

TO BELONG AND TO BE DIFFERENT

BALANCING NATIONAL AND ETHNIC LOYALTIES IN MALE ADOLESCENTS

Dirck H.J. van Bekkum, Cultural Anthropologist, Utrecht, The Netherlands E-mail moira@ctt.nl www.ctt.nl

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter dominant culture is conceptualized in relation to foreign and indigenous ethnic groups in the Netherlands. I will try to do this in such a way that it reflects the contemporary European context and does not violate the historical facts in the emergence of European nation-states. The data is coming from an anthropological fieldwork project in the department of clinical psychiatry of a Dutch Army Hospital.

First the vicissitudes of Mehmet are presented, a drafted soldier from a Turkish migrant family in the Dutch army.

Mehmet is originally himself from a dominant culture. The Turks are proud never to have been colonized or subjected.

But in the Netherlands he is member of a dependent minority group. He offers a good example to clarify and analyse the issue of balancing national (dominant group) and ethnic (dependent group) loyalties in male adolescents.

Secondly the researchproject from which the data sprang is outlined and my own epistemological position is pointed out. This is an anthropological, that is a cross-cultural one. It means that we anthropologists look for comparative grounds with data from other (non-Western) societies to look at dominant and dependent groups. The emic-etic methodology from cultural anthropology and the established-outsider paradigm of Norbert Elias constitute the center of my epistemological position.

In the **third part** the concept of ethnicity in the historical context of the emergence of the Western-European nation-states is discussed. In the fieldwork project drafted soldiers from regional groups like the Frisians from the north of the Limburgians from the south had in many cases more affinity with the soldiers from migrant groups. Ethnicity from this data could in anthropological terms be conceptualized as common to every long term existing group. The core issue of ethnicity: **to belong and to be different** is formulated from the concepts of 'synchronizing' from Edward Hall and 'totemism' from Claude Levi-Strauss.

In the **fourth part** we return to Mehmet's experiences in the Dutch army in order to outline the interdependence between the individual and his national, his religious, his ethnic, his local group. For adolescents finding a balance between their affinity of their own local-ethnic family and group and the national context is an intricately and vulnerable process which is still underestimated in its importance for mature citizenship and for an epistemological framework to analyse dominance-dependence relationships between individuals and between groups. In the **last part** I look ahead to my next fieldworkreport on the connection between unequal balance of power and the loss of cultural self-reflection in the dominant group or culture.

The chapter is **concluded** by lining up some preliminary conclusions and recommendations for contemporary problems among male adolescents in multicultural cities, like Rotterdam and Utrecht in the Netherlands where the author is consulting the local government on these issues.

I) MEHMET AND HIS CULTURAL PROUDNESS

Mehmet was brought in on the psychiatric ward with the symptoms of impulse 'breakthroughs' of aggression followed by periods of total social withdrawal from his military roommates. He was sent to the military doctor of his battalion who had sent him to our department. He was an 20 years old The Hague (West of Holland) born young man from Turkish-Anatolian parents. His parents were divorced when Mehmet was ten and he saw his father regularly every few weeks. He lived with his mother who was a teacher at a secondary school. Mehmet had a sister of 16 years old who was student at a economy and business college. He himself had visited and succeeded at middle level school of electric engineering. Mehmet was proud upon his Turkish background, but also on his Dutch, The Hague background. In his neighbourhood he had friends from different groups among which Dutch indigenous boys. Since his 14th year he was strongly engaged in sport: basketball and boxing. He had focussed on boxing, had become rather good at it and had won several internal tournaments of the boxing school. On becoming 18 he had successfully requested for deferment (delay for drafting) because he wanted to finish school. After finishing school he was eager and proud to fulfill his national duty in the army. One day after several weeks at occupational therapy in which we were solving a problem in his manufacturing a aluminium casing for a sound mix panel Mehmet asked me the following question. "Sir, he said, why do people keep on hurting each other?" His question overtook me with surprise and after a while I replied: "That's a difficult question to which there is no easy answer, but why do you ask?" He was silent for a moment and said: "I am a Turk and proud to be one as my father told me. My father also told me also that Dutch people had difficulties understanding this proudness. I am born in The Hague and have many Dutch friends, they like me I like them. Of course I have been called a Turk and in other ways insulted by boys from other neighbourhoods but in our group there were pals from different backgrounds and we screamed back, fought them when necessary and it was over. I was always in front when to fight, I was never a coward. Then I went into the army. I liked it very much and was proud to serve in the Dutch army because I like Holland. It is also

my country. And then at our room it started. They kept on picking on me. I like a joke, I do it myself on other guys, but they kept on hurting me calling me a stupid Turk, a dirty foreigner, hey 'No Brains' can you count to three'. The first time I laughed then I said Hey man stop it ! But after one week this special guy kept on provoking me. I know I cannot fight outside the Ring and am allowed to fight in the Army with my mates, but then this evening when we came back from a long march with full package. We had just showered and back at our room when this guy very unexpected said something about my mother having mated with an animal and this took the blinds for my eyes. I hit him wherever I could but he was tall and big than he went down and I jumped at him at the floor choking his throat. I didn't know I was doing they told me afterwards what I had done. They tore me from this guy with four mates and called the sergeant. The whole thing was talked over but the biggest insults were not mentioned and I was not going to tell it for them. I was jailed for two days. This happened two other times, I do not know what they said to me then. After the fights when the blinds had gone down I could do anything else than lying on my bed for days. Then they send me to the doctor and he send me here. Why do people keep hurting, that is my question ? I want to be a Dutch soldier" By that time I had tears behind my my eyes and could only say: "I do not know, but some people are just not good, they do not know themselves why they are doing it." As a human being and as a researcher Mehmet's story sticked to my mind for years as motivation to discover patterns and structural aspects in what I then already saw the interdependence and balance of power between members of dominant-majority groups and those from dependent-minority groups.

