STRUCTURALIST AND INTERACTIONIST PERSPECTIVES OF

COLLECTIVE BEHAVIOR AND CONTROL OF CROWDS

Ismail Dincer Gunes, B.A.

Thesis Prepared for the Degree of

MASTERS OF SCIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

August 2001

APPROVED:

Eric J. Fritsch, Major Professor and
    Chair
Gail Caputo, Committee Member
Robert W. Taylor, Committee Member and
    Chair of the Department of Criminal
    Justice
David W. Hartman, Dean of the School of
    Community Service
C. Neal Tate, Dean of the Robert B.
    Toulouse School of Graduate Studies

Gunes, Ismail Dincer, <u>Structuralist and interactionist perspectives of collective behavior and control of crowds.</u> Master of Science (Criminal Justice), August 2001, 110 pp., references, 55 titles.

The purpose of this thesis is to understand the concept of collective behavior from different theoretical perspectives and the policy implications they imply for the Turkish Riot Police Units. The civil disturbances in the 1960s have clearly illustrated range of problems in the domain of crowd control. This work will start with the general characteristics and the classification of collective behavior. Second, two main perspectives on collective behavior, which are the structuralist and the interactionist perspectives, will be examined respectively. The question will be asked whether these two perspectives efficiently and effectively explain the crowds and the crowd control. Finally, the other factors in crowd control will be explored, and recommendations concerning the handling of crowds in a more peaceful manner will be made.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The field of collective behavior requires a broad

knowledge of the interpersonal relations that exist within

a given structured group of people. In order to propose new

initiatives leading to both policy and action implications,

one must have a comprehensive understanding of these

phenomena. The characterization and explanation of crowds

and collective behavior has become a leading area within

sociology. Police work both applies and practices

sociological and criminological theories. As a result, each

law enforcement officer should be aware of surrounding

social problems. Therefore, for the purposes of this study,

it is assumed that any police work that lacks a strong

theoretical basis will very likely be unsuccessful. Riot

police units, in particular, should understand the

formation and kinds of collective behavior they will face

in order to appropriately handle such situations.

Consequently, the research purpose of this study can be

stated as: to understand the concept of collective behavior

from different theoretical perspectives and the policy

implications they specifically imply for Riot Police Units

of the Turkish National Police Organization.

In its broadest sense, collective behavior refers to

any activities that are engaged in by sizable, but loosely

organized groups of people. Episodes of collective behavior

tend to be quite spontaneous, resulting from a shared

experience that engenders a sense of common interest and

identity among members of the group. The informal nature of

the group's structure provides the main source of the

frequent unpredictability of collective behavior.

Collective behavior may be defined as those forms of social

behavior in which usual conventions cease to guide social

action and people collectively transcend, bypass or subvert

established institutional patterns and structures (Turner

and Killian, 1987). As Wellner and Quarentelli (1973)

suggest, collective behavior can be characterized by

concerted group activity when previous norms and/or social

relationships fail to meet immediate needs.

Collective behavior is commonly seen by sociologists

as a normal accompaniment and medium for social change that

is relatively absent in periods of social stability. With

the more or less continuous shifts of values that occur in

any society, emerging values are first given group

expression in collective behavior. Efforts to revitalize declining values also bring forth collective behavior. Thus, the constant readjustments in the power of different population segments are both implemented and resisted through collective behavior. Because it is a means of communication, and because it is always characterized by novel or intensified control over individuals, collective behavior is also able to bypass blockages in communication and to install an emergent order when formal or informal regulation of behavior is inadequate.

The activities of people in crowds, riots, fads, fashions, crazes, and followings, as well as more organized phenomena — such as reform and revolutionary social movements — all fall under the umbrella of collective behavior. Because it emphasizes groups, the study of collective behavior is different from the study of individual behavior, although inquiries into the motivations and attitudes of the individuals in these groupings are often carried out. Collective behavior resembles organized group behavior in that it consists of people acting together. However, it is more spontaneous than is behavior in groups that have well-established rules

and traditions specifying their purposes, membership, leadership, and methods of operation. Consequently, collective behavior is more volatile and less predictable than organized group behavior. Because collective behavior is mainly dramatic, unpredictable, and frightening, the early theories and many contemporary popular views are more evaluative than analytic.

Turner and Killian (1987), define collective behavior as "the spontaneous development of norms and organization which contradict or reinterpret the norms and organization of society". Somewhat similar is Smelser's definition: "mobilization on the basis of a belief which redefines social action" (as cited in Curtis and Aguirre, 1993). This distinctive belief, which is a generalized conception of events and of the members' relationships to them, supplies the basis for the development of a distinctive and stable organization within the collectivity.

First and foremost, collective behaviors are social phenomena that challenge the existing order. Collective behavior is constantly being formed and reformed in a kind of social unrest similar to social disorganization. Unfortunately, social unrest can lead to outbursts of violence. For example, the American urban black uprisings

4

of the 1960s were preceded and accompanied by social unrest in the form of a rise in tensions in black communities throughout the country, while the Russian Revolution was preceded by several years of constant unrest and turmoil, involving random assassinations, strikes, and riots. Social unrest is also marked by contagiousness, and is perhaps the most volatile of collective states. Although social unrest may eventually die down without any serious aftermath, it is a condition in which people can become easily aroused.

Methodology

Collective behavior is still not an area in which generalizations can be presented in a precise form with the backing of experimental or quantitative evidence (Turner and Killian, 1987). An adequate approach to collective behavior must analyze how perceptions, ideas, and feelings get translated into action. Further, no individual or social behavior, which takes place outside an experimental laboratory vacuum, can be construed as anything other than emergent. In the worlds that most of us are familiar with and in which we act alone or together, the physical and social environments are constantly changing. This requires that human beings, in turn, must continually modify,

reformulate and adjust our actions in order to achieve the individual and collective purposes that we pursue within that changing environment.

For more than a century the study of crowds was limited by the methodological stereotype that "systematic research can't be done" (McPhail, 1994). It is very difficult to study entire gatherings in and of themselves. To do so well requires a conceptual scheme that directs observers' attention toward what the investigator considers important to observe and record, sampling procedure for placing multiple observers in randomly selected locations within the gathering, a technology for systematically observing and recording the same points in time at the different places in the gathering, and a procedure for collating and analyzing what is recorded (McPhail, 1994).

During the 1970s, a theoretical shift occurred in social movement and collective behavior scholarship. The focus shifted away from grievances, relative deprivation, and interactional processes, and towards organizational, structural and political factors. Dramatic changes in research methodologies were also associated with this shift. Since the early 1960s, research designs became far more diverse, supplanting earlier methodological hegemony

of survey designs. Researchers have increasingly utilized units of analysis other than individuals, and have employed mobilizing and political opportunity structures as key independent variables.

Researchers have sought out gatherings as opportunities to observe and record people acting collectively. This has yielded a body of knowledge about some recurring forms of collective action in such gatherings. Important strides have been made in the development and exploitation of a variety of systematic procedures for generating and analyzing empirical records of the phenomena. Wide ranges of methodologies have been used to answer different questions about the various forms of collective action that make up temporary gatherings including interviews, questionnaires, observations, experiments, archival records, and computer simulations (McPhail, 1994).

No single method of investigation can answer all of the questions that have been asked about collective behavior. Information about collective behavior has been obtained through the analysis of historical material, survey research, simple and participant observation, and experiments. In this study of collective behavior, the data

comes from an analysis of historical material contained in archival records. The study of collective behavior has already been described as an "armchair philosophy" because of the limitations and difficulties in collecting data. Collective behavior fails on several counts as a methodological tool for framing or directing empirical research. Because of such shortcomings, simple or participant observation has been frequently used as a research tool.

In this particular study of collective behavior, varying sources of information have been gathered to understand the entire conceptual picture of collective behavior. How does it start in a group? How does it develop? How does it spread out? How does it die away? And finally, what are its results? To cover all of these questions related to collective behavior a thorough literature search was done.

While library research played a very crucial role in supplying the necessary sources for this study, the Internet was also used to gather updated information. In order to be familiar with the field of collective behavior, at the very beginning of this work, library catalogs and the electronic resources, such as social sciences

abstracts, sociofile / sociological abstracts, and criminal justice abstracts located in the school library have been searched for books and articles, which have appeared in journals and magazines. This search was utilized to find articles on collective behavior or to locate specific articles. These sources are not limited to books and articles focusing on study of collective behavior; Police and governmental reports are other basic sources. The course notes that I have taken at the Department of Sociology at the Middle East Technical University, Turkey, are especially used in the third and fourth chapters of this study.

In order to reduce potential validity issues, the general outline of this study was derived from the required and the suggested readings of 3 different sociology courses taught at the Department of Sociology, University of North Texas. Basically these courses are about the realm of collective behavior and its related areas such as, social disorganization and social movements. These courses are ranged from undergraduate courses to graduate courses for master's students and PhD students. The required texts in these courses are examined thoroughly. Moreover the curriculums of some other courses that are taught in

different universities throughout the United States have also been examined. The aim of such an examination was to provide consistency within the general frame of this study.

Given that this study is done by one researcher the subjectivity and reliability problems, questioning the inter consistency of a study or a research, will not be an issue to consider.

In chapter two, the general characteristics and the types of collective behavior will be examined under 3 sub-categories: 1) Collective Obsession or Mass Behavior, 2) Crowd Behavior, and 3) Social Movements. In addition to this classification, the continuum of conflict in society from a structuralist perspective, specifically conflict theory, will be studied in the last part of this chapter.

In the third and the fourth chapters, the structuralist perspective and the interactionist perspective of collective behavior, will be explored, respectively. In each of these two chapters, 3 basic figures representing those perspectives will be studied. The works of Karl Marx, Antonio Gramsci, and Michel Foucault are reviewed in the third chapter. The works of Gustave LeBon, Robert E. Park, and Herbert G. Blumer are included to the fourth chapter. At the end of the fourth

chapter, the interactionist perspective will be compared to structuralist perspective in terms of their rhetoric and level of analysis.

In the fifth chapter, the question will be asked whether these two main perspectives efficiently and effectively explain collective behavior. Further, what implications do these perspectives offer for crowd control policy? In this chapter, three major events that have taken place in Turkey in recent years will be examined. Finally, the results of collective behavior and the other factors, which might be effective in crowd control, will be explored, and recommendations concerning the handling of crowds in a more peaceful manner will be made.

CHAPTER 2

FORMS OF COLLECTIVE BEHAVIOR

In this chapter of the study, forms of collective behavior will be explored. They will be compared with each other on the basis of the participation of the people in collective behavior and their effects on society. Finally, the continuum of conflict in society will be studied from the collective behavior approach.

We spend most of our lives in small groups or large formal organizations. We can also become part of collectivities, which are large numbers of people who interact briefly and superficially in the absence of clearly defined norms. Collective behavior, which represents a vast area of personal and group actions, can best be examined under 3 sub categories: 1) Collective Obsession or Mass Behavior, 2) Crowd Behavior, and 3) Social Movements.

Collective Obsessions or Mass Behavior

The various kinds of collective obsession fads, hysterias, and the like, have three main features in common:

1. The most conspicuous sign is a remarkable increase in the frequency and intensity with which people engage in a specific kind of behavior or assert a belief.

2. The behavior or the abandon with which it is indulged is ridiculous, irrational, or evil in the eyes of persons who are not themselves caught up in the obsession. In the case of recreational fads, such as skateboarding, nonfaddists are amazed at the tendency to drop all other activities in order to concentrate on the fad.

3. After it has reached a peak, the behavior drops off abruptly and is followed by a counter obsession. To engage in the fad behavior after the fad is over is to be subjected to ridicule. For example, after a speculative land boom declines, there is a mad rush to sell property at whatever price it brings.

13

The following discussion covers five types of collective obsession: rumors, fads and fashions, mass hysteria or hysterical contagion, crazes, and panic.

Rumors

Collective behavior may also involve beliefs that are simply resulting from unverified information. Rumors are unverified information that is transmitted informally, usually originating with an unknown source (Appelbaum and Chambliss, 1997, p. 426). While rumor sometimes overlaps with gossip, the real distinction between these concepts is the environment in which they take place. Gossip is defined relative to a small preexisting social network, whereas rumors are more public and inclusive, and their transmission paths are less restrictive (Marx and McAdam, 1994). Rumors are the opposite of fashion because they are unconfirmed items or media reports that spread by word of mouth and cannot be verified. They arise during periods of change or in the absence of trustworthy information. TV, radio, and the Internet are common sources of rumors.

