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INTRODUCTION

This paper began as an attempt to examine the issues involved in an effort to create a "community" in a university residence hall. I discovered very quickly, however, that "community" is not merely a dormitory area where people sleep. There has to be a focus on something or some issue outside the physical community itself, in this case the residence hall. In other words, mere proximity of people is not sufficient cause for community to develop.

Definition of Community

By community I have come to mean the common sharing or pursuit of an idea or a cause with a group of people in such a manner that the quality of their lives is improved. I do not mean the more romantic notion of "community" with which I began and which stresses a return to a simpler life where people supposedly have more in common by virtue of living in small towns and having closer ties to nature. This romantic notion of "community" implies that the simpler life creates the need for more sharing among people because they depend on each other for the daily necessities of life. The modern version of the search for "community" too often substitutes independence for interdependence. The emphasis is placed on
"doing your own thing," on the quest for self-sufficiency, and on the search for alternative life styles. Young people in particular are fascinated by the prospect of living the simple life in the hills of Vermont, California, Oregon, or New Mexico. The goal seems to be the creation of another way of living that does not make one dependent on the super conglomerates and corporations of the modern business world. Somehow in the desire to escape the complexity of modern technological society, many young people seem to have assumed that the answer lies in becoming independent and self-sufficient. On the contrary, I have come to believe that it is only by the development of inescapable human dependencies that we can hope to find community.

Erik Erikson thinks that these seekers of less complex life styles are caught up in a romantic search for "community" that blinds them to the rigidity and limitations of this world view. In an effort to find a sense of unity and security in our increasingly complex and technological world, Erikson sees that these "romantic seekers" reject the fact "...that man is apt to feel uprooted within himself on every step of his development as a distinctive person," and that the problem of technical estrangement is as old as the development of tools.¹ Romantic yearning for a sense of belongingness and security does not then provide a solid foundation to begin the search for community. We need to find human solutions to this search while recognizing the reality of
It so happened that in our efforts to create what we called "community" within the residence hall we violated some of the rules and regulations governing student life in the residence hall system. The key issue was one of authority; specifically, who had the authority to establish the rules which governed the life of the students in the residence hall. The students thought they should participate in the making of these rules. The University administration wanted the residence hall staff to "police" the rules which the university had established. The need to establish limits for governing student life in the residence hall was recognized by everyone. However, a conflict arose over who should set these limits; the students, the staff, the administration, or some combination of these three. This conflict turned into a confrontation that threatened the future of our experiment in community living. In retrospect, this above all else is what contributed to our sense of community. The residents of the dormitory united against the rules which they thought were unjust, and the eventual threat from the "outside" served to increase the intensity of our unity.

There is no doubt that a feeling of community resulted from this process, but in a sense it was a negative community. By this I mean that community resulted from a reaction to an
"attack" from the outside rather than the creation of the positive, romantic "community" that we were initially attempting to establish in the residence hall. Even though we began with a definite conception of the community we were trying to establish, it was in reality the reaction to a negative response from the university administration that truly united the residents of the dormitory.

This professional and personal search for community included a job at another college. My tenure on this job included the Spring of 1970, which has become known on college campuses as the Cambodia Spring or the Kent State Spring. On April 30th of 1970, President Nixon went on television to announce that the United States was "temporarily" invading Cambodia. The reaction on the college campus where I was working and on many other campuses across the country was immediate and intense. To an already distinctively anti-war atmosphere on the campus was added this invasion of U.S. forces into Cambodia. The reaction was swift and seemingly nearly unanimous. Student committees were created for the purpose of coordinating a variety of anti-war efforts. In fact, scheduled classes were suspended at some colleges to enable members of the college community to devote more time to this anti-war effort. I remember the feeling distinctly as the college gathered in mass meetings, as students from Kent State were welcomed as exiles, and as people left to demonstrate in Washington, D.C., that somehow "things would
be different from here on." The sense of community was unmistakable and very powerful. People were working together in pursuit of a common goal and the resulting unity was very definitely the community for which I had been searching. Though I felt that the community that I was admiring was also a reaction to a negative force, I am now convinced that this reaction was a positive response to a negative act or situation. Indeed, this response and the confrontation over community in the residence hall setting were political.

**Political Community**

By political I mean the uniting of a group of people around a cause that could not be successfully pursued by anyone acting alone. The realization that one's goal could only be reached through common action with others opened for me a new understanding of the political. While the romantic notion of "community" is passive in its search for simplicity apart from existing social and political circumstances, political community is by definition active. The romantic searches for escape and if escape cannot be found settles for a narrow, often private, existence. The quest for political community must of necessity take existing social and political circumstances into account and can never settle for a solely private existence.

The realization of the possible political nature of community was disturbing to me. It was disturbing because I had been attempting to establish a "community" that would
have a sense of permanency, that would provide a living situation for people that made their lives better, more intimate, more human on a daily basis. My own experiences were shattering this dream of "community." Indeed, what I am calling political community began to make much more sense than my earlier notion of romantic "community" and my fears that a negative community would not lead to the sense of community for which I was searching.

The Romantic Dream of "Community"

Probably the most common manifestation of the dream of romantic "community" in myself and in many people that I have known is the idea of starting your own private school with all of your best friends as the faculty and staff of the school. In this way there would be a common focus to unite these people who would live on the campus of the school within close proximity of their friends and colleagues.

It is not surprising, in retrospect, that the creation of a small private school would be the focus for the dream of establishing a "community." With the increasing size and complexity of nearly all of our institutions, it becomes more and more difficult to find a place where one shares anything in common with other people. An educational institution may be one of the few remaining institutions where one can find a sense of common purpose.