II a) RESEARCH PROJECT

The material and data to view how dominant culture patterns are acquired from guiding and observing young men, among which was Mehmet in military drafting from all over the Netherlands. In 1980 I was in the last phase of my anthropological studies and looked for possibilities to connect my efforts with producing applicable knowledge and insights. I met dr. Ronald Chavers (1972, 1978) whose methodology offered me the opportunity to combine theoria and praxis. I found a part-time job as an occupational therapist in the psychiatric department of a Military Hospital and saw immediately the scientific potential to do fieldwork research as an cultural anthropologist next to my therapeutic work. I combined this for ten years of which I worked seven years on research on the interdependence of male adolescence, ethnicity and mental instabilities. The psychiatric department was an organizational center where older adolescents and young adults with all kinds of deviant problems ranging from substance abuse, criminal behaviour including violence, depressive and psychotic behaviour, affective disorders and simulation to escape drafting were observed, corrected and treated. Because the young men I guided were drafted soldiers from all regions of the Netherlands and from different social and ethnic groups my work and research was an ideal situation to study adolescence, nationality and ethnicity. Drafting could legitimately be considered as one of the main instruments to socialize males into dominant national culture. After a period of two years of getting acquainted with the job, with the team of mental health workers and with major methodological problems in my research I started collecting observations and developing empirically reflected insights on various themes. (see fieldwork reports) One topic was the loyalties the young men expressed towards their regional and ethnic background and towards national-dominant culture. This paper is an elaboration of another fieldwork report I present on this topic. (Bekum 1993)

In the course of my research I came to call the major inter- and intrapersonal activity in and among adolescents: **balancing of loyalties**. The perspective of balancing loyalties is developed from a set of concepts in family therapy in the USA by Ivan Boszemenyi-Nagy. In 1973 he wrote a book on structural aspects in family relationships including the grandparents called *Invisible Loyalties*. (1973) His therapeutical conceptual framework was intergenerational and contained terms like reciprocity, relational boundaries, bonds, triangulation and balance - imbalance in family relationships. For me as an anthropologist I was likely to view people and the individual in their kinship systems in different cultures. Nagy' framework suited as a basis for the pragmatic approach I developed for the adolescent transition to adulthood. In the course of the fieldwork five fields differentiated themselves from the praxis in which urban youth 'balanced their loyalties': ego-family, school-leisure-work, male-female, **national-ethnic** and secular-spiritual. In this paper the fourth field will be worked out from the perspective of dominant versus dependent culture.

II b) EPISTEMOLOGICAL POSITION: ANTHROPOLOGICAL OUTLOOK

The perspective on the relationship between dominant-dependent groups is elaborated from Norbert Elias' concept of 'balance of power' between groups which he worked this out in an excellent fieldwork study: *Established and Outsiders*. (1976, 1988) Elias uses the concept for dynamics in and between groups in European nation-state settings. For example: "democratization means that the balances of power has developed themselves more and more in favour of the former 'common people'." (Elias 1978) He rejects dualistic conceptions and stresses the interdependence between established and outsider groups as a balance of power. Power in his view exist only as a relationship and uses the concept **relative performing force** (Spielstärke) as dynamic synonym for power. (1965, 1988, 491)

Europe is one continent of five. All continents are clearly different in geological and geographical heritage but as science progresses they seem to have been one big continent in the past. When all existing peoples and nations on our planet are human, and I take this for granted, we have to have something in common. Cosmopolitans and new age people in the street sometimes coin this 'having in common' as: 'we are all the same'. Others like social scientists tend to call having in common: "universal features" and anthropologists have even invented the concept "universals". These are, in my view, blurry concepts which do not have sufficient analytical potential to tackle the phenomenon of human diversity. A human

trait which is as wide spread is ethnocentrism and it should be said that dominant cultures do by no means have the monopoly on a blindness for their being one among many (potentially equal) others. The cross-cultural tradition in anthropology has revealed that every continuous group has to be ethnocentric in some way in order to survive. The need to be distinct as an individual, as a family, as a neighbourhood, as a village, a football club, in other words in any long term organized group seems to be a common human phenomenon which can be objectified from empirical cross-cultural and historical facts. Let us look for an effective methodological tool to analyse the interdependence of dominant and dependent groups. The anthropological research strategy of **emic-etic research strategies** can possibly offer such a tool.

EMIC-ETIC RESEARCH STRATEGY

While the theme of our workshop was dominant culture as a foreign culture, **seen through eyes of minorities**, the emic-etic issue can serve as a starting point to conceptualize the methodological position I use in my professional scientific, therapeutic and intercultural consultancy work. In anthropological methodological tradition the emic-etic issue has been on the core of many polemics for decades. In the fifties this originated, inspired by new developments in techniques of linguistics, a conceptual tool of which the methodological potential still has to be fulfilled. This is the emic-etic approach is in fact an interdisciplinary "translation" of the old European philosophical argument subject-object. (see also: Chavers 1972 and Elias 1987)

The emic-etic research strategy can reveal this taboo on collective selfreflection in larger intergenerational organized human groups in general and in dominant cultures in particular very clearly. The cultural anthropologist with his emic-etic tools can function as an intermediary between the dominant and minority outlooks. If empathy is a basis requisite for communication than understanding a member of the opposite sex or someone from a different cultural background can bring about confusion about one's own ways of thinking and behaviour. This experience, of course, has been part of human life for millennia because of contacts between human groups. Anthropologists, in the footsteps of discoverers, missionaries and colonial traders have specialized in the experience coping with anxiety as result from 'loss of culture' being the 'smallest minority' in a foreign and strange environment. (Vidich in Radin 1966, Devereux 1967)

To cope with regular personal and professional confusion, due to permanent contact with tribal cultures and the need to understand their ways, anthropologists developed different methodological tools. The research method developed from these different tools is the emic-etic research strategy. The terms are derived from the analogy of linguist Kenneth Pike: *phonemic* and *phonetic*. Pike posed that emic structure in linguistic research "must correspond to the actor's 'purpose' during the observed performance." (Harris, 1968, 570) In cultural anthropology the emic-etic research strategy has led to a combined procedure of constructing observed realities of studied groups of people a) as appropriate by the studied people themselves and b) as appropriate by the community of scientific observers. (ibid. 571,575) This is the position of Harris and of mainstream anthropology. My position is somewhat different. So: "appropriate by the community of scientific observers" suggests validity and objectivity of the acquired knowledge and insights. And as I do not believe in an ultimate truth in whatever science my position is based upon negotiating two inescapable perspectives: a) appropriate for the studied cultural group and, b) appropriate for my 'professional, state paid, intellectual status as being part of Western culture'. Objective science is from this position a fiction. What I really want to stress here is that the emic-etic strategy can be used as a methodological tool to acquire knowledge from another culture and translate this knowledge to my own and other cultural groups. **And this is what we seem to need desperately in the field of power struggles between dominant and minority groups.** Such knowledge is never static but always dynamic and bound to a specific intercultural context of communication. In this position the legitimate need to be distinct of cultural groups is respected. Intercultural knowledge is by definition ambiguous.