Through experimentation, researchers have tried to figure out how rumors are disseminated and how they might change as they were told and retold. In their study of

rumors, Allport and Postman (1965) conducted an experiment in which a white student is asked to study a photograph with one man menacing another. The student described the picture to another who passed the information on to a third, and so forth. At some point, the information being passed along begins to reflect the commonly held beliefs of the students. As the information was spread, the message came to reflect a picture of a black man was menacing a white man, while in fact the opposite was true.

Allport and Postman (1965) offered the generalization that rumor intensity is highest when both the interest in an event and its ambiguity are great. At least two conditions must be added to interest and ambiguity as prerequisites for rumor. First, rumor abounds when a group of people share the need to act but are reluctant to do so until the situation can be better defined. Second, rumor abounds only when the situation requires that in some essential respect the members of the group act in concert rather than individually.

Rumors are associated with collective behavior as a precipitating event. For example, The Kerner Commission, which investigated civil disorders in the 1960s, found that in a majority of the cases studied rumors played a role

15

(National Advisory, 1968). The Kerner Commission, headed by the then Illinois Governor Otto Kerner, was appointed by President Johnson in 1967 to examine the reasons of the major riots of the 1960s.

Fads and Fashions

In academic and popular discussions, fads and fashions are often treated together. They help fill in large culturally blank areas that haven't explained with other forms of collective obsessions. Fads and fashions occur within nearly every sphere of social life in modern society, most obviously in the areas of clothing and personal adornment. The line separating fads and fashion is hardly clear, as both terms are frequently applied to aspects of change in the physical presentation of the self and to areas not involving large economic investments (Marx and McAdam, 1994).

Fads and fashion can occur together and should be understood as expressive rather than instrumental forms of collective behavior. Because they are noninstrumental actions they show a high degree of emotional involvement. Fads and fashions differ as well: fads are more spontaneous and tend to not follow the cycles that fashions do.

Fads are temporary, highly imitated outbreaks of
mildly unconventional behavior. In contrast a fashion is a
somewhat long-lasting style of imitative behavior or
appearance (Appelbaum and Chambliss, 1997). A fashion
reflects a tension between people's desires to be different
and their desire to conform. Its very success undermines
its attractiveness, so the eventual fate of all fashions is
to become unfashionable. While fads can include "the grunge
look," wearing Levis with holes in the knees, or cramming
people into a phone booth fads are purer examples of
emergent behavior. Fads also more frequently involve crowds
and face-to-face interaction, whereas fashion usually
involves what Turner and Killian (1987) call a 'diffuse
collectivity,' in which widely dispersed individuals
respond in a similar way to a common object of attention.

The origins of fads and fashion seem to have become
more egalitarian in the 20th century. Lower-status and
outsider groups are now as likely, or even more likely, to
contribute to a fad as those of higher-status. It is
generally believed that strain increases collective
behavior participation. Smelser's *Theory of Collective
Behavior* illustrates this approach, by treating fads as
part of the broader phenomenon of "crazes". These, as well

as other forms of collective behavior, are seen as a response to a social order that is not adequately working (Curtis and Aguirre, 1993).

It is tempting to explain fads on the basis of a single motive such as prestige. Prestige is gained by being among the first and most adept at a skill that everyone else covets. That the skill fails as a source of prestige when it is no longer scarce is an important explanation for the abrupt end of a fad. But motives are complex and varied; the exhilaration of joining a band of devotees in an intense preoccupation and the joy of mastering the novel are not to be discounted. An examination of fads in such enterprises as scientific research and recreation sheds light on the fundamental dynamics of all kinds of fads (Aguirre, Quarentelli and Mendoza, 1988).

First, the scientific fad begins with a new idea or a rediscovered idea, though not just any new idea will set off a fad. The new idea must be a 'key invention,' one that opens up the possibility for a wide range of minor innovations. Discovery of a potent new drug, for example, is followed by a rush to test the drug in all kinds of situations. Similarly, recreation and style faddists do not merely copy a pattern; they try out a variety of novel uses

and variations on the basic pattern. The Hula-Hoop was an ideal fad because each child could develop his own particular variation in spinning the hoop.

Second, the termination of fads is largely explained by the exhaustion of innovative possibilities. The drug has been tested in all of the apparently relevant settings; children have run out of new ways to twirl the Hula-Hoop.

Third, the faddish preoccupation means holding in abeyance many routine activities as well as awareness of drawbacks to the fads. So long as the fad is in full force, a sharp ingroup – outgroup sense insulates faddists against these concerns. However, once the faddists run out of new variations they begin to be aware of the extent of their neglect of other activities and to consider possible dangers in the fad.

Fashion is much like fads and other collective obsessions, except that it is institutionalized and regularized, becoming continuous rather than sporadic, and partially predictable (Miller, 1985). Whereas fads often emerge from the lower echelons of society, and thus constitute a potential challenge to the class structure of society, fashion generally flows from the higher levels to the lower levels, providing a continuous verification of

class differences. Continuous change is essential if the higher classes are to maintain their distinctiveness after copies of their clothing styles appear at lower levels. Thus, fads and fashions contribute to both social integration and social differentiation. With fashions tending to change cyclically within limits set by the stable culture. For fads and fashions, established groups usually serve as the settings and conduits through which the behavior passes.

Mass Hysteria or Hysterical Contagion

Mass hysterias are capricious, unpredictable, and contagious (Miller, 1985, p. 98). Blumer (1971), describes mass hysteria as an instance of widespread and relatively rapid, unwitting, and nonrational dissemination of a mood, impulse, or mood form of conduct that disrupts social routines and authority patterns. It is an emotional reaction to perceived threat. Mass hysteria can take almost any form, including widespread physical symptoms of nausea, dizziness, trembling, and fainting, as well as widespread excitement. Occasionally, waves of fear find expression in a rash of false perceptions and symptoms of physical illness.

In 1967, girls in an English school fainted in great
numbers, succumbing to hysterical dizziness, fainting,
headaches, and vomiting; in 1994 women in Mattoon,
Illinois, reported being anesthetized and assaulted by a
mysterious prowler. The best-documented case is that of a
clothing factory that had to be closed down and fumigated
because of reports of toxic insect bites; reports that
could not subsequently be substantiated. Sociologist
Kerckhoff and Psychologist Back (1968) found that the
crisis came after a period during which the women employees
had performed unusual amounts of overtime work. The women
who became ill from the mysterious insect bites had
generally worked more overtime than others and had serious
family responsibilities that they could not fulfill because
of job demands. Afraid to refuse overtime work lest their
job prospects be damaged, yet increasingly upset over
neglect of family responsibilities, they found themselves
in a conflict from which they could not extricate
themselves. Illness from an insect bite provided an excuse
to leave work for a day or two. The epidemic continued for
about 11 days. It began immediately after a large shipment
of foreign cloth had arrived, rendering plausible the
assumption that some strange new insect had been introduced

21

to the plant. The first women 'bitten' were social
isolates, lacking normal social defenses and controls. A
rapid spread then took place among women who belonged to
intimate cliques, in accord with the theory that social
diffusion occurs most readily along well-established lines
of social interaction. In the final stage, the illness
spread to others, irrespective of friendship ties or
isolation.

Mass hysteria also is observed within deviant groups
in society. In this kind of episode, socially disapproved
feelings are given vent following an initial incident.
Beginning with persons who have been holding back a
specific feeling for some time, the epidemic builds up
until persons with other types of suppressed feelings join
in. As the epidemic recedes, these secondary participants
drop out first.

Mass hysteria theoreticians generally state that
circular reaction is both the cause and the mechanism
through which mass hysteria is transmitted. Mass hysteria
studies have offered two general explanations for hysteria
(Miller, 1985, p. 109). The first explanation states that
mass hysteria results from social strain. According to this
view, mass hysteria is a "safety valve" that allows people

to discharge in a relatively harmless way. A second explanation is that people having certain inferior socioeconomic attributes are more prone to involvement in mass hysteria than others. In discussions of mass hysteria, researchers consistently claim that young people, women, and those having little formal education are more likely than others to become involved in mass hysteria.

Crazes

For Smelser (as cited in Curtis and Aguirre, 1993), panics and crazes are shaped by hysterical beliefs, which greatly restrict people's normal concerns to those of individual flight and escape (panic), or unrealistic wish fulfillment (craze). A craze is an intense attraction to an object, person, or activity (Appelbaum and Chambliss, 1997, p. 426). Craze is a long-lasting exciting behavior. Crazes are also defined by the presence of an optimistic belief that promises a positive outcome from a situation that may be ambiguous or otherwise frustrating, harmful, or destructive (Miller, 1985, p. 31).

A craze is not analytically separate from "fad" and "fashion", but it does carry somewhat different connotations. Frequently, it refers to a collective focus

23

on important figures in the entertainment or sports world.
In many instances, crazes suffer the same fate as fads:
they die abruptly. In some cases, however, figures such as
Frank Sinatra and the Beatles outlast the craze and endure
as public figures.

<div align="center">Panic</div>

A panic is a massive flight from something that is
feared (Appelbaum and Chambliss, 1997, p. 426). In a panic,
there is a collective flight based on a hysterical belief
or fear. Panics occur when crowds believe they must
immediately escape a perceived danger, and panics are quite
common.

Panics are defined by the presence of a pessimistic
'hysterical belief,' which converts an ambiguous situation
into a generalized threat (Marx and McAdam, 1994). The word
panic is often applied to a strictly individual,
maladaptive reaction of flight, immobility, or
disorganization stemming from intense fear. For example, a
student "panics" during an examination and is unable to
call upon his knowledge in answering questions, or a
disaster victim in a situation of mild danger panics and
flees into much greater danger. Individual panic frequently

<div align="center">24</div>

occurs as a unique individual response without triggering a similar reaction in others.

Panic as collective behavior, however, is shared behavior. It is defined as a process of collective definition by which a group comes to view a situation as highly threatening (Miller, 1985, p. 109). For example, when an entire military unit breaks into disorderly flight, a group pattern of orderly behavior is replaced by a group pattern of panic.

Collective panic has a number of distinguishing features, four of which are noted by Lofland (Rosenberg and Turner, 1981). First, several persons in social contact with one another simultaneously exhibit intense fear and either flee (or demonstrate disorganization leading toward flight) or remain immobile. Second, each individual's fear and his evaluation of the danger are augmented by the signals he receives from others. Third, flight is indicated as the only conceivable course of action by the signals each is receiving from others. Fourth, the usual rules according to which individuals adjust their behavior so as not to work at cross-purposes are nullified. In the more dramatic instances of collective panic, people trample one another in vain efforts to reach safety.

Crowd Behavior

A thin line separates crowd activities from collective
obsessions. Crowds are temporary groupings of people in
close proximity who share a common focus or interest. Like
other forms of collective behavior, crowds are not totally
lacking in structure. Crowds are also defined as a large
group of people in close proximity participating in an
unplanned activity (Berk, 1974). In crowd behavior, people
are in close enough proximity to interact and influence one
another's behavior. The sociologist asks questions related
primarily to the interaction among the individuals who
makes up a crowd.

According to Marx and McAdam (1994:72), the crowd is,
first, more concentrated in time and space. Thus, a race
riot or a lynching is limited to a few days or hours and
occurs chiefly within an area ranging from a city square or
a stadium to a section of a metropolitan area. Second, a
concern of the majority of the crowd, although many
participants do not always share the concern, is a
collaborative goal rather than parallel individual goals.
The 'June bug obsession' cited earlier, in which dozens of
women went home from work because of imaginary insect
bites, could have turned into a crowd action if the women

had banded together to demand a change in working conditions or to conduct a ceremony to exorcise the evil. Third, because the goal is collaborative, there is more division of labor and cooperative activity in a crowd than in collective obsessions. Finally, a major concern of a crowd is that some improvement or social change is expected as a result of its activity: labor rioters expect management to be more compliant after the riot, while participants in a massive religious revival expect life in the community to be somehow better as a result.

The crucial step in developing crowd behavior is the formation of a common mood directed toward a recognized object of attention. In a typical riot situation, a routine police arrest or a fistfight between individuals from opposing groups focuses attention. Milling and rumor then establish a mood of indignation and hostility toward an identified enemy or enemies. As the mood and object become established, either an active crowd or an expressive crowd is formed. The active crowd is usually aggressive, such as a violent mob, although occasionally it acts to propel members into heroic accomplishments. In contrast the expressive crowd has also been called the dancing crowd due

to its manifestations of dancing, singing, and other forms
of emotional expression.