As institutions become more autonomous as they increase in size and complexity, people feel as if "someone else is in
charge" and that they have lost control of their lives. In an effort to combat this tendency, many people turn to the romantic notion of "community" for an alternative. A small private school provides a perfect medium in which to establish a living situation that has a sense of belongingness and security. However, these are not the goals of political community. A political community is more concerned with developing bonds among people as a result of the active sharing of common projects and participation in common experiences which lead to a sense of public purpose; while the romantic "community" is geared to the more passive goals of belonging and a feeling of being settled and secure.

The Evolution and Purposes of this Study of Community

The result of all this is that the nature of this paper has shifted from an attempt at describing the establishment of a "community" in a residence hall setting to an effort to understand the nature and meaning of the concept of community itself. I now believe that I had been engaged in a romantic quest for something I was calling "community." It is related to the kind of romantic return to the past of people who escape to places like the farmlands of Vermont out of a sense of frustration with the complexity of modernity. However, I am beginning to realize, as Alexis de Tocqueville said in the 1830's about America, that rather than recapturing a mythic past we have got to try to understand our real past
more fully. Tocqueville does not want to abandon the past. His experiences in France reminded him that a failure to hold onto what was valuable in the past was disastrous. He was quite concerned that individualism would become such a strong force in America that people would come to rely wholly on their own understanding based on satisfying their own needs. There were few bonds to the past in America. Unlike aristocratic nations, America lacked any natural ties to past generations and traditions. Tocqueville saw this as a danger because the number of Americans who would think that they could satisfy their own needs would dramatically increase. He paints the following picture of this group of Americans:

They owe nothing to any man, they expect nothing from any man; they acquire the habit of always considering themselves as standing alone and they are apt to imagine that their whole destiny is in their own hands. Thus not only does democracy make every man forget his ancestors, but it hides his descendants and separates his contemporaries from him; it throws him back forever upon himself alone and threatens in the end to confine him entirely within the solitude of his own heart.

Tocqueville understood that in such a world romantic descriptions of mythic pasts would flourish. These too he found unacceptable. His goal was to sustain a common search for shared social and political ends. Americans, he felt, shared a real history. That history could help them define what was shared (or potentially shared) in the present.

Tocqueville hoped that democratic citizens might en-
gage in a search for community. He insisted that the art of "association" must grow as conditions became more equal. He feared that people would stop searching and so lose the "art." I would like to emphasize the word "search." I now believe that community is an ever unfinished process that must be continually created and recreated, that it is transitory in character and indeed it is political in nature, and that one must actively engage in a continuous search for community throughout one's life.

The "search" for community is yet another variation on the theme of community. Romantic "community," negative community, and political community have already been mentioned. These concepts represent the evolution of my thinking on community as I prepared to write this paper. I began with the notion that romantic "community" with its emphasis on belongingness and security was the community for which I was looking. My initial encounters with political community seemed to be what I referred to as negative community because on the surface it seemed the opposite of the positive, romantic "community" that I was trying to establish in the residence hall. Once I realized the significance of thinking in terms of a political community, I also began thinking in terms of a "search" for community. Community came to represent to me a process that one enters into and leaves repeatedly throughout one's life. It is a process uniting groups of people with a distinct purpose in mind. They are groups that
do not naturally form, but must be created if they are to exist at all.

Community is a much used and abused word that needs clarification. My goal is to attempt to make a series of concepts and a body of literature available to counselors that are not usually included in our counselor education. I am trying to present a number of issues that need to be examined, rather than offering a specific solution to the problem of community. It is the "search" and the questions about community that are central to this paper.

The counselor needs to be aware of the questions about community because many young people are looking for answers in a variety of ways. Some of these include the escape to communes, the popularity of a variety of religious movements, the rise of racial and ethnic group solidarity, and the expansion of the personal growth group movement. The role of the counselor then becomes that of serving as a guide on the "search" for community. It is in this role that it becomes important for counselors to ask what knowledge is crucial for the understanding of community. This paper is an attempt to provide the counselor with the framework of that body of knowledge.
Footnotes


4. Ibid., vol. 1, chaps. 1-3.

5. Ibid., p. 118.
PART ONE

THE CONCEPT OF COMMUNITY
The purpose of this initial section of the dissertation is to establish the parameters for the discussion of the concept of community. This will be accomplished with a brief discussion of the origins of the problem of community in the Western philosophical tradition and with an introduction to the idea of covenantal community in America. The key elements in the discussion of community throughout this paper are the concepts of "natural" community and political community. It will be repeatedly emphasized that an appreciation of the need for both forms of community is essential to an understanding of the concept of community.

The term "natural" community is placed in quotation marks to stress that there is no such thing as natural community. There are natural human needs for community, such as the need for security, belongingness, and the basic material requirements of life, but a theme of this paper is that community itself must be created and thus is not a natural process. The family and the neighborhood are natural human groupings, but they do not guarantee the existence of a community. Indeed, community is, in part, political in nature.
The nature of politics as presented in this paper involves the pursuit of a good quality of life as opposed to a more comfortable life which is often the goal of an exclusive search for "natural" community. There is a need to go beyond physical necessity in an attempt to improve the quality of life and to be conscious of this as a necessity of a different kind. I believe that it is this "good quality of life" that most people are searching for when they talk about community. However, as we shall see in this paper, "natural" community has usually been the focus of the search for community in America while political community has been neglected.