Within one's own group knowledge need not to be ambiguous. On the contrary. People need unambiguous knowledge to survive in daily life. No one survives mentally a permanent screening of every experience he/she has in contact with others. With this position we return in fact to the American anthropologist and linguist Edward Sapir in the twenties of this century (1927):

"It is impossible to say that what an individual is doing unless we have tacitly accepted the essentially arbitrary modes of interpretation that social tradition is constantly suggesting to us from the very moment of birth. Let anyone who doubts this try the experiment of making a painstaking report (i.e. an etic one) of the actions of a group of natives engaged in some activity, say religious, to which he has not the cultural key. (i.e. a knowledge of the emic system). If he is a skill full writer, he may succeed in giving a picturesque account of what he sees and hears, or thinks he sees and hears, but the chances of his being able to give a relation of what happens, in terms of that would be intelligible and acceptable to the natives themselves, are practically nil. He will be guilty of all manner of distortion; his emphasis will be constantly askew. He will find interesting what the natives take for granted as a casual kind of behaviour worthy of no particular comment, and he will utterly fail to observe the crucial turning points in the course of action that give formal significance to the whole in the minds of those who do possess the key to its understanding." (quoted in: Pike 1954 ,9-10)

During my fieldwork I have been trained in a dialectic between subject and object. That is: to learn to see a patient as a subject and myself as an object for that patient, and vice versa. (Chavers 1972, Elias 1956) This coincided with the emic-etic strategy: always confronts the patient's view with my own observations and reflections and vice versa. This means that intercultural knowledge, and in fact every knowledge, emerges on the brinks of emic and etic data collection. In medical anthropology the emic-etic argument was pictured concisely by the anthropologist-psychiatrist Arthur

Kleinman:

“By treating biomedical understanding as emic, not etic, and comparing it with patient understanding, similarly viewed, the clinically applied medical anthropologist can negotiate between these usually distinctive (and often conflicting) views and help resolve problems that emerge from them.” (1982,88)

In transferring this methodological position to our theme of dominant culture in the eyes of minorities I hope to open new paths to manage meanings in this field. For the discussion I want to pose the following statement beforehand: A core feature of dominant cultures is the claim of human universality of their values. In other words members of dominant cultures tend to be more chauvinistic and ethnocentric than more dependent-minority cultures, because the last ones have at least to view themselves in the mirror of their dominant counter-part. In the fourth part some consequences of this chauvinism of dominant groups are discussed.

III) ETHNICITY AND EMERGENCE OF NATION-STATES

In anthropological literature there are dozens of examples which picture the reciprocal, more equal, relationships between cultural groups. In the case of dominant groups versus minority groups in Europe history there seems to have developed a structural asymmetry in relationships between cultural groups and in my view this is directly connected with the emergence of nation-states in Western-Europe. I use both concepts of ethnicity and culture to denote the ways people organize, synchronize and express themselves. Culture is here used as more and more commonly used term as developed in cultural anthropology. This conception differentiates itself strongly from the historical European elites rooted concept of Kultur (German) and Culture (French) which is connected with their self-image as “civilized”. (Elias 1988, 3-41) Ethnicity has all the characteristics of culture but I will use it in a more specific sense of core emic features, as seen by the group members as differentiating themselves from other groups. Ethnicity in this conception can be used for both traditional indigenous (Basks, Bretons, Frisians etc) as for contemporary foreign migrant groups (Turks, Moroccans, Ethiopians etc) within nation-states. The existence and superiority of modern nation-states is as self-evident and undisputed as the rising of the sun tomorrow morning. (Davidson 1992) Nation-states got their contemporary form and structure in Europe the last eight hundred years. (Elias 1988) Along with this process we, nationalists, have developed a believe that aboriginal European regional ethnic identities would vanish and merge with nationality. (Smith 1981) As the last five years have bitterly proven this believe to be wrong we have to learn to live with this new reality in which ethnicity is here to stay next to nationality. Such believes of vanishing of indigenous ethnicity seem to be stronger than (scientific) validated insights. Anthropologists for example have refuted this believe already in the first decades of this century. From the studies of anthropologists like Boas, Mauss and Levi Strauss **ethnicity** emerges as the exclusive form in which humans as individuals and as groups can exist. Ethnicity can be described as the "human mould". They used the term culture which is covering the concept of ethnicity here. Without it we cannot become and stay humans. We cannot survive without a specific and unique identity, collectively as well as individually. Ethnicity, for example described as the way in which people express themselves as a group, was already for decades a difficult concept. (Barth 1969, Vermeulen and Govers 1994) The connotations with culture and with "primitiveness" took its toll in the clarity of the ethnicity concept. Until the end of the sixties the prevailing notion among specialists in (and outside) the area was indeed that ethnicity was one of those things to vanish into nationality in the course of modernization. Now time, and certainly the aftermath of the collapse of the Soviet Union, has refuted this view.

ETHNICITY, SYNCHRONIZING AND THE NEED TO BELONG

In the perspective presented here we want to coin ethnicity, as we western educated scientists learned it, more effectively as being strongly interdependent with nationality. Allardt in 1979 presented a map and a list of 46 linguistic minorities within European nation-states. He detects an "ethnic revival" in "advanced industrial societies" in the seventies with three main features a) a **minority group** within a nation-state b) a group with a **territorial basis** and c) a **distinct language**.¹ The last feature implicates a fourth feature, which I want to introduce here in the conceptualization of ethnicity: d) **historical continuity**. Pi-Sunyer (1972), Nash (1989), Macdonald (1993) and Levin (1993) provide case studies on minorities like Jews, Basques, Catalonians, Bretons, and Czech versus Slovak and of groups outside Europe. The very old and close interdisciplinary cooperation between the linguistic and anthropological field have resulted in the scientific fact, if we did not know this already, that language is one of the strongest constants in cultural change. (Kroeber 1948) So **distinct language** means **historical continuity**. And here we arrive at a tricky point, because our argument confronts Western ethnocentrism and monoculturalism at its very heart. Ethnicity in this conception is not only a "survival" out of

¹ The aspect of territory and ethnicity creates a taxonomical problem. How to deal with the exception of the European presence of Roma, Gitano (Gypsies) for more than 5 centuries and Jewish groups in European countries for almost 20 centuries? Nomadic versus sedentary people seems to be out of cultural awareness of Allardt. Jews had no territory until recently and original Gypsies as a group seem not capable of holding land in property. For them land is not for humans. They have no territorial basis and can therefore not be coined as an ethnic group or minority? In our development-history conception of ethnicity these groups are included. Epistemologically we have four categories in the field of territory and ethnicity: a) national sedentary people, b) sedentary migrants with a father/motherland, c) sedentary migrants without a father/motherland, d) nomads.

our "prehistoric and tribal past" as the argument went for decades. The developments the last twenty years in the whole of Europe has proven that: **indigenous ethnic and linguistic minorities in Europe have not disappeared in 2000 years of "civilizing" and "Christianizing"**.

