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Editorial

The Board of Community Psychologists has moved to Western Australia, as has Network. The editorial approach will not change substantially. The aim is to allow communication between community psychologists, and those interested in community psychology, about their aims, aspirations and experiences.

Part of each edition will be devoted to a theme. This edition deals with the Arizona Conference of Div 27 of APA. Adrian Fisher and I participated in the conferences, and our reactions follow.

The next edition the guest editor will be Geoff Syme and will be on the theme of the application of community psychology to social impact assessment.

You are invited to suggest further themes, and these can be explored more fully in the future. One issue that has come to the attention of the Board is that of registration of specialist titles. A specialist title represents a dilemma for community psychology. There are political arguments that can be made for specialist titles. Arguments can also be made that adoption of specialist titles is more a result of economic uncertainties, and can be a disadvantage to the creativity of the field. It would appear that the time is right to consider where community psychology is going, and how we relate to other professionals disciplines and to state regulatory bodies.

The New Executive
As you can see from the inside front cover, there has been a changing of the guard. Whether this is revolutionary, evolutionary or regressive, only time will tell. John Carroll is the new chairperson. He is a senior lecturer at Edith Cowan
University. Together with colleague, Noel Howieson, he began what is now the Department of Psychology at Edith Cowan. It was both the need and the opportunity to move the emerging department in a new direction that took him into the area of community psychology.

Brian Bishop is a senior lecturer at Curtin University. He is currently seconded to CSIRO where he enjoys the pretentious title of visiting Senior Research Scientist. His current interests are in social impact assessment, community participation and development, and rural community psychology.

Neil Drew is currently on leave from Edith Cowan University as he struggles with completing his PhD. He is looking at social impact assessment but is attempting to broaden the approach to include more local issues than traditional large scale developments. He has a broad range of experiences from psychiatric halfway houses to community based diversion programs for young offenders.

Goff Barrett-Lennard has a well established place in Australian psychology. He worked with Carl Rogers, with groups and family process, the course of therapy, and the theory of community.

Shirley Pellegrini is qualified as a clinical psychologist, but has worked extensively in community development programs. She is currently researching rural women's health networks.

Noel Howieson is Associate Professor at Edith Cowan. She also comes from clinical psychology where she has been very active in promoting the profession. Her interest in community psychology also developed because of the perceived needs in the community and as a response by Edith Cowan University.
Brian Bishop (this issue) and I shared a number of the 1991 Biennial Conference activities and took the opportunity to discuss our immediate feelings in Tempe before we went our separate ways. I later had the chance of discussing the conference with a number of other Community Psychologists in the United States. This provided the chance to hear others' interpretations of events and the directions of Community Psychology in North America.

My immediate feelings about the conference and the position of Community Psychology in the United States were mixed. The chance to participate in such a conference could not be beaten, much of the material presented was affirming and thought provoking. Added to this is the chance to interact with Community Psychologists from many other areas of the world -- even though the majority of participants were from the USA.

The Conference was a most rewarding experience. It provided the chance to hear about the current work that is being done in Community Psychology in North America, both in applied areas and in education and training. Being able to meet many of the "names" was also a part on which we can build strong links.
(Contrary to Brian's comment, many of these people I had not met before, I just know how to act really cool.)

Over the three days of the conference there were many sessions one could have attended. Brian has described the symposium by Newborough, et al. very well. (We have been able to get Bob Newborough to provide a paper for this issue of Network covering his thought provoking material.) The ideas of reflective practice, of working as a consultant among equals, of focusing on action research for change and not on research for publication were both refreshing and challenging. It made the participants address the premises with which they work, the assumptions and models which underlie the ways in which we go about doing our tasks. Perhaps the key element to come forward from this is the realization of who "owns" the problem, for whom are we consulting and trying to manage change?

Clearly, much of this session was based in the work of Paulo Friere and the liberation theology movement. It instructed us about empowerment and involvement, and it made us look at in what we base our own beliefs about people. It also instructed us that there are other sources of answers, not just Psychology. This raises the issue of of how broad or narrow should the education of Psychologists be to be able to most effectively work in helping groups solve their problems.

A major theme I saw emerging in many of the sessions that I attended was cultural diversity. While this is one of the three commandments (to continue the religious theme) put forward by Rappaport (1977), it is an area with which Community Psychology is still coming to grips. The level at which cultural diversity was addressed seems rather macro for Australians – Anglos, Hispanics, African Americans, Native Americans, and
Asian Americans -- given our multicultural society and the focus we have on very specific cultural identities within these broader groupings.

When issues of cultural diversity were discussed, however, there are plenty of areas for us to consider in our practice or research. The importance of working within the contexts of cultures was put forward, with warnings about how well, or badly, this could be achieved. A particular note of caution was sounded about people who had only a superficial understanding of a culture and were really operating in ways which were in conflict with deeper levels of the culture and the people. The notion of "culturally designed" rather than culturally sensitive programs was seen as a more effective approach in being able to work with groups other than our own. The culturally sensitive programs still represent the outsiders interpretation of the situation and experience, whether or not these actually map those of the group in question.

One point that was strongly made in this discussion relates to how well we understand our own cultural backgrounds. Our culture colours the ways in which we see the world, what we value, what we see as important or what we interpret as problems. If we have never tried to investigate the assumptions that underlie our own opinions and values, we are going to have a lot of trouble and dubious success in trying to work with people from different backgrounds.

This theme of cultural diversity arose for a number of reasons. One was because the conference was held in Arizona, a state that has gained a poor reputation on multicultural issues, particularly their lack of recognition of the Martin Luther King Birthday holiday. Actually holding the conference in Arizona is still causing discussion within Division 27. For others, there is a
perception of growing racial intolerance in the United States. At
the time of writing, one only has to look at some of the rhetoric
and arguments being put forward in the presidential primaries to
see this surfacing (witness David Duke, former Ku Klux Klan
Grand Wizard trying to run for president).