It is generally assumed that the experience of community has been lost in America. This loss of what I referred to as a romantic notion of "community" in the Introduction usually refers to a form of community that some people assume was once a natural part of life in America. "Natural" community can exist but it requires a great deal of work both within the family and the local community and it must have the active support of a political community. As we shall see, the obligations of political community are necessary for the protection of the rights of "natural" community, and both are critical to the understanding of the model of covenantal community in America. The concept of covenantal community holds that people are drawn together by shared common beliefs, goals, and purposes as much as by physical necessity. Indeed it is the former that leads to a community with a sense of
permanence while the latter fosters communities that are transitory in nature. The shared common beliefs or common purposes that form the basis of the concept of covenantal community need to be drawn out of people. They already exist in the form of a common belief in the importance of such things as human dignity, common experience, shared tradition, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

When I began researching the literature in the fields of counseling and student personnel work in higher education in preparation for writing this dissertation, I discovered that very little was written about the concept of community. The problem of community seemed to be a human touchstone so I set out to explore if indeed it was a problem of students searching for community and identity in the 1960's and 1970's or an older and more general problem. Professionals in these disciplines are usually more interested in defining the skills and techniques that are needed to help others develop a sense of community than they are in gaining an understanding of the basic concepts of community. This section of the dissertation attempts to set the tone for the paper. It stresses the importance of having a philosophy of community as a prerequisite for any search for community.

The role of the counselor is also introduced in this section. The emphasis throughout this paper is not on what theory or techniques the counselor should use in assisting people on their search for community. Rather the focus is
on an appreciation of the prior questions that must be asked if the counselor is to understand the nature of his function and the kind of knowledge that is appropriate to his performance as a guide on the search for community. Counseling skills are certainly important, but the need to talk about common purposes, goals, and beliefs as a basis of community must precede the development of specific techniques to implement these beliefs. Given the necessity of both "natural" and political community to any search for community, it is difficult to discuss the specific role of the counselor in addressing the issue of shared common beliefs. But, a constant theme in this paper is the importance for the counselor to ask the prior questions about the nature of community before the "search" can be undertaken in earnest.
CHAPTER I

THE MEANING OF COMMUNITY

In establishing the guidelines for my study of community, I have found it useful to return to the origins of the discussion of community in the Western philosophical tradition. In fact, Aristotle and Plato defined the basic issues of the search for community centuries ago.

"Natural" and Political Community

Aristotle maintains in the Politics that there are two reasons why people choose to live together in communities. First, people come together to satisfy their "natural impulse" for security, belongingness, and basic material needs, or what I will call "natural" community. This is seen most commonly in the family and the local community. Secondly, people are drawn together by a "common interest" in attaining a share of the "good life" by uniting together in the form of a political community, which I will also refer to as political community. ¹

Plato's Concept of Community

Plato seems to take the other extreme in the Republic arguing that only by abolishing the family can political
community be reached. However, both Aristotle and Plato make the point that community in its highest form must be political in nature, that is, the common pursuit of genuinely shared ends beyond the often narrow restrictions of family and self. A political community is based on a compact or a covenant among people and not on kinship ties.

Plato argues for the establishment of what he calls "the community of women and children." He proposes the creation of a community where the distinction between what is considered to be private and what is considered to be public would be erased. Foremost in this proposal is the abolition of the family. Women and children would henceforth be shared by everyone and would thus no longer be the private domain of any one man. There would be no marriages and any offspring would become public property.

Plato's argument is that if the family, which is surely "natural," remains the sole object of one's loyalty or commitment, then one can never reach his full potential or sense of possibility through the creation of a political community. Family ties can prevent one from reaching his natural fulfillment, i.e., his full potential. People usually feel a conflict between their sense of duty to their family and their sense of duty to what is "good" for mankind. Plato seems to be saying that the suppression of family ties can help to direct people's love toward the more general "good" of genuinely shared and commonly pursued ends and so increase
their chances of achieving their full potential through the creation of a united political community.³

One must, however, take great care with the Republic, as Alan Bloom instructs us in his interpretive essay on the Republic.⁴ Plato was intentionally taking an extreme position. For Glaucon, in his eagerness to discover in this dialogue with Socrates whether this "community of women and children" was indeed possible, "...only wants to know whether the city can exist without determining whether it is natural and hence good....Glaucos desire to see his city come into being has caused him to forget to ask whether it is good for man or not."⁵ The standard which Plato is setting here is for what I am calling political community as opposed to "natural" community with its focus on the family. While establishing the extreme of the total abolition of the family to make clear its importance, Plato emphasizes that people must aspire beyond mere "natural" community if they are to approach their full potential.⁶

**Aristotle's Concept of Community**

Though Aristotle is very critical of Plato's theory of the establishment of a "community of women and children," the problem for Aristotle, as it was for Plato, is how to establish political community among groups of people. When presented with what he sees as Plato's excessive desire of unity, Aristotle's solution is to strengthen family ties as the basis for creating political community. He intended that the
family would serve as the basis for the "natural" development of political community. Plato worried that people often became fixated on the initial stages of this "natural" community development with their propensity for warmth and security. In this way people limit the possibility of reaching their full potential by either ignoring or remaining ignorant of the need for political community. Plato argued that attention had to be paid to what is "good" for man as well as to what is "natural."

The tension between Plato and Aristotle is unresolved to this day. The problem is (as we have seen in much of the political activism of the 1960's) that there is a tendency to reject family and local community in the effort to create a "political" community. At the same time, there is a tendency to rely on the comforts of family and local community as the means of fulfilling one's need for a sense of community. It is the position of this paper that both "natural" and political community are necessary. The individual must both have a sense of security and self-assuredness before he can venture out of the world of the family, and he must have a sense of possibility that he will be able to reach his full potential as an individual beyond the confines of family. Or, as Erik Erikson stresses, a healthy personality must be supported by a healthy society which values and encourages political as well as "natural" community.
The Importance of Political Community

Though the tension between Plato and Aristotle is real, it may be that it is what they share that is most significant to us, that is, a sense of the general importance of political community that both hold up as an ideal. As we have seen, people are drawn together by a "common interest" that is satisfied when the individual attains a share of "the good life" through a sense of unity with others in the form of active participation in a political community. An individual can reach his full potential only through active participation in this common life or political community. An individual acting in isolation from the family or the local community can never reach his full potential. For, while living in the "natural" community the individual remains essentially independent, but lacks the sense of possibility and potential that occurs when the individual is taken beyond himself and his beginnings through participation in a political community.

