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Here I argue for a community psychology based on the worth of all people and focus in particular on what that implies for those of us who do research. I discuss a hermeneutics of suspicion and methodolatry as orientations that can obscure the dignity of persons and offer a community psychology informed by humanism (CPh) as an alternative. CPh as outlined here, works from the assumption that people are good and emphasises a hermeneutics of love. Research involves the commitment to serve a community and an iterative process of working alongside that community while trusting, deepening and challenging your perspective as a researcher. I conclude by giving two examples from my own work and offering five principles researchers may wish to consider if CPh resonates for them.

Community psychology began, at least in part, as a response to the tendency of psychology to focus on the individual as a cause of, and cure for, human problems (Gridley & Breen, 2007; Nelson, Lavoie, & Mitchell, 2007). As a new sub-discipline it brought in fresh perspectives including an emphasis on people in context and a respect for difference. As Rappaport (1977) states in his early text, community psychology refutes the notion that psychologists should “adjust marginal[ised] people to the norm” (p. 1) and instead is based on “a faith in the possibility of a society that is consistent with a belief in the worth of all people” (p. 21, my emphasis). Diversity is at the core of this vision, and the role of a community psychologist is to work as an “agent of the local community” (p. 23) and help facilitate as best they can the flourishing of both the community itself and the people within it.

Here I argue for a turn, or return, to the notion of a community psychology based on the worth of all people and focus in particular on what that implies for those of us who do research. I move between outlining the rules and norms that I consider shackle us to particular positions and may inadvertently serve to perpetuate the status quo, and alternatives grounded in the notion of human dignity; that all people are persons, limited by the circumstances in which they find themselves and with something to offer. I offer this as a radical vision, not in the sense that the elements which make it up are necessarily new, but in the sense that it attempts to go to the root of what community psychology is or could be.

I start by briefly outlining the primary task of research in community psychology being to serve a community and then elaborate on the worth of all people as a core assumption of what I call a humanistic community psychology (CPh). Next, I outline a CPh research process and spend some time outlining the pitfalls of “methodolatry” which, I argue, is endemic in psychology and reverses the emphasis on service and dignity I am advocating here. I conclude by giving two examples from my own work and summarising a list of principles researchers may wish to consider if CPh resonates for them.

The Core Task: To Serve a Community

The core task of research in community psychology as claimed by Rappaport and reiterated in various forms many times since, is to serve a community (e.g., Fine, 2018; Guerin, Leugi, & Thain, 2018; Rappaport, 1977). “Community”, however, is a contentious term (Evans, Duckett, Lawthom, & Kivell, 2017; Kagan, Burton, Duckett, Lawthom, & Siddiquee, 2011). Communities are made up of elements that may include shared social practices, subjective phenomena such as “sense of community” (Sarason, 1974) or
“communitas” (McInerney, 2016), geographical boundaries, and/or rules of membership that define people as in or out regardless of their preference. Communities can be comforting, liberating or oppressive, or all of these especially when considered from the perspective of different people. As I am using it here a community is a group of people who exist in relationship to each other (with the further caveat that the group is not a single family). The question is not whether this community is “real” in absolute terms, but whether, in the rough way of fuzzy categories, the people within it are connected in some non-trivial sense. A group of friends is a community in this sense, so is an organisation, a network of people who recognise themselves as sharing a common identity (e.g., as queer, environmentalists, veterans), a city or a nation. In today’s world it also makes sense to speak of a “global human community” as everyone is in relationship to everyone else via myriad international networks. Community psychology, then, focuses on people-in-relationship and can be located within any level of human systems beyond the single person and their immediate family.

The emphasis on service means that research from a community psychology perspective does not, or at least ideally should not, start from the premise of knowing what this or that community needs and how to study or “fix” it. It starts instead from a broad concern for the wellbeing of a community and a commitment to work with that community to help those within it, and (again ideally) also those affected by it, flourish. The emphasis on service means that community psychology research is never simply research for the sake of research, an agenda that is commonly signalled by euphemisms such as “knowledge advancement” or “blue skies”. Instead it assumes a researcher-in-relationship to actual people who matter. As I will discuss later, an orientation toward service is extremely difficult to uphold in an academic environment that expects both specialised skill and that research of quality should go beyond the “stubborn particulars” (a term used in the title of a book by Frances Cherry, 1995) of the local context in order to make broad claims.

