

WORKING PAPERS OF THE
CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON SOCIAL ORGANIZATION
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Paper #31
July, 1967

The New Segregation:
A Perspective on Age Categories and Social Conflict

John Lofland

July, 1967

Center for Research on Social Organization
The University of Michigan

THE NEW SEGREGATION:

A PERSPECTIVE ON AGE CATEGORIES AND SOCIAL CONFLICT

Given all the current clamor over youth, teenagers and the like, it is with considerable hesitation that I add yet another statement to the confusing cauldron of polemics. At the same time, I feel it necessary to do so, for I have become a bit disturbed by the emotional stance taken by the people who talk about youth. Commentators, or even researchers, on the topic seem to feel so strongly about it, to be so close to it, that they have been unable, I think, to achieve the emotional and social distance necessary for adequate understanding. It seems, indeed, that those things that are most in need of discussion come often to be the most confused and least understood of matters. There may even be a tendency to talk about important topics so much that we become saturated, baffled, and bored, and finally, give up.

Despite my concern over the way in which otherwise dispassionate scholars, especially, can be exercised about the topic of youth, I want to try to approach the "youth question" from the point of view of a bemused and amused, but intrigued, outsider to the debate. From such a distance it is hopefully possible to argue that the issue of youth is only an empirical instance of some very general social processes that have to do with far more than merely youth or even age. From such a distance one can try to surmount the idiosyncracies that arise from thinking largely in terms of popular labels and one can perhaps raise general considerations relevant to, but far more

general than, the topic. By so doing I hope to show again the merit of the famous platitude that the longest way around may be the shortest way home.

In order most effectively to achieve, first distance and finally, closeness, it will be necessary, at the outset, to introduce some very abstract and remote or seemingly irrelevant topics. These apparently remote conceptions involve an understanding of the notions of a social category, of categorical clusterings and of pivotal categories. Focusing in somewhat more, it will be necessary, second, to discuss age as a social dimension and the characteristics of age categories: in particular, the categories of child, teenager, youth, and early, middle and late adult. Third, and finally, I will, from the distance so developed, focus directly upon what might be called "the youth ghetto", and discuss adult conceptions of, and practices toward, it; conduct within it; and interaction between it and categories of adults.

SOCIAL CATEGORIES

The Dividing Species. We may begin with the observation that there exists a most peculiar species of animal whose most distinctive characteristics include, among other things, the following: It walks on its hind legs, uses symbols and is extraordinarily sensitive to what the other animals of its kind think and feel about it. This animal is further distinguished

by, and very peculiar in, the assiduousness with which it feels a need linguistically to designate objects in the world. So it is that this creature has a category with which it designates its general kind of object and which serves to set it off from all other objects in the world. The more esoterically inclined of these animals label the general category homo sapiens; while the more mundane dub the category merely "mankind", "human-beings", "people", or, that vestige of male supremacy, "man".

This animal is not satisfied, however, with simply setting itself off from all the other kinds of objects in the world. Nor is it satisfied with the enterprise of making fine distinctions among and between all the objects that fall outside its own general category. No, this animal, which calls itself man, or mankind, engages also in making distinctions within the category of its most general kind.

One of the more popular subdivisions is based on differential place in what is identified as the reproductive cycle. The dimension of sex is thus divined and there arises a division between the categories of "male" and "female". A second very widespread division identifies the amount of time human objects have existed and divides mankind on the dimension of age. There are, thus, categories such as "child", "adolescent", "adult", etc. the specific terms depending upon who is doing the discriminating and designating.

Because it is possible for selected combinations of people to produce other people and to cooperate in managing their

joint young products and, moreover, to cooperate in the task of sheer survival, there exists yet another basis for further division of mankind, this time along the dimension of their biological relationships to one another. There are, thus, categories of family or kin position. Many units of kin occupying adjacent ground may come to see that particular territory as reasonably and legitimately "theirs", setting it off (at least symbolically) from all other pieces of ground on the planet. As some kin groups come to dominate other kin groups, the claimed area may grow quite large, relative to the total space on the planet. Or, it may be quite small, yet be seen as equally crucial, as, for example, with units such as neighborhoods or even city blocks. Our animal may even get to feel that the location of one's residence on the planet is a crucially important dimension along which to distinguish categories of territorial habitation.

Such a territorial category of mankind, settled in a place for a long period of time, may even come to feel that it has some special way of life that distinguishes "my kind of people" from all the rest of the people in the world. There can thus arise a dimension called, "culture", and various categories of it.

In moving around on the planet, differences in specific definitions of sex, age, kinship and territory may be seen as associated with differences in the color or form of the surface casing of the animal, and another dimension along which to divide kinds of people in the world appears; one sometimes called "race" or "ethnicity".

The process of extracting sustenance from the surface of the planet (or from other people) may place these two-legged animals in relations to one another such that it is felt reasonable to divide the general category yet again, this time along the dimension of how the materials necessary for physical survival are assembled. Such designations may be called jobs or occupations and in some societies may run into thousands upon thousands of distinctive categories. Such categories, themselves, have differential capacity to assemble resources. Some seem able to command the obedience of many of the other animals. Thus there can grow up a dimension of difference, designated by this animal with categories such as the more wealthy and the less wealthy; or the rich and the poor.

This species of animal, then, is that kind of creature that is constantly dividing itself into categories of "kinds of people" along dimensions such as sex, age, kin, territory, culture, race, work and material resources.

Categorical Clustering. Having complicated its world by discriminating all these and other dimensions and designating numerous categories along them; this peculiar animal then tries to simplify its world again through the process of clustering selected categories of some of the dimensions. So it is that a significant proportion of the species feels, for example, that animals of a certain category of the dimension, race, should reside in certain categories of the dimension, territory, and should assemble sustenance by occupying themselves with certain

categories of the dimension, work. More particularly, some of the species feel that what are called "whites" should reside in "nice" neighborhoods and make a living from some of the "cleaner" kinds of work; and correspondingly, other categories of race have their appropriate other places and other categories of work.

Or, some of the species may feel that certain categories of age are most appropriately clustered with certain kinship categories and with certain occupational categories. When these presumed proprieties of clustering are breached, comment and perhaps punishment are undertaken as a means of forcing these erroneously clustered instances of the species back into a proper or acceptable cluster of displayed categories. We see such a concern on those occasions when newspapers, for example, deem as newsworthy, the fact that two married sixteen year olds are publishers-editors of a town newspaper.¹ Or, when it is deemed newsworthy--even to the extent of requiring an accompanying picture--when a 16 year old girl marries a 62 year old man, thereby becoming "stepmother to five, grandmother to another five and a great-grandmother".²

These and numerous other occurrences are seen as news, and as worthy and in need of reporting and comment because they violate shared conceptions of appropriate categorical clustering. Such cluster violations are also, of course, objects of many kinds of punishment--the reason, I suspect, that the 62 year old husband just mentioned felt it necessary to tell reporters, "We'll make

a go of it if they leave us alone." While these age-kinship examples are in a sense, trivial, they illustrate the fundamental principle of categorical clustering.³

If categories are clustered, we can conceive the possibility that a large number of categories along the most fundamental dimensions can pile upon one another, as it were, creating a new or derived class of the species, mankind, out of the coincidence of categories. Thus, in an exaggerated case, the human animals in the category immigrant (on the dimension nativity) can be almost exclusively of a particular category of race or ethnicity and also almost exclusively of low education. They can be also almost exclusively those who occupy certain territories (say, inner city areas); almost exclusively those who work in low-paid, unskilled jobs or who are unemployed; and almost exclusively those who practice a given category of religion and/or culture.

