outsider group can result in intellectual and emotional deficiencies as many empirical investigations have shown for the Burakamin in India or for the Black Americans in the USA.²¹ It is in my opinion a form of exercising collective violence because it destroys the egos of the members of the minority groups.²²

Depending on the fundamental difference between extroverted and introverted individuals the accumulation of aggression of the victims expresses itself either in self-punishing attitude or in canalization of anger against the majority as well as other majority outer groups instead.²³ Whatever the direction of reaction formation may be, I think self-hate and group-hate (latent or overt) is a very common

Psychology, No. 194, 1936.

C- Gross, S.L. and J.E. Hardy (eds.). Images of the Negro in American Literature. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.

21 A- Kipnis, D.M. Changes in Self Concepts in Relation to Perceptions of Others, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 29: 449-465, 1961

B- Leeper, R.W. Some Needed Developments in the Motivational Theory of Emotions. In Levine, D. (ed.). Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1965. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1965.

C- Pedersen, D.M. Evaluation of Self and Others and Some Personality Correlates, Journal of Psychology 71: 225-244, 1969.

22 A- Seeman, M. Adjustment to Minority Status and Intellectual Perspective, Social Problems 3: 142-153, 1956.

B- Sheerer, E.T. An Analysis of the Relationship between Acceptance of and Respect for Self and Acceptance of the Respect for Others in Ten Counseling Cases, Journal of Consulting Psychology 13: 169-175, 1949.

C- Simpson, G.E. and J.M. Yinger. Racial and Cultural Minorities. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

D- Suinn, R.M. and H. Hill. Influence of Anxiety on the Relationship between Self-acceptance and

Acceptance of Others, Journal of Consulting Psychology 28: 116-119, 1964.

23 Simpson, G.E. and J.M. Yinger. Racial and Cultural Minorities. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

consequence of stigma/discrimination because the attribution of worthlessness unrespectability, and inferior status by the established group is internalized and becomes the negative self-evaluation losing self-respect and self-and group-love, starting to hate him-, herself for having the identity he/she has. The aggressions are sometimes canalized against the own group like frequent physical violence, quarrels etc. in outcast groups.²⁴ The victim frequently would deny that he belongs to his minority group trying to escape from his stigma. He would avoid contacts to his group, change all signs and symbols of the belonging to this group. I can remember that my daughter rejected to speak in Turkish as we lived in Germany especially in the public sphere: She didn't want to be recognized as a Turk. I got to know not few Turkish migrants in Germany, who legally gave up their native names and overtook German names. Many primary school teachers reported to me that Turkish pupils wouldn't raise their hands when their Turkish names were called. And Jacky Jason tried during his whole life to turn his black skin to heller color with special creams.

It is known for centuries that the stigmatized group members isolate themselves, avoid contacts to the established and retreat to ghetto enclaves in order to avoid painful experiences of discrimination and stigmatization. Then occurs something very interesting: The established blame the minorities for example guest workers for building ghettos with in the society as it happens in Germany, and turn the mechanism upside down claiming that the Turks are being stigmatized because they live isolated and without contacts to the German population. In case of some individuals the inferiority feeling turn into superiority claims, that means a reversion takes place. These persons develop an inflated I-Ideal (sometimes the whole community a We-Ideal) as a reaction

24 A- Kurokawa, M. *Minority Responses*. New York: Random House, 1970.

B- Levanway, R.W. The Effect of Stress on Expressed Attitudes toward Self and Others, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 50: 225-226, 1955.

formation to compensate for their present inferiority. The belief in being a god selected religious community, building militant fighting bands by the youngsters, or to struggle to achieve a symbolic status are some empirical evidences.

Another inversion of retreat passivity is to react as a clown and attract all the attention. This clown-role usually carries aggressive elements because it annoys the authorities and socialization agents. German teachers frequently accuse Turkish children for disturbing the lesson by clown-playing distracting the attention of other pupils. Curious enough is the explanation for such a behavior in the German literature or by the pedagogues lies only in the too small size of housing of the Turkish migrants²⁵ because they don't want to pay higher rents so that the children have too little space to move, the consequence being the hyperactivity and aggression at school, that means ending up in another blame for the Turkish community.