Although the family can be used as a means of education and preparation for participation in a political community, this is often not the case. It is the political community that enables the individual to achieve what Aristotle calls "self-sufficiency," i.e. the freedom for an individual to reach his full potential by joining in the pursuit of a common interest with others. This is opposed to the more narrow pursuit of security, belongingness, and the material
The essence of political community for Aristotle basically revolves around moral or spiritual causes. These causes include such things as the creation of a comprehensive system of justice, and other causes which fall under the general heading of "the attainment of a good quality of life." The "good" life for Aristotle consists of the ability of the individual to reach his full potential, which is only possible through active participation in a political community. And, as we have seen, a political community consists of the coming together of a group of people around a common, public interest for the purpose of improving the quality of their lives not simply making themselves more comfortable.

Even though the goal of a "natural" community for Aristotle is the creation of a political community, we as counselors would do well to take Plato's warning seriously. The pursuit of the common "good" of the political community may be hindered by familial relationships. The family may be seen as anti-communal in the sense that one may never reach self-fulfillment (the goal of political community) if he gets too involved and comfortable with the foundations of "natural" community. The family is frequently thought to be the most natural reason for people to come together in groups. It is the fundamental living unit in almost every culture on earth. As such, the family serves as the foundation for many social
scientists' discussion of community. But kinship is a peculiar form of human relationship based on natural yet required forms of sympathy and understanding that are a part of one's culture. It is an essential and wonderful form of community, but it is very limiting when taken to be the sole basis for a discussion of the concept of community.

**Covenantal Community**

It may be useful in this light to discuss political community as based on a covenant among people and not on kinship ties— as something that must be created. Man may be a political animal but even classical wisdom found it far from clear that he will always succeed in his pursuit of the "common good" and create a genuine political community. We have every reason to believe that such a search is as difficult (if not moreso) now. It is critical to establish clearly a set of common objectives if they are to have an impact on a democratic society in a post-technological age. We would do well to remember the arguments of our own ancestors in this regard. They provide an interesting complement to the classical insights we have been discussing.

A government based on a covenant means that the citizens and the leaders have chosen to commit themselves to each other and to an ideal which is greater than any one of them, in this case a sense of "common good" for everyone. The citizens are responsible for the running of the government and the leaders are responsible for reminding the
citizens of their mutual moral commitment to a cause greater than any one of them.\textsuperscript{12}

The chief danger involved in the shattering of the ideal of a covenant as the basis of a democratic form of government is that the citizens will quickly feel that the business of the government is not their own, is beyond their understanding and thus should be left to those in charge. Alan Heimert refers to this tendency as the "original social and political sin."\textsuperscript{13} It is at this point that the individual loses his freedom because he can no longer influence the running of his government and thus is at its mercy. As the individual feels increasingly out of control, he will most likely withdraw into the private world of the family and the self. Here, at least, things are more predictable and manageable.

Erik Erikson makes this precise point; only, what Heimert calls the "original social and political sin," he refers to as the "political crisis of wholeness."\textsuperscript{14} Erikson sees that "much political apathy may have its origin in a general feeling that, after all, matters of apparent choice have probably been fixed in advance—a state of affairs which becomes fact, indeed, if influential parts of the electorate acquiesce in it because they have learned to view the world as a place where grown-ups talk of choice, but 'fix' things so as to avoid overt friction."\textsuperscript{15}

As we have seen in this chapter, an understanding of the concept of community requires a knowledge of "natural"
community and of political community. Erikson is able to demonstrate that both forms of community can and should be integrated into a theory of human development. As will be seen in Chapter IX, Erikson believes that a healthy personality can only grow out of a good childhood and family life, and thus a healthy "natural" community. "Natural" community is essential in that it provides the context for the foundation of the development of a healthy personality. But, as Plato and Aristotle have instructed us and as Erikson believes is still true in the twentieth century, an individual can reach his full potential only through active participation in a political community. An individual acting in the isolation of the family can never reach his full potential. Life in a "natural" community makes one independent in the sense of being secure and comfortable, but true freedom is only reached when one joins in the pursuit of a common interest with others for the purpose of improving the quality of their lives. It is the position of this paper that without the support of a political community, "natural" community will not be able to encourage the development of a healthy personality.

One of the themes of this paper is that the family must be supported by a healthy society, which is only possible if the members of the family both value and participate in political community. And, likewise, a sense of political community can only be achieved when the individuals in
society have come from "natural" communities that value and encourage the development of a healthy personality. Thus, "natural" community must be supported by political community, and political community must be supported by "natural" community creating a tension necessary for the development of a healthy personality supported by a healthy society.

Rights and Obligations

The role of the counselor is not to eliminate the tension between "natural" and political community, but rather to attempt to understand it. Basically the conflict between "natural" and political community is a result of the tensions between rights and obligations.16 The person searching for community, as well as the counselor who may be serving as a guide or an educator, should be aware of this tension. In America this can be seen most clearly in our rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that were established in the Declaration of Independence and in our constitutional obligations to insure the existence of these rights.

As we have seen, in a "natural" community people come together to satisfy their "natural impulses" for security, belongingness, and the basic material needs. While in a political community, people come together around a common, public interest for the purpose of improving the quality of their lives and not simply making themselves more comfortable.

