

Alexandra Schierock

Anti-Ghetto Areas and Gated Community-Movement
Producing and Outsourcing Strangers in Postmodern Society

Seminararbeit eingereicht an der Universität Kassel

FB 05 Gesellschaftswissenschaften

Masterstudiengang Soziologie

am

17.01.2011

Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Strangers	4
3. Anti-Ghetto Areas	6
3.1 Anti-Ghetto Areas in Germany.....	7
4. Gated Community-Movement	9
4.1 Hints for the gated-community movement in Germany	10
5. Conclusion: Producing and Outsourcing Strangers in Postmodern Society.....	14
References.....	18

1. Introduction

Are we all becoming strangers these days? Or is the term stranger just changing into a new category, which describes people who are unfamiliar and who are alienated because they have not the same social position as we have? Is the new stranger someone who is unfamiliar and strange by nature or because of his inability to keep up with society's requirements? In this sense the new stranger could describe as an excluded persons, who cannot afford the abilities and resources which are needed for a successfully membership of society's circumstances. And because of his or her¹ inability to participate in social life, the excluded person becomes alienated, unwanted and different. The excluded person becomes a stranger and as a stranger he will be excluded from society's circumstances, furthermore. To proof this line of argument, two socio-spatial phenomena are introduced; firstly, anti-ghetto areas are described as areas where excluded persons are segregated in space. This segregation causes further problems for the anti-ghetto inhabitants, like discrimination, disadvantages in life experience and a deepening of exclusion from society's circumstances. But after all, anti-ghettos are not ghettos in the sense of the totally closed and abandoned US-American ones, which are characterized through the ethnic homogeneity of their inhabitants. In fact they are deeply connected to the welfare state, have high quotes of ethnic heterogeneity, and are still tied to society's values. Secondly, an upcoming gated community-movement is described. After the model of Los Angeles, where gated communities are a regular form of living, which is findable all over the city and where everyday life can no longer be imagined without these closed and access regulated quarters. It is presumed that such a gated community-movement will cross the Atlantic and is also findable in Germany, already. But preliminarily, the theory of strangers is described according to Simmel and Bauman. In conclusion all these three parts, the theory of strangers, the anti-ghetto areas and the gated community movement, should come together under the assumption, that strangers are produced and outsourced in postmodern society. This should mean that strangers are no longer just aliens or foreigners, but that the new strangers are the excluded, unwanted and unneeded people in society.

¹ In the following I would only use the male personal pronoun because of a more fluently reading of the text, but theoretically I mean both the male and female form of the term "the stranger".

2. Strangers

It was once Georg Simmel who gave a short but remarkable description of the stranger, which fulfills the discussions about strangers in society until today. According to Simmel (1983) the stranger is the one who comes today and stays tomorrow. In this sense he is no longer the wanderer who comes and leaves but he is the one who is imprisoned between coming and going. To be a stranger means technically to be a faraway person who is very near, but it means also to be a near person, who is theoretically very far away. In this peculiar situation the stranger is not an outsider person, but an element of the group itself. Another characteristic of the stranger according to Simmel is the mobility which is implied by his neither-coming-nor-leaving character. In this case the stranger is not how Simmel names it, a "bodenbesitzer". He is, even through the eyes of others, permanently on the move, whereas he moves merely within a bounded group. Also implied by the stranger's attributions is objectivity. The stranger moves not only between nearness and distance, but also between carelessness and dedication. This ability of objectivity leads one to give confessions to the stranger, because he seems to have a safe ear in his freedom to the group dynamics. In this sense Simmel proclaims, that objectivity can declare as freedom, because an objective person is not prejudiced through any bondages or engagements to the group. Finally the relationship to the stranger and his attributed objectivity is determined through the equities which one has with him in common, besides the global equities which most people have in common, generally. These special shared equities bond together and makes the stranger a little bit more familiar. Otherwise, the more general equities are seen between the stranger and me, more cold and more remote our relationship would be. In the end, Simmel expresses, because of his shared origin with a plenty of other strangers, the stranger would never be remarked as an individual person, but always as a generalized stranger of a specific type, who is however an organic member of the group.