Such a situation is empirically rare, but in that territory called America, this extreme of categorical clustering has sometimes been approximated.⁴

Pivotal Category. When the categories of a set of dimensions begin, empirically, to pile upon one another--that is, to cluster--this peculiar animal not only perceives and comes to expect the clustering but it introduces a further simplification. One of the categories of the dimensions so piled up is singled out and treated publicly as their most important and significant feature. It defines the character of those animals whose categories are so clustered. That is, there comes to be a pivotal category that

defines "who those people are", socially speaking. Indeed, as we shall see, the singled out pivotal category may have ascribed to it a causal force, it may be seen as responsible for "making" the animals the way they are on their other clustered categories.

Through time and across societies, what particular categories have piled upon one another or have clustered seems to have varied considerably; and, therefore, so have the particular categories singled out as pivotally defining human animals to one another.

Nationalized Pivotal Categories. What category is defined as pivotal is, of course, a function of specific, defined situations and the social organizational units of reference within which human animals are encountering one another. A person momentarily situated within a work setting may be pivotally defined as a worker. The same person shifted to a family, political or religious setting, may, in them, be pivotally defined, respectively, as a spouse or father, politician or believer. In these examples, the social organizational units of reference are organizations and the categories attributed as pivotal derive from the designative framework of the corresponding setting.

Under some conditions the unit of reference with which a large proportion of the population defines one another in specific encounters comes to be the society at large. Thus, in contemporary America, if the male just mentioned is, say, Negro, and in a racially-mixed work setting, others are not likely to pivotally define him as worker but as a Negro who happens incidentally to

be a worker as well.

Those pivotal categories which permeate a wide variety of concrete settings--are used by a very high proportion of the population as a basis upon which they pivotally identify--and which are in conflict with one another may be called, nationally dividing dimensions and pivotal categories. Pivotal categories which are activated as a basis for organizing action and conflict in only a few settings and are dropped in other settings, or permeate a variety of kinds of settings only in some confined part of the population, might be called localized pivotal categories.

In the short history of America there has already been a succession of different nationalized dimensions and pivotal categories around which division and conflict have been organized. Only going back to the middle of the last century, we see, in succession, the nationalized dimension of territory and its nationalized pivotal categories, Northerner and Southerner; the nationalized dimension of income or work and its nationalized pivotal categories, capitalist and worker; the nationalized dimension of nativity and its nationalized pivotal categories, immigrant and native-born; the nationalized dimension of sex and its nationalized pivotal categories, suffragette (female) and male; the nationalized dimension (more recently) of race; and its nationalized pivotal categories, White and Negro.

Although a variety of nationalized dimensions of categorical conflict may be taking place at any given time, it would seem, from these examples, that one or another nationalized

dimension becomes more or less primary in a given period and a variety of other dimensions of conflict are assimilated to the prime nationalized dimension. That is, alliances are formed for the purpose of a single basis of conflict. Thus, in the Northerner-Southerner case, the agricultural-industrial; slaver-non-slaver; states-right-federalism categories became assimilated to a dimension of territory and its categories.

If one or another nationalized set of pivotal categories is likely to be a primary basis of conflict during a given period, there is raised the question of how one or another specific set comes to have this primacy. That is, one can assume there is always some prime dimension of conflict--some prime, nationalized, pivotal categories--and inquire into the conditions under which a particular dimension comes to the forefront.

While this is the most general question to pose, it is not my purpose here to explore a generalized answer. It is my purpose, rather, to take the question and its conceptual context as a framework within which to view some contemporary trends on the basis of which tentatively to project what might be the next nationalized dimension whose pivotal categories are, for Americans, the foremost bases of conflict.

CATEGORICAL CLUSTERING AND AGE

At this time, I am inclined to think that the current piling up of categorical sharing strongly suggests that the

dimension of age (and the categories it provides,) is becoming, or will become, our next identity and conflict equivalent of Southerner and Northerner, capitalist and worker, immigrant and "native stock", Suffragette and male, White and Negro.

Let me point to some of the ways in which this new kind of piling up is occurring, referring first to the age category of youth.

Territorial Clustering and Youth. 1) If a dimension is to provide pivotal identities, it is highly facilitating to have it pile upon or coincide with territory. While territory itself may become the dimension of pivotal identification--as with Northerner-Southerner; USA-USSR--very often the sharing of territory will facilitate the public articulation of some other category that happens to coincide with a particular territory. One wonders, for example, whether the categories Capitalist-Worker, immigrant-native born, Negro-White, would have been so nationally pivotal if they had not also been founded upon each opposing category having its own territory. In these terms, one might suggest, also, that the Suffragettes, in contrast with the groups mentioned above, were never able to escalate sex categories as pivotal identities and bases of conflict to the extent that they might have wished because every major piece of territory they occupied was massively infiltrated by males.

Relative to age in American technological society, we may note that the coincidence between it and territory is proceeding apace and is most spectacular in the host communities of

the ever-expanding multiversities. Into many of these communities in recent years, there have thronged literally tens of thousands of what we might call youth--human animals ranging in age from late teens to middle twenties. Because the political powers have opted for the model of a few large educational institutions, rather than many small ones, "cities of youth" are being created. The populations of some of them now approach or surpass 40 thousand and the end is not yet in sight. Apparently some institutions even project enrollment figures of 50 or 75 thousand within the not too distant future.

Already, for example, thirty per cent of the population of Ann Arbor, Michigan is composed of youth, or more precisely, students at the University of Michigan. They are not, however, distributed evenly throughout the city but are concentrated at its center, around the university. As the current high rate of apartment construction continues and as the university expands about a thousand students a year, one can envision the day when the entire center city of Ann Arbor will be composed almost exclusively of human beings in their late teens to middle twenties. This trend is fostered in no small measure by the enormous rental rates in the center city which are likely to continue to rise and which force other age categories into the suburbs.