Nationalism, in its European manifestation, is relatively young, 500 to 800 years, and indigenous European ethnicity is old, 800 years and older. Ethnicity goes for example back to European traditions of communal property of the land and has little to do with contemporary attitudes and behaviour in nation-states on territory. This ethnicity has to be something very worthwhile, because two millennia continuous struggle for group identity and for own rules and rituals is no sinecure. The paradox of most western conceptualization on ethnicity can be looked upon, from a strictly historical standpoint, as a persistent blind spot in national ideology. It turned out to be: **Without Ethnicity No Nationality**.

We can now connect with the anthropological findings on culture and ethnicity. All ethnic groups, tribal societies and cultures anthropologists studied show at least one common trait: **humans as individuals, as families, as clans, as groups and as peoples are all different and need to express this reality in order to exist as human beings in communication with each other.**

One may ask: how could this be otherwise? This "Binzenwahrheit" however has been overlooked in its consequences by many specialists. My own fieldwork research in psychiatry has affirmed the need to be different in the sense that persons who cannot differentiate themselves anymore from others are called psychotic. Personality as a balanced configuration of cultural (be it national, religious political or ethnic) patterns falls apart in psychosis as a human feature of intense mental instability. And this falling apart in most cases brings about a terrible anxiety which every human being tries to avoid at any cost. And this permanent effort invested in being different is at the same time an effort to reassure that we are the part of a human group with the same set of symbols and signs. We, as human animals, have to **synchronize** permanently, as the American anthropologist Edward T. Hall calls, in order to keep up our mental, emotional equilibrium, which is our being. Hall claims that "syncing" is panhuman. Syncing is more than our usual conception of communication

"It appears to be innate, being well established by the second day of life, and may be present as early as the first hour after birth." (Hall 1976, 72)

Syncing is culture-specific in language, gesture and other body-movements like dancing, walking etc.. Intercultural encounters, according to Hall, are in many cases threatening because so many self-evident, semi-conscious expressions are not or misunderstood. Not being understood structurally endangers one's mental stability. We need to synchronize in order to become or stay someone. He calls group-bound idiosyncratic behaviour "The Silent Language" and the potential intercultural misunderstanding "The Hidden Dimension". He offers many examples of misunderstandings from his fieldwork among diplomats and neighbouring (groups of) people. Irritation, frustration, fatigue, burn out, mental instability and even violent conflicts can be connected with the Hidden Dimension, as the result of intercultural misunderstanding. (Hall 1959, 1966) So ethnicity is also the manifestation of a human need to differentiate, to be different **and** to synchronize with people of the same set of symbols and signs, seems to be universal in human societies and among human groups. My working hypothesis is: the 'call' and 'need' to dominate is a destructive form of this need to be different. We are not only different but we are a better people equipped to guide (and subject) other peoples and groups.

ETHNOCENTRISM AND THE NEED TO BE DIFFERENT

The anthropologist and originator of French structuralism, Claude Levi-Strauss, has tried to conceptualize this complex insight of the "need to be different" and restudied thoroughly an earlier anthropologist Franz Boas' earlier work. In his studies on "The Savage Mind" and "Totemism" (1962) the "why" of the human need to classify and order is formulated by Roger Poole in his foreword in the Penguin edition of "Totemism":

"The final and ultimate question remains: why do men go to such lengths to classify out the universe? What leads them to organize their codes in this excessively subtle way? The answer which seems to emerge from *La pensée sauvage* is that totemic classifications seem to be there to divide men up from each other, these classifications are like what we call 'nationalism'. We call each nation by a semi-condescending nickname, which very often has to do with some animal or plant associated with that nation. Likewise, we might remember the example Durkheim gives of the soldier who dies for a flag. In the same way, the so-called primitive divides himself off from his fellow man: 'The differences between animals, which man can extract from nature and transfer to culture...are adopted as emblems by groups of men in order to do away with their own resemblances' (p. 107). Man does not want to imply recognition of 'a common nature' with other men (p. 108). Totemic symbols are borrowed from nature by men 'to create differences amongst themselves' (p. 108). If this is so, then it is a sad reflection with which to end a study of a mentality we hoped was primitive. Because this (primitive) mentality is, in the last analysis, only our own." (Levi-Strauss 1969b, 62)

One could want to go a step further in asking why it is that people do "not want to imply recognition of a common nature with other men" which leads us to a more psychological realm of human experience. In the context of this paper it will suffice that variation and difference is the central phenomenon in nature and among people. In several traditional cultures one-egg twin babies were killed while this was considered as a major mistake from the laws in nature. No two things in nature are the same, so two alike babies is a mistake of nature. From psychiatry we know that long term over identification, wanting to be (come) the other, leads to loss of ego and to psychosis. This is not only the case for patients, but inadequate professional coping empathy and transference leads to bad therapy and can be dangerous for the mental health of both therapist and patient. To synchronize, to identify with other people within your own cultural groups or without, in other words follow the "need to belong", presupposes and demands at the same time the "need to be different".