Simmel's digression about the stranger is more than a hundred years old, but still today it does not lose its actual presence. So you can see in Bauman's description of the stranger, where the basic elements of Simmel's stranger-descriptions enlighten his course of arguments. Even according to Bauman the stranger is the one who is imprisoned between the boundary of the inner and outer group. In this sense the stranger is neither an outsider, nor an unquestioned member of the inner group. The stranger is not an unfamiliar person. Until this point Bauman's description of the stranger conforms with Simmel's, but maybe because of Bauman's historical experiences he throws a much more dramatically a problematized light of the dealings with

strangers. According to him the encounter with strangers could cause feelings of discomfort, anxiety, or even hatred. It seems, that they are coming into our world, without having an invitation. By staying in my own world of everyday life I see and hear the strangers even if I want them to or not. "Were it not for this reason, they would not be strangers, but just 'nobodies'" (Bauman 1990: 55). But exactly this circumstance of not perfectly knowing them and their behaviors and of not being able to ignoring them either, they are causing confusions and anxieties. They are walking around in my world and I am not able to foresee their behavior, like I could do so with all the other members of my inner group. It is this uncertainty which makes the dealing with strangers so problematic. Especially the confusions and anxieties which could cause by this uncertainty of the strangers behavior can be the breeding ground for feelings of hatred and the will to exclude or more dangerous to destroy the strangers. The strangers show that the group boundaries which are virtually expected to be safe, impermeable and watertight are not this foolproof as they are seemed to be. This verdict of lacking impermeability of the group boundary can cause feelings of insecurity. Even if the strangers are trying to integrate into the group and adopt our manners and behaviors they could arouse hostility and aggression; by imitating our manners they are showing us a caricature of our own life and they are making another step to unclear the distinction between us and them: but here lies a big potential for trouble (Baumann 1990). As mentioned above, in some periods of history the strangers were not only excluded from society, but they were trying to assimilate by oppressing their manners or, at least, it was trying to destroy them (Bauman 2001). Another method is spiritual or territorial separation. The territorial variety of separation "finds its fullest expression in ghettos or ethnic reserves – parts of the towns or areas of the country reserved for the habitation of people whom the native population refused to mix with, seeing them as aliens and wishing their alien status to last forever" (Bauman 1990: 61). Although today we, in our urban societies, live in a "world of universal strangerhood" (Bauman 1990: 63). The people around us are strangers and we are strangers for the people around us. Strangers can no longer be kept away – we have to live with and around them. But instead of these circumstances, still today, there are ways of separation to sort out the strangers and especially to separate different groups. This way is the segregation by space which surrounds us wherever we are. Not only the private space is closed off by security guards, walls or fences, even the public space is more and more segregated. In the following chapters these segregation methods should be pointed out, by focusing on the exclusion of strangers in society. First the anti-ghetto should be introduced as a segregation method in which strangers are outsourced from

society. Secondly a movement which should be called the gated community-movement is explained. In this movement strangers are systematically excluded from the inner society.

3. Anti-Ghetto Areas

By some journalists in the public discourse, during the 1980's and the early 1990's, the French suburbs, the so called banlieues, were described and by this way dramatized as ghettos referring to the US-African-American ones. In consequence a discussion about convergence between the US-ghettos and the European suburbs was arising. But according to Wacquant such a simple resemblance is out of question. In his sense for a deep-going analysis of this problem, the term convergence may only mean "a wholesale 'Americanization' of urban patterns of exclusion in the European city leading down the path of ghettoization of the kind imposed upon African Americans since they joined industrial cities at the beginning of the twentieth century" (Wacquant 2008: 272) And if convergence is supposed to mean this mentioned thesis of Americanization, in the sense of a transatlantic convergence, the answer would be purely negative. Instead of 'ghetto' or convergence by 'Americanization' Wacquant uses the term 'anti-ghetto' to describe the European problematic urban situation. With the term anti-ghetto, Wacquant wants to make sure, that the banlieues or other banlieues-styled European suburbs are rather ghettos in the sense of the US-American ghettos, nor without any problematic context. To Wacquant's understanding these anti-ghettos are, indeed, deprived but this is not an evidence for the validity of the thesis of a transatlantic convergence. The "*banlieues* and ghettos are the legacies of different urban trajectories and arise from disparate criteria of classification and form of social sorting" (Wacquant 2008: 136). To proof this argument of a non-transatlantic-convergence Wacquant (2006) names three points in which the anti-ghetto differ from the US-ghetto: (1) Ethnical heterogeneity; in comparison to the US-ghettos, the Anti-Ghettos are not occupied by only one ethnic group. In the USA you can find e.g. the African-ghetto or the Chinese-ghetto, whereas in the European Anti-Ghettos a variety of ethnic groups is situated. In these European Anti-Ghettos there is also segregation combined with violence and discrimination, "but discrimination and segregation must not be confounded with ghettoization" (Wacquant 2008: 273). It is exactly this ethnical heterogeneity which makes the for-