For others, the multicultural theme represents a basic fact of life.
A number of speakers were from Chicago, a very mixed city.
Many were representatives of various ethnic minorities, and served
to provide information about how to act as a professional in such
settings, as well as relating first hand experience of the
misapplication of the knowledge. Many among these are
attempting to bring multicultural education into psychology
programs in the United States.

There were other aspects which were disturbing in relation to
both teaching and practice of Community Psychology. Among
my roles at the conference was as a "discussant" in one session on
issues in Community Psychology education and training. Part of
this session sparked one of the strongest responses that I have to
the conference, unfortunately it is a negative feeling.

The session related to aspects of the educational program at one
of the major universities in community psychology training.
Students were required in their first semester to establish contact
with a community group or agency to negotiate a research
practicum, to be carried out over the academic year. While the
ideas of applied research and properly being a part of the
community are essential parts of the training, the ways in which
it is done is also so important.

I was somewhat taken aback by the attitude of a right to do
research on "those people" that came through in the presentation.
Indeed, one speaker complained that the students could not get permission from many groups that they wanted to study. This went along with a strong commitment to very traditional experimental design (including a demand from their research supervisors for true experimental design with random assignment) – not really appropriate to the applied research that was supposed to be being undertaken. The notion coming through was that community groups were merely pools of research subjects and that the students had seemingly little responsibility back. Brian Bishop has already alluded to the role that university-based research seemed to take in parts of the program, with the suggestion that it was taking over from much of the earlier action based research that we see as characterising community psychology.

The very next session provided and intriguing contrast. Christopher Keys challenged the audience to examine and discuss how they were using their positions and expertise to work for social change. His particular focus was on acting as advocates for groups who were otherwise disenfranchised. In this way, the idea returned to "our" responsibility to the communities in which we work, or the groups with whom we come in contact. It matches the idea of the so-called experts contributing to the development and growth of those with whom they work.

This responsibility was clearly illustrated by Beverley Long’s discussion of action in the southern states of the USA. Working for racial equality was never a particularly popular activity, and often very dangerous, but her group was able to use creative ways of building powerful coalitions. By putting together groups of people and organizations (a minimum number was always required as the group protected the individual), they were able to gain greater publicity and public support for their aims.
These are some of the highlights of the conference program for me. There were many more sessions and activities that could be mentioned, but the themes are more important. Some activities such as the two poster sessions were most rewarding. They provided an easy chance to review a large variety of work quickly, and to speak directly to the presenters. Much other work (dare I say "networking") was able to be done on the informal level during breaks and at the various social events. These really gave a chance to interact and to learn from one another.

In discussion of the conference, the first thing that Brian and I agreed on was that we really must encourage Australians to try and attend the Biennial Conferences. It costs a lot of money and takes time, but we believe that the experience and the knowledge gained will far outweigh the expense. It will also provide a chance for people to evaluate their own work and understandings against that of people from many other parts of the world. I most strongly encourage members to start planning and saving to attend the 1993 conference (probably to be held in Chicago).

There are even some activities to facilitate the involvement of people from outside North America. The International working group will be putting together some specific sessions at the next conference to highlight the work being done around the world. This is seen as an important step in being able to contribute to the wider development of the field.

Finally, one personal aspect was my change in roles at the conference. As I had studied in the United States, I knew quite a number of the students who were there, and these were my first interaction points. As time passed, I found that I was interacting more with the academics and other professionals as a peer.
While this is an important transition for me, I believe that it also is an opportunity on which to build links between our Board and the profession in the US and other countries.
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The third biennial conference of the American Psychological Association's Division 27: "Community Research and Action" was held in Tempe, Arizona from the 6th to the 8th of June. It was well attended by faculty and students from the major centres of community psychology, such University of Illinios, Michigan State, and Vanderbilt. Several non United States residents attended, with a moderate contingent from Central America, a few people from Europe, a South African and two from Australia (Adrian Fisher and myself). Locals said that the conference was considerably better than APA, which was relatively directionless. The organisers, particularly Manuel Barrera, created an extremely convivial climate for the conference. For example, after the first day, breakfast was supplied in the courtyard of the hotel in which the conference took place. This allowed people to exchange informally ideas, and to allow foreigners to meet the locals.

My initial impressions were somewhat different from Adrian's. I felt a bit like a country boy seeing the big city for the first time; putting faces to the names I have become so familiar with. Adrian had been there, done that, and I suspect, was slightly embarrassed by his ocker friend. Jim Kelly, Ira Iscoe, Bob Newborough, Lonnie Snowden, Ed Tricket, Beth Schinn, Irwin Sandler, David Chavis, Jean Linney, Chris Keys, Paul Toro, Abe Wandersman, Tom Wolff, Marc Zimmerman and Julian Rappaport were some of the names there. One of the most overwhelming impressions was to be in the company of so many like minded people. Like most initial impressions, it started to fade and differentiation became apparent. There appeared to be a
marginal schism between those committed to action and those committed to research and evaluation. More of this later.

The conference was not dominated by any particular theme, although the largest minority of reports were of research in the health, mental health fields and multicultural research and practice. The following titles of symposia and panel discussions should give some idea of the range and flavour of the conference:

- Longitudinal studies of older adult health and mental health.
- Issues in the prevention research and adolescent substance abuse.
- The community psychologist, the mental health system and the chronically mentally ill: Collaboration, conflict and commitment.
- Images and sounds of neighbourhood life.
- Understanding mentoring among African American youth: A collaborative approach.
- Tailoring research methods to participant's needs and situations.
- Teaching empowerment in disempowering settings: Feminism, community psychology and pedagogy.
- A public hearing on behalf of homeless children and families.
- Identifying innovative uses of qualitative methods in research on homelessness.
- Culture-base theory and interventions with youth.
- Visions for a feminist community psychology.
- Toward a post-modern approach to community research and action.
- Community psychologists in public policy: Seeing research in action.
- and, Theoretical development and community applications.

The overall impression was of diversity. Research and action, policy and design, white and non white cultures were all on display. The only constraint was time, which unlike APS conferences was a scarce commodity, rather than hanging heavy.
There were four invited speakers and all were notable for one reason or another, and of which I will give a short description. I will also give a short description of a symposium that I found quite remarkable and seemed to represent the underlying schism between action and research.