Active Crowds

The active crowd identifies an object or group of
objects outside itself and proceeds to act directly upon it
or them (Gurney and Tierney, 1982). It will permit no delay
or interference, no discussion of the desirability of
acting, and no dissent from its course of action. Because
of the high pitch of crowd interaction, subtle and indirect
courses of action cannot win crowd support, though members
are highly receptive to all proposals and examples for
action in keeping with the mood and the object. The stage
of transformation from shared mood to shared action
constitutes the beginning of the true crowd or mob.

The crucial feature of this stage is overcoming such
barriers to behavior as the destruction of property or
violence toward persons, actions against which most people
have strongly ingrained inhibitions. According to
Quarantelli and Hundley (as cited in Evans, 1975), there
are at least four aspects of the way crowd members feel
about the situation that make this possible. First, there
is a sense of an exceptional situation in which a special

moral code applies; the crowd merely carries further the justification for a special code of ethics incorporated in the slogan 'You have to fight fire with fire!' Second, there is a sense of power in the crowd, with its apparent determination and uniform will, that overcomes the individual's doubts concerning his own ability to successfully carry out a momentous task. Third, there is a sense of impunity, of safety from personal injury and punishment so long as the individual is on the side of the crowd. And, finally, there is a sense of inevitability that the crowd aim will be accomplished regardless of the doubts and opposition of individuals.

An active crowd normally ends with a tapering-off period, which is sometimes preceded by a stage of siege. Riot is a good example for an active crowd. A riot is a prolonged outbreak of violent behavior by a large group of people that is directed against people and property. Riots are spontaneous, but are motivated by a conscious set of concerns. During a riot conventional norms are suspended and replaced by other norms developed by the group (Appelbaum and Chambliss, 1997). In riots of limited scale in which no massive police or military forces are used, the peak day is followed by a few more days of successively

smaller numbers of widely scattered encounters. Often the last incidents are in areas not previously hit by rioting. There seems to be some internal mechanism limiting the duration of crowd behavior, though whether it is fatigue, catharsis, or reassertion of ingrained standards of behavior is uncertain (Marx and McAdam, 1994). In serious riots, however, the police and other armed forces are brought into action long before the riot declines on its own. When police power is applied with only enough force to ensure a standoff between rioters and authorities, there is a period, usually ranging from one to three or four days, of siege. The mood of buoyancy gives way to a mood of dogged persistence. Rioters are more cautious and deliberate in what they do. The desire to have the riot over grows among the participants and in the community, but there is reluctance to give up the fight until concessions have been won.

Expressive Crowds

Not all crowds act. In some crowds, the participants are largely preoccupied with themselves or with one another and with participation in a common experience (Miller, 1985). Crowds that exceed conventional limits of revelry

have been common in many historical eras. For example, in San Francisco in 1945, license for public violation of sexual mores characterized the day of celebration at the end of the war with Japan.

Expressive crowds may be secular or religious. What distinguishes them is that the production of a shared subjective experience is the crowd's measure of its accomplishment, rather than any action upon objects outside the crowd. One interpretation is that the same determinants of social unrest and frustration may give rise to both the expressive crowd and the active crowd, but the expressive crowd fails to identify an object toward which to act. As a result members must release accumulated tension through motions and gestures expressing emotion (Gurney and Tierney, 1982). According to this view, an expressive crowd can fairly quickly metamorphose into an active crowd if an object becomes apparent to them. Another interpretation sees the expressive crowd as equally equipped with an object, but with an object that must be acted upon symbolically rather than directly. Thus, one crowd engages in a wild dance to exorcise evil spirits, whereas another seeks to destroy buildings associated with the establishment that it blames for many ills.

The expressive crowd may best serve those types of frustrations requiring revitalization of the individual and group rather than direct modification of external circumstances. Expressive crowds may be especially frequent in periods of frustration and boredom over the predictability and routinization of life, from the lack of a sense of meaning and importance in the daily round of life, and from a sense of interpersonal isolation in spite of the physical closeness of others.

Social Movements

In its broadest terms, social movements are the situations of disagreement, where people reject some of the dictates and operation of dominant culture (Marx and McAdam, 1994, p. 118). A social movement is also defined as a large number of people who come together in a continuing and organized effort to bring about (or resist) social change. They rely at least partially on non-institutionalized forms of political action (Appelbaum and Chambliss, 1997).

Generally, theories of social movement have drawn on the conflict theories to argue that beliefs polarize symmetrically in a situation of conflict (Mueller and

Dimieri, 1982). In Marxian theory of basic struggle within society, for example, the conflict between proletariat and capitalist is traced to the exploitative character of the capitalist system. In addition, Ritzer (2000) articulates that Habermas talks about not only conflict within a society, but also the colonization of those parts, which in turn escalates the tension as a reaction to the existing system. According to conflict perspective, social movements tend to question both accepted relations of power and the ideological underpinnings of those relations and provide weapons for powerless.

Similar to but different from collective behaviors, social movements are organized, goal-directed efforts by a large number of people to promote or resist change outside of established institutions. They are relatively enduring and typically have an organizational base, leadership, and ideology. They are major agents of social change because they are non-institutional challenges to the mainstream.

Perspectives on Social Movements

According to relative deprivation theory, social movements appear when people feel deprived relative to others or the way life was in the past, and develop when

33

people perceive a gap between the reality of their
situation and what they think it should be (Appelbaum and
Chambliss, 1997). They often occur when conditions are
improving. The resource mobilization perspective assumes
that discontent is always present, and what begins a social
movement is the presence and mobilization of resources such
as leadership or money. The strategies and tactics used by
leaders to mobilize resources are key. Another factor is
frame alignment, where the values, beliefs, and goals of
potential recruits are made congruent and complementary to
the movement's values and beliefs. They should be
considered part of the political process because they seek
to affect public policy. According to resource mobilization
perspective, the capacities of social movements are to
attract resources, mobilize people, and build crucial
alliances. The resource mobilization perspective, moreover,
assumes that there will almost always be sufficient strain
that produce social movements (Marx and McAdam, 1994, p.
315).

Social Movement Organizations

Depending on their goals, social movements can be
organized into four types of movements.

1. Reform Movements

   Reform movements are the most common and seek to
reform existing institutions. They are the attempts to
improve society by changing some aspect of the social
structure. For example, the extension of health benefits to
members of a gay/lesbian movement in Chicago in 1997, and
Disability Rights Movement.

2. Utopian Movements

   Utopian movements seek to establish perfect societies.
For example, rebellions seek to overthrow the existing
social, political, and economic system. However, rebellions
lack a detailed plan for a new social order.

3. Revolutionary Movements

   Revolutionary movements have both utopian visions and
specific plans for governing a society once they have
assumed power. Revolutionary movements seek to alter
fundamentally the existing social, political, and economic
system in keeping with a vision of a new social order
(Appelbaum and Chambliss, 1997). These organizations work
outside the system to bring change. American colonists,
Malcolm X and Nation of Islam, and Ku Klux Klan are among
these movements.

4. <u>Resistance Movements</u>

Resistance, reactionary or counter-movements seek to reverse or resist change and to restore an earlier social system along with the traditional norms and values that once presumably accompanied it (Appelbaum and Chambliss, 1997). Counter-movements or Backlash movements, and the New Christian Right that oppose feminism, homosexual rights, and abortion are among reactionary movements. The term reaction is used because often these movements rise as a reaction to some kind of unwelcome social change, and this type of movement opposes social change. Resistance movements, as in the example of Women's Christian Temperance Union that is designed to get people to stop drinking alcohol, also seek limited change in some aspect of people's behavior.

The Life Course of Social Movements

Social movements are hard to begin because they are often met with fierce resistance. Often the beginning requires a charismatic leader to articulate the vision of the movement. The movement must deal with the free-rider problem, where many people who would benefit from the movement let others do the work. Also social networks are

needed, and bloc mobilization, or sharing resources with other movements, is used. Factors that seem to promote a movement's success are having large and organized groups, historical conditions in favor of the movement, the use of strategic violence, and a focus on a single issue.

Many social movements have brought significant changes to world's social order, particularly to American society, including the civil rights and feminist movements. Advanced countries have become more tolerant of movements and legitimate protest is seen as proper.

Collective Behavior and the Continuum of Conflict

Human life is in a constant state of conflict. Indeed it is impossible to have a human social organization without conflict. There are several basic human needs that are especially pertinent to conflict. Some of these can be classified as the needs for recognition, development (and self-actualization), security, identity, bonding, and finally holding power. Even in the most peaceful community, the social organization is maintained because the controlling group can force people to join the organization and force members to obey the organization's rules. The amount of force is subject to limitation, but the ability

to coerce is real. The amount and the level of conflict varies, but conflict is normative.

To understand and clarify this range of conflict in a given society, it is better to concentrate on the spectrum of conflict. This spectrum ranges from low-intensity conflict to full-scale war. This scale probably more correctly reflects the human condition than the belief that we can either be at war or at peace. It also helps us to differentiate the realms of the police and the army.

Because human beings live in a perpetual state of conflict and conflict management, civil coercive power has a place in the spectrum of conflict. Even before conflict rises to the police's level, civil authorities routinely face challenges that must be met by implied or direct force. At the lowest level of the organization, informal norms and mores enforce compliance, and, if they fail, stronger coercive force is applied, such as civil or criminal law. Regardless of the type of enforcement, social groups always have the potential to exhibit coercive force to enforce behavior. At the most basic governmental level, the state faces low-level challenges with ordinary crime; this threat increases to group violence and then to riots and wider disorders.

Conflict is a natural and very typical phenomenon in every type of human relationship and at every level, from interpersonal (the realm of psychology) to global. Conflicts at every level have common significant characteristics and dynamics, and, therefore, it makes sense to examine them both together and comparatively. The study of collective behavior began during the last half of the 19th century. The ideas that developed between the end of 19th century and the beginning of 20th century dominated and shaped sociological thought about collective behavior and social movements. Another important time period for the development of this thought is the 1960s, as there were thousands of demonstrations and hundreds of riots during this decade.

Two tremendous forces of social change were unleashed during the 19th century: the first was the industrial revolution, and the second was the rise of popular democracy. By the end of that century, those two revolutions had swept away the old order of Europe. They changed the character and rhythm of social life and produced a new model of intellectual activity.

Scientists have tried to understand and explain the causes and effects of these revolutions. The concept of

collective behavior was introduced in this period by a number of prominent individuals. From this point on, some important figures and their major works in collective behavior will be studied. Their theoretical approaches, as well as their contributions to collective behavior will be examined.

CHAPTER 3

THE STRUCTURALIST PERSPECTIVE

Introduction

Wellmer suggests that "critical theory could be based on an idea of reason which comprises the image of a harmonious unity of the collective life process" (as cited in Bernstein, 1985, p. 46). It is this observation in the work of Marx which shows how, in the instance of this particular theory, society is studied as a 'collective.' Marx saw these collective societies as divided into social groups, or classes. He looked at the differing relations between these classes (namely the proletariat and the bourgeoisie) and realized that there was a class division between the two because of the means of production (Haralambos, 1996, p. 13). Conflict existed because the ruling class and the working classes were not equal and this was the result of a capitalist society. The conflict theory argues that inequality is system-produced and calls for ideological justification at all times since "the reality of inequality is arbitrarily focused on capital interest" (Kellehear, 1990, p. 61).

One of the universal structural characteristics of human societies is the regulation of violence. The use of violence is a potentially disruptive force everywhere; at the same time, it is a means of coercion and coordination of activities. The structure, or order, of the society, generally regarded as harmonious and conducive to the general well being, has also been seen as conflict-ridden and repressive.

According to the structuralist perspective, especially in theories of class and power, certain norms in a society may be established, not because of any general consensus about their moral value, but because they are forced upon the population by those who have both the interest and the power to do so. Moreover, in structural functionalism, social change is regarded as the adaptive response to tension within the social system. When some part of an integrated social system changes, a tension between this and other parts of the system is created, which will be resolved by the adaptive change of the other parts, and collective behavior is accepted as a compressed way of attacking problems created by the strain (Weller and Quarantelli, 1973).