The Core Assumption: That All People Have Worth

In the version of community psychology I am advocating, the assumption that all people have worth, sits within and informs every aspect of the research process. In various forms, the dignity, worth or wellbeing of the person is often discussed as a foundational principle of community psychology (Gridley & Breen, 2007; Nelson et al., 2007; Rappaport, 1977). However why, exactly, we should consider people inherently worthy, is often less clear. Two sets of questions are important here. First what makes an individual person worthy? Or in other words, why are people, as people, worth our time and effort? The second question is do we mean all people? Community psychology has done an excellent job of honouring those from marginalised groups but what of those who do not fit within these groups? And related to this, what does it do to human dignity to have an intense commitment to people-in-categories as is implicit to the focus on marginalised groups?

To begin to consider these questions, we need to take a short epistemological detour. How do we, and can we, know that people are worthy? In a sense, the short answer is that we cannot know, or at least not through intellectual or empirical means. Such claims are always devices, or the term I prefer, “plays” (Harré, 2018a); founded on uncertainty and embedded within language, other symbols and knowledge-systems that can never be teased apart from our biological being as women and men, the physical and living world we are surrounded by, or from the history of our people and how we are arranged in relationship to each other. These insights are often attributed to postmodernism (see Kvale, 1992), but they also underpin any sensible approach to scholarship in the social sciences. Let’s face it, once you have spent a few years in the knowledge game in psychology or related fields you can’t help but realise that there is
always pretence at the centre of it (see Carse, 1994; Harré, 2018a; Huizinga, 1950). To quote the philosopher James Carse, all “firm knowledge… floats… in myth” (1986, p. 139).

But once you accept that there isn’t a definitive intellectual or empirical route into the core assumptions of, in our case, community psychology, you are still left with the need to take a position. The assumption that people are of profound worth and thus carry dignity, is for me, based on an even more fundamental assumption that people are good (I’ll elaborate soon) and is most accurately described as something like a calling. It is a feeling that is light with possibility and hope. While I can be made to doubt its correctness and practical utility, I find it irresistible; that people are good is a mantra that runs through me and charges me with the desire to act with care.

Now, having admitted that the ground on which I am standing is no more solid than a mere calling, I will backfill it with the scholarship that both affirms and has, no doubt, helped shape it. To cut to the chase, the work within psychology that I have found speaks most reliably to the notion of human dignity and goodness is broadly speaking humanistic (e.g., Brinkmann, 2017; Davidson, 2000; DeRobertis & Bland, 2018; Fromm, 1957, 1978; May, 1969; Muramoto, 2011; Ryan & Deci, 2002; Serlin, 2011).

And a particularly good fit from humanistic scholarship with what I am proposing here is the distinction between a “hermeneutics of suspicion” and a “hermeneutics of love” alongside advocacy for the latter (Robbins, 2016a, 2016b; Selig, 2016).

A hermeneutics of suspicion, as claimed by Brent Dean Robbins in the introduction to a special issue on this topic in the Journal of Humanistic Psychology (Robbins, 2016b), is “widely represented in contemporary critical thought” (p. 220). It assumes hidden meanings and something “inextricably aggressive and violent” in the character of human life (p. 220). A hermeneutics of love on the other hand, assumes goodwill in both ourselves and in those we encounter that is beyond our actions and what these function to maintain. It is characterised by “a generosity of spirit” (p. 220) and profound respect for, and desire to serve, others. In her article in the special issue, Jennifer Leigh Selig (2016) analyses the approach of Martin Luther King Jr. as a case study of the hermeneutics of love. In particular she stresses his emphasis on love for all including “one’s enemies” as a necessary foundation for his notion of the “beloved community” (p. 238). Application of this approach, Selig suggests, can become a type of “culture therapy” which “[puts] love into action for the healing and transformation of the culture” (p. 241).