2) Thrust upon communities typically unprepared for their arrival, a significant proportion of the youth in these territories live crowded together in inadequate housing or

equally crowded together in new, but rent gouging apartment buildings. Indeed the current circumstances of student living conditions--high density, crowding, bad housing and rent gouging--remind one of the living conditions and exploitation of the immigrants in New York and Chicago in the early part of the century and of the Negroes in those (and other) cities somewhat later. Ghetto land-owners come to think of the ghetto area, as one owner of apartment buildings in Ann Arbor has put it, "A real estate paradise."

3) Also similar to early immigrants and later Negroes, the youth piled into these territories have low incomes, a fact which further serves to differentiate them from the surrounding population. Lacking the considerable amount of excess resources necessary to paint-up and fix-up their dwellings, youth, as did immigrants and as do Negroes, come to have publicly identifiable--that is, "sloppy and shoddy"--places of habitation. And, like other low income peoples, past and present, they rent rather than buy dwelling space.

4) Faced with uncertain employment and residence futures--actually a certainty that they will have to move--youth in these territories do not, to any significant degree, develop identification with local social institutions that precede their arrival--the pre-existing local political organizations, churches, business organizations, etc. As was said of the earlier ghetto dwellers--they "stay with their own kind" and participate in informal and formal social organization dominated by others of their own category.

Such piling up of categories makes for, I think, the

possibility of ghettos very similar to those that the dominant population worried about in connection with Italian, Irish, and Polish immigrants some forty years ago and the kind that we still worry about today in connection with Negroes.

Only now, instead of dubbing them Italian, Irish, Polish or Negro ghettos, the dominant sectors of the population may well become concerned about "youth ghettos" and all the social processes that surround concern over ghetto areas are likely to begin. Indeed, they have begun, as I shall suggest in a moment.

Territorial Clusterings and Other Age Categories. First, however, we must pursue the obvious implication that categories piling up in one kind of territory means that other kinds of categories are likely to be piling up in yet other territories. If youth are being territorially segregated, this obviously means that they cannot be in some other places.

These other places are of equal interest for in them reside the sectors of the population who will be engaging in concern over youth ghettos.

Concomitant with the rise of youth ghettos, has been a growth of rather age-homogeneous bands of territory ringing American cities. These are the well-known suburban tracts, many neighborhoods of which have a rather peculiar character.

In some of them one finds a population composed almost exclusively of what we might call early adults--human animals ranging in age, roughly, from late twenties to late thirties;

and children--human animals below the age of about twelve. Middle adults--humans, early forties to late fifties; and late adults--humans, sixties and older; and teenagers are in a decided minority, in many cases, hardly present at all.

Piled upon this age category of early adult and its coincidence with a territory, one finds the employment and financial state known as "struggling" or "being on the way up". The neat row houses of early adults market in the 15 to 25 thousand dollar range. Deep in installment debt, their lives are centered on the family unit. They are concerned that politicians treat them kindly; that is, that taxes should be kept down. And they are likely to have voted for Goldwater.

In other suburban tracts, one finds a population composed almost exclusively of middle adults (forties and fifties) and teenagers. The neighborhood is largely undisgraced by the presence of children, early adults or late adults and the neat row houses of the middle adults market in the 25 to 50 thousand-dollar and up range. In large measure the middle adults have passed their "struggling". They have, in some sense, arrived.

Indeed, there would seem to be evolving a pattern wherein an age-sex unit of early adults establishes itself in an early-adult neighborhood, its members spawn their offspring and then, at the appropriate age, move to a middle adult territory. In this way, age-sex units are always able to be with their "own kind", territorily protected from the contamination of contact with many other age-categories. Teenagers, especially are usually able to be with their corresponding age-category mates.

They can be uncompromised by entanglements with children, early adults or late adults.

Although all of this is only a tendency at present, it would seem to be a growing tendency and one which assumes additional significance in the light of the already more pronounced territorial segregation of late adults. We are all well aware that persons of sixty and over--often described with polite euphamisms such as "senior citizens"--have begun to assemble in special buildings in cities, special neighborhoods within suburbs and, indeed, in special areas of the nation. It is apparently the case that significant portions of Florida, Arizona and Southern California are becoming something like the states of late adulthood. Piled upon these categories of age and territory are others, such as the marginal or unemployed state, often called "retirement". Special kinds of legislation have developed for this age group, defining their monetary rights and duties and relating even to the possibility of their marrying one another.

The Future? Among these six categories of age, two,-- youth and late adulthood,--are already proceeding toward highly pronounced territorial segregation with the concomitant clustering of yet other categorical sharings around their respective ages and territories. The remaining four are already splitting into two sets of two each. Early adults are still territorially linked to children and middle adults are still territorially linked to teenagers.

However, the territorial link between middle adults and teenagers shows signs of weakening, given the absorption that teenagers have in the culture that centers on the high school. While teenagers must still share a household with middle adults and face school-and-other-specialized keepers of teenagers, they are achieving a rather well defined and dominated set of territories spread throughout communities. These include the school itself, drive-ins and the like.⁵ This separation is limited, however, in a way somewhat similar to the way in which the territorial integrity of the Suffragettes was limited. While both had or have special territories, these were or are not large areas from which persons of other categories could or can be, at least informally, excluded.

Nonetheless, this partial territorial segregation exists and is deepening. Combined with the propensity of early adults to send their children to school at ever earlier ages, one can wonder if these remaining two sets of two categories (early adults and children; middle adults and teenagers) will not themselves territorially divide.

Perhaps it is not entirely unrealistic, fanciful or whimsical to suggest that there may come a day when children are almost entirely segregated under the supervision of child-rearing specialists. Perhaps parts of say, Nevada, Utah, Wyoming or Montana, could be given over to the task and designated as Children's States. Under such circumstances, early adults could devote themselves exclusively to the struggle

of making it to the next neighborhood. The increasing numbers of college educated female early adults who now mourn the disuse of their talents and the incompatibility of children and career, would be free more actively to participate with their male partners in the climb up.

Likewise, the separation of teen-agers into teen cities, very much like the developing youth ghettos, would free their middle adult parents to participate more intensively in the social and political machinations of the occupations in which they have now come to power.

Segregation, after all, has its attractions as well as its limitations. Given the already strong tendency for children and teenagers (indeed, for all the age-categories) to group together and to prefer one another's company, these youngest categories may well, in the future, come to demand the same kinds of territorial rights now enjoyed by youth and late adults. At present, of course, they are still rather dominated by their respective age-superiors in territories run by, and fundamentally belonging to, these superiors. Equal justice for all might well be construed in the future to mean that each age category, including children and teenagers, has a right to its own piece of ground.

At such a future time, arguments are also likely to arise for the efficiency and effectiveness of specialized age territories for children and teenagers. In the same way that the family-oriented cottage industry and the "putting-out system" of

industrial manufacture collapsed in the face of competition by the superior effectiveness of centralized, industrial process, so too, the last remaining cottage industry--that of producing persons--might well falter in the face of harsh criticism of its inefficiency, its widely variable standards of production and its excessive rate of rejects. Although phrased in different terms, many educators are, in fact, already making exactly these criticisms.