In this chapter, structuralism will be explored. Major figures of this perspective including Karl Marx, Antonio Gramsci and Michel Foucault, as well as their contributions to structuralist discourse and their works will be identified. At the end a general discussion on these three figures and the structuralist perspective will be made.

Karl Marx (1818 – 1883)

Marx was a German socialist who, with Friedrich Engels, formulated the principles of dialectical materialism, or economic determinism. Marx used Hegel's concept of the dialectic to explain history as a series of antitheses and syntheses, but, whereas the Hegelian dialectic describes the conflict of ideas leading to the development of reason and freedom, the Marxian dialectic operates in terms of economic forces (Wilde, 1991). Marx maintained that economic structure is the basis of history and determines all the social, political, and intellectual aspects of life. The evils of capitalist society cannot be abolished by reform, therefore only the destruction of the whole capitalist economy and establishment resulting in a new, classless society (Marx and Engels, 1967). Because of his revolutionary activities, Marx spent most of his life

outside Germany, and his major work, Das Kapital, was written in London, where he also organized the First International, an association of European socialists, in 1864. His ideas had great influence on Nikolay Lenin and the development of Russian communism.

The basic premise of Marxism is that our perception of the material world is conditioned by the society we live in. History is a process of the continuous creation, satisfaction, and recreation of human needs (Noble, 2000). Fundamentally, the history of the world's societies has been a history of the struggle for wealth and private property, and labor is the force of that struggle (White, 1998). As human beings struggle with their environment in an attempt to satisfy their needs, they are limited by the conditions of the societies in which they work: technology, ideology, divisions of labor, and so forth. Therefore, human history is determined by the relationships of labor to ownership, and the successive stages in the development of history are "just so many different forms of ownership" (Marx and Engels, 1970)

All types of societies, however, are determined by the social regulation of labor. In other words, the economic structure of society determines the legal and political

superstructure as well as the dominant social consciousness of the society, the laws, and the dominant class. The prevailing ideology is the ideology of the ruling class (Kershaw, 1992). That is, the prevailing ideology is the ideology of the ruling class, who are the owners of the means of production. For Marx, the means of production include tools, machines, land, and the technology needed to utilize them for productive purposes.

In a capitalistic system, the bourgeoisie, those who own the means of production, control the economic and political structures of "their" society; the power to shape society lies in the hands of the owners, and they maintain their position through a dominating ideology (Graham, 1992). The interests of the capitalist are preeminent and tend to be in conflict with the interests of those who comprise the remainder of society. The institution of private property is indispensable to any capitalist ideology.

The proletariat (and the nonworkers) makes up the remainder of society, and they suffer from the domination of the capitalist owners (Gramsci, 1973). But until they become a self-conscious group and overcome the factors of alienation and false consciousness brought about by the

45

manipulative techniques of the bourgeoisie, they cannot challenge and overcome the power and ideology of the capitalists (McMurty, 1978).

Alienation is the workers' state of being "other," resulting from domination by those whose power comes from the workers; the workers, hence, are opposed by forces of their own creation that confront them as alien forces. In capitalist societies, work is a means to an end (the end being the wealth of the owners). According to Marx, work should be the end, related to the interests of the workers (Marx, 1964). Alienation in work is fourfold: The workers are alienated from (1) the products of their labors, (2) the forces of production, (3) themselves, and (4) the community (Cooper, 1991). Extending Karl Marx's theory of modern man's alienation from his work, many contemporary students attribute faddism, crowds, movements of the spirit, and interest-group and revolutionary movements to a wide-ranging alienation from family, community, and country, as well as from work (Kershaw, 1992).

When the laboring class, the proletariat, emerges as a class conscious of its status and of the causes of its oppression, it undertakes a struggle for control with the bourgeoisie (Boswell and Dixon, 1993). When the bourgeoisie

is overcome, through violent revolution if necessary, a new society emerges, one that is classless and in which private property is abolished.

To understand Marx's conception of social change, one has to understand the concepts, which were derived by Marx from Hegel, of dialectical materialism. Hegel wrote of dialectical process, opposing forces producing through conflict a resolution or synthesis: Through the conflict of opposites, thesis and antithesis, a new order or synthesis emerges. In the case of opposing social forces, Marx pointed out, a new social order emerges rooted in material conditions (Ollman, 1976).

Before the classless society resulting from the abolition of private property and involving the common ownership of the means of production can be attained, Marx argued, the proletariat has to destroy all remnants of bourgeois society (White, 1998). A dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary to ensure the orderly removal of the vestiges of bourgeois power. The duration of that dictatorship varies according to the conditions in the society being transformed (Ollman, 1976). Once the state has succeeded in achieving a classless society, it withers away, since it is no longer needed.

Major works of Karl Marx are: The Communist Manifesto (with Engels: Manifest der Kommunisten, 1848), A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy (1859), and Capital (Das Kapital, 3 vols.: 1867, 1885, 1894)

Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937)

Gramsci was a co-founder of the Italian Communist party, one of the leaders of the 1920 "Ordine Nuovo" Turin factory occupation movement, and the author of the Prison Notebooks. He was a revolutionary journalist, mass working class organizer and one of the great communist intellectual theorists of the 20th century. His Marxism was unorthodox, controversial and still not fully understood today. His prison notes were an in-depth study of Italian culture and history for the purpose of understanding and defeating Italian fascism and launching an Italian proletarian cultural revolution. His thinking about fascism, Marxism and Cultural Revolution was full of insights that are still relevant to struggles today as groups try to defeat a resurgent fascistic culture and build a totally new socialist world culture.

Gramsci occupies a central part at the ideological thoughts of new revolutionaries in the US and Europe today.

In addition Gramsci has influenced the thinking of many 3rd world revolutionaries in Latin America, as well as new left activists in China, Russia and Eastern Europe looking for new, non-oppressive models of revolutionary struggle. According to Bruhn 's discussion of the diffusion of Gramscian ideas in Latin America, by the mid-1970s, "the ideas of Gramsci 'explode with the force of a volcano'" (1999). In Mexico specifically, "Gramsci's great concepts and preoccupations (civil society, political society, hegemony, historic bloc . . . etc.) were becoming indispensable references in the study of the Mexican nation and its history." Indeed, two major colloquia on the relevance of Gramsci took place in Mexico in 1978 and 1980 (Bruhn 1999). It is commonly believed that Gramsci's ideas are one of a number of bodies of new thinking that can synthesize the need to create a new revolutionary theory for the 21st century.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, through understanding Gramsci it is also highly possible to fully understand Fascism. How and why it was born in Italy, spread like a plague throughout Europe in the 1920s and 1930s, and is now a permanent and central feature of the capitalist world culture. Unlike most other Marxist and

democratic opponents of fascism, Gramsci wrote about

fascism from inside a prison cell, as a historical and

cultural eyewitness.

Marx and Lenin taught that power flows from control of

the *means of production* and the *State*. Gramsci argued that,

in addition to control of the economy and the State, in a

modern Capitalist society, control of the culture was

essential to seize and hold power. The historic defeat of

socialism and the reemergence of mass right wing secular

and religious movements on a world-wide scale parallels

Gramsci's and the Italian working class's defeat by fascism

in the 1920s.Gramsci strongly believed that fascism could

only be defeated and a new socialist culture built in Italy

by ordinary working people winning intellectual and moral

independence for themselves.

As he was a follower of the Marxist ideology, Gramsci

places a great emphasis on the concept of power, and

discusses the ways to hold that power. The most important

concept that Gramsci set forth is the idea of hegemony.

Gramsci defined "the State" as "coercion + hegemony"

(Gramsci, 1973, p. 51). According to Gramsci, hegemony is

political power that flows from intellectual and moral

leadership, authority or consensus as distinguished from

armed force. A ruling class forms and maintains its

hegemony in civil society. Hegemony is exercised by a

ruling class over allied classes and social groups.

According to Gramsci, force is used by the ruling class

only to dominate or liquidate hostile classes.

Historically, middle class intellectuals have been the

"administrators" of hegemony under capitalism. As this

theme taken up by Laclau and Mouffe, "the Gramscian theory

of hegemony . . . accepts social complexity as the very

condition of political struggle" (1985, p. 71).

According to Gramsci, to hold power a ruling class

must achieve hegemony over society, meaning its political,

intellectual and moral authority or leadership must be

predominant. Gramsci argued that a new ruling class takes

and holds state power by establishing hegemony over allied

classes and by using force or coercion against antagonistic

ones. In several Prison Notes the State is defined as

"Hegemony + dictatorship" or "State= political society+

civil society, (in other words hegemony protected by the

armor of coercion)". Again elsewhere in the Notes he says:

" by State should be understood not only apparatus of

government, but also the 'private' apparatus of 'hegemony'

or civil society" (Gramsci, 1973, p. 51).

To Gramsci hegemony means rule by consent, rule by moral and intellectual authority or leadership. Gramsci argued that schools are the key institution of the hegemonic apparatus, but the term is also used to mean "private initiatives and activities", and private associations such as trade unions and political parties. Gramsci attributes the development of the concept of hegemony to Lenin.

Gramsci gives an important role in the war of position to the intellectual, whose "social function is to serve as a transmitter of ideas within civil society and between government and civil society" (Adamson, 1980, p. 143). Undermining the dominant hegemony requires people "specialized in the conceptual and philosophical elaboration of ideas" (Adamson, 1980, p. 145). The Gramscian intellectual, however, "acts only to enter into a dialectic with the democratic organization of the masses . . . founded on political and intellectual self-activity," rather than any "external formula" (Adamson 1980, p. 41).

As Adamson notes, "In Gramsci's view, only parties . . . were of sufficient scale and complexity to be the central 'private' institutions for the formation and expression of consent within the new state" (1980, p. 167). Parties

played a critical role not only in organizing the military

side of the revolution but in preventing the masses from

losing direction; the revolutionary party was the "new

Prince" who "must organize a collective will bent on

realizing hegemony over the whole of society, thus creating

a new state" (Gramsci, 1973, p. 51).

Michel Foucault (1926-1984)

Michel Foucault was a French philosopher, who

attempted to show that the basic ideas which people

normally take to be permanent truths about human nature and

society change in the course of history. Foucault is

renowned for his studies that reveal the sometimes morally

disturbing power relations inherent in social structure. He

was also regarded as a representative of the structuralist

theoretical current, which became an intellectual fashion

in the 1960s in France. In his structuralist perspective,

Foucault offered new concepts that challenged people's

assumptions about some basic structures within the society,

such as the prisons and the police.

The main influence on Foucault's thought was German

philosopher Frederick Nietzsche. Nietzsche maintained that

human behavior is motivated by a will to power and that

traditional values had lost their power over society. Foucault's thought explored the shifting patterns of power within a society and the ways in which power relates to the self. He investigated the changing rules governing the kind of claims that could be taken seriously as true or false at different times in history.

Foucault, in his writings, sought to show that Western society had developed a new kind of power he called bio-power: that is, a new system of control those traditional concepts of authority are unable to understand and criticize. Rather than being repressive, this new power enhances life. Foucault encouraged people to resist the welfare state by developing individual ethics in which one turns one's life into something that others can respect and admire.

Modern governance, as a use of power that is rationally based, rests upon the idea that certain behaviors can be expected and met. Fulfillment of those expectations may be obtained through a variety of techniques, which reside, among other places, within the thoughts of the person who governs and each subject of governance. The contention that these techniques, as tools

of power, reside and operate within the human mind has been proffered by a handful of political and social theorists.

Among the scholars interested in power Michel Foucault, explored Max Weber's conceptions of "techniques" with a similar level of concern. Foucault's work showed how it was possible to establish a mentality, which allowed for governing in general and in particular (Anderson, 1998). Michel Foucault offer critiques of milder forms of power that complement each other.

Foucault was also interested in modern forms of power. His interests came from his lifelong work studying the history of systems of thought. Specifically, as an "inheritor" of Weber's approach, Foucault became interested in the peculiar rationality that developed in the West which came to form a "governmentality" - users of the mentality learned to employ "apparatuses," "mechanisms," "networks" and "techniques" for governing (Gordon, 1991, pp. 5-6).

From Weber, Michel Foucault worked to explore how 'techniques' became more than just carefully prescribed types of action. 'Techniques' were also crucial for establishing a broader understanding, which allowed for governing because governing itself became "thinkable" and

"practicable" once the 'techniques' were known. Foucault

called the combination of the "thinkable" and

"practicable," in his own inimitable way, a "govern-

mentality" (Foucault, 1991). And a 'governmentality' was

suggested as a means to expand the scope of governmental

action. It was, in Foucault's thinking, more than just

governing.