The "attainment of a good quality of life" or the "good life" for Aristotle was the ability to feel self-fulfilled
or to reach one's full potential as a human being. But, in order to accomplish this, both the physical and especially the moral rights of "natural" community must first be realized. The existence of these rights is measured in terms of the amount of respect that is given to man's physical and moral needs. The physical needs of a "natural" community of people consist of security, belongingness, and the basic material needs. In America, a "natural" community's moral needs, or what the French political philosopher Simone Weil calls "the needs of the soul," include life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. However, before one can feel self-fulfilled, both physically and morally, these rights of "natural" community must be supported by a belief in a covenantal obligation.

Covenantal obligation has taken the form of a sense of duty to the "common good" of other human beings since the writings of Plato. The goal has been the hope of improving the quality of life through the common pursuit of genuinely shared ends beyond the often narrow restrictions of family and self. The result is the creation of a political community.

The goal of political community is to insure a sense of individual self-fulfillment for its members. However, this goal may be hindered by the desire for "natural" community if one gets too involved and comfortable with the physical rights of "natural" community and fails to preserve the moral rights.
with the use of covenantal obligations.

So, the desire for the rights of "natural" community, especially the moral rights, must be combined with a sense of covenantal obligation in any attempt to improve the quality of life by helping individuals reach their full potential. The strength of each individual is necessary to the covenant. It is a strength which allows him as a distinct individual to choose to enter into a covenant with his fellows each of whom is an individual himself. The strength of the resulting collectivity or community is dependent on the strength of each separate individual and therefore is dependent on diversity.

In a sense, the search for community is a frame of mind that sees that it is psychologically important to remain in control of one's "natural" community. However, unless one feels a sense of obligation to uphold a political community, the rights of "natural" community will cease to exist, i.e., as we will see in this paper, they will become vulnerable to the control of others and individual freedom will be lost. So, one of the themes of this paper begins to emerge: it is through community, both "natural" and political, that freedom truly exists. The individual American can only be free by realizing that he has political obligations as well as "natural" rights.

Perhaps Figure 1 will help to illustrate the idea of the needed tension between "natural" and political community in
the search for a good quality of life where individuals are able to reach their full potential. I believe that it is this "good quality of life" that most people are searching for when they talk about community. However, as we shall see in this paper, "natural" community has usually been the focus of the search for community in America with political community being neglected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NATURAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;The Good Life&quot;</th>
<th>Covenant Among People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kinship Ties</td>
<td>Moral Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Rights</td>
<td>Covenantal Obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty to Family</td>
<td>Duty to Mankind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Life More</td>
<td>Improve Quality of Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence, Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>Interdependence, Common Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity, Unity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Tension between "natural" and political community in the search for a good quality of life where individuals are able to reach their full potential.
Summary of Chapter I and Implications for
Action by the Counselor

One of the purposes of this paper is to show that counselors need to understand both the areas of conflict and the areas of compatibility between "natural" community and political community. Many of the similarities and tensions between the two forms of community have already been discussed. Figures 2, 3, and 4 will serve as a summary as well as a reference point for further study.

Figure 2 represents the binding structures, the institutions, and the authorities which make up each form of community. That is to say, it represents the various elements that make each of them a community or that bind each of them together. The arrows represent the areas of tension between "natural" and political community, and the absence of an arrow represents an area of agreement.

Figure 3 illustrates the collective consciousness, or the nature of the collective feeling, or the attitudes that are characteristic of each form of community. The areas of tension and similarity are represented as in Figure 2.

Figure 4 follows in the same pattern but sets forth the individual consciousness, or the nature of the individual's feelings, or the individual's psychological position in each form of community as well as the various tensions between the two.
Fig. 2. Binding structures, institutions, and authorities which make up each form of community.
### Fig. 3. Nature of the collective feeling characteristic of each form of community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collective Consciousness</th>
<th>Natural</th>
<th>Political</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape Complexity</td>
<td>Confront the Reality of Modemity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for Simple Life</td>
<td>Improve the Quality of Life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Life More</td>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence, Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>Interdependence Common Goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consciousness</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Duty to Family</td>
<td>Duty to Mankind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Interest</td>
<td>Common Pursuit of Genuinely Shared Ends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth, Security</td>
<td>Sense of Possibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Belongingness</td>
<td>Need for Belongingness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4. Nature of the individual's psychological position in each form of community.
There are only a few examples in American history of the successful working out of the tension between "natural" and political community. Several of them are discussed in the next chapter. The result in each case is the creation of a community based on a covenant. While these examples of covenantal community provide a very useful model for the counselor, they are not meant to be adopted literally.

They provide a successful model of community because they are each able to combine "natural" and political community into a working whole. Perhaps Figure 5 will be helpful in introducing the model of covenantal community.

**COVENANTAL COMMUNITY**

```
"NATURAL" COMMUNITY --> PRIMARY COVENANT
   \  \                                /  \\
   V   \                           /    \\
   POLITICAL COMMUNITY <-- SECOND COVENANT
```

**Fig. 5. Model of covenantal community**

The desire for a "natural" community must be combined with the obligations of a Primary Covenant that revolves around a set of shared common beliefs. Then, a Second Covenant establishes a set of rules or laws in the form of a political community to insure that man in all his imperfection will indeed attempt to live up to the stated beliefs. It
is through participation in a political community, with the assistance of a leader or an authority, that people can confront their tendency to pursue their own private interests and get involved in the public protection of their "natural" community.