Any consideration of divisive forces must, however, at the same time, consider forces that limit the division. There is, after all, a strong ideology that adults should love their children, teen-agers or youth and that they should devote personal attention to them. Persons in the various age-categories are still highly linked, despite geographical separation. Even youth still have parents and know that they will one day move into the older age-categories.

It is nonetheless too easy to overemphasize the importance of such linkages, for youth in particular, as the slogan "don't trust anyone over thirty" forcefully suggests. Parents may be linked to and love their youth but they are still capable of suspicion, rejection and distrust of them. They can feel defamed and betrayed by them. As age-category segregation deepens, as more youth go to live in youth ghettos and come under the influence of the special kind of life carried on there, we should expect an increasing proportion of parents to feel that all the effort they put into Johnny or Mary was for naught and

to ask themselves, "what did I do wrong?" Of course, they did nothing wrong, unless one counts as wrong their willingness to send their youths to college and to allow them to reside in youth ghettos.

Some Social Sources of Age-Category Segregation. In order to reasonably understand the social sources or causes of age-category segregation, a detailed analysis of at least the last seventy years of American history would be required. Systematic comparisons with similar and different developments in other societies would be indispensable. I will here, obviously, only suggest some very gross and very proximate forces promoting age-category segregation.⁶

First, there is the rather peculiarly American guiding conception that the least expensive and most efficient technological alternative in projecting action is the "best" alternative. It seems to be cheaper and more efficient to expand universities and create giant new ones, than it would be to construct and staff a multitude of small ones. It seems to be cheaper and more efficient to build tracts of similarly priced houses on an assembly line basis than to intermix variously priced houses on a custom basis. It is believed to be cheaper and more efficient to bring late adults together into special housing adapted to their "needs", likewise built on an assembly line basis. Specialized organizations and occupations are most cheaply and efficiently provided for each of these age categories, if each of them is massed together in a single area. Professors

are more easily provided for youth; schools are more easily provided for children and teenagers; and medical specialties are more easily provided for late adults.

Second, there are the requirements, or rather, lack of them, of a technological economic system. Despite all the demand for technical personnel existing in some sectors of the economy, the larger fact seems to be that there are simply not enough occupational slots in that economy to absorb any significant proportion of the hordes of youth and late adults existing within the population. In terms of economic necessity, youth and late adults (as well as teenagers and children) are surplus population. That is, a basic condition permitting them to congregate in their own grounds is that the vast bulk of them are not needed, anyplace, to perform economic functions.

One way to manage youth, in particular, is to develop the conception that they require advanced training or education if they are to participate eventually in the technological economy. This conception is given teeth by actually requiring "education" as a condition of employment, a condition which propels an ever increasing proportion of these youth--some forty per cent of them or about six million bodies at the present time--into colleges and a proportion into youth ghettos.

The surplus is eased out at the other end through the development of the conception that people are not really very good workers after about sixty or so, and should, for their own good and enjoyment, give up useful employment.

If age-category segregation is conducted by forces such as these, and many others, we can also see that once begun it comes to have a dynamic of its own. Seeing less and less of one another, it becomes more difficult to know how to interact comfortably across age-category divisions. Having less practice and experience in it, early and middle adults, for example, come to be more uncomfortable about interacting with those late adults they do encounter, and likewise for interactional relations among the other age-categories. Such difficulties, in turn, provoke more mutual avoidance and an increasing constriction of topics about which they might have common interest. Having begun to segregate, a process of spiraling or increasing isolation across the age-grades is set up.

THE YOUTH GHETTO

Let me shift, finally, to a direct focus on the youth ghetto. I will discuss, in order, relations of adults to this territory, conduct within it and some aspects of interaction between the two.

These topics are appropriately conceived in terms that we might use in discussing other, more familiar, kinds of ghettos. The more familiar ones have, of course, historically been based upon religion, ethnicity or race. However, certain kinds of social processes seem relatively common to almost all ghettos, age-category ones included.

Adults and Youth Ghettos. A condition of territorial segregation wherein a variety of additional categories are piled up, promotes a situation of low information flow from the ghetto to the surrounding territories. When low information flow occurs in the context of a measure of suspicion, fear and distrust, the information most likely to be noticed, remembered and circulated by persons in extra-ghetto territories is that which is discrediting or defaming. Adopting the point of view of suspicious, fearful and distrustful persons, it is altogether reasonable for them to be attuned to discrediting information from the ghetto: such information serves to put them further on guard to protect themselves.

1) One type of defamation takes the form of imputing to the pivotal category in question a wide range of personal failings, often felt to be caused by the pivotal category itself. Non-ghetto dwellers build up in their minds an imputed "personality" of sorts that is believed to be characteristic of the particular ghetto dwellers; the particular pivotal category.⁷

In recent years we have begun to see the development of the rudiments of an imputed ghetto personality of youth, or, more narrowly, of students. Adults, the superordinate category in this case, seem to have begun the process of noticing, remembering, and relating a variety of kinds of imputed personal features of this latest stigmatized category.

One hears it commented that "they" are boisterous; they have no respect for property, they work irregularly and drive recklessly.

They throw garbage out of their windows, and break bottles in the streets and on the sidewalks. They lounge in an unseemly fashion on balconies, dangle out of windows and congregate in public thoroughfares. They accost strangers on the street with arcane propositions. They gamble all night, fail to pay shopkeepers and landlords, shoplift and engage in riotous drinking sprees. They hang around on the streets, jaywalk, talk in a loud and crude fashion in public places and live in disorder and filth. They let their dwellings run down, living like "animals", crowded six and seven together in small apartments. They have loose sexual behavior and fail to keep their bodies and clothes properly scrubbed and ordered. They engage in crime. Their women have no shame but dress scantily and recline suggestively on lawns or around buildings. They are residentially unstable, always moving, frequently leaving the landlord or even their own kind in the lurch.

Establishments which cater to their peculiar tastes are dimly lit and outfitted in outlandish decor. Obscene slogans and writings and pictures are likely to be found in their stores, especially the book shops.

While yet scattered and relatively uncrystallized as a personality portrait of youth ghetto residents, there would seem to be here already the elements of the classic portrait of failings, attributed to ghetto dwellers throughout American history. This portrait has typically included--as it does here--the elements of laziness, irresponsibility, hedonism, lack of

pride in property or personal appearance, promiscuousness, deviousness and family and employment instability. We are currently most familiar with this portrait of imputations relative to Negro and Spanish-American ghetto dwellers, but essentially the same kinds of imputations were once made of, for example, the Italians and the Irish before their ghettos disintegrated. Indeed, where ghettos based on these latter pivotal categories persist, the process still goes on.⁸ Such failings were imputed also to "laborers" or working men during the struggle for unions in America.⁹

The similarity between the imputations now beginning to be made to residents of youth ghettos and the imputations made at one or another time to residents of Irish, Italian, Negro and Spanish American ghettos suggest considerable continuity in the portrait of imputed failings in American society. While the particular category that bears the brunt of these imputations has changed, the imputations themselves continue to be with us.