When modern efforts to organize were first instituted,

the principal problem was making people behave (Foucault,

1988, pp. 76-77). Assuring behavior meant disciplinary

tools were needed to control people's actions. When the

first forms of modern governments emerged in their early

bureaucratic forms, there is some reason to believe

improved administration also meant greater control over the

behavior of the nobility, burghers, military and peasants.

At least the early Prussian reforms of their privy councils

by Frederick William I, appear to show that controlling

behavior was sought and found in the formation of public

administration there (Dorwart, 1953). As internalized

'techniques' for insuring behavior among workers in

organizations came to the fore, coercion faded (Pollard,

1965). One may speculate as to the reasons for the change

but Michel Foucault contended it was simply because coercion doesn't work.

> The characteristic feature of power is that some
> men can more or less entirely determine other
> men's conduct - but never exhaustively or
> coercively. A man who is chained up and beaten is
> subject to force being exerted over him. Not
> power. But if he can be induced to speak, when
> his ultimate recourse could have been to hold his
> tongue, preferring death, then he has been caused
> to behave in a certain way. His freedom is
> subjected to power....There is no power without
> potential refusal or revolt. (Foucault, 1988, pp.
> 83-84)

Any use of force that courts refusal or revolt, is less likely to be successful. A 'technique' that disciplines and closes the possibility for refusal or revolt must therefore be a superior form of power. Hence, once a person came to believe he should obey organizational dictates he was subject to a greater form of a more encompassing and mild form of power. Once disciplined, habit could take the place of discipline. "Men attend to the interests of the public, first by necessity, afterwards by choice; what was intentional becomes an instinct, and by dint of working for the good of one's fellow citizens, the habit and the taste for serving them are at length acquired" (De Tocqueville, 1981, p. 584). These social manners, having become customary, are in place and assure a

certain kind of control which needs minimal attention from either the elected official, the manager/administrator, or the subjects of the power (citizens or office workers in public and private organizations). Firmly rooted social manners mean that organized behavior by people in public organizations may be partially assured. The human relations side of organizational theory even suggests that mild treatment of persons will further assure their cooperation (Anderson, 1998).

In sum, to assess the success of a specific modern technique of governing, one may scrutinize whether its particular form of governmentality and habit formation have worked. Applying the understanding within a broader framework, as suggested by organizational theorists, would be most appropriate (Forrester and Adams, 1993). Furthermore, understanding the origins of policies and the conflicts, promises and hopes inherent in the founding struggles is also necessary if one is to predict how reforms will be treated.

Conclusion

Studying structuralist perspective in order to understand the formation of large scaled groups is a

crucial point. Especially the figures discussed in this chapter generally talk about the state and governmentality. They all conceive of state as coercive in nature. For instance, Marx basically saw the state as a means for the exploitation of lower-class by the capitalist bourgeoisie. Gramsci, on the other hand, discusses how the ruling class exercises their power on the ruled. The term he utilized to refer to this concept was the hegemony. He discussed how the ruled can overcome the ruling hegemonic class. Finally, Foucault talked about the power relations in a state and the techniques of governance.

This perspective clarifies how people gather and move against the state and the symbol of the states coercive apparatus such like the police and the military. Once an individual holds a similar perspective on government and involves in a demonstration or a protest movement, the goal obviously become to act violent and to create social unrest to gain the ultimate goal, which is to change the system. Law enforcement agencies have little to do with the people involved in these movements, because these people accept these power figures as an enemy to be defeated.

CHAPTER 4

THE INTERACTIONIST PERSPECTIVE

Introduction

The interactionist perspective of collective behavior, it can be argued, finds its origins with Le Bon, who we know acknowledged the position of an individual within a group. However it was Herbert G. Blumer who worked at the University of Chicago which lead to what is now termed as the 'Chicago school of interactionism,' as opposed to the classical tradition (Manis and Meltzer, 1975: 123). When we examine the works of LeBon, Park and Blumer we can see that they commonly talk about the stereotypes of spontaneity, irrationality, suggestibility, and loss of self-control in crowds.

As it is stated by McPhail (1994), the characterization and explanation of crowds and collective behavior that was spawned by Gustave LeBon (1895), conveyed to the U.S. by Robert Park (1904; 1930), then formalized and perpetuated by Herbert Blumer (1939) dominated scholarly thinking regarding social control actions toward crowds for much of this century

Interactionism is individual in its theory, accommodating the micro approach rather than the more common macro that previously existed in sociological research. Haralambos (1996), notes that in this respect, human interaction is a continuous process of interpretation, with each taking the role of the other.

This chapter will examine the characteristics of interactionism and determine what sets it apart from other theories. Major theorists of this perspective including Gustave Le Bon, Robert E. Park and Herbert G. Blumer, and their works will be identified. Finally, the concept of interactionism will be compared to the structural perspectives in terms of level of the analysis.

Gustave LeBon (1841 – 1931)

Gustave Le Bon was a French scientist, philosopher, who is accepted as the father of collective behavior. In the late 1880s, France became the site of one of the first major showings of the force of the crowd, a revolutionary movement with the power to topple governments. He was one of the eyewitnesses to bloody week in Paris in 1871, which was defined as the first modern revolution by Karl Marx. Parisians revolt against the government. This time it was

different from the 1793s revolution against oppressive hereditary monarch, and then the target was the elected government of the National Assembly. Not long after, Gustave LeBon published his seminal study on social psychology and 'The Crowd' as generally known was then born. Gustave Le Bon identified the crowd and revolutionary movements with the excesses of the French Revolution. For LeBon, the key to understand the origins and the consequences of the great revolutions was their emotional component.

For LeBon these events were more than a national tragedy, they also demanded an explanation. The ideas LeBon set forth came to constitute the social contagion perspective within the field of collective behavior. Contagion Theory, developed by Gustave Le Bon stresses the imitative nature of collective behavior arising out of emotional contagion. For example, initially peaceful demonstrations can turn into rock-throwing melees if some participants become angry, and fearful.

LeBon's most influential book was The Crowd, published in1896. LeBon (1960), states that all crowds exert a profound and inherently negative influence on people. He describes this influence as contagious mental unity that

emerges whenever people interact in a group. Furthermore, this interaction reduces the mental capacity of enlightened and cultured people to the level of inferiors.

LeBon's crowd is, obviously, amoral. He places great emphasis on the destructive effects of crowds. The contagious mental unity in the crowd overcomes the individual's rational capabilities. For Le Bon, people acted destructively, under the influence of instincts, which are ordinarily inhibited (Turner and Killian, 1987). Although LeBon quite definite in his descriptions of the effects of contagious mental unity, he is quite vague when explaining how this mental unity emerged in crowds.

Robert Ezra Park (1864 – 1944)

Robert Ezra Park was born in 1864 and grew up as the son of a wealthy businessman. After his graduation from the local high school, Park went to the University of Minnesota. After one year there, he transferred to the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, and became a member of a student group who discussed the social issues of the day. Having been immersed in a progressive atmosphere at the University of Michigan, Park decided upon graduation in 1887 not to go into his father's business but to seek a

career in which he could give expression to his reforming concerns (Coser, 1977). From 1887 to 1898 Park worked for daily newspapers in different cities, where he covered the urban scene.

He went to Harvard to study philosophy in 1898. There, Park studied psychology with Muensterberg and philosophy with Royce and James. After earning his M.A. in 1899, he went to Germany for further studies. He first went to the University of Berlin where he listened to Georg Simmel and was deeply influenced by him. Then, Park went to Strasbourg and later to Heidelberg to study with the neo-Kantian philosopher. He wrote his Ph.D. thesis, entitled *Masse und Publikum*, under Windelband. Returning to Harvard in 1903, he put the finishing touches on his dissertation and served for a year as an assistant in philosophy.

The underlying assumption in Park's theoretical system bears the distinctive historical imprint that marked the worlds not only of Dewey and James, but of other interactionists, including Charles Horton Cooley, George Herbert Mead, and W. I. Thomas among others (Perdue, 1986). Park and Burgess defined sociology as "the science of collective behavior" in their classical textbook, *An Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (McPhail, 1991, p.

6). Park, who coined the term collective behavior, defined it as "the behavior of individuals under the influence of an impulse that is common and collective, an impulse, in other words, that is the result of social interaction" (Coser, 1977, p. 358). He emphasized that participants in crowds, fads, or other forms of collective behavior share an attitude or behave alike, not because of an established rule or the force of authority, and not because as individuals they have the same attitudes, but because of a distinctive group process. Park, without denying the place of individual motivation in any complete explanation for collective behavior, has more often stressed a distinctive quality or intensity in social interaction. Park's characterizations of crowd behavior seem to reflect a pathological approach, it is clear that he did not regard collective behavior as abnormal or undesirable (Turner and Killian, 1987). Park, associates collective behavior with "circular reaction," a type of interaction in which each person reacts by repeating the action or mirroring the sentiment of another person, thereby intensifying the action or sentiment in the originator.

For Park, a relatively stable social order is one in which mechanisms of social control have for the time being

succeeded in containing antagonistic forces in such a way that an accommodation has been reached between them. But while accommodation may be reached temporarily between specific groups and individuals, there is, according to Park, every reason to believe that an overall accommodation, at least in modern society, can never be permanent because new groups and individuals are likely to arise and claim their share of scarce values, thus questioning the scheme of things that has arisen from previous accommodations (Coser, 1977, p. 359).

Herbert George Blumer (1900 – 1987)

Herbert G. Blumer was born in 1900 and grew up in St. Louis, Missouri. He received his B.A. and M.A. from the University of Missouri and was an instructor there from 1922 to 1925. In 1927, he received his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago with his writing, *Method in Social Psychology*. He worked as a faculty member from 1925 to 1975. In 1983, the American Sociological Association honored Blumer with its award for a Career of Distinguished Scholarship. Blumer died on April 13, 1987.

Herbert Blumer was a Sociologist who dealt with much of George H. Mead's work in social psychology. Blumer

determined a desire for social change in collective

behavior, as expressed in his definition: "a collective

enterprise to establish a new order of life." This

definition, however, excludes many of the temporary escapes

from conventional life through revelry and orgies, punitive

actions such as lynchings, and panics, which are not

oriented to any kind of reconstruction of social life or

society. Most students of collective behavior, however,

would not restrict the field so severely. For Blumer

(1971), a typical sociological approach presumes that a

social problem exists as an objective condition or

arrangement in the texture of a society.

However, like Park, Blumer did not regard collective

behavior as pathological, destructive behavior (Turner and

Killian, 1987). Blumer adds a subtlety to Park's circular

reaction theory by sharply distinguishing the circular

reaction from "interpretative interaction," in which the

individual first interprets another's action and then makes

a response that is usually different from the stimulus

action (Griffin, 1997). Blumer's views follow three basic

principles. First, human beings act towards things on the

basis of the meaning that the things have for them.

Second, these meanings are the product of social

interaction within human society. Finally, these meanings

are modified and handled through an interpretive process

that is used by each individual in interpreting the symbols

they encounter (Meltzer, 1975, pp. 61-62).

Conclusion

In this section, interactionism will be contrasted to

structuralism in terms of their rhetoric and level of

analysis. The most notable comparison is the focus on the

individual in society (micro) used by interactionists and

the importance of society upon the individual (macro) for

the structuralist theories.

In concluding, this chapter has identified

interactionism in its evolution of ideas, displaying its

emphasis on the individual in society. The focus on the

concept of the individual within groups, and the

interaction with the others, are evidence of a contrasting

approach to sociology when compared to the structuralist

conflict theory. The conflict theory explains the effect

of capitalism on the division of labor within the class

structure. Finally, the comparison between the micro-

sociological and macro-sociological perspectives is

distinct, indicating that both approaches are required to

form an understanding of society, as this is the true goal
of sociology.

Interactionists view symbols — things to which we
attach meaning — as the basis of social life.
Interactionists are interested in the symbols that people
use to define their worlds, how people look at things, and
how that affects their behavior. Through the use of symbols
people are able to define their relationships to others,
coordinate actions with others, and develop a sense of
themselves. On the other hand, according to structuralists,
conflict theorists in particular, society is viewed as
composed of groups competing for scarce resources. Karl
Marx focused on struggles between the bourgeoisie, the
small group of capitalists who own the means of production,
and the proletariat, the masses of workers exploited by the
capitalists. Conflict theorists look at social institutions
as the primary means by which the elite maintains its
privileged position. Contemporary conflict theorists, such
as Foucault, have expanded this perspective to include
conflict in all relations of power and authority.