So, there is a four step process that begins and ends with the desire for "natural" community. As we shall see, the role of the counselor in this process is:

- to let people know that there is indeed a successful model of community building in America's history;
- to recognize people's tendency toward self-interest;
- to remind people of the primary need for shared common beliefs in any search for community;
- to understand that a means of enforcing these beliefs must be established;
- to educate people about the importance of political community as being just such a vehicle;
- to encourage the need for both "natural" and political community;
- to attempt to create opportunities for successful community whenever possible;
- to help people on their own unique searches for community.
Footnotes

1. Aristotle, *The Politics of Aristotle*, trans. Ernest Barker (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946), p. 111. Aristotle maintains in the *Politics* (p. 1) that the state or polis is the highest form of human community. He believed that there are three forms of community: the family, the local community, and the political community. He argues that there is a "natural" development of community from its most basic form, as seen in the family, to its highest form, as seen in the polis or the political community. The family is "...naturally instituted for the satisfaction of daily recurrent needs." The local community or the village is an outgrowth of the family but provides for "...something more than daily recurrent needs," e.g. the development of a social life as opposed to the satisfaction of daily material necessities. The polis or the state is composed of a number of villages and is concerned with the satisfaction of even higher and more spiritual needs, such as "the attainment of a good quality of life." Thus, political community having developed out of other "natural" communities is itself a "natural" community. However, Aristotle emphasizes that the political community is natural in its own right and not just because it develops from other "natural" communities. Political community "...is natural in itself, as the completion, end, or consumption of man and man's development—the essentially natural condition of anything being its final, or complete, or perfect condition." Aristotle, *Politics*, pp. 4-7


3. Ibid., 449a-473c.

4. Ibid., p. 389.

5. Ibid.


7. Aristotle understood that political community can be seen as being separate from "natural" community, i.e., as being natural in its own right. For a detailed
discussion see footnote 1 above.


10. Ibid., p. 6.

11. Ibid., p. 7.


13. Ibid., p. 531.


17. Ibid., p. 7.

18. Ibid., p. 5.
PART TWO

THE IDEA OF COVENANTAL COMMUNITY IN AMERICA
Having laid the theoretical foundation for this study of community in Part One, we can now turn to the meaning of community in America. This section of the paper will examine the tradition of covenantal community in the American context. I believe that it is important to examine the problem of community within specific cultural contexts. While many of the questions about community are universal, the solutions to these questions vary from society to society. This paper focuses on the search for community in America as an attempt to achieve a balance between "natural" and political community.

There are but a few examples of community in American history. By this I mean that only on several occasions has the need for both "natural" and political community been realized and implemented. The examples I have chosen are the Puritan experience in seventeenth century America; the political career of Abraham Lincoln; and the Populist Movement in the late nineteenth century. It is interesting to note at the outset that these examples occurred when people were struggling against a crisis of anti-communitarian trends and individuating odds. Community ties seem to be most
apparent in our history when they are most threatened.

As will be the case throughout this paper, there is a summary at the end of each chapter with a discussion of the implications for action by the counselor. The role of the counselor as presented in this paper is oriented toward counseling within an educational institution, such as a school or a college.
CHAPTER II

THE PURITAN EXPERIENCE IN AMERICA

Alexis De Tocqueville, the famous French observer of American society, maintains that when considering the history and character of a nation "the circumstances which accompanied their birth and contributed to their development affected the whole term of their being."¹ Puritanism is just such a force in the history of American society. It was here first and thus has to be responded to by succeeding generations.

**Definition of Puritanism**

Puritanism was a belief that the church of England should separate itself from the traditions and ceremonies inherited from the Catholic Church. These traditions had lost touch with the real world and the challenges it imposed. The Puritans confronted living in this world directly while attempting to follow God's word. It was to be sure tempting to withdraw from the world as a monk devoting himself totally to God, but that was not permitted. Puritans had to live in the world and so face and overcome temptation.

For the Puritan, every society was defined by a
"Covenant." The Covenant was more than a simple contract. It was based on the values and goals to which the members of a community committed themselves. Specifically, the Puritans under the leadership of John Winthrop believed that every nation or people owed its existence to a covenant with God, an agreement where he would treat the people well if they obeyed His laws. Governments were in turn created by the people to help them carry out their part of the covenant. Thus the purpose of government was to help people to enforce God's laws. This, however, did not relieve the people from responsibility. If the government was performing its duty, the people must support it. But, if the men placed in authority failed to exercise their duties and succumbed to the evils they were supposed to suppress, then the people were expected to replace them with new leaders or face the wrath of God.

**History of Puritanism**

The Puritans of sixteenth and seventeenth century England did not find the inevitable failures of the men in government of sufficient importance to attempt to replace them. However, after Charles I assumed the throne in 1625 and reinforced a belief that man could achieve faith and salvation by one's own will power, the Puritans could not sit idly by while the people's covenant with God had been broken. The Puritans had been living in an uneasy state of compromise
with the regime of Elizabeth and James I, but they could not tolerate Charles' abuses of his power. They feared that the wrath of God would punish England and all her subjects; for when governors failed to uphold God's laws, the Puritan's covenant with God held that the governed were responsible for making the necessary changes in leadership.

There seemed to be two available responses for the Puritans. The first was revolution, to depose Charles and replace him with someone who would fulfill the covenant. Or, the second option was in effect to attempt a second Protestant Reformation, i.e., to renounce the Church of England and to leave as they had left the Catholic Church one hundred years earlier. This alternative was very attractive for it provided both a means of escape and a freedom from responsibility. Nonetheless, most Puritans, including Winthrop, rejected this route. Those who followed it were called separatists. They were purists who totally rejected the Anglican Church and left England to establish their own churches.

Winthrop and his followers chose a third option. Recognizing that there was no escape from the evils of the world, they did not desert their church. The Puritans saw the Anglican Church as temporarily beyond saving and thus decided to avoid the problem by leaving England to establish "a government of Christ in Exile."‡

The Massachusetts Bay Company was formed and preparations for the journey to New England began. Winthrop re-
mained very sensitive to the charges of separatism that were raised against him. With much agony, he was able to convince himself that it was better to preserve the Church in exile than attempt in vain for reform at home. Then in better times, they would return to England. Whether or not one can agree with this line of reasoning, there is no denying that the intensity and self-discipline of their search for community remains as a valuable lesson in community building for us today.