Such continuity, despite change in the particular pivotal category that is the object of the imputations could, indeed, be taken to suggest the social necessity of a stratum which is believed to embody all the failings so feared by the dominant sectors of the society. Such an embodiment of what most people should not be seems always to be there, a vivid and living object-lesson in the difference between good and evil. After all, if everyone is good, how are participants in a society to know the difference between good and evil? It is perhaps through the

dramatization of evil, achieved by assigning some sector of the society the task of "acting it out", that the remainder of the society more easily finds it possible to be good. The repository category of evil provides "good citizens" with the empirical materials needed in making a meaningful contrast and in gauging the appropriateness of conduct.¹⁰

2) In addition to becoming objects of defaming imputations, ghetto dwellers find themselves the recipients of specialized processes of social control and recognition. Such efforts are specialized because, while they are sometimes described as though they applied to the entire population, the objects of the control and recognition are the ghetto dwellers in particular.

Although relatively rudimentary as yet, we already see such specialized control and recognition efforts in, for example, Ann Arbor's regulation prohibiting students from operating an automobile anywhere in the entire county without special university permission. New laws regarding mufflers on motor vehicles have been adopted, and aimed, according to the public discussion, at the motorcycles of youth. (They are, it is said, terribly noisy).

Within the context of ghettoization, already existing controls aimed especially at youth, take on new significance. The military draft, which falls with special force on youth, comes to be defined as a special burden. Because of the ambiguity over whether any one of them is or is not 21 years of age, the purchase of alcoholic beverages becomes, typically, an occasion for an ID shakedown. In much the same way that Negroes in some parts

of the country even today have to worry about obtaining public service, youth have to be concerned over producing a sufficient amount of "ID" even to ratify their minimal standing as persons. The treatment they receive at the hands of bar maids and bartenders and liquor store clerks serves well to communicate their special pivotal identity and to communicate others' assumption that youth are "likely to be liars". So, too, their credit may be a matter for suspicion and the obtaining of a telephone may require a special "security deposit", serving organizationally to impute their untrustworthy personal character.

And also similar to Negroes, employers are willing to offer many youth only menial unskilled jobs and reluctant to proffer employment with career or developmental possibilities. That is, employers discriminate against youth in terms of whether they have made some kind of settlement with the military. If none has been made, reasonable employment is difficult to obtain. While employers are entirely rational in this, it constitutes, from the point of view of youth, a form of discrimination.

Youth become, too, objects of special recognition in the name of non-discrimination. A few radio stations, for example, have demonstrated their democratic virtues by having not only ethnic and racial radio programs, but by setting aside hours or even days for youth programs. Radio stations in Ann Arbor not only recognize that area's special German past with "old country" shows, but at least one station gives over Saturday to student "ethnic radio". The youthful announcer for that day refers to

Ann Arbor as "student city".¹¹

Eventually most ghettos rouse the moral sentiments of the dominant population to the point that a special corp of helping and rehabilitative personnel are recruited and deployed into the areas. It is the mission of these personnel to reduce the number of horrendous things that go on there and to make the residents straighten up and be good citizens.

While this kind of missionary activity, on any significant scale, may lie far in the future in relation to youth ghettos, one can discern its beginnings in such enterprises as the "campus ministry" and in the expansion of psychological counselling for those youth who are students.

If and when there comes to be a "war on youth ghettos", and even federal programs for such, these missionaries will no doubt follow the classic pattern of previous ghetto forays. They are likely to be more concerned with adjusting people to their lot within the existing structure than with considering alternative modes of social organization.

3) Informational inaccessibility and fear and suspicion of ghettos promotes, in addition to defaming stereotypes of imputed personal features and specialized control, a special revelationary literature.

This literature is centrally oriented to the question, "What are X (the pivotal category) really like?" Whether the "X" has been Southerners, workers, Suffragettes, immigrants, or of late, Negroes, the popular press has frenzied itself with efforts to

"inform" the dominant sectors of the society what is "really" going on. What, of late, is "happening": Such popular revelations promise us an "inside view" of the innermost sections and horrendous events of the ghetto. Complete with the most grim or most bizarre of photographs and drawings, such revelations often lead the reader to believe that not only are his worst suspicions true, but things are even worse than he had thought.

While we are most familiar with these popular revelations, historically, in connection with immigrants and Negroes, a similar kind of presentation is now being made about youth. One of the most recent, put out by Look, the contemporary master of the popular revelation, is called Youth Quake.¹² Retailing for one dollar, its cover features a blurred psychedelic-like photograph of youth on a dance floor in "wildly" colored dress, presumably wreathing under the sounds emitted by a musical group. The front page text promises to tell us, among other things, "WHAT'S HAPPENING...Turned on and Tuned in...Teeny-boppers, Hippies... Sunset Strip to Washington Square...Conversations parents never hear--Sex, Drugs, God, Morality, Success--Mod and Mini...Psychedelic Lights...and much much more".

It should be noted that popular revelations of ghetto life are not entirely negative in character. While there is a large element of indignation and "tut-tutting", it is perhaps most accurate to say that these revelations contain a mixture of horror and romantic fascination with "people who live that way". Evil, after all, must have its attractions--to be natural--, otherwise it would

not be so popular.¹³ Nor would the dominant categories of a society have to put so much energy into eliminating or holding it in check.

It is in part such romantic fascination that, in the past, made Harlem such a lure for white Manhattan residents and tourists.¹⁴ Indeed, historically, a variety of kinds of ghettos have come to service the vice needs of the population at large. Youth ghettos will perhaps also come to service the demand for vice.

Parallel to the growth of popular revelations and lagging behind them somewhat, there begins to be produced about ghettos a much less titillating but probably more accurate body of scholarly revelations. In historical succession, sociologists, for example, have produced an enormous body of materials on immigrants (now no longer read by much of anyone but historians of the field) and on Negroes, under the rubric, "race relations". They are now "getting hip" to the "youth thing" and the scholarly out-pouring has begun. Originally called "juvenile delinquency" in the fifties (when there were large amounts of money to be had for research on that) the caption has been expanded to "youth". Highly indicative is a recent well received collection of writings called the Handbook of Modern Sociology, which has a special chapter on "Position and Behavior Patterns of Youth", without a corresponding chapter on any other age category.¹⁵

Interestingly enough, the theoretical debate common to the sociological literature on immigrants, Negroes and youth is the question of the degree to which they are "really" different or

similar to the rest of society. In all three bodies of materials, some people argue that "they" are significantly different in some fundamental fashion. This position is opposed by theorists who choose to emphasize different facts, in the direction of saying that the category is fundamentally similar. The debate has focused, in particular, around whether the ghettoized category has a distinctive culture, or "subculture".¹⁶

The urge to produce such revelations inevitably gives rise to the phenomenon of ghetto spies, persons who either are permitted openly to hang around in the ghetto or who actually pass as "one"--whatever the "one" in question. The spies of popular revelations are often reporters on assignment, but quite often, also, free lancers, as was apparently the case with race-ghetto spy John Griffith, author of Black Like Me.¹⁷ Paul Goddman is perhaps the leading youth-ghetto spy among a wide range of persons who have tried to get in on this new kind of act.¹⁸ Perhaps the ultimate in age-category spying has, however, already been achieved by that 33 year old lady who claims that "I Passed as a Teenager".¹⁹ As always, the scholarly revealers have lagged behind in getting out their own spies, but they are beginning to catch up.