To understand human behavior, it is necessary to grasp
both the social structure (macrosociology) and the social

69

interaction (microsociology). Both are necessary for us to understand social life fully because each in its own way adds to our knowledge of the human experience. Macro and Micro, the perspectives mentioned above differ in their level of analysis. Macro-sociology focuses on large-scale features of social structure, providing macro-level analysis because they examine the large-scale patterns of society. It investigates large-scale social forces and the effects they have on entire societies and the groups within them. It is often the approach utilized by functionalist and conflict theorists. In contrast, interactionists carry out micro-level analysis because they focus on the small-scale patterns of social life. Micro-sociology places the emphasis on social interaction, or what people do when they come together. Symbolic interactionism is an example.

The last two chapters focused on two different perspectives, which are structuralism and interactionism respectively. In this part, before starting the conclusion chapter, it would be better to compare these two perspectives in very broad terms. This section of the study will principally differentiate between the impact that individuals have on change from that associated with evolving institutional structures. Although the influence

of the individual is acknowledged by the interactionist perspective, if to express the social change in general, social change is more concerned with the influence of larger structures rather than the individuals, which is mainly covered in structuralism. When change occurs in structures, like the global economy, the lives of individuals are greatly altered. The changing economy transforms the character of social relations between people. Huge social structures anchored in history ultimately dictate the character of day-to-day social relations.

The actions of individuals, however, don't have that much impact on society. Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, Napoleon, Jesus, Lenin, Gandhi, Nelson Mandela, and Martin Luther King are individuals that have had a great impact on society. Although individuals have an impact on society, we tend to exaggerate what an individual can do. The actions of individuals happen within power structures, culture, and institutions inherited from the past. These exiting conditions make it difficult for an individual to change society substantially.

In sum, while interactionist perspective tends to focus on interpersonal relations that basically occurs in

rumors, fads and fashions, and crazes, these phenomena explains an individual action rather than a collective one. However, such individual actions sometimes play an important role in the formation of collective actions. On the other hand, structuralist perspective gives a better explanation at collective behavior more than the interactionist perspective. The interactionist perspective has excellent explanations about the collective obsessions, such as rumors, fads, crazes and panics. However, when one approaches these phenomena from a policing perspective, it can easily be noticed that police have little to do with them. The structuralist perspective, in contrast, more effectively explains the crowd behavior and the social movements, which requires not only individual interactions, — like rumors — or entertainment events — like fashions and crazes —, but large-scale activities — like riots, demonstrations, and protests — that police are more likely to encounter. Consequently, the study of structuralist perspective could give police a better understanding of the collectivities that they deal with.

CHAPTER 5

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

The control of crowds and public demonstrations has quickly emerged as one of the most delicate and difficult aspects of police activities since the 1960s. The ambiguity in the definition of crowd control makes it vulnerable to criticism. Especially in Turkey, the lack of a complete code of actions within a specific act results in tremendous uncertainty in its operational definitions. Although, the vast majority of police work is defined under two acts — the Police Organization Act of 1937 (act no 3201) and the Police Duties and Powers Act of 1934 (act no 2156) — there are many other regulations also related to police work.

In crowd control situations, police frequently find themselves in a difficult position that requires them to protect the constitutional rights of the demonstrators as well as the non-demonstrators. This is a critical point where police must guard against the ill treatment of all involved. Police have the vital and challenging job of protecting public safety. Performing this job effectively should not require sacrificing civil liberties. Hence, all

police forces need to respect the rights of individuals while enforcing the law.

The last chapter of this study will focus on the policy implications of the theories on collective behavior. In this part, the question will be asked whether these two main perspectives — structuralist and interactionist perspectives efficiently and effectively explain — crowds and the crowd control, especially in Turkey. Three major events — the Gazi Disturbance in Istanbul, the Sivas turmoil, and the student protests against the Higher Education Council — that have taken place in recent years will be examined as examples of large-scale collective actions. These incidents are included in this study as they were based on class struggle or religious factions that the Turkish police have to deal with. These events will also serve as additional evidence that the structuralist perspective is more applicable to police work than the interactionist perspective. Use of lethal and less-than-lethal force in crowd control situations, training considerations of Riot Police Units in Turkey will be discussed respectively. Trojanowicz's slot machine model on riots will be explored and applied to the examples of

collective actions in Turkey. Furthermore, the results of collective behavior and the other factors, which might be effective in crowd control will be explored and recommendations concerning the handling of crowds in a more peaceful manner will be made. Finally, an overall conclusion will be made focusing on the whole study and probable future studies.

The Gazi District Disturbances, Istanbul

Incidents that have occurred in Turkey in recent years clearly illustrate a range of problems and shortcomings, which have characterized some police operations, especially in the domain of crowd control. In Turkey, the Turkish National Police is the only law enforcement agency to handle riots, protests and demonstrations in the city centers. To accomplish this task, separate units have been launched in all the cities throughout Turkey. These special riot police units are made of full-time police officers whose duty is just to handle urban disturbances and collective actions. The number of the personnel in these units goes up to 5,000 officers in Istanbul, which indicates the importance of such issues in Turkey. The

75

major cities, like Izmir, Ankara, Bursa, Adana, and the alike have similar separate and large-scaled departments.

As a result of immigration from central Anatolian cities to Istanbul in the late 1980s, new and unplanned ghettos began to appear all over Istanbul. The Gazi district is such a ghetto located on the Anatolian side of Istanbul. It is one of the main districts populated by the Alevi population, which is a faction of Islam. This district was also a main place where leftist groups were very active. The Gazi district is economically undeveloped and not very well planned. These factors combined with a poor neighborhood creating an aggressive atmosphere towards the local and the national authorities. The police also had some contradictions with the district people before the 1995 disturbance.

The 1995 Gazi district disturbance in Istanbul holds a unique position among other incidents. On March 12, 1995 a taxi was stolen in Istanbul by two people who are still unknown today. These two individuals in the car fired with a machine gun into 5 coffee houses in the Gazi district and killed 2 people. After this event the Alevi population complained that the police were responsible for not being pro-active to the incident leading to a protest the police.

The next morning, Riot Police Units deployed to the
district and intervened with the protestors. That was the
moment when the whole situation turned into an
uncontrollable urban riot. Police units encountered
difficulties in dispersing the crowd and removing
overturned torched cars and barricades put in place by
demonstrators. The high tension between the police and
religiously motivated minorities living in the Gazi
district of Istanbul resulted in two days of riots and huge
property losses ending only with the intervention of
military forces. Eighteen people were also killed in
clashes between the police and the demonstrators. The Gazi
disturbance flashed Turkish society's thoughts back to the
civil disturbances of the 1970s, which were similar to the
ones that swept through the whole of Europe during the same
decade, and the civil disturbances of the 1960s in US. For
years to come, politicians and sociologists will be trying
to find out why this happened. What were the deep roots
that ignited this tragedy, this upheaval? There will be
many questions and many answers. Furthermore, there was not
really only one direct, immediate cause that was the flash
point of this incident.

The laws of Turkey protect the rights of the individual, and thus all policing is supposed to be by mutual consent, not suppression or dictatorship. The tranquility within city boundaries is supposed to be provided by police forces and, under normal conditions, military intervention is not approved by either the public or politicians. Although the military is not supposed to be directly involved in policing issues, a very strongly organized and politicized military force, which has always been respected and accepted as the most powerful apparatus of the Turkish Republic, frequently intervenes in general policing policy or even individual incidents. The military, as a result of long standing Turkish governmental tradition, has an overwhelming intervention capability for riot situations, but it usually exercises this capacity in major internal security operations, such as the troubles in the Southeastern Anatolia Region, where the PKK, a leftist separatist terrorist group, plays a very important role against the unity of the Turkish Republic.

Although the Gazi disturbance ended peacefully, it is obvious that the credibility of the police forces in dealing with the mass movements decreased. Likewise, the Sivas case in 1993, and 1999's student protests against the

higher education council in several cities were also

significant events that police had difficulties handling.

The main distinction between these two demonstrations is a

crucial aspect. While, there were thirty-seven casualties

in 1993s Sivas turmoil, the 1999s student protests against

the higher education council were proportionally peaceful,

with no casualties or property lost.

The Sivas Turmoil

In the summer of 1993, Sivas, a city located in the

Central Anatolian Region of Turkey with a population of

over 200,000, witnessed a very shocking and horrific series

of incidents: a local festival turned into a mass turmoil.

Surprisingly, the tension between the two groups involved

was based on similar motives to the incident that happened

in the Gazi district. On July 2nd, 1993, the annual

celebration of Pir Sultan Abdal, who was a religious symbol

for the Alevi population in Turkey, was moved from a nearby

town of Sivas to the Sivas city center. These celebrations

were promoted by the Alevi and leftist groups. A group of

people were also invited to the city for cultural events.

Aziz Nesin, who was an author, was among the guests who

were also invited to the celebrations. In those days,

Nesin's translation of Salman Ruhdi's book, *The Verses of Satan*, which was claiming that the verses in the Holy Q'uran of Muslims were the words of Satan, was being printed in a daily newspaper. And it was the same days that Aziz Nesin publicly pronounced himself as an Atheist. The local people of Sivas were disturbed by the transfer of the festival into the city center and Nesin's visit to the city. After the Friday Prayer people started to gather in the city square. They started to walk towards the Madimak Hotel where Aziz Nesin and the other people were staying. The protests and the demonstrations went on for more than 7 hours and the police did not intervene to the protestors. At the end, an aggressive group among the crowd attacked to the hotel and set it on fire, resulting in large flames in shooting out of the doors and windows. The hotel seethed with heavy white smoke that slowly turned to rolling black clouds fed by billowing flames eating their way through the upper floors. Intense flames burned in all directions. Ultimately thirty-seven people died and a vast amount of property was damaged. The police response was inadequate, and law enforcement was unable to successfully intervene in the incident. Subsequently military intervention was successful in terms of ending the disturbances.

The Student Protests Against The Higher Education Council

In 1999, there was a series of student demonstrations and protests against the higher education council's decisions banning university students from wearing religiously symbolic scarves in universities. Unlike the Gazi District and Sivas incidents, the majority of the demonstrators were women and the demonstrations, while illegal, were peaceful. Police forces in different cities again had difficulties in dispersing these groups. In most of the cities the police were outnumbered against the demonstrators. There wasn't a unified type of police action against those groups. In different cities police response to the protests were unlike to the other cities. In some cases, the police were criticized for being too soft on these groups, while other police actions were criticized for using unnecessarily excessive force against protestors.

Even though there are differences between these three incidents in terms of their locations, ideological thoughts, and consequences, police forces were not successful in handling all of them. In all the examples cited above, police was outnumbered against the demonstrators or the rioters. Necessary numbers of officers were not deployed to the incidents on time. Although it was

81

the police's responsibility to handle these incidents in a peaceful manner, the Gazi District disturbances and the Sivas turmoil ended with military intervention. This was the number one reason why these incidents were not accepted as a success for the police. Furthermore, if the police had intervened to the Gazi District and Sivas incidents on time and with sufficient officers, the death toll for both of the events would not have been as much as fifty-four.

First of all, when we look at these incidents from the structural perspective, we see clashes of ideas based on marginal ideologies, such as leftist movements, or religious diversities. While intervening those kinds of incidents, the rioters or the demonstrators would conceive the police as the coercive apparatus of the state. Under these circumstances it is not likely to put a peaceful end to such clashes. Therefore, police should be aware of the balances in society. These kinds of groups would always act hostile to the police and their ultimate goal would be change of the existing order.

Although these incidents were class-based, we should also focus on the actions of the participants from the interactionist perspective, which was discussed in the fourth chapter. Once these people engaged in similar

activities willingly or not, eventually they act on the basis of information available to them at that time and would incorporate into the characteristics of the crowd. The higher the complexity of the groups, the more the members show submission to the group mind. To prevent or at least to dissolve the high tension on a location, police should find ways to separate the individual from the crowd, that is, to disperse it.

