The Relationship Between the Police and Third Generation Turkish Immigrants in Germany

Özden Dumanlı

Submit your article to this journal

The Relationship Between the Police and Third Generation Turkish Immigrants in Germany

Özden Dumanlı ID
Ministry of National Education, Ankara, Turkey

Abstract

With globalization, countries' demographic structures have evolved into multicultural societies and this has laid the groundwork for ethnic, religious and cultural conflicts. The conflict process was also the beginning of ongoing integration problems between the majority in a society and minorities with different origins. Third generation Turkish immigrants are nested with a serious identity problem in Germany today. In this a specific example of multiculturalism, Turkish immigrants have adopted spatial segregation as a security method. This is caused by identity security anxiety and reveals another dimension of alienation and exclusion in modern societies with their criminalization by the police. The police are expected to stop conflict by considering the principle of equality and to reduce discrimination to the minimum level. Criminalizing Turkish immigrants and negative experiences in judicial processes, also shape the confidence people have in the police. Finally, immigrants attempt to seek proper security of their own, in the community, where the sense of trust is also alienated. This article discusses the presence of crime and violence as a part of the everyday life of Turkish immigrants, by what means does subjective security become the cause of objective insecurity, and how two different cultures confront each other due to feelings of insecurity towards the police, in the search for security.

Introduction

Globalization, one of the most popular concepts in recent years, and cultural identity, in the slippery zone of multicultural politics, are in the field of action with postmodernism encouraging pluralism and play an effective role in the present changes in societies. Today, on many platforms, especially in European countries, the realisticity of multiculturalism is discussed. Although criticized by multiculturalists, the idea that

CONTACT *Özden Dumanlı* ✉ *ozdendmnl@gmail.com*

real warfare will come from cultural, religious, and traditional differences, refers to the difference between "us" and "them" in today's societies. For this reason, political scientist Samuel P. Huntington's supporters view multiculturalism as a cause of conflict in today's societies (Karlsson, 2005), while others see multiculturalism as a solution to the problem of immigrant' integration and to accommodate cultural differences in a better way (Parekh, 2000).

The German sociologist Ferdinand Tönnies uses two concepts, *Gemeinschaft* (community) and *Gesellschaft* (society), to explain social development/change on the basis that people seek to achieve an objective or a goal and seek the most appropriate means to reach it. In *Gesellschaft*, there is also the *Gemeinschaft* point where the individual can declare his personal identity even if he participates in the dominant society. At this point, the individual internalizes the dominant image, accepts it, but simultaneously is able to reveal their image. However, the way in which the person reveals their identity during this internalization is strictly controlled by the dominant culture. Tönnies, within this system, perceives conceptually that *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* exist together or side by side (Tönnies, 2011). The concept of subculture, which is a topic of constant debate, is based on this model. Modern societies' perspectives towards ethnic/religious identity is not different from this. Here minority groups, with different cultural practices and viewpoints from the dominant culture, regard themselves as culturally separate from other groups in society (Giddens, 2000). The discrimination and prejudice that these community members, which have been referred to as "minority groups" in sociology since the 1930s, face in the society that surrounds them, strengthens their shared commitment and interest.

The fact that minority groups perceive the one different from themselves as a threat, results in their withdrawal to their communities, which they regard as a safe environment. If "us", as much as it is far from instability, represents a thing that enables the reproduction of order and a thing that fits the purpose of existence, then; "the other" represent the disruption of order, instability, and the thing that has the potential to remove the traditions, laws, and norms that enable the order to work and is the thing that is dangerous. As shown in Moslow's pyramid of needs, it is not in vain that the individual's safety needs immediately come after physiological needs. The fact that ethnic groups that perceive others as a threat have a tendency to live together with those who have the same identity as themselves, is another way of meeting security needs. As Zygmunt Bauman stated in his book, *Gemeinschaften*, "Community means a safe environment in which there are no thieves and strangers. In fact, the community is nothing more than pushing and separating itself out of society, putting up a wall between self and the other and putting a guard gate in front of the door" (Bauman, 2014, p.78).

The dangerous other (Kulcasi & Gökmen, 2012) is the basic reason for minority

groups' search for security, but it is not the only reason. Like the concept of security, the concept of crime, which is hard to explain, creates the need for security for individuals. The first criminologist, George Vold (2002), who argued that criminality is a product of social clashes, and a reflection of political and social inequality, claims that minority group behavior is generally described as a crime in eyes of the law, since they do not have the power to influence the legislative process.

In a specific example of multiculturalism today, immigrants or different ethnic groups in Germany are considered target groups, when crime is the issue. Survey results also support the perception that immigrants commit offenses more than domestic citizens (Geißler, 2008). Keeping foreign criminality constantly on the agenda, in the media, politics, and in the public sphere, creates the main argument for those who advocate for the restriction of immigration policies. Creating criminal foreigners (kriminelle Ausländer) to increase tension in society and to influence ideologies through discourse, triggers a fear of crime and a sense of security. This has become the most preferred method of extreme right populist parties in all European countries, not only in Germany. In particular, criminal charges against young people with immigrant backgrounds and slandering them has been seen as a repetitive situation in Germany for many years. The first group that was stigmatized as guilty in Germany following the signing of the labor agreement in 1961, was second generation immigrants, the children of guest workers who came there to work. While immigrants are followed by refugees and immigrant families in regard to the concept of crime; lastly Muslim youth were used in the same way with the concept of crime. However, the reason or cause of heretical and violent behavior in public discourse evolves into interpretations based on culture (Spies, 2010). Mass media, also affects the individuals' perceptions about crime very preliminarily. Studies conducted in this context show that the language used in the preparation of the news and the shared news, create a large space for foreign criminality, which leads to an increase in the rate of crimes committed crimes against immigrants, and to the emergence a fear of crime in society (Walter & Neubacher, 2011). Thus, the perceptions of crime in society is characterized by very poor discourse (Pfeiffer, et al., 2005).