And, as has occurred relative to previous ghettos, some members of the dominant pivotal category defect to "the other side". In the same Marxian manner in which some of the economic elite are said to see the "true" direction of history and defect to the workers, or that some whites defect to and take up the Negro cause, we are now beginning to have age-category defectors.

Edgar Friendenberg is perhaps the leading exemplar of such deflection.²⁰

Conduct in Youth Ghettos. In attempting briefly to characterize what happens within ghettos, themselves, we must keep in mind two previously discussed points. First, the piling up or clustering of devalued categories in a given territory is in fact taking place. Second, this factual clustering is perceived (however dimly) by the surrounding populace and becomes a basis upon which all manner of additional failings are imputed. Taken together, factual clustering and the additional imputations form the situation of the ghettoite.

Two significant features of the situation of the ghettoite are: 1. extraordinary exposure to others of "his own kind" and correspondingly limited exposure to persons of "other kinds"; 2. limited objective possibilities for establishing a stable life style, primarily because of low income which is, in turn a function of the imputations and practices of disreputability made of "his kind" by the surrounding populace.

The situation of the ghettoite is conducive to or "ready made for" familiar strategic lines of adaptation or response. I will mention two well-known strategies of adaptation appearing frequently in all ghettos and which are now appearing in youth ghettos.

First, it is possible, and rather reasonable, for the ghettoite to accept the just mentioned facts of his situation and to accomodate to them. He can come to believe that the imputations made and

treatment accorded to his category by the dominant sectors of the society are in a significant measure true, reasonable and justified. While he views these as sad facts, he nonetheless accepts them as valid. The imputations of the ways in which he displays personal failings become then a basis upon which actual and new items of "personal failure" are predicated. (The irony here, of course, is that such new personal failings are perceived by the dominant categories and become the basis upon which they, in their turn, predicate more intensive imputations and discriminatory practices. That treatment, in its turn, feeds back to the ghettoite, etc.)

Under conditions of low income and almost exclusive exposure to one's "own" stigmatized kind and an uncertain residential future, and indeed, an uncertain future generally, it becomes reasonable to relax one's efforts at a conventional personal appearance and to relax one's efforts to maintain a conventionally clean, well-kept and orderly household.

We are, of course, familiar with the relaxation of personal and household standards in ghettos based on ethnic or racial pivotal categories. And we are familiar, too, with imputation sometimes made as to why these standards are relaxed. Among the most popular has been the notion of a special "lower class" or "Negro personality" which causes personal and household disorder and dirt.

However, exactly the same pattern of personal and household dirt occurs in youth ghettos. The youth found to display this

pattern are drawn largely from middle and upper middle class backgrounds, a setting which presumably trained them in high standards of personal and household order and cleanliness. In the youth ghetto, we find a portion of them living in a fashion very similar to how people in other ghettos have and do live. 21 And presumably when they depart from the ghetto for early adult neighborhoods, they will maintain the very particular style of cleanliness and order so characteristic of those neighborhoods. It can be suggested that the youth ghetto pattern of personal and household disorder and dirt is a very important "control" or contrast case which tells us that it is not ghetto people qua deep lying personality patterns that conduces to this relaxation, but rather the ghetto situation. As mentioned, the ghetto situation is one of high exposure to one's own kind, low income, and uncertainty of residential and general future. Exposure almost exclusively to one's own kind reduces the felt need for "respectable" presentation. Low income makes respectable presentation extremely difficult to accomplish. Middle class people are insufficiently appreciative of the very high total cost of the tools and machines, paint, repair materials and furnishings necessary to the rehabilitation and maintenance of a "respectable" household. This is especially the case where one is attempting this in what is already a ghetto dwelling. And, of course, an uncertain residential and general future renders the entire effort unreasonable in the first place. If we are to understand this pattern of ghetto living, then, we are better advised to scrutinize the characteristics

of the ghetto situation rather than the personal characteristics of whatever category of people happen to be found there.

Second, while the majority of ghetto residents seem to "take it" and a proportion drift into the first pattern, a minority refuse to accept their situation and project a more active strategy of response. Co-mingling in the intensive fashion now made possible and necessary, there begin to crystallize among some ghetto dwellers, new and unusual ideologies which purport to explain and interpret their particular situation and, typically, also to describe and explain all the rest of the world. Members of the human species who live in the ghetto situation seem particularly likely to spawn and be attracted to new and unusual ideologies that are characterized by members of the dominant society as "radical", "bizarre", "peculiar" or "fantastic". Ghettoites are particularly likely to so occupy themselves because of lack of exposure to the more moderate and modulating categories of persons who might convince them of other realities; because of the stigmatizing imputations they face; and because of the objective deprivation and social exclusion under which they labor.

The general class of active ideological responses to the ghetto situation itself divides into two types of directions, which even sometimes compete with one another for adherents. One type, which might be called the political response, defines the ghetto situation and other sectors of society in terms of relatively immediate measures that can be undertaken to better the lot of

ghettoites and perhaps even the life of the entire society. We are, of course, quite familiar with this relative to Negro ghettos and the variety of civil rights organizations that seek to make this or that concrete change in the social order. The suggestion here, however, is that we can best understand what is called "The New Left", meaning most prominently, Students for Democratic Society, as a movement rising out of the youth ghetto in exactly the same way political movements have, historically, risen out of other kinds of ghettos.

If the ghettoization of youth continues, we should expect to see the rise of a variety of kinds of other political responses, many of them more limited and moderate than SDS. Already there are attempts to organize renters and to register student voters in order to increase their political power. There may come a day, indeed, when some cities will find that their politics revolve around the voting strength of various age-category ghettos, in the same way that Chicago politics has long revolved around ethnic and racial enclaves.