Brinton Lykes (Rhode Island College) spoke of her work with the children of rural Guatemala. She had worked in an interdisciplinary and multinational team with the victims of war. The team had decided that the parents were too scared by war to change much, and concentrated on the children. While they were about community development and change, their work had to be framed in the context of health care for local officials. While democracy and peace have been restored to Guatemala, it is an uneasy peace. Villagers still fear the central government and the military. A well known Guatemalan psychologist, with whom she had worked, had been assassinated recently. Her work was not for the faint hearted.

The second invited speaker was Beverly Long of the National Prevention Coalition and National Mental Health Association. Her paper was about creating change. She started describing her work in the 50s and 60s with civil-rights in her southern home State. She argued that most people were not racist, but naive and uninformed. She found that most people were amenable to reasoned argument. (Having heard her speak, I am sure I would have been convinced by anything she said). One tactic they used was to approach 50 well known business people asking to be able to use their names to endorse a campaign for change, and their money to fund it. These people were approach with the proviso that they were approaching 50 well known people and that unless they got a majority to agree, then they would not proceed. She was able to get 25 people and was able to launch successful education champaign.

Another tactic she used was to approach politicians for support, but she argued that the politicians have to be approached before an election. Also, one does not need to be able to predict the voters intention, one canvases all candidates. She was able to
convince Jimmy Carter, and more importantly, Mrs. Carter, of the need for a fresh look at mental health in the US, before Carter was elected. Through this lobbying, she was able to get Carter to set up a Presidents commission into mental health.

Another featured speaker was Gerado Marin (U of San Francisco). He described a wide variety of health educational campaigns for non-European Americans. He described a set of principles for working with ethnic minorities. These primarily revolve around three points. First, do not assume you know what will work in an ethnic community. Second, involve the community at the very beginning of the planning of change. What you see as a health issue may not be seen as one by them. Finally, understand the dynamics of the culture you are dealing with.

The final invited speaker was Gerald Patterson (Oregon Social Learning Center). His talk complimented a symposium earlier in the week. Together with his colleagues, an extensive research program, involving a large number of staff and students, looking at antisocial behaviour and conduct disorders, was described. Using Liseral structural models, they were able to account for much variation in delinquency. It was suggested that a major variable in delinquency was the mother/child interaction, starting as far back as 8 months. Patterson suggested that antisocial behaviour was well established by the child’s first year at school. His talk created considerable discussion. The lack of a historical focus, the applicability of the model to females and the individualistic focus were raised as issues.

The final presentation that is worthy of mention was a symposium conducted by Newborough, Dokecki, and O’Gormon, with a commentary by Moroney. The first two speakers are community psychologists, the third, a lecturer in divinity studies, and the last speaker was a planner. The symposium dealt with a Catholic dioceses within which Newborough, O’Gormon and Dokecki had been invited to attempt community and organisational change. Newborough and Dokecki gave the intellectual context of the case study. O’Gormon described Latin American church communities (Comunidad Ecclesial de Base-
literally, a church community from the base) that have evolved out of liberation theology. It was argued that the social upheavals of Latin America were forcing community responses that could be used as models for the United States.

The presentation prompted one of the audience to comment that they had not referred to any psychologists. Dokecki commented that while Gergen and Sarason had been mentioned, most references were outside psychology, and properly so, as community psychology is necessarily wider than psychology.

This interchange crystallised a number of issues. There was a rift between those committed to action and those committed to research and evaluation (Wilson, 1990, also noted that action was not integrated with research in his report of the previous biennial conference). Newborough et al. were concerned with creating change, and in doing so, needed to go outside traditional psychology to find a conceptual base and models for change. Three of the four invited speakers also emphasised putting action before research. There is a difference in emphasis in these approaches. The first would champion the aphorism that if you want to know something about a system, try to change it. This approach reflects Reiff's (1970) call for the development of a body of knowledge in community psychology and for the development of specialist generalists. It would appear to have more in common with the community psychology envisaged at the Swampscott Conference in 1965, and "substantive theorising" (Wicker, 1989). The second approach appears to be based on the belief that through increasing specialisation and research, mechanisms for change will be found. It appears to be dancing to a different tune. The American university system that requires the headlong hurtle into publication, the same system that community psychology recognised as damaging traditional psychology, appears to be constraining the growth of community psychology.

Two comments heard in the last session of the conference seemed to exemplify the capture of community psychology by the university system. The first was by a presenter who described the effectiveness of an evaluation of an agency in the following terms:
"The evaluation was so effective that I was able to get a ten fold increase in funding for a more extensive evaluation."
The second comment came from a young man who had recently obtained tenure. He said that he and his wife had an agreement that he would work 70 to 80 hours a week until he got tenure. He had done this for 4 years and now was going to establish contact with his 4 year old child.

In reviewing what I had witnessed in a few short days, events that I had enjoyed and had been greatly impressed by at the time, seemed to pale somewhat. One final example of one of the problems facing American Community Psychology presented itself on the first day. Marc Zimmerman chaired a discussion of the impact of Martin Luther King on community psychology. Jim Kelly, Blanca Ortiz-Torrez, Christine Iijima Hall and Lonnie Snowden gave touching and thoughtful comments on the impact of King on their approaches to community psychology. This panel discussion was set in the context of the people of Arizona’s refusal in a referendum commemorate King in a national holiday. The discussion was meant, at least in part, as a means of showing Division 27’s disapproval. At the end of the session someone asked why there had not been an external publicity, and why the press were not present. An organiser commented that they had approached supporters of the pro-holiday campaigners and asked how they could help. They were told that the best way was for those at the conference to donate money to the cause. In some ways the panel discussion was sad, in that it could be inferred that when it comes to creating change, community psychologists hearts are in the right place, there could be no doubting the sincerity, but when it came to action, what they did was to talk.

I would hope that I do not give the impression that the conference was not worthwhile. Community psychology is a process of creating social change, and that change will not come quickly. American academic community psychologists have to attempt social change, while having to deal with a conservative university system. Two aspect of the conference filled me with hope. The first was two sessions that were run by APA’s political lobbyists. They said they enjoyed community psychology
conferences as they get a good audience. At APA they often out
number the audience.