mation of a unified cultural identity shared by all the different groups in an anti-ghetto impossible. (2) The different ethnic groups in an Anti-Ghetto are not capable to produce and satisfy their basic needs by themselves, moreover they have no need to do so, because the anti-ghettos are still governed by the state and are deeply connected to the welfare state. The inhabitants of an anti-ghetto are achieve welfare-state-benefits, there are state-running programs and public institutionalized and organizational structures, like social housing, public schools or youth centers. Division-lines are more drawn between classes and social positions than between ethnicities or cultures. On the other hand or rather on the other side of the Atlantic, American ghettos are isolated from the state structures, completely. (3) Finally, Anti-Ghettos are still tied to the whole society especially to their ambitions and their wishes according to consumer habits. Divisions and tension with an ethnic or racial tenor are not becoming deeper because of a growing separation or alienation of the different groups in space, but because of their growing propinquity in social and physical space.

3.1 Anti-Ghetto Areas in Germany

There are two areas in Germany, which can be described as anti-ghettos. These are at once the socially deprived areas in the inner city and at second the deserted areas of the former Eastern Germany countryside. To pick just one example for anti-ghetto areas in Germany, let us take a look at the inner city anti-ghettos and their characteristics after the three points named by Wacquant.

First in German cities, too, there is a great diversity of migrants of any ethnic group, so that no insular ethnic enclaves are findable. Highly concentration of migrants in a specific inner city quarter more refers to a polarization between social positions not between ethnical groups. Because of social structural changes during the last decades, more and more migrants find themselves in a position, where their labor qualifications are not adequate enough for the success-oriented labor market. For most migrants poorer quarters are no longer just a passageway on their journey to a new life of fulfillment. Actually, most of them get no chance to leave these poorer quarters. Growing segregation in these poorer quarters is also enabled because of growth removing of natives, who can afford to leave. Left behind are migrants with language problems, job finding problems and low diversity of social contacts, who cannot ac-

cess at any resources which would allow a breakout of the anti-ghetto (Häußermann/Läpple/Siebel 2008). The identities of the left-behind cannot spread and widening on their own, that is why a job-finding becomes more and more difficult and the unintended segregation leads to a deeper disposition of the already poor social position. Thus, it is not just ethnic heterogeneity which determines an anti-ghetto in Germany, more it is the heterogeneity itself of all kind of social and ethnic origins and attributes of the anti-ghetto inhabitants. It is mainly this heterogeneity, which causes problems and conflicts; that is why the inhabitants of the anti-ghettos barely have shared interests or so a sense of comprehensive solidarity (Häußermann 2006). This loss of similarities causes a growing distance between the anti-ghetto inhabitants; in consequence there is disintegration and disagreement. However, anti-ghettos are determined through heterogeneity, they are also determined through social homogeneity in matters of the social positions of their inhabitants. They all live in anti-ghetto areas because of their poorness and their lack of resources (Häußermann/Kapphan 2004). Anyhow, that is still no argument which turns these areas into ghettos, moreover they can be described as anti-ghetto areas of the German inner cities, and the next point which arguments with the connection to welfare state will deepen this assumption, furthermore.

Mostly, areas in the German inner city, which can be described as anti-ghettos, are deeply connected to the welfare state. Because of very high quotes of unemployment in the anti-ghetto areas most inhabitants depends on social benefits to secure their subsistence (Häußermann/Kapphan 2004). Besides, in most anti-ghetto areas, local affair programs and arrangements, e.g. social housing or youth centers, are working against degeneration and pauperization of endangered quarters in the inner city. Anyhow, social benefits and local programs can cause negative effects on their recipients; Feelings of dependency, powerlessness as discrimination and stigmatization can deepen an indicated pattern of exclusion, which hinders the job finding process, furthermore (ibid.). The connection to welfare state embodied as receipt of social benefits, only, cannot pull out the, in this way discriminated, anti-ghetto inhabitants of social isolation and out of patterns of exclusion. The receipt of social benefits cannot give them hope for better life circumstances or chances to leave their situation of exclusion from society's cohesions. The connection to welfare state is by this way an indicator which turns the German poorer quarters in the inner city into anti-ghettos. Their inhabitants are the recipients of social benefits and other social arrangements, like local affair programs. The unintended cause of discrimination and stigmatization of such a kind of connection to welfare state leads to an increase of the excluded situation of their inhabitants, furthermore.