Many criminal accusations are made through the media and create the fear of crime in society, this effects not only the formation of the perceptions of crime to increase, but also public demand for punishment to be stricter (Windzio & Kleimann, 2009). While immigrant generations in society are stigmatized as criminals, even before they are judged, official crime statistics prepared and published each year from police resources do not provide the results that can change this perception. As a matter of fact, the dark area (black numbers) are the reason that criminal measurement in criminology never reflect truth. Ferri observes criminality and defines as legal criminality, and real criminality and this correspondes to the real criminality line. The dark area

consisting of gaps such as undetectable, unreported, unrecognized, and unrelieved crime is evidence that police statistics will never reflect truth. Nonetheless, Turkish immigrants, as the subject of a 60-year migration experience in Germany, have been portrayed as the most criminal population among Non-German crime suspects. This is for criminal offenses in total since the 90's, without violations of immigration law in these statistics. According to the statistics published in 2015, Turkish immigrants are listed as suspects in 73,712 crimes of all the 555,820 crimes committed in Germany in the past year (Police Crime Statistic, 2015). In 2015 the Turkish immigrants were suspects in 13.5% of the crimes committed by immigrants without German citizenship in Germany. This number was the lowest in 2015, because the Turkish immigrant crime rates in the statistics before 2013 was not less than 20%. These numbers, published by the Federal Criminal Office (BKA), are also part of academic studies investigating the relationship between crime and immigration in third generation Turkish immigrants. The majority of them show that this diaspora tend to commit crime and, agree that the reasons are low social status (relative deprivation) and Turkish culture.

However, when this case is focused and considered, one type of crime can not always be compared to other types of crime, nor can it occur with the same conditions and reasons every time. The structural, situational and individual circumstances specific to the situation should be considered in each case. To express that Turkish community members tend to commit crimes in the media, politics, and public sphere, is to generalize the causes of crime or deviant behavior to a community, and thus ethnicize it. From now on, the question of 'why does a person commit a crime?' is more important than the question of 'what a behavior can be regarded as a crime?'. As Howard Becker (2013) mentions in his book, *Outsiders*, age, gender, ethnicity, and class differences all lead to the tendency to break laws. Becker's theory explains why immigrants are more likely to be attributed crimes in multicultural societies. He explains that immigrants are not prone to commit crimes or to deviant behavior, but rather by the actions of the majority in society. The criminalization of foreigners in Germany (recorded as suspects in the records) are two to three times more than Germans (Mansel & Albrecht 2003, p. 339). Likewise, it can be proven that criminals are exposed to increasingly aggressive sanctions (Pfeiffer, et al., 2005). Immigrants are suspected to commit crime more than German people, not only because social and cultural situations make them potential criminals, but also because the German authorities in the investigations and prosecutions give them more intense responses by perceiving crime and deviant behavior in diasporic community members, differently.

Today multiculturalism is the primary feature of modern societies, and in this respect existing relationships are not clear when compared to the past. Not only people but institutions also have the responsibility, to find solutions to the problems arising from efforts to keep ethnic and cultural differences together. In this process, the police

have a special and important role. While performing this task in front of society, the police are expected exhibit an attitude towards abuses such as racism and discrimination without ignoring the principle of equality. In this process in which ethnic conflicts and violence are a danger to modern societies, empirical studies are needed to measure the police perception of minority groups that are seen as threats. The movements of the police, who are often in the pubic eye can be inspected and evaluated by politics, media, and society (Göttel, 2021). This manifested in, the fact that Turkish immigrants tend to spatially segregate due to subjective security concerns and consider the police as the other, that then pushes them to seek objective security in their own ways. Eventually, they become a pathological part of society that can be suitable for criminalization. On the axis of crime and security, like a gyroscope, they turn around with the police and this shows how a multicultural society can turn into an crime scene, and the crime and security struggle of a minority group in the same society, as well as how this group could be both perpetrator and victim of the negativities experienced in the society.

This article[1] aims to examine judicial experiences and police perceptions obtained in the context of the security seeking and the criminalization of third generation Turkish immigrants, who were mostly born and raised in Germany. This research seeks to determine how police perception is affected in exchange of the criminalization by judicial authorities, parallel the alienation of third generation Turkish immigrants living in Germany.

The Discursive Dimension of Criminalization: The "Other" as a Threat

The migration experience of Turkish immigrants over the past half a century has been problematic, with some titles shaped under the theme of "European Turks". Turkish immigrants have experienced many material, conflicts, and drama during this period, and have tried to cope with encountering a foreign culture and the difficulty of establishing relations with this foreign culture, them despite their language differences. They have also experienced the difficulty of building a new life in Germany. They have always been intertwined with the main problems such as identity, family, youth, and religion. The elements of conflict that stand out in the way of immigration focus on phenomenas such as intercultural encounter and interaction, xenophobia and discrimination, assimilation and exclusion, inadaptability in institutional relations, and insecurity and ghettoization. Although it has been possible for the Turkish immigrants to cope with these problems from time to time, the problems related to cultural iden-

---

[1] This article was inspired by Özden Dumanlı's master's thesis titled "Almanya Kreuzberg'te Polisin Üçüncü Kuşak Türkiye Kökenlilerle İlişkisi" presented to the Police Academy Forensic Sciences Institute, Department of Forensic Sciences in 2017.

tity have acquired a permanent character.

While the identity formation in traditional societies is shaped by belonging to the society in which they live, individuality and individual reasoning are on the foreground in modern societies. In the postmodern era, the characteristics of identity have displayed overly fragmented and hybrid properties. Identity has evolved from being something we are born with, to a task. Identity is thought to be a vague and slippery concept. It can be examined in two dimensions according to Adam Smith; individual identities and collective identities (Coker, 1990). Individual identities are versatile and situational, and the importance ratings can change at different times depending on the circumstances. Briefly, the individual can completely change the order of preference for the elements that make up their identity (ibid, p. 139). Amin Maalouf (2000) thinks that this is about which element of our identity is more threatened. Family, gender, class, region, religion, ethnicity and nation are our individual identities. On the other hand, it seems that collective identity is also important, not the preferences and feelings of individuals. Ethnic, religious, and national ties are collective identities that attempt to reveal the differences between groups correspond to the expression of social identities at the community level (Smith, 2002).