At another session Catherine Stein talked about a course she runs on counselling and interpersonal skill development. What was courageous and innovative about this was that she had two groups of students. The first group was comprised of normal college students, the second group of chronic psychiatric patients. Other than pairing patients with students, the class was run as it normally would have been. From the enthusiasm of her presentation, it was obviously a great success for both groups.

One final point is that Australian community psychology is on a par with America, if not in funding, certainly in terms of quality. I came away feeling very enthusiastic, and very keen to return in June, 1993. I also came away convinced that Americans have more to learn from us, and visitors from other countries. Partly, this is because we know their work, while they see little of ours. Also, it is because our culture is different, our governmental and bureaucratic structures are different, and these influence the nature of community psychology in Australia. These differences should not be treated a mere cultural oddities, but rather as windows into our culture and theirs, which is where community psychology came in.

References:
TOWARD A THEORY OF COMMUNITY FOR COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY

J. R. Newbrough
Peabody College of Vanderbilt University

This article began from a concern that the social community in the United States has become fragmented, with a overemphasis on individuality and personal gain. It seemed to me that community had a meaning that was overly onesided, and I wondered whether there was a more balanced perspective that could be taken. I began with the assumption that community was a complex, many sided idea, not just characterised by the central notion of togetherness. The idea has a history and, as I found out, has been considered in terms of at least three metaphors--organic, mechanistic and mutual-personal. What I came to was a dynamic orientation, requiring the continuous processing of all three traditions in order to provide for the balancing and integration of goals among the interests of the individual, the local community and the large scale collectivity.

I. Concepts of community and political theory

I want to begin with concepts of community and their relationship to political theory. This historical moment in the United States is described by such authors as Amatai Etzioni (1968) and Immanuel Wallerstein (1988-89) as the Post-Modern period, following almost 500 years of modernisation. Etzioni marks the beginning arbitrarily as 1945, when great technological breakthroughs, made possible by World War II, began to find their way into society. Such things as air transportation, television, prefabricated housing, birth control, infection control with antibiotics, electric business machines, and airconditioning moved daily life beyond the stage of working for a living, and provided people the opportunity to be more directly concerned about the quality of their lives.

The Post-Modern era has begun and at this point we are in a period of transition. There are major dislocations of production, there are many new ideas, there are many old ideas, there is a cry for good leadership and there are many indications that things are not working, or are no longer acceptable. As community psychologists, we
constantly encounter discontinuities, disorientation, demoralisation and dependency. Wallerstein (1982) goes on to say:

...the world is in the midst of a crisis, structural and therefore fundamental, very long term and therefore one that lends itself not to a "solution" but to an "unfolding." We are also simultaneously in the midst of world economic stagnation...this current situation is not the crisis...the crisis [is the] demise of the capitalist world economy. ...It seems to be a crisis of transition ... to a [new] world order.

If Wallerstein is correct, this historical moment may well last for a hundred years, maybe longer. We are all in for some very tumultuous times.

Many will reject the Wallerstein analysis, seeing the free market system as being the most efficient and strongest that it has ever been. Even the Communist countries such as the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries are joining the Western economic market. Yet its success is its biggest problem. That is how to manage the new political relationships, the new pluralisms of countries, the new forms of buying and selling (such as corporate raiding in the United States), the dislocations of labor pools that come with world wide markets. "Future shock" as described by Toffler in 1970 seems to have arrived.

The free market economic system has a basic dynamic of relocating capital and other resources to central locations and away from the periphery--from the small communities to larger cities, from underdeveloped countries to developed countries. There is often little sense of the need for reinvestment in the peripheral parts of the system, so that their resources become depleted--much like overgrazed or overfarmed land.

A personal experience in this regard. I worked this past year in the state of Colorado on a rural revitalisation project. There were 20 small towns with a population under 5000 in the project. The people had become concerned, and in some cases demoralised, by the constant loss of economic viability. The project was helping them to mobilise to become active and to work on reversing the trend. The approach was classical community development, providing leadership training and encouraging them to set their own priorities and to begin on any project they chose. In all 20 cases, people became interested, hopeful and often excited that their efforts at participation might make a difference. They are working on such projects as revitalising the
downtown, developing a city park, attracting tourists and improving their water system. In the short run, over the next few years, it looks as if the project will make a difference in at least some of these towns. Yet, what has to accompany this, for the long term, is a national reinvestment policy that provides residents meaningful work and basically changes the economic structure of their community. Otherwise they will become discouraged by the lack of any real change.

Wallerstein (1982) describes the effect of the global market as having set up a dynamic that undermines the viability of the local municipality and the province, and makes the basic social unit the nation. The nation has then to learn to operate with other nation-states in a process of international relations.

John Dewey was seemingly prophetic when in 1927, he spoke of community at the national level, he called it the National Community. Walter Lippman in 1937 wrote about the Good Society—a book about going beyond industrialised mass society. These writings were foundations for the programs of President John Kennedy and President Lyndon Johnson in the 1960s. The issues of justice and equality became more salient. It moved too fast for the country. The general populace became frightened and wanted to retain the familiar, the status quo. The past 20 years in the United States has been the re-establishment of the importance of industry and the corporations.

Having made industrialism apparently successful again, the United States as a country is now again confronted with questions about the purposes of society and of human life—for issues of human welfare have become major problems all over the globe; issues such as hunger and starvation, poverty, pollution, infant mortality, the greenhouse effect, and the loss of human rights.

The core problem of community is the relationship of the individual to the social grouping. This is called the paradox of the One and the Many. There are three different solutions to this paradox as shown in Table I.

Community refers functionally to a group of people living together. There is typically a place or territory identified with the group, and a sense of belonging to the group that gives the members an identity (Bernard, 1973). The psychological sense of community (McMillan & Chavis, 1986) refers to a high degree of personal intimacy, emotional
depth, moral commitment, social cohesion and continuity in time. Tonnies called this Gemeinschaft.