From the observation of the Jewish community in the USA one more psychological reaction of belonging to a stigmatized group is found in the literature for at least a century: Neuroticism, hypersensitivity, uneasiness and this anxious feeling of being observed by the “others” all the time. They see themselves with the eyes of the majority members: It is as if they look at a mirror and see their image in the mirror.²⁶

Only a few of the outsiders reach that much level of ego development that their personal suffering leads to a general sympathy and solidarity for all victims, suppressed and weak members or groups. The outsiders

25 Eichener, V. Außenseiter und Etablierte; Ausländer auf dem Wohnungsmarkt, In Korte, H. (ed.). Gesellschaftliche Prozesse, Frankfurt, 1990.

26 A- Howe, I. The Stranger and the Victim; The Two Jewish Stereotypes of American Fiction, Commentary 8: 147-156, 1949.

B- Stember, C.H. (ed.). Jews in the Mind of America. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

C- Pettigrew, T.F. Parallel and Distinctive Changes in Anti-Semitic and Anti-Negro Attitudes. In Stember, C.H. et. al. Jews in the Mind of America. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

mistrust the members of the established society; don't feel uneasy about cheating or lying to the established, especially to their authorities.²⁷ In many courses, German public workers complained about the aggressiveness, combative, pugnacious and rebellious behavior of their foreign clients, not realizing that their aggression toward the Germany society is being targeted at the authority representing this collective at the moment. Also the deviant roles in value a covert hostility towards any form of authority exercised by the members of the majority group.²⁸ They reported that to request a Turk to complete a missing document or to come a day after to end the procedure at a public office would cause in many cases a rebellion and anger of the client. It is clear that the Turkish client suspects at that moment that he is again being discriminated and being set back unrightfully as he has experienced many, many times in the society. The cause of overreaction to a blame or criticism by one of the majority member is also the same mechanism.

Another collective reaction to an outsider role is the strengthening of We-Group binding and cohesion, feeling of belonging and the development of a strong group identity²⁹ even between people who would never have felt such mutual solidarity in their countries of origin, for example between the rural people, industrial workers, intellectuals, middle and upper class members, arm and rich. We know that an outside threat makes groups more cohesive.³⁰ But the disintegration of the group is another possibility if the differences within the minority group-religious, cultural, class differences- are unbridgeable so that the

27 Allport, Gordon W., *Die Natur des Vorurteils*: 367. Köln: 1971.

28 Kurokawa, M. *Minority Responses*. New York: Random House, 1970.

29 Diab, L.N. *National Stereotypes and the "Reference Group" Concept*, *Journal of Social Psychology* 57: 339-351, 1962.

30 A- Sherif M. and C.W. Sherif. *Groups in Harmony and Tension*. New York: Harper, 1953.

B- Ewens, W.L. *Reference Other Support, Ethnic Attitudes, and Perceived Influence of Others in the Performance of Overt Acts*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Iowa, Iowa City, 1969.

higher status members choose to be rather assimilated into the dominant culture and group and escape from the stigma of their group by avoiding any contact and similarity to other members. You can indeed detect this disintegrative reaction among many middle- and upper class Turks, who have succeeded to ascend in status and profession: They don't want to be reminded of their ethnic or cultural origin at all. In one of the meetings, I led in Hannover; such status-Turks repeated exactly the prejudices the Germans have against the migrant Turks:

“My god, these Anatolia bears bring with their uncivilized behavior disgrace to all of us.”

“It is clear that the Germans don't want us here as long as the villagers (köylüler) without any culture make the streets here dirty.”