CONFRONTATIONS WITH "NATIONAL" CULTURE

During the fieldwork many difficulties were encountered in observing, lining up and analysing observations of interethnic situations. I observed in and between the individuals in the groups I guided, all kinds of features I couldn't bring home. Only after numerous repetitions did the separate observations start to cluster. One of the clusters was the conceptualization of the majority-dominant group versus the minority-dependent group. I first used the model of Norbert Elias of "established and outsiders," but the ethnic component couldn't be integrated satisfactorily. (1965) In my training with Ronald Chavers I learn to combine the model of established and outsiders with the concept of a-culturalisation to denote a macro historical process in Europe in which original indigenous cultures were Christianized and nationalized. Chavers: 'As I said before, much of in our natural- and cultural-historical development is already is already estranged, suppressed, and even destroyed, because the natural and primal conditions have been lost an also disrespected. (Examples of this can be found in the colonial wars of all times.) ... The basis of this is expressed in the ac-culturation process of any ethnic group. Their natural historical conditions were destroyed through the super-rationalistic capitalistic and specific mechanised norms, and social-cultural living- and power-structures. The conquest wars of the Greeks, Romans, and later of the different European peoples in America, Africa, Australia and those of the various islands are proofs of the above. Also the European cultures such as the Etruscans, Celts, Germanic peoples, the Slavs, the Gypsies, the Jews and other cultures have suffered enormously in these long historical processes.' (1978, 77)

By bringing ethnicity and a-culturation "back to Europe" Chavers' method of development-history made it possible to compare indigenous and foreign ethnic cultural patterns. This was a methodological breakthrough. I started to observe patterns in adolescents from such differing areas as Limburg, in the south of Holland, and e.g. in Surinam-Hindustani adolescents and could order them in the same clusters.

IV) BALANCING NATIONAL AND ETHNIC LOYALTIES

As mentioned above the Turks are a proud people. They are in their own eyes never subjected or dominated, but have a long history of dominating other peoples and groups. Beside the Kurdish Turks almost all Turks are identifying strongly with this self-image. But when as labour-migrants in Western Europe, especially in a small country as the Netherlands, they are an ethnic minority and are treated like one with all the negative consequences. This can be seen as the first paradox Mehmet had to solve.

Going back on holidays to Turkey in his family Mehmet and his "Dutch" relatives were looked upon as the rich ones in the family, but at the same times the majority of the Turkish public opinion looks down upon their Turkish fellow citizens in Western Europe. Mehmet had also to solve this second paradox in nationality and ethnicity. The provocation of his Dutch mates is a logical reaction of members of a dominant group. What is not logical is the continuity of the provocation. What should never be accepted in any situation where young people are guided and trained are insults towards ones person and family, especially the mother. I had no further information of the insulter but it sounded like the ones who were regularly hospitalized because of their weak developed ego who acted their inferiority feelings out on others. What did explode Mehmet were a number of **unsolvable conflicting loyalties between his nationalities and ethnicities**. He was over-average motivated to solve these ones but his broken family situation and the high level of provocation of the insulter had **triggered the unbearable tensions created by his conflicting loyalties**. Male adolescent peer groups are particular prone to these kinds of build-up tensions and triggering them among themselves. To cope with these potential explosive situations male peer groups develop a high level of trust among each other and protection against the outside world. The multicultural context of peers in the situation of Mehmet was expected to be controlled by the organization by officers. But the context was in fact uncontrolled and most aggressive members of the dominant group (because the army is the manifestation of the dominant group) can easily abuse their position to pick on others. It got out of hand when the build up tension of the insulter sought its way to get rid of it by provoking Mehmet who had this "un-Dutch" proudness on being both Turkish and Dutch. Mehmet's tension-complex was much more complex and intense. He lost the confrontation because his performing force (Elias 1976) in the situation was structurally weaker than of his insulting opponent. He got the blame the situation and his black out the days afterwards can be interpreted as an ultimate coping with the shame coming from his violated honour and the breaking of the rules of two of his beloved objects the army and boxing.

Being drafted in the army, from a historical nation-state perspective, can be considered as a special example of being "initiated into the national tribe". For Mehmet this was the case he was proud to serve in the army because he could really prove himself being a genuine Dutchman. The army, willy-nilly, has to establish a bond between the young man from whatever (social and ethnic) group and the national level. Politics also play a part in this but underclasses do not have much affinity with parliamentary political affairs. So for boys from the outer (ethnic) regions of the Netherlands and from foreign ethnic background, drafting is, next to the possibility to "become a man", most of the time also a confrontation with the dominant Dutch culture from the west. For boys from the western part of the Netherlands the confrontation with the "national values" is most of the time less because the army organization is, and should be, Dutch in national sense. These boys, perhaps not dominant themselves personally, are seen and stereotyped as being already member of the dominant "national culture". The language is ABN (general civilized Dutch) and the writing and reading is in bureaucratic, governmental "dialect". The Flag and the Queen are representing the "Vaderland", the homeland which has to be, if necessary, defended with our lives. This all, in the case of the "uniform" literally, is uniforming religious, class and

regional differences between the boys.

The diverse composition of the groups, which I guided, offered possibilities for participant observation of dynamic interethnic communication between all these different patterns. And in many cases informal and partly unconscious, the dominant-dependent patterns could be observed in all its facets. The workshop and occupational therapy structure served as a means to evoke an idea along the line of (by me) guided fantasy (rooted in the boys background), to design and to make a valuable product for the boy with as much satisfaction as possible. Competition was accepted, but suppression, mostly done by belittling, by dominant boys, whether personal or/and group rooted, was opposed when it damaged the creation and manufacturing process of the targeted boy. Whenever the creation and manufacturing blocked from "inside" we, the adolescent and me, tried to find out, verbally as well as non-verbally, what caused the blocking. These were the hardest, the most instructive and the most joyful, when we were successful, moments. Here one part of the collecting of data on ethnic and national balancing happened. (Another part of collecting data was done in the group sessions on art and craft experiences.) If we couldn't resolve the blocking on the technical plane, I distracted the attention towards some other subject I knew he was interested in. Many times the boy would tell me of some experience on the ward, my workshop was located in the garden away from the psychiatric ward, and other times he would tell me of army experiences. In these stories the "keys for his decompensation" or flipping out were hidden. Material that was relevant to the treatment I brought into the team meetings where the diagnosis and the therapy program were made. But within the occupational therapy structure these encounters, including the the hidden keys, yielded trust and non-verbal understanding and communication. It was in this field I discovered the potential of the non-psychiatric orientation on mental hospitalization and psychiatric diagnosis, and the value of the anthropological paradigm.