As shown in the first line of Table I, Gemeinschaft community, the small village or tribe, is a solution of the One: where the community is more important than the individuals, with loyalty and dependability emphasised. This comes to us from Pre-Modern times. Kirkpatrick (1986) calls this the Organic theory; where individuals were seen as natural parts of the whole community.

In the second line, the Modern period is exemplified by the complex city with differentiated functions, described by Tonnies as Gesellschaft. It derives from the social contract theories of society from such 16th and 17th Century writers as Hobbs, Rousseau, and Locke. From this perspective, humans were thought to have to give up some freedoms in order to join together in community. This would be the solution of the Many, with an emphasis on individual performance and independence.

In the third line, the Post-Modern period is symbolised by the Human Social System where the unit is the nation-state, and solution of the paradox is to combine the One and the Many. The Chicago School of Sociology used the theory of human ecology (McKenzie, 1968) to provide for the integration of the One and the Many, emphasising Interdependence and Balance as the goals for human and community development.

Organic Community

Tonnies in his description of the Gemeinschaft community called it a living organism. (It) should be understood as a living organism."... At the heart of the Gemeinschaft community is a "special social force" or "reciprocal, binding sentiment" called understanding or sympathy, "which keeps human beings together as members of a totality." ... Persons who live together in such a community are living in "a product of nature..." They experience its power in their laws, folkways, and mores, and through these they know that the significance of the community has "absolute and eternal validity for its members. (Kirkpatrick, 1986, p. 71,72) The unity of persons is thought about in terms of their individual activities fitting together into an overall integrated pattern, like the
activity of bees in a beehive. This is the view of the Community as One.

The notion of organic unity has been applied to the family, the village and the small town (Kirkpatrick, 1986). But it also provides the basis for considering the characteristics of a tightly bound, centrally directed organisation of a corporation, an army or a nation-state. Pressures can be very strong to enforce proper behaviour, and moves by individuals and groups to assert themselves can be perceived as dangerous and revolutionary. The Organic Community can, without some forms of check and balance, become oppressive. The struggle in China with liberty moves on the part of students and repressive moves on the part of the government seems to be occurring within an organic framework. The unity of the country in support of the central government is the paramount value to be pursued.

Community by Social Contract

As shown in the second line of Table I, Gesellschaft association refers to the relationships of special interest groups, where a complex of contracts gives the association a purpose on which all parties have
agreed. This notion of contracts between the individual and the social group was a view developed by the Enlightenment philosophers in which persons were seen to be originally in a state of nature where they were entirely independent individuals, who then came together by contract "for securing the liberty and property of others" (Gierke, 1934, p. 113 as cited in Kirkpatrick, 1986, p. 55).

Kirkpatrick (1986) describes Tonnies as noting that social contract theory is appropriate to city life, the national life, cosmopolitan or international life (p. 73). The concepts of atomism (as the small interest group) and contract are the basis for the national belief in individualism in the United States. Individualism coupled with market theory has led to the major development of capitalism, with "competition, private ownership of property, independence of economic units and ... self-reliance" (Kirkpatrick, 1986, p. 51).

Lack of trust, alienation, loneliness, impersonality and a self-defeating quest for privacy are characteristics that Kirkpatrick describes as resulting from the national focus on individualism. This is the community of the Many.

The experience of the strain of Gesellschaft life leads to major emphasis on a private life where one can escape to avoid burnout. There is a predilection not to participate in community life nor to take positions of leadership. This is a form of retreatism, described by Bellah and colleagues (1985) as yielding a society without "civic virtue"—a lack of concern with the common good and an absence of socially responsible behaviour. Kirkpatrick identifies these characteristics of individualism as creating the possibility of totalitarianism. Without a check and balance, the onesided emphasis on liberty and liberalism can have the same outcome as the organic community—takeover by the powerful.

Human Social System as Community

The Community as One (Organic Model) and the Community as Many (the Contractarian Model) are both incomplete as a theory of community. In Table 1, I have identified the third position as the One and the Many, suggesting that a solution to the paradox of the One verses the Many could be an integrated position. That solution is a pluralistic one rather than a unitary one, where a wide range of
Manys has to be tolerated under some organizing principle of the One. In the table, I have indicated that the characteristics of the Third Position include an emphasis on Interdependence as a primary virtue, which will work best within a loosely coupled organisation. I do not know what the best metaphor should be for the unity pattern of the Third Position. I offer the "Human Social System," to contrast with the Organic and the Social Contract positions, and to try to incorporate both ideas. Alternatives might be Buckminster Fuller’s (Brenneman, 1984) "spaceship earth," Etzioni's (1968) "active society," or Hobb's (1984) "competent and caring community."

**Connection with Political Theory**

I have suggested that community theory needs a dominant metaphor that integrates the One and the Many. It also needs connection to political theory that can be used practically at the local level to encourage political participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Metaphor</th>
<th>Political Principle</th>
<th>Political System</th>
<th>Social Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>Fraternity</td>
<td>Centrally Controlled</td>
<td>Security Dependability Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Construct</td>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Risk Taking Interdependence Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Social System</td>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>Polyarchic Mutualism</td>
<td>Development Interdependence Balance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This being the bicentennial year of the French Revolution, I was inspired by the three basic principles, liberty, equality and fraternity, as a useful set of core concepts for a balanced and humane political system. In Table II, I have applied them to community theory to them to provide some implications for social action and for social policy.
Fraternity as noted on the first line of Table II is an organic principle associated with centrally controlled governments. Social ideals are security, dependability and cooperation, much like the pre-modern, feudal village. The consciousness within this kind of social organisation is the desire to be free of domination, oppression and coercion.

Liberty is shown in the second entry line in Table II. The first move made to separate from the organic/fraternity model is usually towards liberty and freedom, basing that on human rights as provided for in some form of a social contract (like a constitution). This was the case in the American revolution. Liberty-based community is one that emphasises independence, risk-taking and competitive enterprise.