The other type of "more active" ideological response is considerably more sweeping in the scope of its projected change in the social order, but ironically more passive in the degree to which it seeks to make changes in that order. I refer to the various retreating and utopian, not untypically, religious, responses which involve withdrawing into highly distinctive residential enclaves, often within the ghetto, and living out therein a life that is considered perfect and ideal. The outside

world is seen as sinful, demented, deluded, decadent or otherwise in need of revolutionary change. Except for, perhaps some efforts at making individual converts, such utopians do not directly attack the social order. The most famous instance of this type of response in connection with Negro ghettos has, of course, been Father Divine's Heavens.²² We are witnessing, I think, an analytically identical strategy of response in the so-called "hippies" who have appropriated certain dwellings in youth ghettos as their utopian communities and who have even moved out to create their own ghettos, as in the Haight-Ashbury district of San Francisco. Although yet lacking a widely acknowledged messianic leader (Leary is apparently "out"), their ideology is remarkably similar to that espoused by followers of Father Divine, especially in the emphasis upon "love", good-will and the decadence of the larger society.

One other pattern of response should be mentioned, although it has not as yet appeared in the youth ghetto, at least not in organized form. This is the militant revolutionary pattern, exemplified by the Black Nationalists, or at least those among the Black Nationalists, who advocate guerrilla warfare and violent subversion. But perhaps this still lies in the future and will only appear if youth ghettoization becomes very extreme.

The possibility and viability of the militant revolutionary pattern, and all the other patterns of response are, of course, crucially undercut by a fundamental feature peculiar to age itself. While people who are identified in terms of racial and ethnic pivotal categories will remain instances of those categories all

their lives, youth as a category is impermanently occupied. It would seem to be enormously difficult to predicate any kind of enduring collective action upon a population of participants that is continually leaving the category while others are continually arriving. In the end, that feature must be recognized as fundamentally debilitating to organized age-category conflict.

Age-Category Confrontations. Nonetheless, conflicts between the age categories of a more limited but highly spectacular character are still possible, and even likely, under conditions of youth ghettoization.

The prime meaning of ghettoization is, as mentioned, the piling up of all manner of categories of dimensions that are different from the categories of the rest of the society. A prime effect of this piling up of categories shared within a territory and little shared across territories, is the decline of routine, trustful relationships with individuals and organizations in extra-ghetto territories. Ghettoites are intensively and routinely exposed to other ghettoites, but only fractionally exposed in a routine fashion to non-ghettoites.

Such a situation of separation of categories of people serves to create distance, in both the physical and social senses, and, therefore, to engender relative ignorance or lack of information as to the intentions, plans, motives and good or evil will of the other pivotal category.

If there comes to be an absence of cross-categorical interaction, joint-problem solving, routine negotiation and the like, there is

created within both pivotal categories a condition of distrust and fear of the opposite category. This situation of separation and therefore distrust and fear spawned by ignorance is to be contrasted with the kinds of relations between social categories that create trust and confidence and, therefore, social stability. Cross-categorical trust and confidence are most likely to prevail where there is a high rate of relatively free interaction, relatively large numbers of communication channels and prompt attention to grievances which can easily be brought to the attention of persons who will act to settle disputes in a just manner. A large number of communication links between categories allows each reasonably to present its point of view, its motives, its plans, its intentions. While each category may not agree with the other on such matters, each side is at least relatively accurately informed and there is little or no necessity for making all manner of surmises, guesses and imputations of the motives and plans of its opposite number. Equally as important, in preparing such cross-category revelations of its plans and intentions, each is conduced to modify its perspective to order to make it more acceptable to the opposite category. Concomitant with such exchanges are personal friendships, informal ties, personalistic advantages and pay-offs, and other more diffuse inter-categorical modes of compromising the involvement of persons in their own category. A tradition of exchange of views and negotiated settlements makes it more likely that any action initiated by one side will be received in an atmosphere of trust. All these

practices make it less likely that any action by either category will be defined as fundamentally threatening.

We find precisely the opposite obtaining between ghettos and the host society. The absence of effective communication, co-optation and compromise breeds, as noted, fear, suspicion, and distrust. Such a situation is fertile ground for the spread of all manner of fearful and cynical rumors as to what "the other side" is "really" up to. In the absence of reasonable information, the most gross of cynical motives can be and are imputed. (cf. the slogan, "don't trust anybody over 30".)

It is in the situation of separation, fear, distrust and negative imputations between categories that an action initiated by one category can be defined as fundamentally threatening to the basic interest of the opposite category.

If an action is defined as a fundamental threat, then it is reasonable to respond to this threat with a swift, decisive, strong defense. The opposite category which is the recipient of this defense thereupon, of course, now feels itself grossly threatened. The recipient category, in order to protect its now felt to be threatened fundamental interests, reciprocates with its own swift, decisive strong defense. The opposite category is now even more threatened and responds in kind. We thus have what is called the escalation of conflict, a process that is the joint product of the two parties and a process that seems always to have an ambiguous beginning point, unless one traces the history of the relation all the way back to the beginnings of the

original categorical separation.²³

Where the swift, decisive strong defense involves large numbers of ghetto persons acting in a non-routine manner in public places, it is popularly labeled a demonstration, riot or collective outburst.²⁴ We have seen a number of these in connection with Negro ghettos. It is in exactly the same terms of ghettoization--the terms of separation, of fear, of distrust and of high probability of threat--that we can also best understand similar events occurring on college campuses; that is, in youth ghettos.

If youth ghettos have already fired their shot heard around the world, it was probably the University of California, Berkeley "demonstrations", "disturbances", "revolt" or "revolution" of 1964-65. (Pick a label according to the preference of your age-category).

The well-known events at Berkeley were only a spectacular episode in a long history of decreasing categorical sharing and the growth of a relatively enclosed youth ghetto along the southern edge of the Berkeley campus. The relations between the two categories--university and youth--came finally to a confrontation where each category saw itself enormously threatened by the other category. Each category saw itself as rightly defending itself against the threats posed by the other category. It is indeed ironic that the growth of Berkeley's academic eminence in America closely corresponds to the growth of the conditions of separation between youth and the university that laid down the

conditions of ignorance, and fear, creating the possibility of youth and the university being seen as threatening to one another. Berkeley's scholarly and research eminence were purchased at the price of relative indifference to, and separation from, its almost 28,000 charges. And, as the university learned, the price was much higher than it had been originally calculated. Although allowing at least one-quarter of the tenured faculty in many departments to be on leave for research, (and a large "in residence" proportion on psychological leave) and allowing a large proportion of the teaching to be performed by youth called teaching assistants, is conducive to a world-wide reputation for scholarship, these practices, when combined with a wide variety of other kinds of indifference and separation, are incompatible with linking the category of youth to the social order.²⁵

And even more ironic, where there has been little communication, co-optation and compromise between categories, it becomes all the more difficult to initiate them. Under conditions of separation, fear, threat and defense, each category comes, indeed, rather fiercely to pronounce its refusal to compromise what are now well articulated and ideologized principles. That is, the existing separation tends to deepen and solidify into principled inter-categorical opposition.