It is important to note that love for all is fundamental to the hermeneutics of love presented here, as it falls apart if we extend it only to those who are apparently deserving. Having said that, the primacy of this open-ended respect for the other certainly does not remove the need to analyse and challenge the social systems that perpetuate suffering. It is rather that we try not to allow our suspicion of systems to morph into a blanket suspicion of those we see as benefitting from these systems. This separation of what a system functions to do from the people involved, is a move that may sometimes be missed, or seen as unnecessary, in critical approaches to community psychology. For example an article by David Fryer and Adele Laing that offers a critical community psychology approach, states that they are “ultimately interested” in “critical questions” that concern “who has… authority” and “whose interests are served” (Fryer & Laing, 2008, p. 7, emphasis added). Similarly, the chapters in the Theoretical Foundations section of the Handbook of Community Psychology on critical and feminist psychology (Evans et al., 2017; Riger, 2017) emphasise social justice, power and oppression/subordination.

This emphasis on who does and does not benefit from the status quo risks turning community psychology into an us/them game with the distribution of power at its core. Somehow the nuance, potential and constraints of the actual people involved may slip away in the rigidity by which they are categorised. A hermeneutics of love does not
deny power, but it focuses on what is possible when people are enabled to bring forward the best they have to offer.

While a hermeneutics of love is at its core an act of faith, it is supported by a huge body of research in psychology that emphasises the social nature of people and our desire to belong (see Baumeister, Dale, & Muraven, 2000; Harré, 2018b; Ryan & Deci, 2002). An attachment to others this research would suggest, is much more fundamental than the specific forms it takes including ingroup/outgroup divisions. Even evolutionary perspectives that have helped create the notion of the self-serving individual can be framed to emphasise the cooperation that underpins survival and reproduction (see Nowak & Highfield, 2011; Tudge, 2013). To put it crudely, people want to love and be loved, even when this impulse is derailed by ideology, social history and circumstance.

So, to pull together what I’ve discussed so far, I am proposing a community psychology focused on service to people-in-relationship that begins and keeps turning back to the assumption that all people are worthy of, and motivated by, love. (Or, to modify the latter part of this claim a little, that we try and look for the love that motivates others.) For the rest of this article, I am going to call this a humanistic community psychology (CPh). I do not mean by this to start a new sub-sub-discipline (and note that there is already at least one community psychology programme that explicitly weaves in humanistic scholarship at Point Park University in Pittsburgh), but to signal the assumptions discussed and their implications for research.

The Research Process from a CPh Perspective

I turn now from this brief outline of the core task and assumption of a CPh to an equally brief sketch of how, ideally, CPh research might proceed. First, such research would begin with the researcher who I will refer to as you. Remember that you are a person and thus required, from a CPh perspective, to treat yourself as someone of intrinsic worth with good intent. In practical terms this translates to a strong sense that the potential project is worth bringing yourself to as fully and deeply as possible. This is a bigger ask than it may seem at first glance, as academia encourages strategically informed rather than intrinsically informed choices; those based on the likelihood of formal recognition via publication in top journals, citation by peers, appeal to a funding body and so on (see Harré, Grant, Locke, & Sturm, 2017; Moore, Neylon, Eve, O’Donnell, & Pattinson, 2017). Good ways to win the academic game are the same for community psychologists as other researchers: find a mentor, piggyback on their networks, become an expert and stick with it. To do CPh it is important to resist the normative distractions of the academic game and consider instead if you see meaning in the project and are not just echoing a received justification for its value.

Second, you need to recognise in the project you are creating or being invited into, a community that you wish to serve. You may have a strong sense of your people, such that it is simply obvious that you will work with those like you to resist, reform, transform and articulate what it is that does not work and how the situation could be improved. For example, in the School of Psychology at the University of Auckland where I work, Jade Le Grice, who identifies as Māori works with, and for, Māori in her scholarship (e.g., Grice, Braun, & Wetherell, 2017). Similarly, Sam Manuela, who is Cook Island, focuses on the wellbeing of Pacific people (e.g., Manuela & Sibley, 2013). Or you may see injustice or need in a community you are not part of and feel drawn to becoming an ally through your work. Another example close to me is the work of two Auckland academics, Shiloh Groot and Darren Hodgetts, with people who are homeless (e.g., Groot & Hodgetts, 2012).

A community may also come to you, and something in their struggle and hopes aligns with what you sense is true of the world we live in. However you have become entwined with a community, you need to have skin in the game; that is a compelling sense of personal recognition rather than just
wanting to help them with their problems. (Or worse, wanting to improve your CV).