These early Puritans in America, though neither the prudes nor the prohibitionists that popular conceptions support, did make strong demands on themselves. They were attempting to establish a society where every detail of the will of God would be followed. The Puritans knew that every nation exists as a result of a Covenant and since God had delivered them safely to New England it was now up to them to live up to their part of the Covenant and build within the limits of human contrivance a Godly political community.

To be sure some of the emmigrants were perfectionists, outright separatists, or men with separatists leanings. They had come to New England convinced that they were right and the rest of the world was wrong. These Winthrop rejected in his quest for community.

For Winthrop separatism is an effort to achieve the perfect community where people set unrealistic goals that can only be reached by individuals acting alone, if then.
This is a lesson that contemporary counselors would do well to note as they help people on their various searches for community. Winthrop succeeded in creating community because he was able to establish realizable if demanding limits for people by presenting goals which they had to pursue together. They were not goals that an individual could achieve alone, but rather they were **common goals** that people had to pursue together. It was in this process that community was created.

The role of the counselor in helping people meet their communitarian needs thus becomes one of setting limits. This is done by stressing the importance of having goals that must be pursued with other people in addition to having one's private goals. College students seeking community are particularly vulnerable to idealistic world views and solutions. It is at this point in their lives that students need a person of authority to help them attempt to understand the wide range of new ideas and life styles that are opening up before them. The counselor can play an important role in this process by assisting the student in the setting of goals which are realistic rather than perfectionistic. Even in his intensity and demand for self-discipline, Winthrop has shown that an important ingredient of community is the understanding of the necessity for the establishment of realizable limits and the setting of goals toward which people **can** then work together.

In England the center of Puritan dissatisfaction had
been the church, and in Massachusetts the primary task of the colony was the establishment of churches which met God's requirements. Of course, there was much debate over the definition of these requirements as put forth in the Bible. The separatists formed a movement called congregationalism which lacked any system of central authority. Every church was independent. Quickly the need arose for these independent congregations to come together as one church after another threatened to split away from the community. Informal methods were somewhat successful at holding the community together, but some central authority was needed to settle disputes among the independent congregations. This became Winthrop's role as leader of the community's government.

The Idea of Covenantal Community

The English charter for the Massachusetts Bay Colony gave Winthrop unlimited authority to establish any government necessary over the settlers. Winthrop was convinced that men like himself should be in charge of civil government, for the members of a community as a whole were unfit to rule. He did not, however, establish an oligarchy. Rather, he transformed the Bay Company's charter into a institution giving the citizens of the community the right to vote and hold office. It was the idea of a covenant that prompted Winthrop to voluntarily relinquish the absolute powers granted him by the charter. He felt that it was "the nature and essence of every society to be knit together by some Covenant, either expressed
But there was a second covenant involved in the establishment of the community. After joining in the covenant with God, a government must be agreed upon and formed to enforce the covenant. Thus, the members of the community, lacking perfection and wanting to carry out the demands of the first covenant, had voluntarily to create a second covenant.

The primary covenant was the need for founding principles or shared common beliefs. For Winthrop this was the essential first step to community building that he was so desperately trying to create in America. The second covenant was between the citizens and their elected leaders.

Winthrop felt very deeply that a community should not under any circumstances be reduced to what he called a "mere democracy." By this he was referring to a situation where the people themselves are the government without having the benefit of elected leaders to serve and to guide them. This would by definition have to involve only a small number of people who would gather and attempt to run the government themselves.

Winthrop believed that the people should elect their leaders to run the government, but that they were to maintain the responsibility of overseeing these elected leaders and replace them if they abused their powers. This was the second covenant. "Mere Democracy," he feared, tends to encourage privatism, faction, and disunity rather than a
sense of community. Winthrop believed that man is naturally concerned with his own private interests to the neglect of public concerns. People too easily forget that it is the fulfillment of public obligations that most protects their private rights. Elected leaders are needed to prevent the inevitable retreat from civic responsibility. Even the private interests of elected leaders (viz. to stay in office) were more closely related to the interests of the people than are those of individuals pursuing their own private interests. Winthrop hoped that these officials would both check private excess and sustain the people's sense of their own responsibility to uphold their end of the second covenant. They were to be nurturant educators as well as "police-men" -- a dual role not always advocated by those who worried about mass democracy.

Madison's View of "Mere Democracy"

The dislike of "mere democracy" was to continue to be a theme in American history, but with some important variations. For example, James Madison in writing the Federalist Paper Number Ten in 1787 speaks out against what he calls "pure democracy," or "...a society consisting of a small number of citizens, who assemble and administer the government in person." Madison rejects "pure democracy" because it cannot in his eyes control the evils of the faction. By faction he means "...a number of citizens whether amounting to a majority or a minority of the whole, who are united and
activated by some common impulse of passion, or of interest, adverse to the rights of other citizens, or to the permanent and aggregate interests of the community." He sees the faction to be a danger because he feels that factions in the form of powerful interest groups would grow to control the government in America if not checked.

Madison sees factions as inevitable because of the diverse nature of men and their interests. However, even if the causes of faction cannot be checked, Madison was campaigning in Federalist Paper #10 for the control of their effects. By this he meant to avoid the possibility of a majority of people banning together for a cause that would be against the "...interests of the public good and the rights of other citizens." In essence then Madison was trying to preserve the private rights of individuals against the conflicting interests of factions.

Madison's alternative to "pure democracy" was a republic where the authority would be vested in an elected government. He favored an "extensive republic" where it would be more difficult for factions to form because there would be a greater and more diverse number of citizens. An elected representative can be responsible for a large group of people, whereas a "pure democracy" by definition contains a small group of people and is thus more vulnerable to factious tendencies.