Still another reaction formation to stigmatization is the displacement of aggression: Unable to attack the powerful, the minority members develop prejudices and hate against other minorities. This is the main cause of conflicts and fights between different ethnic minority groups in the USA and elsewhere. The history, also the Turkish history, contains many cases even of annihilation of one minority groups by another.

Kitano³¹ (P.104 ff) describes a special form of assimilation of the stigmatized group as an avoidance strategy against the stigma: He calls it “Superpatriotism and ritualized adjustment”. The individual would strictly obey the social rules, norms and standards of conduct but pay no attention to cultural ideals. He would overidentify himself with the system and imitates the styles of behavior. Symbols of majority group belonging would be exaggeratedly and demonstratively respected, like the newly nationalized migrants in Germany putting a German flag on top of the roof. This type of reaction is like a voiceless cry to the

31 Kitano, H.H.L., Race Relations, 5. Edition, JLN Books, 1996.

established: “See, I am one of you, don’t hurt me any longer.”

How Effective Are Legal Measures Against Discrimination?

Right from the beginning of anti-discrimination law demand conservative jurists in the USA brought the argument against these liberal voices that laws could not change prejudices. This argument is wrong in 2 ways:

1) The experience in England has shown that prejudices against blacks have decreased considerably after the issue of the anti-discrimination law: For example, considerably more white people declared that they would see no problems in having black people as neighbors³² The state as the sole monopolist of physical violence can effectively influence not only the behavior of people but also the way they think. What is socially acceptable or unacceptable is very much related to what is allowed or not allowed by the law.

2) Prejudice is a mental and psychological phenomenon but discrimination is the acting out of these negative feelings and attitudes towards a group of people; it is in the realm of detectable behavior and action taking. The law has the power to inhibit a discriminatory behavior even if members of the majority group would foster negative, hateful feelings against the minority group. Just as we don’t attack someone against whom we feel aggression because physical violence is forbidden according to law, a prejudiced person would control his behavior not to discriminate even if he hates a minority group member. Commission for Racial Equality (CRE), the central institution in Britain’s Anti-Discrimination politics, formulated the fundamental logic of anti-discrimination policy like this: “We are only marginally

32 Commission for Racial Equality (CRE). Sorry , It’s Gone: Testing for Racial Discrimination in Private Rented Housing Sector, London: 1990.

interested in the question whether people are racists. The more important the question is, how they can be hinder to act out their racism.” State and legal norms create the “public conscience” and behavior standards both because of fear of sanctions and through the internalization of external constraints by the citizens. Discriminating laws or laws which permit discrimination because the punishing sanctions are in existent strengthen prejudices for sure. This is one of the reasons why the international agreement CERD (Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination) obliges the member states to protect their citizens against discrimination by other private people by issuing anti-discrimination laws (Art.5)

3) Martin Luther King once said: “I can’t demand that you (whites) like me but that you give me rights.” Discrimination means that the target group is excluded from social, legal and economic resources, rights and advantages. Legal measures to stop this exclusion do have a positive impact which reduces discrimination. Are there any empirical positive results of the existing anti-discrimination law systems of some countries? There are and these empirical results prove the effectiveness of laws, regulations and other state administered measures to stop discrimination.

In the USA the percentage of the black Americans in the number of employed could be increased from 8% to 12% and of the Hispanics from 2% to 6% between 1966 and 1988 due to the measures of positive discrimination (affirmative action)³³). Likewise the positive discrimination for the Catholics in Ireland caused an increase of their position among the employees of the public sector from 27,7% to 35% within a very short period 1981-1989³⁴ experiences have been made

33 Glazer, N. Affirmative Action: 17ff, New York: 1972.

34 Lustgarten, L. Edward, J. Racial in Equality and the Limits of Law. In: Braham, P (ed.) Racism and Antiracism, London, p. 270ff, 1992.

also in Australia (New SouthWales)³⁵

4) The existence of anti-discrimination laws, which means declaring the illegality of discriminatory acts by the state, brings a psychological relief to the injured pride and ego of the members of the target group. It enables them to fight against the racists, to raise their voices and to identify themselves with the state. It is not only for the sake of regaining the impaired self-esteem of the members of the target group but also in order to discourage the discriminators from repeating their discriminatory actions: We know from empirical researches that the opposition and fighting back of the discriminated persons and groups against the discrimination is an effective measure to hinder the discriminator from repeating such acts.