Careful asking, listening and answering was my part of the game to dissolve the hidden keys. And when the boy felt understood in something he did not understand himself caused a trust, feelings of safety and many times an opening in which he was willing to try to formulate the disrupting experiences which had brought him into this situation. This was part of transforming his (traumatic) experiences which I always tried to translate into the structure of occupational therapy. Inserting meaning, next to beauty and function, whenever possible, into his creation and manufacturing process was the main goal of the therapeutic process. Next to other conflicting needs, demands and interests, the balancing of ethnic and national loyalties in boys from indigenous and foreign background was part of this process. Humour and in particular irony is, in my experience, central in intercultural encounters. A man from Twente, eastern middle part of the Netherlands, once told me some rhyme which contains the ethnic-national controversy:

"God created from golden corn
the Drents and the Twents.
From the chaff and the rest

the people from the West"

From these experiences I learned to observe, order and react interculturally. This means, nothing more and nothing less, meeting each other half way. If a stranger or a threatened person feels, verbally or non-verbally, recognized by his opponent, his distrust and anxiety (and resulting anger) lowers and positive-constructive contact becomes possible. As I hoped to have shown the adjusting of the offered orientation to their familial, class, religious, urban, rural, regional, Dutch dominant and ethnic minority back-grounds is vital for a successful dissolving of blocking behaviour. For an anthropological-psychiatric orientation the research population was categorized in five main groups:

- 1) men from dominant Dutch groups, most of them residing in the western part of Holland,
- 2) men from indigenous ethnic backgrounds like the "Limburgers" from the South, the "Frisian" from the North and the "Achterhoekers" and "Tukkers" from the East of Holland,
- 3) men from semi-foreign ethnic groups like the migrants from former colonies as Surinam, the Caribbean Antilles and the Dutch Indies, (many of these people are Euro-African-American and Eur-Asian mixed)
- 4) men from foreign ethnic groups migrated from South European and Non European countries,
- 5) men from recent mixed marriages like Moroccan-Dutch, Surinam, Turkish, Antillean-Moroccan etc..

CLINICAL PRAXIS AS SOURCE FOR SOLVING THE DOMINANT-MINORITY RIDDLE

In an overview paper of my fieldwork in 1994 I searched for a plausible clustering and ordering of my observations on different (mixed) backgrounds of adolescents I guided and studied. (van Bekkum 1994) In fact the door to a methodological breakthrough on the subject was opened by the "indigenous ethnic" adolescents from the outer regions in the Netherlands . I knew of course from school, as a genuine "Dutchman", the stereotyping and "resocializing" making fun of the "country boy" and of the dialect speaking guys, e.g. from Enschede. But I still felt some mild inexplicable jealousy towards these boys while they had their own "language" in which they seemed to talk and express themselves more vividly than in genuine Dutch. I encountered this mild jealousy again in my fieldwork research among these young men from the outer provinces. By their differentiation of "they: the others" and themselves I saw a total new map of the Netherlands. I started to travel the country to collect data on this topic. The Limburgians in the south spoke of "they, from above the rivers", the people from Twente and the Achterhoek in the east talk about "Westerners" and the Frisians in the north refer to the dominant Dutch groups as "Hollanders". This is the old name of the south-west of the Netherlands, which means Holtland (wet woodlands), where national power is historically centralized and monopolized. This fieldwork through the outer regions of the Netherlands yielded a "multi-ethnic" outlook upon the National-Dominant-Dutch **and** their history. From different groups I obtained a

specific view upon their balance of ethnic and national identity **and** upon their historical process of nationalizing. This knowledge was directly applicable in my clinical situation. The adolescents putted more trust in me as I recognized and supported their attempts to verbalize their dilemmas in ethnic and national loyalties. And we could together more easily develop a consciousness about the stream of events in which they had fallen. This development of a consciousness on "the happened stream of events" in direct communication with the adolescent is in my opinion an area where re-integration, rehabilitation and transformation of possible conflicting loyalties can have the greatest effects. When the young man's mental condition was stabilized this process of **realization** starts with an offering of a plausible explanation, in terms of their own life world, of the things happened to them in their adolescence, in the army **and** in their hospitalization in the psychiatric department. It is the transferability, coherence and transformational potential of this explanation which determines the development of a successful coping strategy in his situation. The medical-psychiatric conceptualization of mental instabilities is far, far away from the adolescent world and it is of course not meant as basis for a coping strategy. Throughout the fieldwork I sensed a deep need for orientation on what had happened and what was happening to them. I learned to differentiate three components in this need for orientation. According to their phase of re-integration they needed orientation

- a) on the psychiatric hospitalization,
- b) the diagnosis and the consequences of this for their further life.
- c) on how to deal with the hierarchic military system,
- d) the alienating bureaucratic organization,
- e) the interethnic situation of the group of soldiers (platoon, etc.) in which they are assigned.
- f) on the cultural shock effects they suffered due to the changed ethnic environment.

Joining the army as drafted soldiers, particularly, brought out their strength, weaknesses, ambivalences and dilemma's between their original cultural code and the "nationalizing" army structure. With original here is meant the codes developed in the locality(ies) and region(s) where they had been brought up. Among these codes I found urban, rural, indigenous, foreign and mixed ethnic, major or minority, ex-colonial and European, non-western and Mediterranean backgrounds.

The adolescents from dominant Dutch background from Western urban areas had less problems with the balancing of national and ethnic loyalties, due to their already mentioned monocultural outlook. Ethnicity did not exist for them as a concept on the same level or sphere as their nationality. The identification with their regional (south-west of the Netherlands called Holland) ethnicity coincided more or less with the national cultural codes. Boys from regional and foreign minority groups for them were "not yet Dutch", but even this theme was often not discussible with the "Hollanders".