The level of orientation that Turkish immigrants have towards their own identities is directly proportional to the perception level of discrimination. In his work entitled *Interkulturelles Lernen in der Schule*, Manfred Schreiner (2001) says that "the more our foreign citizens protect themselves, the more they will be rejected" (p. 22). And when you turn this expression upside down, that will turn into "the more they are rejected, the more they will take refuge in themselves" (ibid, p.22). However, identity is not the desire to be rejected, but rather it is the desire to introduce yourself to the other and receive approval or appreciation. With Hall's (1998) expression, "the other must pass through the pinhole in order to an build itself. The "I" and the "other" are in a complementary relationship. When we exclude the other, we form I; and when we exclude I, we form the other" (p. 93). From here, in a society, it is not possible to talk about a single self, it is about the individual's loss of self and the adoption of identities in the existing culture patterns. This culture is reflected in discourse. According to Foucault (1977), the raw material of identity is formed in discourse. Then it is internalized by the individual and a sense of identity is formed and performed within the process. Discourse, which is a social practice, is regarded as an act that directs people's lives in their social life spaces (Wodak & Meyer, 2002). The complexity of postmodern societies, the relations among societies, and the interactions between different societies in the same society can be attributed to multiple causalities. But, this causality is not at the level where it can explain the complexity and uncertainty. Thus, as with the formation of identity through language, everything else is explained within the context of discourse.

Ickler ([2006](#)) suggested in his book, *Normale deutsche Rechtschreibung*, that *Universalwörterbuch* users should use the verb *türken* carefully and stated that this expression means humiliation in the colloquial language. In the case of a fraud or dishonesty situation, German people sometimes use the verb *türken*, which means defrauding and deceiving. This reveals their anti-Turkish sentiments, which have been in existence for hundreds of years and are now out of consciousness. In the election campaign organized by the Republican Party (Republikaner-REP) in 2008 in the Hessen province, after seeing the party's official publication *Zeit für Protest*   ([*Deutsche Welle*, 2008](#)), and a banner printed on it with a blonde woman and a big punt-bar saying *Mach mich nicht an, Ali!* (Ali, don't touch me!), it is possible to detect Turkish hatred that is reflected easily in the German language. Or, in a morning newspaper, we can see the words *Auch heute wieder gingen Millionen von Muslimen ganz normal zur Arbeit.* (Today millions of Muslims went to their jobs smoothly) ([Welt, 2008](#)).

Discourse does not only describe or judge the state of the world and of humanity, contrarirly it changes them. Discourse is the other side of actions. The language used can also be the power itself, like other types of violence ([Krämer, 2005](#)). With Saussure's ([1976](#)) *There are only divisions in the language* ([p. 86](#)); the other struggles and is humiliated by words, as in the Homer's Iliad, the old testament, in Goethe, in Kleist, and in the parliamentary talks. The words of the Swiss writer Max Frisch, *Wir riefen Arbeitskräfte, und es kamen Menschen* has been the motto of the West to describe the problematic foreigner for many years. Identity construction with language can not be ignored, but its power in influencing ideology, one of the elements of identity, should not be found odd. Here the following expressions of Gee ([1999](#)) may come to mind: "Discourse always has a political content, no matter where and at what time. Because language is surrounded by the social world that surrounds it and the ideologies of that social world. Behind the language there is a political discourse that stands inseparably from it" ([p. 192](#)). From this point of view, it is normal for crime policy to create criminal identities through discourse.

While some content used regularly reveals the reaction based on crime policy when explaining a behavior in terms of criminology, vice versa is also possible. Crime policy can create criminology, which is part of it. It is the responsibility of the instrumentalization of crime politics in the political market, as well as the rhetoric in the media. It is the best starting point for political discourse that creates a fear of crime towards the other in the ones who consider the other a threat. Today stereotypical rhetoric from extreme right-wing political parties in multicultural societies, such as 'stricter laws and less crime', 'more police and more security' and 'foreigners/ immigrants tend to be criminal' are the public products of crime policy ([Prittwitz, 2008](#)). Crime policy inevitably resorts to offender-focused criminology. This situation may cause people with a migrant background, whose social characteristics are seen as a reason for crime, to be subject to

a selection in judicial processes.

Individuals determine their attitudes and behaviors according to how they perceive the truth, rather than realality. As the American sociologist, William Isaak Thomas (1928), puts it: "When people actually describe the situation, they eventually become real" (p. 21). Most people view mass media as a source of information, so they can be aware of the crime. It is no coincidence that, the media intensely covers sensational crimes, especially violent crimes committed by young immigrants in multicultural societies. Research has also shown that covering selective news contributes to society's perception of the number of violent crimes and the danger that may arise from this as a red alarm situation (Walburg, 2014). The most important reason non-German minorities in Germany are turned into guilty aliens can be based on unchanging and prejudiced discourse in politics, media, and society. This is described by the American political scientist, Walter Lippmann (2018), in his book *Public Opinion*, "The images we have formed in our minds about outer world structures can be entirely different from the outer world" (p. 147). There is a common negative judgment about the creation of an immigrant profile caricaturized in German media in the news related to immigrants, when content analysis is made. According to this shaped common image, foreigners are a threat to the workplace, the social environment, and society and, above all, will put public safety in jeopardy (Geißler, 2008). In 1997, the newspaper *Frankfurter Allgemeinen Zeitung (FAZ)* and *Siegener Zeitung (SZ)* were followed for five weeks and it became clear that the results were gloomy in terms of foreigners. About 59% of *Siegener Zeitung*'s news reports on ethnic minorities were about alien crime. In short, the content of three out of every four news was foreign criminality. Likewise, news on ethnic minorities in *Frankfurter Allgemeinen Zeitung* were significantly more than that of *Siegener Zeitung* (Geißler, 2008). In 2003 a study about children and young people's foreign immigrant perception showed that a shared perception of a 'foreigner who is prone to resort to violence' and a 'macho Turk' are formed through talkshow and court show programs that are loved by children and young people. The results of criminological research on scandalous headlines in daily newspapers on the relationship between Islam and violence in 2010 are also striking; Young Muslims: "The more you believe, the more violent you are" (Geißler, 2008, p.98). *Süddeutsche Zeitung* newspaper used the headline "a fist was raised against praying". These headlines constitute the probable result that was preferred by *Spiegel Online*: "Muslim, tyrant" (Baier et al., 2010).