114

5) Summa summarum legal and political measures to protect the stigmatized and discriminated groups against the face-to-face, direct and indirect as well as institutional discrimination is a powerful instrument to canalize their frustration and aggression to productive and socially accepted fighting arena instead of losing their energies in physical violence and reaction formations we have read in the previous section.

35 Rittstieg, H., Rowe G.C. Einwanderung als gesellschaftliche Herausforderung. Baden-Baden: 1992.

References

- Allport, Gordon W., (1971). *Die Natur des Vorurteils*: 367. Köln.
- Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Sozialordnung, ISG-Befragung. *Ausländerfeindlichkeit*, 1990
- Chesler, M.A. (1965). Ethnocentrism and Attitudes toward the Physically Disabled, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 2, 877-881.
- Commission for Racial Equality (CRE). (1990) *Sorry , It's Gone: Testing for Racial Discrimination in Private Rented Housing Sector*, London.
- Cooper, J.B. (1959). Emotion in Prejudice, *Science* 130, 314-318.
- Cooper, J.B. and J.L. Mc Gaugh.(1963). *Integrative Principles of Social Psychology*. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman.
- Cooper, J.B. and D.N. Singer. (1956). The Role of Emotion in Prejudice, *Journal of Social Psychology* 44: 241-247.
- Coopersmith, S.A. (1959). Method of Determining Types of Self-Esteem, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 59, 87-94.
- Corthran, Tilman C. Negro (1951). Conceptions of White People, *American Journal of Sociology* 56, 458-467.
- Crandall, V.J. and U. Bellugi. (1954). Some Relationships of Interpersonal and Intrapersonal Conceptualizations to Personal-Social Adjustment, *Journal of Personality* 23, 224-232.
- DeFleur, M.L. and F.R. Westie. (1959). The Interpretation of Interracial Situations, *Social Forces* 38, 17-23.
- DeFries, G.H. and W.S. Ford. (1969). Verbal Attitudes, Over Acts, and the Influence of Social Constraint in Interracial Behavior, *Social Problems* 16, 493-505.
- Diab, L.N. (1962). National Stereotypes and the "Reference Group" Concept, *Journal of Social Psychology* 57, 339-351.

Dillehay, R.C., W.H. Bruvold, and J.P. Siegel. (1969). Attitude, Object Label and Stimulus Factors in Response to an Attitude Object, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 11, 220-223.

Edlefsen, J.B. (1956). Social Distance Attitudes of Negro College Students, *Phylon* 17, 19-83.

Ehrlich, H.J. (1992a) Stereotyping and Negro-Jewish Stereotypes, *Social Forces* 41, 171-176.

Ehrlich H.J. (1962b) The Swastika Epidemic of 1959-1960: Anti-Semitism and Community Characteristics, *Social Problems* 9, 264-272.

Ehrlich H.J. and N. Van Tubergen. (1969). Social Distance as Behavioral Intentions: A Replication, A Failure, and A New Proposal, *Psychological Reports* 24, 627-634.

Ehrlich H.J. and N. Van Tubergen. (1971). Exploring the Structure and Salience of Stereotypes, *Journal of Social Psychology* 83, 113-127.

Eichener, V. *Außenseiter* und Etablierte; Ausländer auf dem Wohnungsmarkt, In Korte, H. (ed.). (1990). *Gesellschaftliche Prozesse*, Frankfurt.

Elias N. (2006). *The Court Society* edited by Stephen Mennell. Dublin: UCD Press.