The more "ethnic" boys had more trouble to cope with the "nationalizing" army organization. Their loyalty balancing took them much more energy and managing then the "Holland" guys. Frequently in the media incidents are reported between soldiers in their sleeping quarters. A boy is molested, raped or needled severely. A number of the documented cases show the boys who cannot stand this anomalous atmosphere who become depressed, explosive, aggressive and also suicidal landed in our department. This "scapegoating" phenomenon will be worked out later. (van Bekkum, 1997)

These incidents as the cases from different locations indicate a patterns of scapegoating. An in a number of this "scape goat" situations in the army the ancient "established and outsider" mechanism comes into play. (Elias 1965) The "urbanites" and the "dominant Dutch guys" exercise their irrational, but very real, superiority over their "rural" and "ethnic" room and platoon mates. This interregional phenomenon is nothing new because the army had already for decades a policy to cluster the "Amsterdammers", "Brabanders" "Frisians" in platoons. Several older officers still can recall this policy and speak with mild nostalgia of this period, for positive competition was strong. I don't know if there is still such a policy. The mentioned atmosphere can be harsh and severe while the, by both groups experienced, new and threatening army environment is by the "established" taken out on the "outsiders". (Elias 1965) It is clear that this mechanism can easily shift to racist incidents if the population of drafted soldiers is multiculturalized with foreign ethnic minorities. It should be added that in many situations these mechanisms does **not** come into play and all kinds of positive group solidarities come into being.

V) UNEQUAL POWER BALANCE AND LOSS OF SELFREFLECTION

Some cultural groups are more dominant than others. From the perspective of Elias' balance of power the strength of dominant groups, or its members, is never absolute, even if it is the ultimate goal of dominant groups. (Elias 1978) For example in a master-slave context the master is dependent on the slave while without him or her there is no wealth, no power and no feeling of superiority. One context which seems to come close to absolute power is the torturer-tortured situation which is so common the last decades that it seems institutionalized. But the illusion of a feeling of absolute power is bound by a) isolating an individual from its cultural or social group and b) the power of the torturer over life and death of his victim. Apart from the impossible question of how many lives will lead to absolute power in the experience of the offender, the (generations of) offenders will find themselves in a dead-end street of dehumanizing themselves with every victim.

Franz Fanon and Paolo Freire pulled an even more threatening aspect for the dominant group into the limelight. (1967, 1970) In order to survive, as a member of a minority group and as a minority group as a whole, under the influence of a dominant group one is under pressure to perform an emic strategy. The better I understand my oppressor the better I can organize my reactions towards him or her and the better I can survive. The existing Jewish groups and Roma (Gypsy) groups in Europe are living prove proofs of this thesis. A paradoxical example to which this mechanism can lead can be found in the American, especially the USA context. When listening to Indians and to Afro-Americans, reading their books and looking at their movies one finds much knowledge on White Americans which is not consciously familiar to the Whites themselves. This can be seen as a part of the so-called 'White Man's Burden' and threatens the racist groups, which fuels their dogmatic attitudes and attacks. (Baldwin and Mead 1973)

The claim here is that the dominant groups are vulnerable in their (collective) selfreflection needed to cope with all kinds changes a group has to face in order to survive on the long term. This claim can be supported from another angle. In 1993 I wrote:

"In the cluster of majority-minority communication I made an important discovery about the reluctance and resistance of adolescents from "Holland" background to communicate about their ethnic background in group meetings. Members from indigenous and foreign ethnic backgrounds were likely to tell or show something of their region, country and group, but it was difficult for Dutch boys from the provinces of South and North-Holland and the big cities to do so and some of them belittled the expressions of the others and said for example: "We don't need such things". In my view this was an expression of the majority versus minority argument which goes something like:.. we were always here and people from the outer provinces (and foreigners) have to adjust to our ways of doing and saying things. This controversy is already old and is connected with the continuing controversy between city and country, urbanites and farmers, modernization and tradition and perhaps with the dualism between nationality and ethnicity. Being a member of the majority seemed to give a feeling of security based on a self evident feeling of superiority.

This component in majority code seems to coincide with a monocultural perspective which can be a burden in the rapidly increasing multiculturalisation of Europe and for that matter of the whole world. In the occupational therapeutic meetings I had a hard time protecting the therapeutic structure and atmosphere whenever this issue was raised. Confronting nationality with its ethnicity, with its historical roots, with its "ownness", even in expressing one's non-Holland ethnicity seemed in my observations to raise reactions which resembled stereotyping, discrimination and racism in many group members with a 'Holland' background." (van Bekkum 1994,265-266)

CONCLUSION

The material collected and reflected from my fieldwork and rearranged here suggests the need for intensive action research, not on the minority groups, but on the balances of power between dominant and minority groups. And especially on the common blindness on self-reflective development of National-white-dominant-elite groups in the emergence of the nation-states. One crucial component of today's dominant Dutch complex is the history of the Dutch VOC, (United East Indies Company). This is Dutch government based colonial trading company is the world's first multinational with shareholders and a board of directors. This company and its descendants played a mayor role in the development of capitalism, of colonization, of slave trade and of slavery. (Choenni 1995) If we, Europeans are not willing to understand our own historical dominance and our own loss of self-reflection springing from it, the United States and other followers of the European blue print of domination will keep on copying it and will not be able to escape this cultural dead-end street. And while the chances of dramatic processes in multicultural situations like the insulter and Mehmet will increase this research on balances of power between dominant-dependent groups and the resulting teaching and intervention programs are needed tomorrow.

EPILOGUE

Our future as European culture, not as a civilization, is bounded by our capacity and courage to look in the mirrors of other cultures to see ourselves. Let us, White (Male) Europeans from the Old World, look in the mirror of our dominant partners of the New World in the USA with which we are still entangled in a double bind.

Two black people, an older man and a young woman are in dialogue on dominant-national (USA) and ethnic-dependent (Afro-American) loyalties. (Baldwin and Giovanni 1973)

"Baldwin Suddenly and to America's blunt astonishment American society discovered that other people in the world do not like Americans. I have always known that, because I never liked them. Some I love, you know, but...

Giovanni Because they are not nice. There are two kinds of people ...

Baldwin No, they are not nice.

Giovanni There are two people in the world that are not nice: the master and the slave.

Baldwin Exactly. Though we will never be able to precise this statement by correct denoting the categories. It cannot be done, never. But there is truth in it.

Giovanni Thus it always was a question of ... I mean for me it was always a matter of power.

Baldwin Yes.

Giovanni And for you it is a question of moral. I have never wanted to be the human being with the highest moral of the

world.

Baldwin I agree with you. I know what you...

Giovanni I would ... I would sell my soul ... You know what I mean ? What profit is there for the man who conquers the world and loses his soul ? The world ! Do you understand ? The world. That's his profit.

Baldwin I know.

Giovanni So you aim at the soul ... at something which is spiritual. Take the world, give me Jesus.

Baldwin Yes, yes.

Giovanni You can have Jesus, but give me the world. I take the world even if she lose every hundred years 25 percent of her energy or something like that ridiculous.