As stated in the National Integration Plan, "A sense of unity occurs when people feel that they are accepted and do not feel like an outsider and participate in our society both in business and in private life, and their success is appreciated" (Die Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration, 2008, p. 2). The principle of togetherness requires that people approach each other with respect, first of all. This

is not compatible with the stigma that citizens of Turkish origin have in society, and does not reflect the *we* feeling in seen in official language. The spoken language is quite different.

Insecurity and Ghettoization

In the historical context, the term ghetto is used for areas where people belonging to a certain religion, race, culture, or ethnicity live voluntarily or involuntarily, isolating and limiting them. For example, Laura Vaughan (1997) explained the concept of ghetto with demographics. According to Vaughan, for an urban space to be considered a ghetto, at least 60% of the cluster formed by religious, racial, sectarian, and ethnic groups must live in that area. Loïc Wacquant (1997), on the other hand, defines the concept of *hyper ghetto* as ethnically and socially homogeneous areas with a high level of physical and social insecurity. While this homogeneity will strengthen the relationship between the community dwellers, the separation between them and the rest of society increases. The homogeneous relationship is a directly established relationship between the ghetto residents. Examples of these homogeneous relationships are seen in community dwellers preferences to shop from each other rather than outside, to use their own language when speaking to each other, to want to marry similar individuals in the same homogeneous society, and to give priority to each other in commercial activities. These relations are the equivalent of common traditions, customs, and cultural homogeneity in space. Established homogeneous relations create a homogeneous society that is widely discussed in sociology. A homogeneous society is a society made up of people of common tradition and origin and with little social distinction between them. Therefore, the homogeneous relations established between the ghetto residents, who have similar socio-cultural values, creates a homogeneous society in that area (Bauman, 2003). In this context, Turkish neighborhoods created by Turkish immigrants in Germany are some examples of ghettoization. Luis Small Mario (2008) discusses the homogeneous relations formed in the ghettos where occupational, class, property or religious minority groups live, through the phenomenon of cooperation and trust. According to Mario, the exclusion of certain minority groups due to prejudice increases the relations of cooperation and trust within these groups.

Place identity has lost its significance, but has gained a huge meaning with globalization. Because everyone in this stacked and spatial collages of images around us, occupies a space that separates themselves from others. How we distinguish ourselves from others is about our identity. If no one in this changing world knows where they are, the question of "how can a secure social order be created?" comes to mind (Harvey, 1985, p. 27). In the present day when individualism is at its peak, security has become a subject that encourages the do-it-yourself method. Communities with individuals that have the same identity as they do, in a specific place where the state can not reach,

try to provide their own people the sense safety. This is the product of the security industry so to speak. This is the same as in Sharon Zukin's book, *The Culture of Cities* (1995). Zukin notes the measures taken in the public arena about security concerns in Los Angeles: "Helicopters fly continuously over the Ghetto; The cops do not give the young members of the street gangs no quarter; the true owners of the city learn all the defense techniques necessary for them…" (p. 27). Zukin argues that this is the beginning of the process of institutionalization of horror that emerges with urbanization. This created fear policy puts making new prisons or imposing heavier punishments against crimes committed on the agenda. Safe areas controlled by armed guards, the expulsion of beggars and bums who are enemies of others, the construction of territories having different entry gate in public spaces, the separation of the common life styles rather than advocating common life, and criminalization of the remaining difference are important dimensions in today's multicultural life. This formation necessitates equality in itself, but the equality mentioned here means that there is no other, whose next move is unpredictable since they are from another identity. The foreign profile arises from being scared of unknown, totally. Richard Sennett (1996) states that being scared of the unknown ultimately leads to the search for a safe community and notes that this process works in the form of a self-fulfilling prophecy. The effect of this anticipation stiffens the individuals' driving forces causing them to act with security sentiment and the re-generated justifications and excuses each time. Eventually the homogenous formation that comes together with this sameness, becomes proof of their existence and security. Labeling a region according to ethnicity or religion takes place with symbol and sign systems that focus on the elements of identity, and their boundaries are drawn through the environment to which they belong. Security and identity linked to the social environment emerges a concept as this space transforms into a container for collective identity. Spatial segregation involving marginalization processes and negative stereotypes, as well as the response to it are based on deep-rooted fear, hatred, and insecurity.

Security is an issue in which, not only states play role, but also individuals and systems, and in which economic, social and environmental factors, as well as political and military factors have an effect. It is not true that individuals can feel secure only in situations where they are not at war or exposed to violence. There is another dimension, called subjective security, that means protecting individuals from constant and sudden stresses that can threaten their daily lives. Today, in multicultural societies, gathering different ethnic, religious, national, and cultural groups in ghettos with subjective security concerns is an identity-based question. As the political scientist, Arnold Wolfers (1952), tries to explain, security is a safeguard of individual values (national identity, religious identity, culture, etc.) as well as being away from physical violence (threat). In this case, when the individual is far from their own identity, they

perceive the other as a threat to their being, and their integrity, and become afraid. To describe the other as a threat, a danger, a bad, or irregular is a phenomenon that arises from a persons identity. If people build an identity based on being scared of other, then the fact that they will perceive the other against themselves is absolute.