At last German poorer quarters can be described as anti-ghettos, because their inhabitants are indeed not an active and integrated part of the entire society, but they are still tied to society's values. This value-tie is less an experience of inclusion into society's circumstances, than more a pursuit of integration into society. Exactly because of their experience of exclusion, they want to make clear that they have the same social rights like everyone else have, too. For instance, for them it is very important to refer to their honor and dignity, to remind the included part of society, but also themselves, that they have the same rights like every other member of society, too (Bude 2008). Moreover, and maybe the more important part of the tie to society, is that social structural changes have an influence even to the anti-ghetto areas. These changes could be political appointments, law changes, cultural fashion, or economic impact. Furthermore, it is important to distinguish the mode of tie to society's several divisions. In this way an anti-ghetto inhabitant can be tied to society in a political, cultural or economical manner or division. Mostly they are excluded from labor-market; in consequence they have a low income and cannot afford the same things like the included part of society. But that must not mean that they are not influenceable by consumption and its advertisement. Especially the youth uses and needs the media, like smartphones or social networks to get connected to each other and to get an illusion of inclusion into society's circumstances. Also, the holding of the newest stuff, like fashion or technology can conceal the real exclusion of society's circumstances and can simulate an all-over inclusion in society.

Summing up, the poorer quarters in German cities are not entirely closed areas, which are abandoned from welfare state, are forgotten from politics and are not influenceable by consumption, nor have the inhabitants their own culture or a daily life which is totally closed from the outer world – they are not US-American-styled ghettos. Moreover the poorer quarters in German cities can be described as anti-ghetto areas, though.

4. Gated Community-Movement

Gated communities are a common housing type in countries, where the gap between rich and poor is very deep. Especially in the USA, you can find them since the beginning of the US-American history, started with the first settlers. Today there is an increasing appearance of

gated community forms especially in the so called 'Sunbelt' (Blakely/Snyder 1997). Los Angeles which is a geographical part of this 'Sunbelt' has a highly concentration of gated communities in any possible form of their appearance. In his book *City of Quartz*, Mike Davis (1992) names some elements of exclusion in Los Angeles which can be described as a leading area of the gated community division in the USA. For the segregated situation along class- and ethnic boundaries, Davis describes three hints which can be seen as an evidence for an upcoming gated community-movement. Such a movement could be assigned for the situation in European cities, as well. According to Davis the three hints are: (1) Fear proves itself as William Whyte said already for New York. For Los Angeles Davis follows that "the social perception of threat becomes a function of the security mobilization itself, not crime rates" (p.224). Where there is an actual rising of crime, the dread white middle-class not even recognize it, because crime and violence are impermeable through ethnic- or class boundaries. The dread white-middle-class imagination is feed off by the media with their sensationalized reports of unrealistic crime rates and violence narrations. (2) Maybe because of this self-proving fear, security rises into a prestige-symbol. Security becomes more and more an acquirable good, which reflects the income and social position of its consumer. By this way "the market provision of 'security' generates its own paranoid demand" (p.224). In this sense security no longer provides merely safety, but it makes sure that the holder of security will not get in touch with "'unsavory' groups and individuals, even crowds in general" (p.224). (3) At last the "neo-military syntax of contemporary architecture" (p.226) excludes unwanted people, by insisting violence and conjuring imaginary dangers. The so called public spaces are rather pseudo-public-spaces, where the access is regulated through invisible signs. These signs are invisible for all who are pretty welcome i.e. consumers and the white-middle-class, but 'the Others' - "poor Latino families, young Black men, or elderly homeless white females – read the meaning immediately" (p.226).

4.1 Hints for the gated-community movement in Germany

Now someone can asks if such a gated-community-movement will cross the Atlantic and come to European cities as well? To answer such a question it is necessary to collect the findable hints which are observable in Europe as well. A special look to find such hints should make at Germany, to see if there is an upcoming gated community-movement in the sense of the one which is recognizable in Los Angeles.