Equality, the third entry line in Table II, is a principle to provide resources to all members of the society so that they may have meaningful participation and an opportunity to improve their lives (Veatch, 1986). I located this in the Third Position, indicating it as the primary principle for the Human Social System organisation. The social ideals are of development, interdependence and balance. The political system is named Polyarchic Mutualism, a principle that does not yet exist as such. Lindblom, in his book Politics and markets (1977), invented the word "Polyarchy" to mean "ruled by many." It refers of a new pattern of behaviour called for by a particular complex set of authoritative rules "that limit the struggle for authority, specifying a particular orderly and peaceful process to replace armed conflict, threat of force and other crude contests." (p. 133)

Mutualism comes from Kirkpatrick's (1986) analysis of community theory in which he takes Martin Buber's I-Thou relationship and argues that human relations have to be based on respect for others as persons. There needs to be a mutual or reciprocal affirmation of worth, integrity and dignity—of persons with each other. This is another way of putting humanity first. Self-worth then becomes a matter of interdependence within the community, because it depends on each of us affirming that worth in the other. Polyarchy and Mutualism combined indicates a complex, decentralised political system that has the authority struggle limited to peaceful means, and is guided by values that respect the mutual worth of people for each other.

Changes in political systems typically go from fraternity to liberty (as
in contemporary China) or from fraternity to equality (as in the Bolshevik revolution in Russia or in the Maoist revolution in China). In Russia, liberty was also part of the revolutionary ideology, but Lenin removed it soon thereafter declaring that the Vanguard had to protect the revolution. Fraternity and liberty often remain in tension, with oscillations back and forth between them.

Table II, after I constructed it, seemed too simplistic. All three principles seem to me to be present in some form in all political systems. As illustrated in Figure 1, I chose the triangle to illustrate the three principles, and put at the top, the dominant principle. The dominant principle would be primary and visible, the others would be secondary and less clear. That seemed appropriate for the fraternity and liberty positions since they represent a single solution to the paradox of the One and the Many. The triangle has flat sides and implies stability. For the Third Position, I chose a circle since it has within it the competing forces of the One and the Many, and needs to be seen as more dynamic. The circle has equality on top, but one
could start with any of the three principles so long as all of them were considered prior to setting a social policy or taking a social action. This arbitrary entry point is symbolised by the arrow at each position on the circle.

The Third Position provides for a much different political system from the two previous ones because of the dynamic character of the sharing of power and decision making. In particular, Fraternity takes on a new meaning. Instead of being the basis for a controlling principle, it becomes a force for community--as it was in pre-modern times (McWilliams, 1973). Fraternity means brotherhood. In the Third Position, it stands for brotherhood and interdependence, support, cooperation and caring with dignity and respect in human relations. The Human Social System emphasises the humanity of the particular social organisation.

Table III illustrates the situation where three questions about impact should be asked of any policy such as a rule, a law, a tax or a program. As seen in the table, Equality is the principle that provides the resources for growth and development within the community. The impact question is: "Does this policy enable persons to meaningfully participate?"

Fraternity is the principle that states the need for effective social development and the experience of social cohesion, the psychological sense of community. The impact question is: "Does this policy enhance the development of community competence?"

Liberty is the principle of individual development. The impact question is: "Does this policy enhance individual pursuit of personal goals?"

These considerations should be done as a cycle, where they need doing time and again. Each cycle should lead to an improved answer. They provide the basis for a human social system that can simultaneously develop communities that are competent and caring, and that promote individual human development.

II. Dependency as the Primary Social Problem

In the first section, I defined community as having three different metaphors characteristic of three different historical periods, and as being related to three different political principles (fraternity, liberty
and equality) as alternatives to solve the paradox of the One and the Many. Community theory is described as moving to a third position which I have called the Human Social System, and which has been the focus of intellectual work since the Chicago School of Sociology developed the human ecology approach between 1920s and 1950s (McKenzie, 1968), and since Parsons (1951) began writing about the social system. Gradually the human and social sciences are adopting a general systems or ecology metatheory.

For this part, I selected dependence as the core social problem. Memmi (1984), the author of The coloniser and the colonised, has written a book called Dependence in which he argues that dependence provides the core idea for community. Everyone is insufficient and imperfect, and thus requires that others help them get their needs met. Need meeting is the basis for most human transactions whether they are in the marketplace or in the social service agency or with a professional.
The three community theories offer three different solutions of the matter of dependence. The Organic community, with historical roots in feudalism, emphasises membership and loyalty. Dependency is a basic characteristic and does not have a social stigma. Those in charge have obligations to take care of the less fortunate; who in turn have obligations to be supportive. Everyone has a right to belong and to be supported. It is a paternalistic order, with the dependent treated as children—in which there is emphasis on the common good. Cooperation is usually relatively easy to achieve.

The Social Contract society emphasises the opposite—the hero is the person who is active and self reliant. Credit is to be taken for individual performance and achievement. This is a competitive order, with the dependent treated as less worthy and as marginal. It is difficult to get cooperation on matters of community since the strong are self centred and competitive, and the weak are passive and without belief that their efforts will have any payoff. This period seems similar in human development terms to the adolescent who is asserting his or her independence in a rebellious and arbitrary fashion, often within the constraining environment of the family.

The Human Social System emphasises integration of all members into the society, seeing the dependent and the marginal needing to become active participants, less dependent and more central. Rather than independence and separateness, the value is on interdependence and functional integration (Waterman, 1981). People have to learn to participate in ways that build from their assets and strengths, and at the same time contribute to the welfare of the community. The social organisation has to be decentralised in a structured and organised way, so that organisations and networks will function (Bauer, 1962), and at the same time, people will develop individual and creative solutions. A good example of this philosophy at work is with the normalisation and mainstreaming of the mentally retarded. The human development analogy is that of the mature adult who has settled into life for the long term, and has adopted an adaptive lifestyle that still keeps the intellect and the social conscience active.

As stated above, we in the United States are in the transition from the Modern to the Post-Modern period, but the general consciousness and values are still in the Second Position, and are social contract based. Second Position thinking tends to be in dichotomies, or as David Bakan (1968) describes it, as dualistic around gender concepts. Things
are male or female. Independence is good, strong and male, dependence is devalued, weak and female. These are strong stereotypes exemplified by "machismo" in Latin culture. The rise of the women's movement around the world is sign of the transition to the Third Position.