Third, the methodology by which you conduct your research should spring from the relationship between you and the community you are working with and reflect your collective hope that it will lead to greater flourishing. This flourishing may be primarily directed within the community itself or include non-human nature and/or other communities within the ecological framework. Crucially, the method should result in outputs that will be intelligible to the community, or at least readily translatable into intelligible outputs. This is in keeping with the philosopher Roberto Mangabeira Unger’s (2014) claim that the role of the social sciences is to help imagine the “adjacent possible” or what might happen next if we move in a particular way. In this sense, CPh is strongly aligned with liberation psychology (Moane, 2003; Montero, Sonn, & Burton, 2017) and firmly in the activist-scholar model (see Fine, 2018).

In developing the methodology for a CPh project it is crucial to avoid what Kerry Chamberlain (2000) has called “methodolatry”, a trap Chamberlain defines as “the privileging of methodological concerns over other concerns” (Chamberlain, 2000, p. 285). Methodolatry essentially reverses the process discussed here. As it is endemic within psychology and forms a tenacious barrier to the CPh approach I am advocating, I will now discuss its core features.

The Trap of Methodolatry

In psychology, methodolatry is most obvious in the peculiar binary between qualitative and quantitative research and researchers that rips social psychology in two, and seeps into nearby sub-disciplines including community psychology. Both sides in the methodological divide, perhaps self-consciously or perhaps by uncritically soaking up the rules of the game, shore up their position.

Quantitative researchers often drag in their wake standardised measures that distance them from what is happening in people’s lives. I have heard students of such researchers being advised not to change a standardised scale in any way, or it would reduce their ability to publish their findings. It did not matter that the project involved a different group of people to those for whom the scale was designed, or that the student concerned may have read and thought about the underlying concept on which the scale was based and had concerns about its face validity.

Qualitative researchers on the other hand often insist on complex preambles to their work that locate it within a branch of qualitative psychology. Chamberlain describes this as the “canonical approach to methodology” with adherents to a particular type “the fundamentalists – the literal interpreters of the one true way, the followers of the canons and commandments of the method” (2000, p. 288, emphasis in the original). As Chamberlain discusses, this adherence allows researchers to make claims of “quality” and report on a plethora of associated indicators such as “trustworthiness, authenticity, saturation, meaning-in-context, recurrent patterning, and so on” (p. 290). This is similar to the claim of Paul Duckett and colleagues that “technical discourse has become increasingly dominant in how the concept of the good is applied in judging research” (Duckett, Fryer, Lawthom, Easpaig, & Radermacher, 2013, p. 146).

While issues of technical quality are not meaningless, they may function to create a methodological artefact that sits in the way of research that springs from relationship-in-community and a hermeneutics of love. In one of the research projects I draw on later, we held workshops in which people were asked to literally leave the markers of their social location at the door. They did this by writing down whatever identifiers they would usually offer in the introductory round of a workshop and silently depositing what they had written in a box by the door. This was to signify that, just for this workshop, we were going to focus on commonalities and not differences. When I submitted an article based on data from these workshops for consideration in a community psychology
journal it was rejected without peer review. The editor described two major concerns, one being that there was insufficient description of the participations. In particular the editor drew attention to the lack of information on the age or SES of participants and that it was not possible to tell if the research included participants who were economically or socially marginalised.

Now having invited participants to experience what happens if we set aside our social locations, it would have been very odd indeed to then ask for their age, economic status, ethnicity, and so on. Frankly, I am always uncomfortable asking these questions of participants, as is probably true of many community psychologists who are attempting to work alongside people as people. We did describe the context for each workshop (e.g., that it was staff of a sustainability organisation, school teachers, a community group), but we broke the rules by not collecting and describing the demographic characteristics of individuals. And, a particular faux-pas for community psychology, we could not prove, as we did not ask participants to declare their income level, that some were from marginalised groups. Having made these errors-of-quality, the editor seemed to feel that it was inappropriate for us to even speculate that the findings, with all their limitations, may point to something about what people value. We moved on and the work was published elsewhere (Harré & Madden, 2017; Harré, Madden, Brooks, & Goodman, 2017). I’ll leave interested readers to decide if it is “good” research, but it is research aimed at challenging the neoliberal narrative of the self-interested individual, a narrative that we argued stifles action for the common good.