In this way, the other enables the collective identity to discover itself as a potential threat and a source of conflict with its existence. In this case, Giddens's (1991) concept of ontological security comes into play. The most important link to reach such security, is confidence in the other side. The individual wants to see what they can be, to anticipate the behavior of community members surrounding them, and to plan for the future. Under this condition, people can be themselves and can capture the self-completeness that can fulfill their expectations. Individuals whose values are unprotected may feel insecure, and will attempt to fight for their values by themselves. As Thomas Hobbes mentioned in his famous work *Leviathan*, "human nature has three fundamental causes of conflict: competition, not to be safe and honor" (Hobbes, 1976, p.103). The motives behind a war caused by competition is to gain ground. The motive behind a war caused by not being safe is to reach security, and the motive behind a war for honor is winning prestige. Human beings are actually in constant conflict with thoughts and actions that are fed from these three factors (ibid, p.85). In this case, the ghetto, which is seen as a safe zone, is almost like a greenhouse of security, but it can be turned into a labaratory of atomizing and anomie.

Loïc Wacquant (1993), who has been carrying out social research in Chicago's gettos for many years, thinks that ghettoization contributes to the criminalization of poverty (where social status is especially emphasized), after identifying it as an organic part of the waste mechanism. There is a very active flux and reflux between the ghetto and prison. The ghetto and prison have two important strategies to keep unwanted people away; limiting and immobilizing. These are the tools of strict exclusion and humiliation. These are indicators of how the system works as a recycling mechanism, in which the lower classes and the poor are able to get out of there and jump into upper class and then fall back into the sub-class according to their social benefits. There are no other options for those who fall into a sub-class, as they are stigmatized as people having endemic criminal tendencies.

Labeling a region according to ethnicity or religion is related to the common identity elements of the community living in the region and the social environment they belong to. This ethnic spatial segregation includes marginalization and negative stereotypes, and the response to this formation is based on insecurity. Just like Loughran said, "We have to live alongside people we don't trust and fear" (Loughran, 2009, p. 92). Since an environment shaped according to the culture of an ethnic community is formed according to the perception of "me" and "other", it is important in determining

specific feelings such as the sense of security. The perceived, designed, and lived experinces in this environment are determined by the social environment to which individuals feel belonging. The experince of determining a place for yourself brings along a localized security (being in the right place) and insecurity (Moran & Skeggs, 2004). The other's domain then becomes an unsafe place. By acting with a sense of security in this environment and owning these areas, a social space emerges here. These areas identified with cultural symbols cease to be neighborhoods with rows of houses, and instead contain expressions and identities (Sennetti, 1996). The relationship between space and security ensures that the community inside can both control others and control themselves. Ensuring the security of the environment through the police, which provides a sense of security to an ethnic or social community, is also heterogeneous and multi-layered.

Institutional Racism for the Construction of Order: Police and Ethnic Profiling

German journalist and writer Hans-Günter Wallraff, worked in various places, disguising himself as a Turkish person, for two years in 1983. He eventually wrote the bad things he experienced, ill-treatment of foreign workers, tax evasion scandals, and business security violations in a detailed way, in his book titled *Ganz Unten* (The Underwriters). The foreword of this mentioned book is like this:

> I was not a real Turk. But you have to disguise yourself to drop the mask of the community. You have to deceive and fake to reveal the truth. I still do not know how an foreigner struggles with daily humiliation, hostility and kin. But now I know what it is and how far it has gone to humiliate people in this country. A piece of Apartheid (racist discrimination system) is in our democracy. The things I had fully met my expectations. Of course, negatively. I have experienced events in Federal Germany, which should actually be included in history books written only on the 19th century (Wallraff, 1986, p. 2).

Very few of the everyday practices of diasporic community members are known, despite the egalitarian law, which was issued in the shadow of controversial anti-discrimination legislation, particularly demanded by the European Union, since the recent history of politics and economy in Germany. Starting from this, Bielefeld University interviewed with about 1,000 people from Italy, Turkey, Vietnam, Sri Lanka, Croatia, and Serbia on the experiences of discrimination they experienced. Participants in the study were asked whether they had encountered discrimination in the past 12 months and whether this had been about ethnic origin. The answers reveal that discrimination predominantly arose from ethnic origin. Another worrying result is that a high proportion of participants think that they are treated badly in public institutions or by the

police (Salentin, 2007).

A report published by Amnesty International at the end of 2016 stated that the number of attacks based on racism has never been so high since the establishment of Germany. In the same report, it is emphasized that institutional racism increases with the hate crimes in Germany, and the police are the forefront of the discriminating institutions. What is particularly emphasized here is that the police are not deliberately racist. Actually, on the contrary, institutional racism, unlike racism in the social context, is a form of behavior shaped by unconscious prejudices or a collective failure of an institution. It is well known that the police first questioned the relatives of the victims as probable suspect in the murders of 9 Turkish people killed by the National Socialist Underground Organization (NSU) in Germany in 2000-2006, which were known as "doner seller killings" in the media. It is disturbing that the 15-year-old daughter of a victim killed by NSU was questioned about whether her father was a drug dealer and if she had been sexually abused during police inquiries. In 2011, during the NSU murder trial, research commissions were set up to reveal mistakes or omissions by police and other judicial authorities. However, these commissions did not reached a definite conclusion on whether institutional racism might have taken place. In 2015, the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe concluded that the racist dimension of crime was not seen in the German police authorities' work and that the police did not act in a structural bias in the NSU-serial killings. However, empirical studies confirm the discriminatory behavior of the police against people with foreign origins (Amnesty International, 2016). The issue that has been particularly emphasized in recent years is ethnic profiling methods used by the police (Tagesschau, 2020).