Elias N.(2012). *On the Process of Civilization* [note new title], edited by Stephen Mennell, Eric Dunning, Johan Goudsblom and Richard Kilminster. Dublin: UCD Press.

Elias N. and J. Scotson. (2008). *The Established and the Outsiders*, edited by Cas Wouters: 19, 20, 22. Dublin: UCD Press.

Elias N. (2012). *What is Sociology?* Edited by Artur Bogner, Katie Liston and Stephen Mennell. Dublin: UCD Press.

Elias N. (2009). *The Loneliness of the Dying and Humana Conditio*, edited by Alan and Brigitte Scott. Dublin: UCD Press.

Elias N. (2008). *Quest for Excitement: Sport and Leisure in the Civilising Process*, by Norbert Elias and Eric Dunning, edited by Eric

Dunning. Dublin: UCD Press.

Elias N. (2007). *Involvement and Detachment*, edited by Stephen Quilley. Dublin: UCD Press.

Elias N. (2007). *An Essay on Time*, edited by Steven Loyal and Stephen Mennell. Dublin: UCD Press.

Elias N. (2010). *The Society of Individuals*, edited by Robert van Krieken. Dublin: UCD Press.

Elias N. (2013). *Studies on the Germans* [note new title], edited by Stephen Mennell and Eric Dunning. Dublin: UCD Press.

Elias N. (2010). *Mozart, and Other Essays on Courtly Culture*, edited by Eric Baker and Stephen Mennell. Dublin: UCD Press.

Elias N. (2011). *The Symbol Theory*, edited by Richard Kilminster. Dublin: UCD Press.

117

Ewens, W.L. (1969). *Reference Other Support, Ethnic Attitudes, and Perceived Influence of Others in the Performance of Overt Acts*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Iowa, Iowa City.

Fagan, J. and M. O'Neill. (1965) A Comparison of Social-Distance Scores Aong Collage Student Samples, *Journal of Social Psychology* 66, 281-290.

Fendrich J.M. (1967). Perceived Reference Group Support: Racial Attitudes and Overt Behavior, *American Sociological Review* 32, 960-970.

Fey, W.F. (1955). Acceptance by Others and Its Relation to Acceptance of Self and Others: A Revaluation, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 50, 274-276.

Fey, W.F. (1957). Correlates of Certain Subjective Attitudes towards Self and Others, *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 13, 44-49.

Fey, W.F. and Omwake

Fink, H.C. (1971). Fictitious Groups and the Generality of Prejudice:

An Artifact of Scales without Neutral Categories, *Psychological Reports* 29, 359-365.

Fishman, J. (1955). Negative Stereotypes Concerning Americans Among American-Born Children Receiving Various Types of Minority Group Educations, *Genetic Psychology Monographs* 51, 107-182.

Fishman, J. (1961). Some Social and Psychological Determinants of Inter-Group Relations in Changing Neighborhoods: An Introduction to the Bridgeview Study, *Social Forces* 40, 42-51.

Frenkel-Brunswik, E. and R.N. Sanford. (1945). Some Personality Factors in Anti-Semitism, *Journal of Psychology* 20, 271-291.

Gardner, R.C. and D.M. Taylor.(1969). Ethnic Stereotypes: Meaningfulness in Ethnic-Group Labels, *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science* 1, 182-192.

Gergen, K.J.(1967). The Significance of Skin Color in Human Relations, *Daedalus* 96, 390-407.

Gilliland, A.R. and R.A. Blum. (1945). Favorable and Unfavorable Attitudes Toward Certain Enemy and Allied Countries, *Journal of Psychology* 20, 391-399.

Glazer, N. (1972). *Affirmative Action*: 17ff, New York.

Goffman, E. (1986). *Stigma*. New York: Simon & Schuster Inc.

Gordon, M.M. (1964). *Assimilation in American Life*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gordon R. (1962). Stereotype of Imagery and Belief as an Ego Defence, *British Journal of Psychology, Monograph Supplement*, No. 34.