Universities that embark on the Berkeley quest for eminence, and in the same manner, might be apprised of the possibility that there may be a youth ghetto like Berkeley's in their future.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

I have suggested the possibility that we may be embarking upon a period in the American experience when age will become a nationalized pivotal dimension around which categories of persons are differentiated. I necessarily imply that a new kind of segregation may be afoot.

I am, of course, mindful of all those oft printed remarks, running back at least to ancient Greece, which tell us that almost every generation has thought that new and unprecedented (and most often terrible) things were taking place among its youth. Such reprinted expressions of alarm are intended to tell us that the perception of the unpredicated, typically of the decadent, is simply a generational illusion spawned by the fears of older persons. While I will make no judgment as to whether younger generations were or are decadent, one can say that very frequently there has in fact been an enormous change in generational views and practices, a change enshrined most recently in the transformation of western societies into advanced, industrial, technological social orders.

We should be prepared to expect that the coming of this newest kind of social order might itself create a wide variety of likewise new types of categorical segregations, while yet other segregations disintegrate. So far as I have been able to determine, the current scale of the clustering of persons into territories on the basis of age is indeed a new phenomenon.

While the emerging primacy of the age dimension, and its categories, seems to be new, the social processes it follows, and that follow from it, are very old and universal. While we may have to come to grips with a new content and substance of social conflict, we need not at all despair because we do know something about the character of the formal and analytic processes involved, and the concepts and proposition appropriate to an understanding of it. The primary question becomes, then, will this human animal use such understanding in coping with this new and emerging basis of conflict, or will it stumble through in the same gruesome manner it has done in the past, and play out, yet again, the painful drama of blind hostility?

NOTES

* Revision of an address presented on July 13, 1967 in the Kalamazoo College Chapel Lecture Series, The Moral Revolution of Our Time.

I should like to express my indebtedness to the works of, and conversations with, Lyn H. Lofland, Jerry Suttles and Max Heirich. The seemingly unconnected but actually parallel and complementary work of Suttles on an inner-city slum and Heirich on campus demonstrations provided, in part, the data, concepts and propositions upon which I have attempted a more generalized statement with particular reference to youth. While these people are responsible for what follows in the sense of making it more possible, they are not to be held accountable for the direction taken or conclusions reached. See: Gerald D. Suttles, Taylor Street: Identity and Conduct in an Urban Slum (tentative title) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, in press); Max Heirich, Demonstrations at Berkeley, 1964-65 (Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley, 1967).

1. Bill Sudomier, "Teens Face World as Publishers," Detroit Free Press, March 15, 1965, p. 1.
2. Associated Press, wire release, Detroit Free Press, July 21, 1965, p. 2.
3. For more detailed and general discussions, see Everett Hughes, "Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status," American Journal of

Sociology, (Vol. L, March, 1945, pp. 353-359); "Social Change and Status Protest," Phylon (Vol. X, 1949, pp. 58-65).

4. Cf., Suttles, op. cit., Part I.

5. James Coleman, The Adolescent Society (Glencoe Ill: Free Press, 1961).

6. For more detailed discussion particularly relevant to age-category segregation, see Kenneth Keniston, The Uncommitted (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc. 1965).

7. Cf. Suttles, op. cit. and the literature cited therein.

8. Suttles, Ibid.

9. A similar kind of imputation of personal failings, of course, also takes place between regions of nations and nations themselves that are in conflict.

10. There are a variety of other "reasons" why a stigmatized category may be socially necessary for the maintenance of a society. See: Robert Dentler and Kai Erikson, "The Functions of Deviance in Groups," Social Problems (Vol. VII, Fall, 1959, pp. 98-107); Lewis Coser, "Some Functions of Deviant Behavior and Normative Flexibility," American Journal of Sociology (Vol. LXVIII, September, 1962, pp. 172-181.)

11. Paralleling separate entrances for whites and Negroes in Southern states, Ann Arbor, Michigan's YM-YWCA has a special side door neatly lettered with the words, "YOUTH ENTRANCE".

12. Cowles Educational Books, Inc. [sic.], Youth Quake New York: Cowles Communications, Inc., 1967.

13. This is a long-noted feature of "evil" but it was most forcefully brought to my attention by Gerald D. Suttles, private.

communication.

14. See, for example, Malcolm X, The Autobiography of Malcolm X, (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1964).

15. David Matza, "Position and Behavior Patterns of Youth" in Robert E. L. Faris, Editor, Handbook of Modern Sociology, (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1964) pp. 191-216.

16. Relative to youth, see the summary by Matza, Ibid., pp. 198-200, "Loose Integration and Partial Autonomy." See also: David Matza, Delinquency and Drift, (New York: Wiley, 1964), Ch. I; Frederick Elkin and William Westley, "The Myth of Adolescent Culture," American Sociological Review (Vol. 20, 1955, pp. 680-684.)

17. John Griffin, Black Like Me, (New York: Signet, 1961).

18. Paul Goodman, Growing Up Absurd, (New York: Vintage, 1956); "The New Aristocrats," Playboy, May, 1967, pp. 110-11; 151-159.

19. Lyn Tornabene, "I Passed as a Teenager," Ladies Home Journal, June, 1967, pp. 113-118, and a book of the same title which should not be dignified by formal citation.

20. Edgar Z. Friedenberg, Coming of Age in America, (New York: Random House, 1963).

21. I refer here to "garden-variety", run of the mill youth in such ghettos, not simply to the more spectacular patterns embodied in youthful radicals or hippies.

22. Sarah Harris, Father Divine, Holy Husband, (New York: Doubleday, 1953).

23. Excellent documentation and conceptualization of these situations and processes are presented in Suttles op. cit. and Heirich, op. cit. The process sketched in the foregoing passages

may well be among the few that are found at all levels of social organization. See, for example, William Kornhauser, The Politics of Mass Society, (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1959); Clark Kerr & A. Siegel, "The Inter-Industry Propensity to Strike" in A. Kornhauser, et al, eds., Industrial Conflict (New York: McGraw Hill, 1954), pp. 189-212; S. M. Lisept, et al., Union Democracy, (The Free Press, 1956); M. Sherif and C. W. Sherif, Groups in Harmony and Tension (New York: Harper, 1953).

24. When such defensive action involves merely individuals or small groups, it is labeled crime, delinquency, or deviance. When it involves nations it is labeled "war". Such differences in popular labels should not detract attention from the essential similarity of the social processes. For an excellent discussion of current political ambiguities and propensities in labeling intra-national defensive actions, see Allan Silver, "The Demand for Order in Civil Society: A Review of Some Themes in the History of Urban Crime, Police, and Riot" in David Bordua, Editor, The Police, (New York: Wiley, 1967) esp. pp. 20-24.

25. My characterization of the Berkeley events is drawn from Heirich's definitive study, op. cit., especially, Ch. I., "Structuring the Conflict."