Two Projects that Attempted the Art of CPh

Community psychology research informed by humanism (CPh) is best described as an art that involves an authentic examination of yourself as a researcher, a trust in your sense of what matters, a deep desire to serve a particular community and a willingness to find a methodology to suit the

were departures from business as usual, turning them into business as usual. In the example given, the rule that community psychologists should include marginalised people is an attempt to move beyond WEIRD participants (those who are Western, educated, and from industrialized, rich, and democratic countries) whose experiences are then assumed to represent humanity in general. Good. I am certainly not trying to argue against community psychology’s emphasis on working alongside people who are most disadvantaged by current systems. However once this becomes a rule, researchers want to do their research with/on “marginalised people” which is counter to the notion proposed here that researchers work with communities they are genuinely drawn to, rather than drawn to for strategic purposes. Furthermore, it feeds an assumption that people fall neatly into social categories and these most fundamentally describe them. Their dignity, our dignity as persons then becomes elusive.

Being truly radical, that is engaging in a struggle to name, challenge or evoke that within social systems that stifles and promotes human vitality is very hard indeed because, in part, of the ready tendency of the social system to absorb contradictions (Marcuse, 1964; see also an analysis along these lines in Fryer & Laing, 2008), and ignore or ostracise those who don’t play the game (Duckett et al., 2013; Merton, 1965/1979). Methodolatry is one of the tools by which this absorption and ostracism is aided. Methodolatry is part of the focus on our academic peers that is common in universities and that pulls us away from the close observation, vulnerability and open-endedness that accompanies real work in service of community.
project at hand. While this places relentless emphasis on your development and judgement as a researcher, the entire process evolves through multiple iterations of being in relationship to others. Importantly these others are first and foremost the people you are drawn to “out there” and not academic peers and the rules they enforce. To tease out the art of CPh I will briefly discuss two of my own projects. They are, of course, particular to me and my concerns, and so only hint at what can be, and is being done, by those whose work has a CPh-like foundation.

Project one: Psychology for a Better World, a book, short film, talks and workshops. The first project was prompted by my long involvement in school, local government and community-based environmentalism. Because I am a psychologist, people in these settings often asked me about “behaviour change” as if people are a problem to be solved that along with technology, international agreements and political will just might save us from planetary disaster. At first I would feel an immediate resistance to these requests to, as I saw it, “correct” the actions of others. After a while however, I recognised that this request was not necessarily as it appeared. People wanted, I wanted, a cultural shift in which others shared in the struggle we were engaged with. The cry for behaviour change was, I came to think, a cry to be in a world that made sense because people were acting according to the obvious need for those of us living in wealthy contexts to reduce our consumption of fossil fuels, use water wisely, rid the oceans of plastic, preserve biodiversity and so on.

So that was the starting point: a community, in this case one I identified with, and a sense that something which mattered was amiss. I had done, and continue to do, sustainability-related action research projects, but it increasingly felt as if something else was needed (at least from me). To greatly simplify a messy process, I decided to gather all the psychology research I could find that might help me and others inspire people to get involved in sustainability-related projects and advocacy. This became a book Psychology for a Better World (first published in 2011, updated in 2018a), a 15-minute video and a series of talks and workshops in which I shared this research and its implications. The book was initially self-published and available for free in PDF format, meaning it quickly spread through sustainability networks in Aotearoa New Zealand. Simultaneous to my growing sense that this was by far my most worthwhile research contribution to date, I found it tremendously difficult to explain to my more conservative academic peers: this strange combination of research and community service that didn’t even result in a “programme” or “policy contribution” that could be clearly attributed to me.

Project two: The Infinite Game. The infinite game project came from my experience with Psychology for a Better World. While doing talks and workshops focused on encouraging involvement in sustainability-related projects, I increasingly saw an alignment between projects to conserve the natural environment and projects to promote community wellbeing that was often overlooked. The failure to recognise our common cause seemed to feed the competitive, life-damaging systems we were attempting to challenge by creating a demand for exclusive allegiance to this or that social movement or analysis. The infinite game then, is a way to both critique and reimagine our lives together that assumes the hermeneutics of love discussed earlier and a social system that often distracts from our potential to contribute to the common good (see Harré, 2018a).

From the beginning of the project I wanted to offer people an infinite game experience under game-like conditions. So, after tossing around ideas with many people involved in social change and doing trials with interested groups, I came up with a research workshop in collaboration with Helen Madden. The workshop involved a series of activities, including asking participants to write down what they considered of “infinite value.” Infinite values were defined as that which is “Sacred,
precious or special; of value for its own sake; that which makes the world truly alive.”