Gough, H.G. (1951). Studies of Social Intolerance: I. Some Psychological and Sociological Correlates of Anti-Semitism, *Journal of Social Psychology* 33, 237-246.

Gross, S.L. and J.E. Hardy (eds.). (1966). *Images of the Negro in American Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Gutman, R. (1966). Demographic Trends and the Decline of Anti-Semitism. In Stember, C.H.(ed.). *Jews in the Mind of America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hanlon, T.E.P. Hofstaetter, and J.O'Connor. (1954). Congruence of Self and Ideal Self in Relation to Personality Adjustment, *Journal of Consulting Psychology* 18, 215-218.
- Harlan, H.H. (1942). Some Factors Affecting Attitude toward jews, *American Sociological Review* 8, 816-827.
- Hartley, E.L. (1946). *Problems in Prejudice*. New York: King's Crown Press.
- Heer, D.M. (1966). Negro-White Marriage in the United States, *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 28, 262-273.
- Hess, R.D. and J.V. Torney. (1967). *The Development of Political Attitudes in Children*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.
- Hettlage-Varjas, (1990) A. Die Entstehung des Fremdenhass in Unserer Gesellschaft, *Wege zum Menschen* : 42, 8.
- Hofstaetter, P.R. (1952). A Factorial Study of Prejudice, *Journal of Personality* 21, 228-239.
- Holloway, R.L. (1968). Human Aggression: The Need for a Species-Specific Framework, In Fried, M., M. Harris, R. Murphy (eds.)s *War: The Anthropology of Armed Conflict and Aggression*. Garden City, N.Y.: National History Press.
- Horowitz E.L. (1936). The Development of Attitude toward the Negro, *Archives of Psychology*, No. 194.
- Horowitz E.L. and R.E.Horowitz. (1938). Development of Social Attitudes in Children, *Sociometry* 1, 301-338.
- Howe, I. (1949). The Stranger and the Victim; The Two Jewish Stereotypes of American Fiction, *Commentary* 8, 147-156.
- Hraba, J. and G. Grant. (1970). Black is Beautiful: A Re-examination of Racial Preference and Identification, *Journal of Personality and Social*

Psychology 16, 398-402.

Hyman, H.H. and associates. (1954). *Interviewing in Social Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hyman, H. (1959). *Political Socialization*. Glencoe, III.: Free Press.

Insko, C.A. and J.E. Robinson. (1967). Belief Similarity Versus Race as Determinants of Reactions to Negroes by Southern White Adolescents: A Further Test of Rokeach's Theory, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 7*, 216-221.

Irwin, M., T. Tripodi, and J. Bieri. (1967). Affective Stimulus Value and Cognitive Complexity, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 5*, 444-449.

Iahoda, G. (1959). Nationality Preferences and National Stereotypes in Ghana Before Independence, *Journal of Social Psychology 50*, 165-174.

Jaros, D., H. Hirsch, and F.J. Fleron. (1968). The Malevolent Leader: Political Socialization in an American Sub-Culture, *American Science Review 62*, 564-575.

Jennings, M.K. and R.G. Niemi.(1968). Family Structure and the Transmission of Political Values, *American Political Science Review 62*, 169-184.

Johnsen, K.P.A (1969). Progress Report on a Study of the Factors Associated wit the Male's Tendency to Negatively Stereotype the Female, *Sociological Focus 2*, 21-35.

Johnson, G.B. (1944). The Stereotype of the American Negro, In Klineberg, O. (ed.). *Characteristics of the American Negro*. New York: Harper.

Jones, E.E. and H.B. Gerard. (1967). *Foundations of Social Psychology*. New York: Wiley.

Jones, M.A.(1960). *American Immigration*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jourard, S.M.(1964). *The Transparent Self*. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand.

Katz, D. and K.W. Braly.(1935). Racial Prejudice and Racial Stereotypes, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 30, 175-193.