The European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance defines ethnic profiling as an operation by the police taking into account the characteristics such as race, color, language, religion, nationality, nationality, and ethnicity without objective and reasonable justification, in the context of inspection, control, and investigation (ECRI, 2007). Ethnic profiling was added to religious profiling carried out on Muslims following the September 11 attacks in the USA, to see if the actions followed racist influences (Tatort & Henry, 2007). In Germany, ethnic and racial profiling are a substitute for property measures, which is merely an outward appearance, and do not indicate reasonable suspicion. Despite the view that ethnic profiling violates the principle of equality based on the German Constitution, it is possible to encounter ethnicity-based criminal profiling or criminal typification. In this respect, crime or suspicion may be attributed to a perpetrator, according to personal characteristics (criminal profiling) or behavioral characteristics (behavioral profiling), which are usually determined in a criminological study (Agentur der Europäischen Union für Grundrechte, 2010; Open Society Institute, 2009). To determine this perpetrator, ethnicity can be an important starting point for the police to base their investigation, as well as other criteria such as

color and religion. It is known that the German police are not indifferent to profiling, especially when conducting identity checks (Cremer, 2013). According to the answer from the Ministry of Interior in response to a parlimentary question given by a representative, the German police conducted ID checks 2,953,844 times without valid reason, in 2015. These checks are often conducted only on the basis of factors such as skin color and origin (Deutsche Welle, 2016; Das Erste, 2021).

In addition, a survey was conducted by the European Union Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA) to find the number of people who have been stopped by the police in the last 12 months. According to responses, 25% of Turkish people had been stopped by the police, while only 11% of German people responded positively. In the same study, when asked about the checks, 1.8% of German people said that they had also been frisked when being stopped, while 2.1% of the Turkish people explained that they had faced the same result. The data released by the Foreign and German Youth Research Institute in 2003 is also striking. In the questionnaires conducted with German, Greek, Italian, and Turkish youth, 27.5% of German people stated that they did not trust the police. This rate was 29.7% in people with foreign origins. However, when a comparison was made between Italian, Greek, and Turkish youth, 68.8% of the youth of other foreign origins did not trust the Berlin police and 83.9% of the Turkish youth reported that they had a trust problem with the police. According to another study conducted by the same institute, 34.1% of the Turkish people stated that they were frequently mistreated by the police (Gesemann, 2003). Police work has an important place in communication and interaction between the individual and the others. If the police are considered to be fair when taking precautions before the crime, it strenghtens the denouncement (asking for help) possibility for young people before or during a crime. In this case, positive outcomes will be revealed in terms of the police and society. Perhaps this will not be able to completely eliminate the crime rate, but it will be possible to reduce it. It is important that communication between the police and the society is continuous and satisfactory. In the proactive phase, if the police cooperate with the society and are considered to be a helper for society, then society agrees on acting jointly with the police (Göttel, 2021). This can only be provided with mutual confidence. In today's multicultural societies, it seems extremely difficult for the police and foreigners to be able to build mutual trust when both of them, that represent two different cultures, are in a confrontation. Police prejudice and negligence towards people with foreign origin causes them to secure their justice between themselves, therefore it is possible for police to lose their authority in ghettos (Sauer, 2006). While society-supported policing (Community Policing) in Germany is encouraged by all circles and the police are known for their protective, preventive, interventionist, punitive identity, however in ghettos, you can find police officers who prefer looking at events from far away, are passive at preventing crime, and are only busy with dist-

ributing the crowd after the crime, and you might also find police who do not obtain practicing when it comes to punishment (Zdun, 2008).

In this way, it is arguable to rely on the police when they are considered to be the other. In a presentation in the Human Rights and Police Seminar organized in Brandenburg Police Academy given by a researcher from the European Union Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA) (2017) on ethnicity profiling and policing, 63% of Turkish people rely on the police throughout Germany. And then through the same data, 87% of the Turkish people did not contact the police, even though they were the victims of threats and serious harassment. The contradiction between these two conclusions indicates that it is necessary to draw attention to the point between actually having confidence and having to trust. Thus, when criminological analysis of a ghetto is made, it turns out that the police have produced criminal individuals with discrimination or ethnographic profiling, from individuals who are regarded as embodied in danger in the ghetto, in order to regulate society. During this time, the feeling of insecurity towards the police, which is formed in the same individuals, can also result in feeling guilty even though they are the victims, especially when they go on to provide their own security in the next stages.

Conclusion

The problem that has to be emphasized at this point is that the Turkish people as potential criminals in inconformity, conflict, and criminal statistics has been placed in the society, which affects the social lives of Turkish immigrants living in Germany. This crime policy hampers the integration policy that Germany has been waiting for years to succeed and has made crime and violence a practice in the daily lives of Turkish people living in neighborhoods. Turning ghettos into a crime scene is a product of today's globalizing politics. The fact that the police can make punishment in various forms by witnessing who is guilty and who is innocent before members of the Turkish community have been brought to court, turns the others who are considered to be a threat as threat to society, into potential criminals. This situation directs some of the Turkish people living in the ghetto to crime and causes the fear of crime to occur in the other part. With this anxiety, their law and order demands cause them to be distanced more from general society. Given the understanding of Hannah Arendt (2003) arguing that the support of people who give power to the institutions of the country, the police who are always in sight of society, politics, and the media, can only perform their task with the help of alienated others. This can be successful with the development of mutual trust. However, when the police are regarded as the political organ which supports the crime, leads others to seek security in their own way. Violence is regarded as one of the ways to solve problems in an unjust world. It can also be regarded as a means of ensuring ones' own justice. The understanding that power shapes power, not

that the law shapes power, may emerge among individuals. The natural feeling that you are not safe, pushes people into fighting and struggling to reach security; even so *Homo homini lupus* (a man is a wolf to another man). "The security search also turns immigrants from being victim to criminal situations again. The security gap turns into self policing behavior. Although immigrants think that they can cope with their insecurity problems, albeit temporarily, the self policing method may eventually lead to an environment of crime and violence for community members" (Dumanlı, 2017, p. 190). At the end, there is a community which constantly turns itself around on a crime and security axis. The police perception of the Turkish immigrants is shaped by the interaction with subculture, which is the localized reference for police culture and the crime, based on the ghettoization and alienation from the feeling of trust.