First the self-proving fear is not only recognizable in the USA. In Germany, too, the media creates and reproduces fear by publishing sensationalized reports. Naturally, fear is a reaction followed by a specific signal of danger. But when fear begins to prove itself, the distinction between real and suggested danger seems to be abolished. Violence and threat are reported and reproduced constantly, not only by the media but also by politics and science, e.g. by publishing criminal statistics, analyzing exposures in public spaces or by stereotyping special acts of violence into some violent groups. In recent times especially terror warnings are an instance for the on-going self-proving fear caused by media, politics and science. That there could be a real threat of terror is out of discussion, but that the possibility of terroristic attacks is raving into an outstanding fear surrounded by every move someone steps in the public space, could be a greater danger than the real threat of terroristic attacks. The defense of possible dangers should parry the threat and with it the fear, but sometimes such an enhancement could stoke fears and maybe reproduces fear, instead of putting it down. However, fear is as a feeling and especially as a collective phenomenon not easy to catch. An increase of self-proving fear can only be recognized through further social phenomena and collective patterns of action like the upcoming of gated communities, doormen buildings and general retreating to privacy, an increasing market share of security companies; or so scandalized violence reports and an added talking about possible threats. Such social phenomena and collective patterns of action could lead to the assumption that fear is one of the driving forces, which lead to processes of exclusion and to an increase of boundary processes, by which unfamiliar and unfitting persons – by which strangers are barred.

Secondly, also in Germany security becomes, like Davis said, more and more a prestige symbol. The self-proving fear as explained above seems to be a coping strategy for the handling with strange and unfamiliar influences. This means that the want for security not just reprehends to the defense of real appearing dangers, but to something more. The mentioned self-proving fear is more a diffuse fear of alienation and strangeness. However, the increase of possible threats and the self-proving fear demands for more actions of security. By this, security becomes a good produced by private security companies (Häußermann/Läpple/Siebel 2008). Threat is merchandised, fear is advertised and the product of security must to be consumed, unavoidable. Especially in the upper class, but also in the middle class, the need for security embodies itself as boundary strategies and a retreating to privacy. An example for security as a consumer good is the Arcadia housing estate in Potsdam. As one of the first totally closed gated communities in Germany, the Arcadia is surrounded by huge walls and fences, monitored

by security cameras and observed by doormen around-the-clock. But by looking at the criminal statistics for Potsdam you can find no incidents for a need to a highly security level. And by looking at prices for a square meter of living in Arcadia (up to €3.500) and the offer of services beside security, someone can guess that it is not the high level of security, which leads the Arcadia inhabitants for a move in. In fact living in Arcadia means to live surrounded by a range of services, e.g. a concierge service, or mail delivery service etc. (Kruse 2008). It is more the status of luxury less of security which seems to be the motivation for a living behind walls and fences. Service and luxury camouflaged as security refer to the social status of their consumer. Security in this sense is more a prestige symbol as a keeper of danger. After all it is not only the upper class, where security raises as a prestige symbol, also the middle class seems to use security as a symbol of status. An instance for this guess is the assignment of private security services in middle class neighborhoods. Like Wehrheim (2006) says, independent from any income groups, security provided by public police is expected to be insufficient. Commercial private security services are more able to orientate themselves at annoying behavior or bothering groups of people, as the public police could do so. Also, it seems to be the social pressure of the neighborhood, which leads to the usage of such security services. And moreover it is the bare offer of such services, which leads to a usage of them. “[...] the market provision of ‘security’ generates its own paranoid demand” (Davis 1990: 224). Hence, when the market provides security, and a neighborhood starts to consume this provided security the social pressure of consuming this security and to be a part of the security movement, not to be excluded from the fashion of security, seems to lead security as a prestige symbol in the middle class, too. But when security becomes a prestige symbol consumed by the upper and the middle class, there is only the lower class left. And then the lower class turns to be that group which is barred by the security arrangements of the upper and middle class. The lower class is excluded, because they are not able to afford the prestige symbol of security – what turns them into strangers.

And last, German architecture already is as near as exclusionary comparing to the US-architecture. As Davis recognizes it for Los Angeles, there is also an increase of pseudo-public spaces in German cities. These pseudo-public spaces show their faces as shopping-malls, big shopping-center-like train stations, public inner city places which are consumer occupied or e.g. city parks surrounded by huge fences and locked closable gates. Architecture always reflects the current socio-spatial order in society. It can be seen as a mirror of current society’s circumstances (Dangschat 2009). By this, architecture not only reflects current art or fashion, but also concentration of special income groups by segregation, or even exclusion of some