Over 1,000 people in Aotearoa New Zealand participated in these workshops and Helen and I developed a system to code the data into keywords that represented a minimum of 10 responses. The main reason we set the 10 response threshold was to enable the data to be displayed as a word cloud that would convey the infinite values collected in a form likely to resonate with those working to protect the natural environment and promote social issues. After the first set of workshops, we were able to show the latest version of the infinite values word cloud as part of the workshop itself.

I’ve already discussed the reception to the infinite values data by a community psychology journal. People who were responding as people on the other hand, most often indicated that the word cloud promoted in them the sense they were part of a human community with shared values, and feelings of being reassured, uplifted and hopeful (Harré, Madden, et al., 2017; notably some people were sceptical of the word cloud for similar reasons to the journal editor, this is discussed further in the article cited).

Both projects arose from communities I identified with and were intended to speak to those communities. They played with knowledge, constructing and framing it in ways designed to offer new ways of thinking about what is and what could be. Through this “play I like to think each gave insight into new possibilities and emboldened (some) people’s actions for the common good. I often get emails from people saying what they learnt from experiencing a workshop or reading one of the books and how they have incorporated these insights into their practice. Each was also an uncomfortable fit with the academic research game and would never have happened if I had taken the rules written and enforced by (some of) my peers to heart.

**Principles of a CPh Approach to Research**

To conclude here are five suggested principles for, and signals of, a CPh approach to research.

1. Both the community you work with and the research project itself should be personally meaningful to you. I understand (from considerable experience!) that much of the time this is simply impossible. Students must fit in with their supervisor’s projects and we all get drawn into research that seems strategic or worthy even though it doesn’t quite make sense to us in the way I mean here. I also know that if you consider yourself privileged, it may seem indulgent to start with something meaningful to you. You, seen through a hermeneutics of suspicion, are inherently problematic and cannot be trusted to accurately feel your way into what can be done to promote better ways of living together. However part of what keeps us skimming the surface and feeding the competitive neoliberal game is our fear of deep engagement with what we are drawn to. Be brave, take yourself seriously. If you follow this principle alongside the other principles there will be plenty of opportunities to notice and respond to your inevitable errors of judgement.

2. In developing a research methodology you must be prepared to look for means to shed new light on and help shift the situation in some way, being careful not to see only solutions that fit your pre-existing suite of skills or that simply help community members adapt to the broader society. In doing so, the project may well look very odd to the holders of methodological quality. If it does not look at least a little odd from this perspective, this may signal that you have fallen into the trap of methodolatry.

3. Constantly learn by observing yourself, the communities you are involved with and engaging with scholarship. Be careful not to confine your forays into a single discipline, paradigm or methodological bent, and seek out both broad social analyses and material that takes you into the lives of people not-like-you. By refreshing, deepening and challenging your perspective, what is personally meaningful to you will be increasingly informed by all layers of the ecological system and thus, ideally, your research will gain in its
potential to genuinely challenge the status quo.

4. An important element of all community psychology is the recognition that the experience of persons and their social location are entwined. It is easy to favour the latter over the former in the rush to negate psychology’s emphasis on individuals. CPh is about bringing real people to life, not in stylised forms that assume members of particular social groups have certain experiences and motivations but in forms that make visible “what it is to be me/us”. Ask yourself: does this project make visible experiences that are currently hidden from view? And does it make these experiences visible in such a way that radical action is encouraged by those in the community and/or who affect or are affected by it?

5. Finally, attempt to act as if there is good in all others, even those whose actions seem self-serving and perpetuate the systems you despise (a word I use deliberately). It is not only those most disadvantaged by current systems who are trapped within those systems. Too much emphasis on power holders, I suggest, turns our endeavour into an us/them game rather than an attempt to bring forward new possibilities for living well together.

Just as my discussion of what I call a humanistic community psychology is not intended to promote yet another speciality, these principles are not intended as yet another set of rules. Instead I hope that they encourage readers to consider if, and how, their discourse and research practice has fallen into stylised moves that are weighed down with methodological correctness, suspicion, or self-doubt. I also hope they encourage a turn, or return, to a community psychology based on the inherent dignity of all persons.
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