Orcid

Özden Dumanlı iD *https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6337-9642*

References

Agentur der Europäischen Union für Grundrechte (FRA). (2010). *Ein Handbuch: Für eine effektive Polizeiarbeit: Diskriminierendes „Ethnic Profiling" erkennen und vermeiden.* https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/1133-Guide-ethnic-profiling_DE.pdf adresinden alındı.

Amnesty International. (2016). *Living in Insecurity: How Germany is Failing Victims of Racist Violance.* https://www.amnesty.org/en/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/EUR2341122016ENGLISH.pdf adresinden alındı.

Arendt, H. (2003). Şiddet Üzerine. (Çev. Bülent Peker). İletişim Yayıncılık-Politika Dizisi.

Baier D, Christian P, Simonson J & Rabold S. (2009). *Jugendliche in Deutschland als Opfer und Täter von Gewalt*. Hannover: Kriminolgisches Forschungsenstitut Niedersachen e.V. (KFN), https://kfn.de/wp-content/uploads/Forschungsberichte/FB_107.pdf adresinden alındı.

Bauman, Z. (2003). *Modernlik ve Müphemlik*, (Çev. İ. Türkmen), İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Bauman, Z. (2014). *Gemeinschaften. Auf der Suche nach Sicherheit in einer bedrochlichen Welt*. Der deutschen Ausgabe Suhrkampf Verlag. 3. Auflage 2014.

Becker, H. (2013). Hariciler (Outsiders) : Bir Sapkınlık Sosyolojisi Çalışması. Heretik Yayıncılık.

Cremer, H. (2013). *Racial Profiling – Menschenrechtswidrige Personenkontrollen nach § 22 Abs. 1a Bundespolizeigesetz.* Berlin. https://www.institut-fuer-menschenrechte.de/fileadmin/_migrated/tx_commerce/Studie_Racial_Profiling_Menschenrechtswidrige_Personenkontrollen_nach_Bundespolizeigesetz.pdf adresinden alındı.

Coker, E. (1990). Adam Smith's Concept of the Social System. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (Feb., 1990), pp. 139-142.

Das Erste. (2021). Racial Profiling: Immer wieder Polizeikontrollen. https://daserste.ndr.de/panorama/archiv/2021/Racial-Profiling-Immer-wieder-Polizeikontrollen,panorama13780.html adresinden alındı.

Deutsche Welle. (2016). Almanya'da 3 Milyon Keyfi Kimlik Kontrolü. https://www.dw.com/tr/almanyada-3-milyon-keyfi-kimlik-kontrol%C3%BC/a-19175959 adresinden alındı.

Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration. (2008). *The National Integration Plan: Driver of Integration Policy*. file:///C:/Users/Asus/Downloads/docl_8572_61616702.pdf adresinden alındı.

Dumanlı, Ö. (2017). *Almanya Kreuzberg'te Polisin Üçüncü Kuşak Türkiye Kökenlilerle İlişkisi*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Polis Akademisi, Adli Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adli Bilmler Anabilim Dalı, Ankara

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2017). *Fundamental Rights Report*. https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/fra-2017-fundamental-rights-report-2017_en.pdf adresinden alındı.

Europäische Kommission gegen Rassismus und Intoleranz (ECRI). (2007). *Allgemeine Politische Empfehlung Nr. 11 von ECRI. Bekämpfung von Rassismus und Rassendiskriminierung in der Polizeiarbeit*. https://rm.coe.int/ecri-general-policy-recommendation-no-11-on-combating-racism-and-racia/16808b5ade adresinden alındı.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: the birth of the prison*. London: Penguin.

Geißler, R. (2008). *Die Sozialstruktur Deutschlands*, VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, e-book, ISBN 978-3-531-91195-3

Gee, J, P. (1999). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. New York: Routledge.

Gesemann, F. (2003). Ist egal ob man Ausländer ist oder so – jeder Mensch braucht die Polizei. Die Polizei in der Wahrnehmung junger Migranten. A.Groenemeyer, J.Mansel (Hg.), *Die Ethnisierung von Alltagskonflikten*. p. 209, 210 and 211. Wiesbaden 2003.

Giddens, A. (2000). *Sosyoloji*. Ankara: Ayraç Yay. p. 224.

Giddens, A. (2014). Modernite ve Bireysel-Kimlik - Geç Modern Çağda Benlik ve Toplum. Say Yayınları.

Göttel, S. (2021). *Ethische Analyse von Predictive Policing*. Vossenkuhl Scriptum Verlag.

Hall, S. (1998). Eski ve Yeni Kimlikler, Eski ve Yeni Etniklikler. In D. K. Anthony (Eds.), *Kültür, Küreselleşme ve Dünya Sistemi* (p. 41). Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.

Harvey, D. (1985). Consciousness and urban experience. Oxford.

Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of Delinquency*. University of California Press. P. 16-34.

Hobbes, T. (1976). *Leviathan – Bir Din ve Dünya Devletinin İçeriği, Biçimi ve Kudreti*. Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Huntington, S. P. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Ickler, T. (2006). *Normale deutsche Rechtschreibung*. Verlag: Leibniz Verlag / Reichl 5. Aufl.

Karlsson, I. (2005). *Din, Terör ve Hoşgörü*. Homer Kitabevi ve Yayıncılık.

Krämer, S. (2005). *Gewalt der Sprache – Sprache der Gewalt. Hg. von der Landeskommission Berlin gegen Gewalt*. Berlin.

Kulcasi, K & Gökmen, M. (2012). Tehlikenin Çehresi: Amerikan Medyasının Arap, Müslüman ve Ortadoğu Temsillerinde Sakal. In Gökmen, M. (Eds.), *Batı Medyasının Ortadoğu Tasavvuru, Popüler Jeopolitik Oryantalizm ve Uluslararası İlişkiler*. İlke Yayıncılık. P. 57.