In addition to the individual events mentioned above, there are also annual events that Turkish police forces must deal with. The two most prominent annual events are the May 1st Labor Day and the Nevroz celebrations (celebration of spring). Such incidents, which are prone to violent demonstrations and have political basis, attract public attention easily. For these reasons, they comprise the main source of news for mass communication services. After these kinds of events, the use of excessive police force has always been criticized by the media, and videos showing scenes of police violence are shown repeatedly on major TV stations. Furthermore, a large number of non-governmental organizations and some politicians held meetings after the events, where it was argued that police conduct during the demonstrations were unacceptable.

Historically, a lack of coordination between the police from different units combined with the lack of skills and experience in dealing with turbulent or violent groups of people has resulted in an overly hasty use of force. To complicate the situation, there has been a tendency to fire shots in the air and beat the typically peaceful civilian demonstrators with their batons and the butts of their weapons. Despite this, the Turkish National Police has begun to draw upon their initial experiences and has achieved a better mastery of these kinds of operations. It is also important to note that, over the last years, there has been instances where police units have acted with sang-froid, that is they have defused tense situations by peaceful means, reduced the level of conflict and tension in the violent hot spots in major cities, and facilitated dialogue. Easing future tensions with positive actions of this kind could serve to prevent a downward spiral of crowd violence and the disproportionate use of force by police during lawful and peaceful public gatherings.

Some police actions, including the tendency to use force and intimidation, can be explained by a lack of experience and specialized training, as well as fear when confronted by hostile crowds, especially if there are other

armed individuals present. In addition, there are a number of major constraints which impede police operations in these situations. Police agents frequently find themselves alone when faced with agitated crowds, typically without the means or authority to address or resolve the problems underlying the protests. Politicians tend to criticize police units confronting such groups for being incapable of solving the dispute in proper ways. It is the politicians, rather than the law enforcement agencies, however, who have the ability to initiate solutions. Police officers frequently feel this lack of necessary support from the political arena. Although the state retains the right to use violence against its citizens, most of the time it is the state that condemns the use of violence. Moreover, in handling very large demonstrations, small police units often feel isolated in the midst of violent gatherings and find themselves without proper equipment, such as tear gas or bullet-proof vests, and lacking the possibility of calling for reinforcements. These difficulties increase considerably once participants begin to throw stones and petrol bombs at the police.

Violent or threatening responses by the police during demonstrations cannot, however, be attributed to

operational constraints alone. The need for better

supervision, improved coordination between police units,

and further training in crowd control has been recognized

by police authorities. Initial corrective measures have

already been taken in this direction. A "Rapid Intervention

Force" (Cevik Kuvvet Birimi) composed of police officers

has been created and has received specialized training in

crowd control. Currently, the unit has been deployed to

control crowds. It should also be noted that the failure to

wear necessary protective equipment has also created

problems in crowd control situations. Because of this

issue, rapid intervention force officers are supplied with

high quality personal protective equipment to ensure their

safety when responding to extremely violent circumstances.

Furthermore, these units, which have been established in

most cities, are being given further training in advanced

crowd control techniques.

Use Of Lethal and Less-Than-Lethal Force

According to McEven (1997), each and every law

enforcement agency should have a policy to reduce their

liability, containing guidelines and limitations on the use

of lethal and less-than-lethal (LTL) force by department

personnel. Since no universally accepted policies exist with respect to this delicate issue, the application of such policies varies within and between countries. LTL policies must include guidelines which designate which LTL weapons should be used and under which circumstances. Legislation should be enacted that contains provisions on training and reporting requirements together with guidelines that deal with the excessive use of force and medical aid issues.

According to Article 6 of the Police Duties and Powers Act of 1934, "an officer may use whatever legally granted force necessary or reasonable to achieve control in a given situation." This statement, which can be defined as the continuum approach to use of force, clearly aims to limit the actions of officers and accepts an increasing use of force gradation, ranging from warning to the use of deadly force. Two major components of this issue, unquestionably, are necessity and reasonability, which define the proportionality of the use of force to the incident.

While there is a clear-cut definition for the use of deadly force, there is an insufficient definition of the use of LTL force. This gap in legislation causes police chiefs to exercise their discretion on the use of LTL

force, which is highly criticized. This vagueness becomes more detectable in crowd control situations, where individual police officers have the discretion to use force most of the time. Avoiding the use of excessive force is another topic that must be discussed along with the use of force. Police departments should also train their staff employed in rapid intervention forces in this subject. Therefore, a unity in the use of force can be reinforced.

Training Considerations

It is generally accepted that the only reasonable way to successfully resolve a riot is to use advanced tactics and officers trained in pro-active methods. In order to realize these goals some precautions have to be adopted. It is at this point that the training of police officers and police chiefs should be taken into consideration as effective riot management requires a high level of officer training. The ability to report and inform higher management of the situation has to be carried out so well that the communication barrier within these units can be defeated.

Certain issues must be considered in the training of individual officers, such as riot formations and group

movement, along with restraining and arresting the non-armed violent attacker in a non-firearms situation through the use of a baton, shield or chemical device. In addition, more senior officers need to know how to manage large groups and the optimum tactical deployment for effective results. In addition, clear communication of intelligence to upper management is critical so that appropriate resources can be assigned. Management of a crisis requires excellent communication between the person in direct charge of the scene, the major incident commander of that situation and the most senior officer of the agency in charge of that operation. Good communications and good vehicle tasking enables groups of officers to deploy most effectively.

The General Directorate of the Turkish Police has been offering a full package of riot and crowd control management training using qualified instructors and has trained the Rapid Intervention Force officers in the latest skills. These training programs have been pursued annually for the last couple of years. The target population of this program is the staff employed in cities, which are more prone to major civil disturbances. The program aims for realistic and challenging situations.

Beside these trainings that are directly related with the police practices, I, furthermore, emphasize that the education of Riot Police Units in related theoretical perspectives would give them an opportunity to understand the groups that they encounter in crowds. This education will additionally help police officers to act consciously in crowd control situation. They will not act according to the "crowd mind", which makes the police also act like the crowd that they deal with. Evidently, any tensions between two crowds would create volatile actions, which in turn would result in excessive use of force against the demonstrators. Moreover, I, assert that, this kind of education will help the police to understand these people on the streets and act in more rational ways rather than their emotions. Finally, by this way TNP would have the opportunity to enhance its relations with the public, which will increase its reliability.

The Slot Machine as a Model for Violence

According to Trojanowicz (1990), escalating hostility, violence and instability will cause negative effects to our social environment, just as the accumulating greenhouse gases threaten our physical environment. However, social

scientists do not have a mechanism to analyze the level of threat, unlike meteorologists who can map data on the greenhouse effect. Instead of domestic tranquility nationwide, we see a society where people, particularly of different races, are afraid of each other.

Trojanowicz scans the society for racial disruption. He indicates that people get to a point where their anger overwhelms rationality, and they therefore no longer respond to internal or external demands for restraint. Trojanowicz (1990), explains this phenomenon with the slot machine as a model. People reach this point when similar objects appear in all three windows, labeled: "Past History," "Current Stress" and "Precipitating Event."

To define these three windows separately, Trojanowicz uses the 1967 Detroit riot, where 43 people were killed and property damage was approximately $500 million, as an example for his model. He thoroughly examines past and present tensions in Detroit and calls this situation a "Riot in Slow Motion." To understand the level of threat today, we need to look at the three windows of the slot machine through the prism of minorities.

Window One – Past History

First of all, we must understand the history of racism along with the current stresses on black communities living in the hot spots of our cities. Although there has been tremendous progress in equal opportunity for blacks, the gap in income between blacks and whites appears to be widening, resulting in instability and insecurity. Slavery and lynchings are also another part of the current tension, which are rooted in the past history of the US. McGovern (1982), states that the number of lynchings happened in the US since the 1880s was nearly three thousand. If this window is applied to the three incidents in Turkey, which were cited above, the history of the religion in Turkish society and the tensions between religious minorities must be analyzed and understood clearly. Any unplanned action against these minorities would probably result in unforeseen incidents, as happened in Istanbul and Sivas in recent years.

Window Two – Current Stress

There are serious problems, which help to fill in the second window. High rates of violent crime and drug use among blacks, combined with being a member of the

underclass, which is distinct from poverty, causes a current stress. According to Trojanowicz, the issue is not morality but economics, and these neighborhoods, suffering from the weight of heavy problems associated with the underclass, are on the verge of collapse. These problems can also be applied to the incidents in Turkey. Poverty and being a member of underclass could be highlighted among the reasons of Gazi District disturbances in Istanbul. On the other the reason current stress in the Sivas turmoil was the general tension caused by the Aziz Nesin's translation of the Salman Rushdi's book, *The Verses of Satan*.

The Third Window – Precipitating Event

If the first two windows line up on the slot machine, it doesn't take too much to fill the third window. Generally speaking, police actions trigger the ensuing riot. On the other hand, strained relations between police and the black community appear in all three windows. The dilemma of contrasting aggressive police action against criminals and the potential for a triggering incident in urban disturbances is always critical.

The slot machine model can be applied to other civil disturbances initiated by minorities. Before allowing the

third window to fill to the model, crucial precautions must be put into effect. Once a riot starts, options narrow quickly. The government's first duty is to restore order as quickly as possible. Therefore, stopping the third window has to be done before triggering a riot. This is accomplished by dialing down the ongoing tensions in society. Basically, police units should identify areas at risk, find a way to address weaknesses in neighborhoods, try to reach law-abiding citizens for their cooperation, and reduce the overall tension in a given district.

In the Turkish cases, the precipitating events were all different. In Gazi District disturbances it was the killing of two people in a coffee house and the police actions in the following day against the demonstrators. The Sivas case and the student protest against the Higher Education Council did not have anything to do with the police actions or misconducts. In the Sivas case the precipitating event was the visit of Aziz Nesin to the city for a festival, and the Higher Education Council's decision banning university students from wearing religiously symbolic scarves in universities was the precipitating event in the 1999s student protests.

The Results of Collective Behavior

When a collective behavior is over, no matter what kind it was, there are some results which can affect the society to a higher degree, while the others fade away. The most noteworthy direct effect of all kinds of collective behavior is to change the salience of various problems, issues, and groups in public opinion. For example, a fad can easily call attention to recreational needs. Another result of all forms of collective behavior is its impact on polarizations in society, forcing people to take sides on issues and removing the middle ground. Polarization within society most of the times either alters or strengthens the makeup of group and community leadership. A riot or a wildcat strike usually reveals the inability of established leaders to control their members and produces emergent leaders acceptable to the group members.

The results listed above can be called short-term results; however, the long-term results are differentiated from those. In the long run it becomes more difficult to be sure whether a particular type of collective behavior actually makes a difference or whether it is merely a shadow cast by passing events. Scattered forms of collective behavior are common in every society. But when

there is widespread social unrest, collective behavior soon becomes a prominent feature of social life. Sometimes, collective behavior even supplies a testing ground for new ideas. These new ideas are tried out for general acceptability and groups test their strength against forces of resistance. The outcome of this testing is sometimes change and sometimes public demonstration that the old order is still viable.

Attempts at Control

Control of collective behavior is a complex issue. It is not always an easy thing to be done. Attempts to control collective behavior vary according to whether change or stability is sought. For example, advocates of change seek to control counter movements, as well as those expressive crowds and fads that anesthetize people to their complaints, whereas advocates of stability seek to control crowds and movements that undermine public order or threaten revolution. Advocates of both change and stability likewise make use of collective behavior in achieving their aims.

The most sensitive and difficult control problem occurs at the moment of the first precipitating incident

and during the stage of transformation in an active crowd. Once collective behavior fully escalates there is seldom any control technique available except massive suppression. As the intensity of feeling begins to decline, it is the time to end the crowd behavior.

Recommendations

There is a popular saying; once is more than enough. Even though this reality is well known, in Turkey we can still see unwanted scenes of police misconduct during a demonstration or even an entertainment activity such as a sporting event or a concert. In order to be able to handle tense situations in a peaceful way police forces, particularly the special police units involved in policing during these kinds of events, should learn from the mistakes of the past incidents. In this section of the conclusion chapter of this thesis, some recommendations related to the control of crowds will be made. Police chiefs and the ranking officers, especially, as the ones who are in charge at the time of an incident should incorporate these recommendations into their policies and planning:

1. In situations where there is potential for confrontation between demonstrators and others, there may be times when police need to establish corridors or security perimeters to ensure the safe passage of meeting-goers

2. In case of an urban upheaval with a high threat of possible deaths or a huge loss of money the city managers should be required to ratify any declaration of civil emergency within a short time.