special unwanted groups in society. Urban development programs are in action to build plenty of the so called pseudo-public spaces, where especially underprivileged groups of society are banned. Such developments in the city – like an increase of shopping malls – following the aim that unwanted groups are vanishing completely out of sight and mind of the busy consuming and included part of society. For instance the rebuilding of train stations all over the German cities into huge shopping center like, sterile, monitored and secured constructions are following the intention to banish unpopular groups like homeless persons, drug users and dealers or prostitutes (Dangschat 2009). It seems that the Berlin main station was rebuilt in 2006, with the intention of banishing unpopular groups, too. After that the Berlin station no longer looks like a mystical travellers place but like a shopping center. Everything is constructed after consumer needs, you can find no waste on the floor even you can find no one who could fit into one of the unpopular and unwanted groups. All what is left is a sterile clean place where everything is regulated by buying power, conformable behavior and consistency of status of the welcome consumers. It is a pseudo-public space of cleanness, order and affluence, like you can find them all over German cities. But where is cleanness, there must have been waste, and where is order there must have been chaos, and last where is affluence there must be redundancy. Certainly, to be redundant means to be not needed, to be useless (Bauman 2005). And when you are needless and useless in some circumstances you will be banish out of this circumstance, you are forced to leave the place. If you cannot afford the participation of consumption there is no need to stay in places which are built for consumption, only. But there is not only no need for staying there, it seems to be that there is no more right to stay there, too. The free opened public spaces are going to be more and more minimized. This minimization goes along with the exclusion of some unwanted groups in society. The great danger of such a development is not only the cleavage in society, but also an increase of intolerance and a loss of social cohesion. Furthermore such a development of cleavage, intolerance and increase of pseudo-public spaces could threaten publicity, which is a needful and essential precondition for democracy (Herlyn 2004).

5. Conclusion: Producing and Outsourcing Strangers in Postmodern Society

The assumption of this thesis was to identify mechanisms in current society which leads to a production and an outsourcing i.e. exclusion of strangers, of strangers, who become unfamiliar and alienated to the wholesale society. The presumption that strangers are produced in our postmodern society assumes that the stranger is not a strange and alienated person by nature, but that the strangeness of the stranger is a dedicated one, because of his ascribed deviate behavior. Deviance “is created by society” (Becker 1963: 8), furthermore, “social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance, and by applying those rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders. From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an ‘offender’. The deviant is one to whom that label has successfully been applied; deviant behavior that people so label” (Becker 1963: 9). Now, the label of strangeness is dedicated because of one or more of the person’s attributes, whom is labeled as stranger. These annoying attributes are not fitting into the agreement of social norms of the community or society. That is why these attributes dedicates someone as a stranger. For the expected circumstances of a production and an outsourcing of strangers in this thesis, the deviant behavior of a stranger must not be an intended behavior, or a behavior that is against law or normative commitments. It is more the pure fact, that the stranger possesses not the same attributes, resources, gains or at least social position like all the others do. That is why the stranger is excluded from society.

To avoid misunderstandings, the difficulty of strangers in the context of this thesis must be delimited from the instance of strangers in the public sphere of the city i.e. from high level of anonymous of public life in the city. In fact those two types of strangeness – which is the stranger as an excluded person on the one hand, and on the other hand the stranger as an anonymous person in the city, who has the same level of anonymous like all the others have – may stick together in some points, after all. One clue between those two types of strangeness can be found in the instance of ‘civil inattention’. Civil inattention means that during interactions in the public sphere of the city, people show that they recognize one other, but by avoiding politely eye contact or unintended conversations (Goffman 1959). This definition of civil inattention applies to the anonymous stranger. But in case of the stranger as an excluded person civil inattention now means no longer being polite and respecting the privacy of one an-

other. It is more an active uncivil inattention by which strangers are totally avoided. It is assumed that civil inattention in case of the stranger as an excluded person is no more an overall inattention caused by motivation of anonymity, but it is more concentrated of not seeing the stranger and his unfitting attributes, altogether. Civil inattention in case of the excluded stranger means to give the stranger absolutely no attention with the intention to banish him from the public horizon and in consequence to banish the stranger from society's circumstances, which means to exclude him.