In the U. S., there are two types of dependency that are characteristic of the Second Position, the Modern period. Both reflect the social values of independence and are worsening during this period of transition. First are the problems of addictions—drugs, alcohol, tobacco, sex, food, gambling, shopping. Contemporary writers have associated them with a dependent personality and have suggested that the significant persons associated with them, family members and friends, often help them adapt to the dependence and help keep them dependent through a process called co-dependency. This is construed in lifestype terms, and the dependent person is thought to be responsible. Ryan (1971) notes that the person is held to be responsible for the cause of the problem and to be responsible for the solution to it. The society then does not take any direct responsibility for helping. Levine and Levine (1970) characterised this as reflective of conservative times, while in progressive times, the theory is that the society needs to take responsibility for improving behaviour.

The second type of dependency is where the able bodied workers, often many of them skilled workers, cannot find work (Morris, 1986). They are often part of a surplus labor pool created locally by the change in business or industry. The overall process is market dislocations; that means that most of these persons will have to be substantially retrained if they are to re-enter the labor force and not remain dependent. In the United States, there has been reluctance to invest in retraining, or to put into place policies that would restrain business and industry from using more automation and fewer skilled persons. At this moment, businesses can move to other countries where there are cheaper labor and fewer legal requirements.

This presents a critical problem for the domestic social order, for there are many surplus people. Some of them gravitate to crime and to the underworld economy. Others become demoralised, and lose their self confidence so that they become passive, even in the face of new opportunities. Everyone needs something to do that is meaningful and gives them a way to earn money.

The two problems are, as Morris suggests, problems of transition and
should be improved over time with a redefinition of values and opportunities. But that could take a number of years, and is little help for the person who needs food, shelter and opportunity for himself and his family right now. Some attention to building community and an economic opportunity structure is necessary throughout the world.

A political theory that operationalises the Third Position has been developed by Amatai Etzioni in his book, The active society (1968). He argues that the first problem is to redefine the relationship between the elites and the citizenry. It has to become more of an advise and consent relationship, where everyone is encouraged to be active participants, and where authenticity of development and expression is the goal for social relationships. A cooperative enterprise has to be developed that does not rely on lying and deceit, and power tactics to carry out business and government. It is a society that has to develop its own competence while developing the citizens. Dokecki (1983) speaks of this as the caring and competent community. More adequate political and social theory is needed.

The world crisis that we are experiencing has been brought about, according to Wallerstein, by the development of a world economic market that has systematically undermined the Gemeinschaft of local communities and has substituted a need for Gemeinschaft forces at the level of the nation. The National Community is required; we do not know how to bring it about. The International Community is required; we do not know how to bring that about either. A first step might be the development of some common goals and common resources to pursue them. As community psychologists, we need to bring the three principles of community into our work.

III. Community Psychology as a Psychology of Helping

The larger context was set out to suggest that we in the United States are early in a post-modern phase where lots of social and political dislocations are occurring as we begin to participate more on an international scale. These dislocations are creating problems in lack of opportunity to work and to participate in the community; there is being created a large dependent population all over the world. All of this impinges on the local community and on our work as community psychologists.

The work of the community psychologist is oriented to social
improvement activities that are directed to supporting or strengthening individuals, or enhancing social organisation. This work can be described as helping others to do something. It provides for participatory exchanges so necessary for learning, teaching and human development. Everyone needs help, everyone can give it. Some help is helpful; some is not helpful. It can have both good and harmful effects. But helping can be a process for bringing about interdependence.

Brickman (1982) developed a typology of helping to understand "how people decide whether material aid, instruction, exhortation, discipline, emotional support, or some other form of help is most appropriate" (p. 368). They distinguished between clients' attributions of responsibility for causing the problem and the clients' responsibility for solving the problem. Figure 2 shows four different types of helping when one classifies the two characteristics into high and low. The left column, High Responsibility for Solution, is one that assumes that the client has the ability to change and emphasizes helping that yields action on their part. The right column is one that does not assume that clients can actively change things.

Cell 1, in the upper left corner, called the Moral Model, is helping oriented to achieving the maximum performance. It is like training an athlete for competition in the Olympic Games. Persons are expected to be able to perform, and need consultation and stimulation to do it.

Cell 4, in the lower right corner, called the Medical Model, is the helping oriented to getting people back on their feet. They are assumed to be weakened by causes that are no fault of their own, like having pneumonia or small pox, and are expected to go along with the treatment so that it can cure them, letting nature take its course.

These two cells constitute a diagonal in the table, an independence-dependence continuum. The other cells, 2 and 3, are off the diagonal, and are most likely to be the types of helping that can develop interdependence. These are the ones for community psychology to look at most carefully. If one used a theory of community based on the Third Position, these two cells exemplify what the practice might look like.

Cell 2, called the Compensatory Model, is described as helping the recipients be more assertive, to empower them to deal more effectively
with their environment. The helper approaches the recipient with the message, "At your service. How can I help you?"

This is typically the approach taken by persons who work in the self-help movement—who assist persons in the establishment of self-help groups. People with similar situations are assisted to come together as support groups and action groups—such as advocacy groups for parents with handicapped or mentally retarded children, or a neighbourhood food buying cooperative. This creates an experience of working together, in common cause, that helps persons learn what interdependency might be like.

Cell 3, called the Enlightenment Model, helps people gain insight into the cause of their personal problem, such as drinking, using drugs, smoking, gambling, or overeating, and to recognise that they cannot personally control that behaviour. Successful help is to be gained within a community of similarly positioned persons who commit themselves to help each other, such as Alcoholics Anonymous. This is a form of mutual support, of interdependence, that has proved to be very effective in teaching people to ask for and give help to each other.

These two cells are the most interesting in the sense that they encompass people who are defined as potentially strong and others potentially weak, with each needing to learn to be interdependent. The work of creating community yields more active, assertive participatory behaviour on the part of the recipient. It also requires a particular approach to professional work.