3. When a pre-planned or an annual major event, such as May 1st Labor Day and Nevroz celebrations (celebration of spring), is to take place with the potential for large-scale demonstrations, the City should be prepared in terms of the resources needed for crowd management, crowd control, and the protection of civil liberties.

4. All of the law enforcement agencies throughout the country should make sure that their police officers receive training in civil liberties as it relates to crowd management and crowd control.

5. Each and every law enforcement agency should, obviously, have a policy containing guidelines and

limitations on the use of lethal and less-than-lethal
(LTL) force by department personnel

6. If the use of LTL weapons is authorized, the decision
   to employ them should be made at the command level,
   and only officers specifically trained in the use of
   LTL weapons may be authorized to carry or use them.

7. If the use of LTL weapons is accordingly authorized,
   the following policies on the use of LTL weapons
   should be adopted:

   - LTL weapons may be used only when an individual
     poses an immediate threat to officers or others.

   - They may not be used against an individual who is
     fleeing or complying with orders, or against a
     nonviolent demonstrator passively resisting
     arrest.

8. Police departments should develop policies and
   procedures for managing crowd control in ways that do
   not unduly restrict civil liberties and provide
   adequate notice and time to disperse along a safe and
   clear dispersal route.

9. To prevent the individual actions involving excessive
   use of force without the authorization of the command

post, all police officers must at all times be clearly and readily identifiable by name and department.

10. Police chiefs of the cities should have mechanisms in place to properly investigate allegations of police misconduct in crowd control situations.

11. In case of emergencies, the city should place first-aid stations based on the size and scope of the activity.

12. Depending on the size, scope and duration of the activity, the police department should determine in advance how the police officers assigned to an activity would be fed and hydrated.

13. The communication and the coordination of the units should be handled from a command post, which consists of high-ranking officers who are experienced in issues of crowd management and crowd control.

Conclusion

In Turkey, policing is a very hot issue because of its social history and its multi-cultural structure, resulting in ongoing tensions and conflicts between ideologically marginal groups, destabilizing the economic, social and cultural aura. Most of the times, police forces feel

isolated from society when intervening in these ideological clashes, resulting in formation of a strong sub-culture among police officers, one of which characteristic is being conservative in nature. That is, they must intervene because of their job but at a great emotional cost. This conservative character also has ramifications on the overall education policy.

Once it is recognized that police need to be familiar with all the issues surrounding the social environment, it is necessary to teach those issues during that education period. However, not teaching the basic theories as they are supposed to be taught is a huge flaw in the Turkish police education system. Theories such as Marxism, Fascism and Socialism have always been perceived as a threat to existing order and a taboo by the Turkish police for promoting left-wing ideologies in Turkey.

It can't be denied that the general social unrest basically was caused by these ideologies that Turkey went through in the 1960s and 1970s. Yet, it is not an adequate excuse to act as if these theories are insignificant for policing in our modern world. And if it is hypothesized that there is a direct correlation between conservativism and being uninformed of these theories, then one can simply

justify this correlation by ignoring and excluding these theories from the curriculum. Therefore, political actors who make decisions about these kinds of issues regarding to a general policy implication must act on the basis of scientific objectivity rather than their subjectivity. This is the only way to be certain that the overall policy is effective.

It is a big concern for the Turkish governments how to deal with urban uprisings and demonstrations, and large groups of people in a collective manner. Officers in riot police units, in particular, lacking a strong theoretical background eventually become detached from the problems they are handling each and every day. On the one hand, there is the issue of exercising the democratic rights, such as free speech and free expression, usually shaped by an ideological discourse; on the other hand, there is the need to maintain public order. Hence, comes the concept of crowd control which is very complex. In order to handle such confrontations between the police and demonstrators, it is necessary for the police to deal with it as psychologists do and integrate the theoretical knowledge of collective behavior and their personal experiences. Moreover, no two individuals have the same set of

experiences or the same perceptions. Until police act with a theoretical basis, we can expect to see quarrelsome interventions. If officers are ignorant to theory and inexperienced, in a tense situation they will respond emotionally within their social psychological perspective and will always be prone to make mistakes.

Before making young police officers deal with complicated incidents, they should be educated and prepared to analyze how the control is lost under many circumstances and how chaotic processes of interaction take over and show a kind of emergence of new subjective realities, which no one really controls, and they may take all kinds of directions, which are immeasurable, unpredictable and uncontrollable.

My point is really that within all kinds of collective subjects, whether you term them crowds or masses or social movements or whatever, there is an interaction process going on. It is partly shaped by culture, social history, media and power structures, however it is partly spontaneous and escapes control. It generates forms, which may surprise everyone. Having a strong theoretical background in related issues gives an important degree of confidence to the police officers. The sociological

perspective, especially, is important because it provides a different way of looking at a familiar world. It allows us to gain a new vision of social life. Additionally, putting the different theoretical perspectives together provides a different and often sharply contrasting picture of the world.

In this study, following to the methodological issues, basic definitions, concepts, and the classification of collective behavior are studied. Second, two different perspectives of collective behavior — structuralist and interactionist perspectives — and the major figures of these perspectives are examined thoroughly. Finally, the focus was on the relationship between these perspectives and their policy implications in the Turkish Riot Police Units. The future studies of collective behavior can be directed to reconceptualize in terms of an entirely new group of theories known as the "Chaos Theory", "Complexity Theory", "Emergence Theory" and "Self-Organization Theory". In my opinion, these theories can shed new light on what is really happening under the umbrella of collective behavior in different circumstances and from different point of views. Those problems in terms of social psychology might

be very well reconceptualized in an analytical study and

have a useful, new approach to those problems.

REFERENCES

Adamson, W. (1980). <u>Hegemony and revolution: A study of Antonio Gramsci's political and cultural theory</u>. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Aguirre, B. E., Quarantelli, E. L., & Mendoza, J. L. (1988). The collective behavior of fads: The characteristics, effects, and career of streaking. <u>American Sociological Review</u>, <u>53</u>, 569 – 584.

Allport, G. W., & Postman, L. J. (1965). <u>Holt</u>. New York: Rinehart & Winston.

Anderson, J. L. (1998). 'Techniques' for governance, (Special issue: Focus on governance). <u>The Social Science Journal</u>, <u>35</u>, 493 – 501.

Appelbaum, R. P., & Chambliss, W. J. (1997). <u>Sociology: A brief introduction</u>. New York: Longman.

Berk, R. A. (1974). A gaming approach to crowd behavior. <u>American Sociological Review</u>, <u>39</u>, 335 – 373.

Bernstein, R. (Ed.). (1985). <u>Habermas and modernity</u>. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Blumer, H. (1971). Social problems as collective behavior. <u>Social Problems</u>, <u>18</u>, 298 – 306.

Boswell, T., & Dixon, W. J. (1993). Marx theory of rebellion: A cross-national analysis of class exploitation, economic development, and violent revolt. <u>American Sociological Review</u>, <u>58</u>, 681-702.

Bruhn, K. (1999) Antonio Gramsci and the Palabra Verdadera: The political discourse of Mexico's guerrilla forces. <u>Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs</u>, <u>41</u>, 29 – 62.

Cooper, D. (1991). On the concept of alienation. _International Journal of Contemporary Sociology_, _28_, 7 – 26.

Coser, L. (1977). _Masters of sociological thought_, (2nd ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

De Tocqueville, A. (1981). _Democracy in America_. New York: The Modern Library Press.

Dorwart, R.A. (1953). _The administrative reforms of Frederick William I of Prussia_. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Forrester, J., & Adams, G.B. (1993). Budgetary reform through organizational learning: Toward an organizational theory of budgeting. _Administration & Society_, _23_, 466 – 490.

Foucault, M. (1988). _Michel Foucault politics, philosophy, culture: Interviews and other writings 1977-1984_. (L. D. Kritzman, Trans.). New York: Routledge, Chapman & Hall.

Foucault, M. (1991). _Governmentality. The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality_, (pp. 87-104). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Gordon, C. (1991). _Governmental rationality: An introduction. The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality_. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Graham, K. (1992). _Karl Marx, our contemporary_. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Gramsci, A. (1973). _Antonio Gramsci: Letters from prison_. (L. Lawner, Ed. and Trans.). New York: Harper and Row. (Original work published 1932).

Griffin, E. (1997). _A first look at communication theory_. New York: The McGraw-Hill.

Gurney, J. N., & Tierney, K. J. (1982). Relative
     deprivation and social movements: A critical look at
     twenty years of theory and research. <u>Sociological
     Quarterly</u>, <u>23</u>, 33 – 47.

Haralambos, M. (1996). <u>Sociology: Themes and
     perspectives</u>, (Australian ed.). South Melbourne:
     Longman.

Kerckhoff, A. C., & Back, K. W. (1968). <u>The June bug: A
     study of hysterical contagion</u>. New York: Appleton-
     Century-Crofts.

Kellehear, A. (1990). <u>Every students guide to sociology</u>.
     South Melbourne: Nelson.

Kershaw, T. (1992). <u>Karl Marx: Great thinkers of the
     western world</u>. New York: Harper Collins.

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). <u>Hegemony and socialist
     strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics</u>. New
     York: Verso.

LeBon, G. (1960). <u>The crowd: A study of the popular mind</u>.
     New York: Viking. (Original work published 1896).

Lofland, J. (1981). Collective behavior: The elementary
     forms. In R. L. Curtis, & B. E. Aguirre (Eds.),
     <u>Collective behavior and social movements</u>,
     (pp. 70 – 76). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Marx, K. (1964). <u>Pre-capitalist economic formations</u>. New
     York: International Publishers. (Original work
     published 1858).

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1967). <u>The communist manifesto</u>.
     London: Penguin Books. (Original work published
     1848).

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1970). <u>The German ideology</u>. New
     York: International Publishers. (Original work
     published 1846).

Manis, J., & Meltzer, B. (Eds.). (1972). Symbolic interaction: A reader in social psychology, (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Marx, G. T., & McAdam, D. (1994). Collective behavior and social movements: Process and structure. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

McEven, T. (1997). Policies on less-than-lethal force in law enforcement agencies. Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategy and Management, 20, 39 – 59.

McGovern, J. R. (1982). Anatomy of a lynching: The killing of Claude Neal. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.

McMurty, J. (1978). The structure of Marx's world view. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

McPhail, C. (1991). The myth of the madding crowd. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

McPhail, C. (1994). The dark side of the purpose: Individual and collective violence in riots. The Sociological Quarterly, 35, 1 – 32.

Meltzer, B. (1975). Symbolic interactionism: Genesis, varieties and criticism. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Miller, D. L. (1985). Introduction to collective behavior. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Mueller, C., & Dimieri, T. (1982). The structure of belief systems among contending ERA activists. Social Forces, 60, 182-187.

National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorder. (1968). A searing analysis of the causes of and remedies for the violent racial crisis in America today, (The New York Times Edition). New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.

Noble, T. (2000). Social theory and social change. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Ollman, B. (1976). <u>Alienation</u>, (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Perdue, W. D. (1986). <u>Sociological theory: Explanation, paradigm, and ideology</u>. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing.

Pollard, S. (1965). <u>The genesis of modern management: A study of the industrial revolution in Great Britain</u>. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Quarantelli, E. L., & Hundley, J. R. (1975). A test of some propositions about crowd formation and behavior. In R R. Evans (Ed.), <u>Readings in collective behavior</u>, (pp. 370 – 385). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally College Pub. Co.

Ritzer, G. (2000). <u>Sociological theory</u>, (5th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

Smelser, N. J. (1993). The nature of collective behavior. In R. L. Curtis, & B. E. Aguirre (Eds.), <u>Collective behavior and social movements</u>, (pp. 21 – 28). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Turner, R. H., & Killian, L. M. (1987). <u>Collective behavior</u>, (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Trojanowicz, R. (1990). <u>Community policing: A contemporary perspective</u>. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing.

Weller, J. M., & Quarantelli, E. L. (1973). Neglected characteristics of collective behavior. <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, <u>9</u>, 665 – 685.

White, J. R. (1998). <u>Terrorism: An introduction</u>, (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Wilde, L. (1991). Logic: Dialectic and contradiction. In T. Carver (Ed.), <u>The Cambridge companion to Marx</u>, (pp 275 – 295). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.