Baldwin O, please do not believe anything you hear.

Giovanni No, but it is not my concern. Even if the world is polluted, ugly, filthy give her to me. Or I come and get her.

Baldwin I agree. I agree. But speaking for myself and as a representative of my generation ... It is probably safer if I speak only for myself. In my own case, on what I have experienced and still experience, maybe in another way, though I have felt the things through the years, when we marched along dusty highways with Martin ... Listen, I left church when I was seventeen. Since then I was never really in a church anymore, except for some donation services, where I was expected. And I was not exactly the kind of Christian Martin was, if I could even pass for being a Christian.

Giovanni It is difficult to be that kind of Christian he was.

Baldwin Yes, I liked him. I love him, more honestly. And I knew that something in him was happening. And that it was my thing too, yes, my care for the world. But I had seen what white people did to the world and I had seen what white people did to their children. Because while they were busy to conquer the world, they lost something.

Giovanni Their life.

Baldwin No. They lost their capacity to love their own children.

Giovanni Or the possibility to love themselves....." (Baldwin and Giovanni 1973, 11)

LITERATURE

- Anthony E. Alcock, Brian K. Taylor and John M. Welton, (eds) *The Future of Cultural Minorities*, MacMillan Press, London, 1979.
- Erik Allardt *Implications of Ethnic Revival in Modern, Industrialized Society*, in: *Commentationes Scientiarum Socialium*, 12, 1979.
- James Baldwin and Nikki Giovanni, *A Dialogue*, Lippincott Co., New York, 1973.
- Frederic Barth (ed.) *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: the Social Organization of Culture Difference*, Boston, Little, Brown, 1969.
- Dirck van Bakkum, *On the Razor's Edge: National and Ethnic Loyalties in Male Adolescents*. Presented at the congress "Anthropology and Ethnicity" in Amsterdam, december 1993.
- Dirck van Bakkum, *Adolescence and Ethnicity: An Interdisciplinary Model in Occupational Therapy and Vocational Training*, *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 1994, 4, 253-69.
- Dirck H.J. van Bakkum, *The Times They Are A' Changin': Adolescents Left Alone! Well-Being, Health and Ethnicity*, *Lessons from Anthropology*, *International Journal Adolescent Health and Medicine*, 1996.
- Dirck van Bakkum, *Can I live myself and my heritage ? Scapegoating as Consequence of Loss of Culture*, (fieldwork report in preparation) 1997.
- Marc Bloch, *Feudal Society*, two volumes, University of Chicago, Chicago, 1961/74.
- Boszomenyi-Nagy, Ivan and Geraldine M. Spark. *Invisible Loyalties: Reciprocity in Intergenerational Family Therapy*, New York, Harper and Row, 1973.
- R. E. Chavers, *Dialektik als Wissenschaftsbegriff, Eine Untersuchung über die Aspekte dialektischer Begriffsbildung im Hinblick auf den Methodenstreit der Wissenschaften unter erkenntnistheoretischen Voraussetzungen*, Dissertation, Freie Universität, Berlin, 1972.
- Ronald Chavers, *Tractat einer entwicklungsgeschichtlichen Methode*, 1978, p.77 (unpublished manuscript).
- Choenni Chandersen en Artwell Cain, *The Intensification of Racism in the Dutch Labour Market*, in: *Racism and the labour market*, in: M. vd Linden en J. Lucassen (eds) Berne, P.Lang AG, 1995.
- Davidson Basil. *The Black Man's Burden: The Curse of the Nation State*, Times Books, London, 1991.
- George Devereux, *From Anxiety to Method in the Behavioral Sciences*, Mouton, The Hague, 1967.
- Norbert Elias, *The Civilizational Process*, London, 1939/1988.
- Norbert Elias, *Problems of Involvement and Detachment*, *Journal of Sociology*, 7, 1956.
- Norbert Elias, *The Established and the Outsiders, A Sociological Enquiry into Community Problems*, Frank Cass and Co, London, 1965.
- Norbert Elias, *What is Sociology ?* Hutchinson, London, 1978.
- Norbert Elias, *Involvement and Detachment*, Blackwell, London, 1987.
- Franz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1967.
- Paolo Freire, *The Pedagogy of the Opressed*, New York, 1970.
- Edward T. Hall, *The Silent Language*, Double Day, New York, 1959/73.
- Edward T. Hall, *The Hidden Dimension*, New York, Double Day, 1966/82.
- Marvin Harris, *Emics, Etics and the New Ethnography*, chapter 20 in: *The Rise of Anthropological Theory*, Columbia University, New York, 1968.
- Arthur Kleinman, *Clinically Applied Anthropology on a Psychiatric Liaison Service*, in: N.J. Chrisman and Th. W. Maretzki (eds) *Clinically Applied Anthropology*, Dordrecht, Reidel, 83-117, 1982.
- Alfred Kroeber, *Anthropology*, (2 vol) Harcourt, Brace, New York, 1948.
- Claude Levi-Strauss, *The Savage Mind*, Nicholson and Weidenfeld, London, 1962a.
- Claude Levi-Strauss, *Totemism*, (with introduction Roger Poole), Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1962b.
- Bronislaw Malinowski, *Sex and Repression in Savage Society*, Meridan Books, New York, 1927/55.
- M. D. Levin (ed.) *Ethnicity and Aboriginality, Case Studies in Ethnonationalism*, Un. Toronto, 1993.
- S. McDonald, (ed.), *Inside European Identities: Ethnography Western Europe*, Berg, Oxford, 1993.
- Kenneth Pike, *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior*, vol 1, Glendale: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1954.
- Oriol Pi-Sunyer (ed.), *Limits of Integration: Ethnicity and Nationalism in Modern Europe*, Research Report nr. 9, Dep. Anthropology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts, 1971.
- Manning Nash, *The Cauldron of Ethnicity in the Modern World*, University of Chicago, Chicago, 1989.
- Paul Radin, *The Method and Theory of Ethnology*, London, 1933/1966.
- Eugene Roossens, *Creating Ethnicity, The Process of Ethnogenesis*, Sage Publications, London, 1989.
- Hans Vermeulen and Cora Govers (eds.) *The Anthropology of Ethnicity: Beyond 'Ethnic Groups and Boundaries'*, Het Spinhuis, Amsterdam, 1994.