According to Simmel the stranger is a person who recruits from another community or society – in fact, mostly, the stranger was a migrant. But today, strangers are no more only migrants, who in fact come from another culture and society. Sometimes it seems that today's strangers are recruiting from the same society in which all the other, well-known included members live-in. It seems that the new postmodern stranger experienced a transformation from inclusion to society and its circumstances to exclusion from exactly this same society. A transformation from being inside, from being well-known too being outside and strange, suddenly. In Bauman's description a postmodern form of the stranger becomes clearer. To Bauman, even as to Simmel, the stranger is not an unfamiliar person; otherwise he could not be identified as a stranger and he would be a mere nobody. The stranger causes confusion, even feelings of hatred, because he is not exactly the same like me, but anyhow, he walks around in my world, so that I cannot ignore him, if I like to or not. Sometimes the stranger dare to impersonate myself and my manners, he tries to assimilate himself into my world, but it is exactly this impersonation of myself and my manners, which makes me angry (Bauman 1990). This exaggerated view shows a look at the stranger, which is infiltrated with the fear of confusion. The stranger disturbs, because with him he brings something new, unexpected, something unknown, something that causes the fear of destroying a well-known order of social life and everyday life, something that brings the fear with it of destroying future expectations. After all, like Bauman said already, one strategy to handle with this new, unexpected and order-destroying threat is to exclude the factor which is meant to cause this disorder and confusion: in conclusion the stranger is forced to exclude from the well-known circumstances of society, it is trying to banish him from the view of all the included people so it is trying to blow the stranger out of mind.

Now, to identify the exclusion and in this way the production and the outsourcing of strangers two socio-spatial phenomena were described; the anti-ghetto areas as well the gated community movement. First, the anti-ghetto areas, which are especially poorer quarters in the inner city, are not only a spatial phenomenon. Moreover, anti-ghetto areas reflect current division in

society's order. With their three characteristics, namely the ethnic heterogeneity, the connection to welfare state and the tie to the entire society's values, anti-ghettos are not totally closed and abandoned quarters in the city. But after all they are a place where discrimination, stigmatization and at least social exclusion are deep-rooted with the life circumstances of their inhabitants. In anti-ghetto areas a special group of people is concentrated i.e. segregated in space. It is a group who is a victim of social structural changes during the last decades. Social structural changes like welfare state reforms, aging of society, structural unemployment, high quotes of migration etc. The inhabitants of the anti-ghetto areas are people who are unemployed over a long term, who have not a widespread diversity of social contacts, who lost faith in welfare state and in society's social institutions, they are people who feel their powerlessness, who wear the stigma of it on their bodies and who get the feeling of a meaningless life every day. By this anti-ghetto areas are not merely areas where the victims of social structural changes i.e. the excluded people live, they are also areas, where patterns of exclusion are generated and deepened themselves. The anti-ghetto inhabitants are excluded from society's circumstances and by this way, they are not only the excluded, but also the strangers for all the other included people of society. Anti-ghetto areas produce excluded people, deepen the attribute of strangeness of their inhabitants to the included part of society and push the outsourcing of strangers.

But not only the anti-ghetto areas themselves produce and outsource strangers from society's circumstances by patterns of exclusion. This is where the gated community movement joins the game of exclusion and production of strangeness. The gated community-movement was described as a socio-spatial phenomenon, which operates with mechanisms of partition and exclusion by demonizing some groups of society which cannot afford a life full of consumption and prestige. Therefore the gated community-movement operates with mechanisms to banish these resourcelessness groups, by spreading fear with reports about sensationalized crimes, with exaggerated security protections and with segregative architecture that transform public spaces into pseudo-public-spaces. The mainly effect of this movement and the mainly intention of it, seems to reach a total exclusion of everything that not fits into the pseudo-public spaces of a consuming and successfully middle- and upper class. What does not fit into the model of privacy, exclusiveness and habits of consuming seems unfamiliar and strange and by this it seems not identifiable. It is this strangeness, which disturbs and needs to be banned, needs to be excluded from the pseudo-public-spaces. This strangeness is something that does not fit, it is the thing which blocks the gear wheel of sameness and regression. This strangeness

is threaten to destroy the well-known order of consumption and a civility that only takes effect for an exclusive, integrated part of society.