IV. Professional Work: A New Look

The professional is a specialist with expert knowledge who is expected to bring new ways to persons who are familiar with old ways (Kirschner, 1986). He or she redefines the situation and prescribes the actions necessary for resolution, based on knowledge from research and clinical work. Since the recipients are assumed not to know what is really going on, their task is to be compliant, to do what they are told, and the techniques are expected to work properly. This is a social position that has evolved from the more primitive role of the healer who used magic forces, unknown to most people. The magic originally derived from the gods; now it comes from science and learned study.
This kind of professionalism, a directive expert, can be effectively applied in the helping that is illustrated in Cell 1 and Cell 4—where persons are relying on expert judgement. But in Cells 2 and 3, another kind of help is required. It is consultative, it is supporting, it is enabling, it is facilitory, it is not directive. One has to be very careful not to enhance dependence with this type of helping—or the purpose of it will be defeated.

Nicholas Hobbs (1982), Paul Dokecki (1977) and I (Newbrough, 1977) have developed an approach called Human Development Liaison, that characterises the kind of community psychology professional that we aspire to train. Dokecki (1977) describes a new type of professional whose primary orientation is to work with people by helping them be more community oriented and community minded. There is the need to emphasise common behaviour, and to get people to work on local resources that are held in common. A support group, a self-help group, a community project are examples of these local resources. In addition to a new theory of community, there is need for a new model of the professional role and of professional work. Traditional expert

---

**Fig. 2. Models of Helping, from Brickman et al (1982)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client responsibility for Cause</th>
<th>Client responsibility for solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Model</td>
<td>Enlightenment Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching for Action</td>
<td>Learn self-Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonliness</td>
<td>Fanaticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensatory Model</td>
<td>Medical Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Self Help</td>
<td>Treatment &amp; compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienation</td>
<td>Dependence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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professional roles often create and maintain dependency. The challenge to us as community psychologists is to engage in practice that enables people to become interdependent in competent, productive, satisfying ways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Development Liaison Functions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Creative and flexible
- Increase options
- Catalyst for change
- Oriented to strengths, not weakness
- Enables and facilitates
- Coordination of services
- Interdisciplinary
- Win/win philosophy

From Dokecki (1977).

V. The New Theory of Community

A new theory of community is needed that will be useful at the level of the nation and its policies, while at the same time, be useful for work at the local community level. We now live in a Global Village and we need to understand our social connections in those terms.

It is no longer acceptable in the world today for nations to be so internally oriented, for governments and corporations to be so power oriented, for professionals to treat their clients impersonally as objects or paternalistically as children. The new theory of community has to move beyond the dualisms of individual versus community, and to take up what I have called, here, the Third Position.

Two different approaches to community thought seem to exemplify the Third Position. In the United States, Julian Rappaport (1981, 1987) has put forward the argument that empowerment should be the guiding theory for community psychology. Empowerment is contrasted with the concept of prevention as the kind of work to be done by community psychologists. Prevention is oriented to the needs of dependent persons "to be helped, socialised, trained, given skills, and have their illnesses prevented..." (Rappaport, 1986, p. 151).

Empowerment is concerned with the provision of rights and choices to citizens. Livert (1989) in a critique of the theory argues that
empowerment is not sufficient, that it is too onesided and used alone may lead to an overemphasis on individualism. He suggests that commitment to the overall community could balance the empowerment, and "maintain a goal of enhancing the whole of the community." (p.12) Rappaport's work is an important early step in the development of a new theory for community psychology in the United States. Later work can be expected to broaden it more directly address community.

A second and more comprehensive theoretical approach is that of Serrano-Garcia, Lopez, and Rivera-Medina (1987) at the University of Puerto Rico. It is centred around reciprocal relations between the social construction of reality and social activation. The model is an attempt "to establish the mechanism through which alternative definitions of reality arise." (p. 437). While considering that changes in both social function and social structure both yield social change, they opt for changes in social structure through the creation of new settings for behaviour. Often the form is oriented to conducting a research project through an action research model that Irizarry and Serrano-Garcia (1979) call "intervention within research." Such a model is particularly well suited to community intervention from the university—it gives the project credibility and provides for a database to assess just what was done and what happened. Such a data oriented evaluation process will help to keep social interventions honest. They centrally involve the residents of the community with the project, providing them with the results and help on how to use them. The objectives of their action model are summarised in Table V. This model is exemplary of the critical and generative approach to social and community phenomena that is characteristic of community psychology in Latin America, and provides for an evolutionary move from the Second Position to the Third Position.

The work on community that I know about in Latin America seems broadly oriented toward the Third Position. It is characterised by an integral commitment to practice through community action and reflection. The works by Friere (1971, 1972), by Falls Borda (1985) and by Ander-Egg (1980) are exemplary of that. They start with where the citizens are in their consciousness and practices, and through a process of education help them to become aware of possibilities for choice. The work covers fraternity, equality and liberty—all three principles. Fraternity seems to be the binding concept for community through group development. Other community development work using a
social action approach has been done in many Latin American countries: Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Mexico, Nicaragua, Santo Domingo, and Venezuela. Many are active, without having published or presented their work. But the approach is shared; the activities seem widespread. Each works within a concrete reality. Most important is the attainment of some of the goals, of making a difference in the social situation.

The Third Position is a position of unity and synthesis, not fragmentation and separateness. The university has to work on it. Science has to work on it. Governments have to work on it. We as

---

**Table V**

*Serrano-Garcia, Lopez & Rivera-Medina’s Social-Community Model Objectives*

**Practice should lead to:**

1. The democratisation of access to direction, production, and consumption of social wealth by all sectors of society

2. the need for an informed and socially active community

3. the development of research directed toward the improvement of the quality of life

4. the development of collective work teams that increase the intellectual, cultural, and material production of society

5. the development of critical questioning and the analysis of institutions so that they may better serve their social functioning

6. the legitimation of popular culture and consciousness

7. the development of a social consciousness through the process of education and attitudinal change
community psychologists have to work on it. To paraphrase Schumacher (1973), we need communities, cities, governments, businesses and a world as if people mattered (Short, 1989).
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