Kelly, J.G., J.E. Ferson, and W.H. Holtzman.(1966). The Measurement of Attitudes toward the Negro in the South, *Journal of Social Psychology* 4, 391-399.

Kipnis, D.M. (1961). Changes in Self Concepts in Relation to Perceptions of Others, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 29, 449-465.

Kitano, H.H.L., (1996). *Race Relations*, 5. Edition, JLN Books.

Koch, H.L.(1946). The Social Distance between Certain Racial, Nationality, and Skin Pigmentation Groups in Selected Populations of American School Children, *Journal of Genetic Psychology* 68, 63-95.

Kurokawa, M. (1970). *Minority Responses*. New York: Random House.

Kurtner, B. and C. Wilkins, and P. Yarrow. (1952). Verbal Attitudes and Overt Behavior Involving Racial Prejudice, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 47, 649-652.

Landis, J., D. Datwyler, and D.S. Dorn. (1966). Race and Social Class as Determinants of Social Distance, *Sociology and Social Research* 51, 78-86.

LaPiere, R.T.(1934). Attitudes vs. Actions, *Social Forces* 13, 230-237.

LaPiere,R.T. (1936). Type-rationalizations of Group Antipathy, *Social Forces* 15, 232-237.

Lee, D.E., and H.J. Ehrlich. (1971). Beliefs About Self and Others: A Test of the Dogmatism Theory, *Psychological Reports* 28, 919-922.

Levanway, R.W. (1955). The Effect of Stress on Expressed Attitudes toward Self and Others, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 50, 225-226.

Lustgarten, L. Edward, J. (1992). *Racial in Equality and the Limits of Law*. In: Braham, P (ed.) *Racism and Antiracism*, London, p. 270ff..

Memmi, A. (1987). *Rassismus*, Frankfurt /M.

Novak, D.W. and M.J. Lerner. (1968). Rejection as a Consequence of Perceived Similarity, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 9, 147-152.

Ohnmacht, F.W. and J.J. Muro. (1967). Self-Acceptance: Some Anxiety and Cognitive Style Relationships, *Journal of Psychology* 67, 235-239.

Omwake, K.T. (1954). The Relation between Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others Shown by Three Personality Inventories, *Journal of Consulting Psychology* 18, 443-446.

Pastore, N.A. (1960). Note on Changing toward Liked and Disliked Persons, *Journal of Social Psychology* 52, 173-175.

Pearl, D. (1954). Ethnocentrism and the Self-Concept, *Journal of Social Psychology* 40, 137-147.

Pedersen, D.M. (1969). Evaluation of Self and Others and Some Personality Correlates, *Journal of Psychology* 71, 225-244.

Pettigrew, T.F.(1959). Regional Differences in Anti-Negro Prejudice, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 59, 28-36.

Pettigrew, T.F. (1964). *A Profile of Negro American*. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand.

Pettigrew, T.F. (1966). Parallel and Distinctive Changes in Anti-Semitic and Anti-Negro Attitudes. In Stember, C.H. et. al. *Jews in the Mind of America*. New York: Basic Books.

Philips, E.L. (1951). Attitudes toward Self and Others: A Brief Questionnaire Report, *Journal of Consulting Psychology* 15, 79-81.

Piaget, J. (1947). *The Psychology of Intelligence*. London: Routledge, Kegan Paul.