Anti-ghetto areas and the gated community-movement are not independent from each other, moreover they generate one another by including and mainly excluding unfamiliar, alienated people who can be described as 'strangers'. With the intention of generating order by social control, deviation is not allowed resp. it will be sanctified, more precisely it will be sanctified with exclusion from society's circumstances and society's everyday life. But deviation in this sense is not about breaking law or social conventions and commitments; it is more about not keeping up with society's pace. A deviator in this sense is someone who cannot afford a life in lockstep with this pace. A deviator is someone who has not the necessary resources to keep up a life of consumption and success. A deviator is someone who has not the luxury of being proactive and taking every offering chance. With this kind of deviation someone can become unfamiliar and alienated to all the successfully, resourcefulness, consuming part of society, who has the luxury of being proactive and is able to keep up with society's pace. By this way such a deviator becomes a stranger and a stranger is trying to threat society's order, because with him he brings something that is not likely, that is different to the successfully lives of all the hard-working, proactive and consuming people. The stranger disturbs this pace of society, which does not allow any influences which could change the well-known order of cadence and uniformity. And because of his annoying differentness, the stranger must be excluded from society's circumstances and by this way, from the public view. The gated community-movement tries its best to advance such patterns of exclusion, and mostly the excluded live in anti-ghetto areas, where their exclusion is just deepened furthermore by stigmatization and discrimination. But visualize a world of perfect order, without deviation and without strangeness of any kind: It would be a dystopian world without innovation, but after all it would never be possible and could only remain a dystopian world of bad imagination. Ignoring and outsourcing the strangeness of society is always the wrong way, which could only lead to greater problems, like unsocial minds full of ignorance, intolerance and selfishness. The only way of avoiding such a dystopia is trying to reintegrate the strangeness and taking care of the excluded by trying to give back faith to civil society and changing mechanisms of welfare state. All this must go on without losing the sense of individuality, which is denied to the strangers, who are only reduced to their labeled unfitting and strange attributes.

References

- Bauman, Zygmunt (2001):* Making and Unmaking of Strangers. In: Beilartz, Peter (ed.): The Bauman Reader. Blackwell Publishers. Oxford. p.200-217.
- Bauman, Zygmunt (1990):* Thinking Sociologically. Blackwell Publishers. Oxford.
- Becker, Howard (1963):* Outsiders. The Free Press. New York.
- Blakely, Edward J./Snyder, Mary Gail (1997):* Fortress America. Gated Communities in the United States. Brookings Institution. Washington D.C.
- Bude, Heinz (2008):* Die Ausgeschlossenen. Das Ende vom Traum einer gerechten Gesellschaft. Hanser. München.
- Dangschat, Jens S. (2009):* Architektur und soziale Selektivität. In: Architektur der Gesellschaft. Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte. Heft 25/2009. S.27-33.
- Davis, Mike (1992):* City of Quartz. Excavating the Future in Los Angeles. Vintage Books. New York.
- Goffman, Erving (1959):* The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Anchor Books. New York.
- Häußermann, Hartmut/Läpple, Dieter/Siebel, Walter (2008):* Stadtpolitik. bpb. Bonn.
- Häußermann, Hartmut (2006):* Die Krise der ‚sozialen Stadt‘. Warum der sozialräumliche Wandel der Städte eine eigenständige Ursache für Ausgrenzung ist. In: Bude, Heinz/Willisch, Andreas (Hg.): Das Problem der Exklusion. Ausgegrenzte, Entbehrliche, Überflüssige. HIS. Hamburg. S.294-313.
- Häußermann, Hartmut/Kapphan, Andreas (2004):* Berlin: Ausgrenzungsprozesse in einer europäischen Stadt. In: Häußermann, Hartmut/Kronauer, Martin/Siebel, Walter (Hg.): An den Rändern der Städte. Suhrkamp. Frankfurt a.M. S.203-234.
- Herlyn, Ulfert (2004):* Zum Bedeutungswandel der öffentlichen Sphäre – Anmerkungen zur Urbanitätstheorie von H.P. Bahrdt. In: Siebel, Walter (Hg.): Die europäische Stadt. Suhrkamp. Frankfurt a.M. S.121-130.
- Simmel, Georg (1983):* Exkurs über den Fremden. In: ders. Soziologie. Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung. Duncker & Humboldt. Berlin. p.509-512.
- Kruse, Alexander (2008):* Die geschlossene Gesellschaft. In: Westfalenpost. Nr. 182, 2008. www.geographie.uni-potsdam.de/index.php?option=com (29.03.2010).
- Wacquant, Loïc (2008):* Urban Outcasts. A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality. Polity Press. Malden.
- Wacquant, Loïc (2006):* Das Janusgericht des Ghettos und andere Essays. Birkhäuser. Basel.
- Wehrheim, Jan (2006):* Die überwachte Stadt. Sicherheit, Segregation und Ausgrenzung. Barbara Budrich. Opladen.