Lippmann, W. (2018). *Public Opinion*. New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Loughran, J. (2009). From Management to Transformation: Lessons in Community Peacebuilding. The Experience of INTERCOMM. In Belfast. C, Hauswedell, M. Johannsen, & Nolan P, *Demilitarizing Conflicts – Learning Lessons in Northern Ireland, Palestine and Israel* (pp.99). Rehburg-Loccum: Evangelische Akademie Loccum.

Maalouf, A. (2000). Ölümcül Kimlikler. Yapı Kredi Yayıncılık. P. 19.

Mansel, J & Albrecht, G. (2003). Die Ethnie des Täters als Prädiktor für das Anzeigeverhalten von Opfern und Zeugen. *Soziale Welt: Zeitschrift für Sozialwissenschaftliche Forschung und Praxis*. DOI:10.2307/40878419.

Mario, L. (2008). Four Reasons to Abandon the Idea of Ghetto. *Symposium on the Ghetto*. First published online: December 1, 2008, p. 389.

Moran, J. L & Skeggs, B. (2004). *Sexuality and the Politics of Violence and Safety*. London: Routledge.

Open Society Institute – OSI. (2009). *Ethnic Profiling in the European Union. Pervasive, Ineffective and Discriminatory*. New York 2009. https://www.justiceinitiative.org/uploads/8cef0d30-2833-40fd-b80b-9efb17c6de41/profiling_20090526.pdf adresinden alındı.

Parekh, B. C. (2000). *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural diversity and political theory*. Cambridge Mass. : Harvard University Press.

Pfeiffer, C, Kleimann, M, Petersen, S & Schott, T. (2005). *Migration und Kriminalität. Ein Gutachten für den Zuwanderungsrat der Bundesregierung*. Baden- Baden: Nomos.

Police Crime Statistic. (2015). Police Crime Statistic Federal Republic of Germany Report 2015, BKA. https://www.bka.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/EN/Publications/PoliceCrimeStatistics/2015/pks2015_englisch.pdf;jsessionid=D12438D120F4CB5AB6E4C9E6E0D23F1E.live301?__blob=publicationFile&v=3

Prittwitz, C. (2008). *Kriminalpolitik in der Mediengesellschaft*. Berlin.

Salentin, K. (2007). *Diskriminierungserfahrungen erthnischer Minderheiten in der Bundesrepublik*. Universität Bielefeld, Institut für Interdisziplinäre Konflikt- und Gewaltforschung, September 2007. https://www.ufuq.de/wp-content/uploads/2009/07/diskriminierungserfahrungen.pdf adresinden alındı.

Sauer, M. (2006). *Das Image der Polizei bei türkeistämmigen Migranten in Nordhein-Westfallen*. Essen.

Schreiner, M. (2001). *Interkulturelles Lernen in der Schule,* https://www.yumpu.com/de/document/view/21930996/interkulturelles-lernen-in-der-schule adresinden alındı.

Sennetti, R. (1996). *The Uses of Disorder, Personal Identity and City Life*. London: Faber 1996, p. 194.

Smith, A. (2002), *Küresel Çağda Milletler ve Milliyetçilik*. İstanbul: Everest Yayınları.

Spies, T. (2010). *Migration und Männlichkeit. Biographien junger Straffälliger im Diskurs*. Transcript Verlag. P. 106.

Tagesschau. (2020). Racial Profiling: Studie jetzt durchführen. https://www.tagesschau.de/inland/racial-profiling-studie-101.html adresinden alındı.

Tator, C & Henry, F. (2007). *Racial Profiling in Canada. Challenging the myth of "a few bad Apples"*. University of Toronto Press. Pp. 55-91.

Thomas, W.I. (1928). "The Behavior Pattern and the Situation," Publications of the American Sociological Society, Vol. XXII, p. 1-13.

Tönnies, F. (2011). *Cemaat ve Cemiyet Nazariyesi*. (Çev. Z. Fahri Fındıkoğlu). İstanbul Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Mecmuası.

Vaughan, L. (1997). The Urban Ghetto: the spatial distribution of ethnic minorities. Paper given at the *First International Space Syntax First International Symposium*, University College London, 16-18 April 1997. To be published by the Space Syntax Laboratory in 1999.

Vold, Bernard. (2002). *Theoretical Criminology*. 5th Edition, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Zdun, S. (2008). Die jungen Russlanddeutschen. In Schweer,T, Strasser, H, Zdun, S (Eds.), *Das da draußen ist ein Zoo und wir sind die Domptuere. Polizisten im Konflikt mit ethnischen*

Minderheiten und Sozialen Randgruppen (pp. 39-63). Wiesbaden.

Zukin, S. (1995). *The Culture of Cities.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Wacquant, L. (1993). Urban outcasts. Stigma and division in the black American ghetto and the french urban periphery. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*,17.3, p. 365-383.

Wacquant, L. (1997). Three Pernicious Premises in the Study of the American Ghetto. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, v: 21, p.341.

Walburg, C. (2014). *Migration und Jugenddelinquenz. Mythen und Zusammenhänge*. https://mediendienst-integration.de/fileadmin/Dateien/Gutachten_Kriminalitaet_Migration_Walburg.pdf adresinden alındı.

Wallraff, G. (1986). *En Alttakiler*. Interpreter: Osman Okkan. Verlag Kipenheuser and Witsch, Köln, Milliyet Yayın A.Ş.

Walter, M & Neubacher, F. (2011). *Jugendkriminalität*. P. 312.

Welt. (2008). Warum ein Mensch zum Terroristen wird. https://www.welt.de/politik/article2355190/Warum-ein-Mensch-zum-Terroristen-wird.html adresinden alındı.

Windzio, M & Kleimann, M. (2009). Criminal society and criminal immigrants: A social construction of reality by mass media? In M. E. Oswald, S. Bieneck & J. Hupfeld-Heinemann (Eds.), *Social psychology of punishment of crime* (pp. 93–112). John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Wodak, R & Meyer, M. (2002). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

Wolfers, A, (1962). National Security as an Ambiguous Symbol, in: Discord and Collaboration. Essays on International Politics John Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, p. 147-165.