Pierson, Donald (1950). *Race Prejudice as Revealed in the Study of*

- Racial Situations, *International Social Science Bulletin* 2, 467-478.
- Poole, W.C., Jr. (1927). Social Distance and Personal Distance, *Journal of Applied Sociology* 11, 114-120.
- Rittstieg, H., Rowe G.C. (1992). *Einwanderung als gesellschaftliche Herausforderung*. Baden-Baden.
- Rundquist, E.A. and R.F. Sletto. (1936). *Personality in the Depression*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Saenger, G.H. and E. Gilbert. (1950). Customer Reactions to the Integration of Negro Sales Personnel, *Public Opinion Quarterly* 4, 57-76.
- Saenger G. and S. Flowerman. (1954). Stereotypes and Prejudiced Attitudes, *Human Relations* 7, 217-238.
- Sarbin, T.R. (1964). Role Theoretical Interpretation of Psychological Change, In P. Worchel and D. Bryne (eds.). *Personality Change*. New York: Wiley.
- Schoenfeld, N. (1942). An Experimental Study of Some Problems Relating to Stereotypes, *Archives of Psychology* 38, (Whole No. 270).
- Schwartz, M.A. (1967). *Trends in White Attitudes toward Negroes*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center
- Schuman, H. and J. Harding. (1964). Prejudice and the Norm of Rationality, *Sociometry* 27: 353-371.
- Secord, P.F. (1959). Stereotyping and Favorableness in the Perception of Negro Faces, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 59, 309-314.
- Secord, P.F. and C.W. Backman. (1964). *Social Psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Secord, P.F., W. Bevan, and B. Katz. (1956). The Negro Stereotype and Perceptual Accentuation, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 53, 78-83.

Seeman, M. (1956). Adjustment to Minority Status and Intellectual Perspective, *Social Problems* 3, 142-153.

Sheerer, E.T. (1949). An Analysis of the Relationship between Acceptance of and Respect for Self and Acceptance of the Respect for Others in Ten Counseling Cases, *Journal of Consulting Psychology* 13, 169-175.

Sherif M. (1935). An Experimental Study of Stereotypes, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 29, 371-375.

Sherif M. and C.W. Sherif. (1953). *Groups in Harmony and Tension*. New York: Harper.

Sherif M. et al., (1961). *Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation: The Robber's Cave Experiment*. Norman, Okla. University Book Exchange.

Shuey, A.M., N. King, and B. Griffith. (1953). Stereotyping of Negroes and Whites: An Analysis of Magazine Pictures, *Public Opinion Quarterly* 17, 281-287.

Simpson, G.E. and J.M. Yinger. (1965). *Racial and Cultural Minorities*. New York: Harper and Row.

Simpson, R.L. (1959). Negro-Jewish Prejudice: Authoritarianism and Some Social Variables as Correlates, *Social Problems* 7, 138-146.

Singer, D. (1967). The Influence of Intelligence and an Interracial Classroom on Social Attitudes, In Dentler, R.B. Mackler, and M.E. Warschauer (eds.). *The Urban R's: Race Relations as the Problem in Urban Education*. New York: Praeger.

Sklare, M. and M. Vosk. (1957). *The Riverton Study. How Jews Look at Themselves and Their Neighbors*. New York: The American Jewish Committee.

Stember, C.H. (ed.). (1966). *Jews in the Mind of America*. New York: Basic Books.

Stock, D. (1949). An Investigation into the Interrelations between the Self-Concept and Feelings Directed toward Other Persons and Groups,

Journal of Consulting Psychology 13, 176-180.

Suinn, R.M. (1961). The Relationship Between Self-acceptance and Acceptance of Others: A Learning Theory Analysis, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 63, 7-42.

Suinn, R.M. and H. Hill. (1964). Influence of Anxiety on the Relationship between Self-acceptance and Acceptance of Others, *Journal of Consulting Psychology* 28, 116-119.

Tajfel, H., A.A. Sheikh, and R.C. Gardner. (1964). Content of Stereotypes and the Inference of Similarity between Members of Stereotyped Groups, *Acta Psychologica* 22, 191-201.

Thompson, E.P., (1980). *The Making of the English Working Class*. Victor Gollancz Ltd.

Triandis, H.C. (1964). Exploratory Factor Analyses of the Behavioral Component of Social Attitudes, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 68, 420-430.

Triandis, H.C. (1967). Toward an Analysis of the Components of Interpersonal Attitudes, In Sherif, C.W. and M. Sherif (eds.) *Attitude, Ego-Involvement, and Change*. New York; Wiley.