Madison's goal seemed to be to take people out of govern-
ment and replace them totally by their elected officials. He wanted to "...make it less probable that a majority of the whole will have a common motive to invade the rights of other citizens; or if such a common motive exists, it will be more difficult for all who feel it to discover their own strength and to act in unison with each other." As the political theorist Wilson C. McWilliams instructs us, Madison and the other Framers of the constitution were hostile to the concept of the "faction" and all other intermediary bodies between the individual and the general government.

Their answer to the dilemma of intermediate groups is, of course, well-known. The large state, and its proliferation of groups and associated factions would leave the government with a multitude of competitors, albeit disunited, for civic affection. Even if a group managed to monopolize the loyalty of its members, it would be unable to "conceit" its schemes with the other groups necessary for a venture at control.

Their goal was:

...to diminish the "firmness and confidence" of individual opinion, leaving the individual, though free from constraint, "timid and cautious," a decent and prudent citizen. That aim is best achieved through the division and fragmentation of loyalty so that few men are associated with others—too few, at any rate to disturb the political order. In this chaos of interests, each unable to fulfill the interests of the individual, the general government would emerge as the sole guardian of interest and the sole object worthy of genuine affection.12

Thus, Madison effectively was eliminating political community as an option for the common citizen. He was pro-
tecting their private rights or their "natural" community, but at the expense of their public or political obligations. It is true, as Madison said, that the cause of faction could not be removed by taking away the freedom which gives people the right to form factions. However, his alternative was to control the effects of factions by forming an authority that places elected officials in a position of being totally responsible for the public rights of the citizens, while leaving the private realm to them. So, Madison does indeed want to do away with "mere democracy" as did Winthrop, but in doing so he effectively removes people from the role in government that the Puritan covenant demanded.

Tocqueville's View of "Mere Democracy"

Writing forty years after Madison, the great French observer of the American scene, Alexis de Tocqueville, was also concerned about "mere democracy." He felt that man's natural state was one of self-interest. This being the case he demonstrates the need for leadership in a democratic country to insure that man achieves a balance between the private and the public realms. Or to put this in the terms of this paper, people in America need to be reminded that they must achieve a balance or a tension between "natural" and political community.

Tocqueville spoke to the danger of doing away with this second covenant which was so important to the early
history of community building in America. He believed that the nature of oppression in democratic nations is directly related to the absence of this covenant. In his view, democratic people too easily become equal and alike, each pursing their own private interests:

Each of them, living apart, is as a stranger to the fate of all the rest; his children and his private friends constitute to him the whole of mankind. As for the rest of his fellow citizens, he is close to them, but does not see them; he touches them, but he does not feel them; he exists only in himself and for himself alone; and if his kindred still remain to him, he may be said at any rate to have lost his country.\(^3\)

This privatism is a result of the glorification of "natural" community and the neglect of the covenant of political community.

When the covenant between the people and their government is missing, the government assumes a position of authority that in Tocqueville's view seeks to keep the people in perpetual childhood. Such a government

...provides for their security, foresees and supplies their necessities, facilitates their pleasures, manages their principal concerns, directs their industry, regulates the descent of property, and subdivides their inheritances: what remains, but to spare them all the care of thinking and all the trouble of living?\(^4\)

The dilemma for the leader and for the counselor is that people both want to be led and they want to be free. The democratic solution to this problem is to create an
all-powerful form of government, but one that is elected by the people. The danger is that people will relinquish their responsibility for upholding their end of the covenant once they have elected their leaders. Winthrop demonstrated originally and Tocqueville reaffirmed that the covenant of a political community is essential for the creation of community in America. A sound "natural" community of friends and family is also vital, but it is not sufficient for a community to be sustained.

Building Community

The differences between Madison and Tocqueville's fear of "mere democracy" serve to highlight some of the important lessons of community building for the counselor today. Madison wished to avoid "mere democracy" by excluding the people from the government. His vision was that the people would take care of their private affairs while the government took charge of their public concerns. However, Tocqueville, following in the tradition established by Winthrop, warned of the dangers of an extreme public-private split in a democracy. He too saw "mere democracy" as the enemy, but insisted that the people not give up their covenanted duty to oversee their elected officials and indeed replace them if they abuse their powers. People need to see that their private feelings matter and that their public world can and should speak to them.
Two larger issues grow out of this discussion of the need for a covenanted community. First, there is the focus on the importance of the primary covenant, i.e., a set of obligations that revolve around shared common beliefs. John Winthrop and the Puritans demonstrated that a shared common belief must serve as the basis for any community building effort. Second, there is the confusion caused by people's need for both authority and freedom.

Establishing a basis of shared common belief at the outset was not difficult for the Puritans. New England provided a hostile environment which they had to face together, and the hardships that occurred drove people into covenants for their own survival.

A hostile environment can make community very attractive. However, with the absence of this challenge from the outside the duties of community can come to seem burdensome indeed. Winthrop realized that people will choose the comforts of "natural" community over the responsibilities of political community if given the chance. Therefore, he had to create a situation where people would be induced to enter political community as well as following their self-interests into "natural" community. Still, he feared forcing people to participate in a political community for the same reason he feared "mere democracy." He knew that to give the responsibility of government to the many was to feed their natural desire to reduce their public obligations and to follow their
own private interests. And likewise, to force people into political community only increases their resentment of having responsibilities that detract from the pursuit of their own interests.

Winthrop understood that where neither the negative forces of nature nor the hostile forces of other men drive people into a community, this sense of cohesion must be created in positive moral obligations or in shared common beliefs. The need for political education was constant even though membership in a community must be voluntary and based on a covenant if it is to succeed. This leads us to the second and most difficult issue — the problem of authority and freedom.

In responding to this issue the Puritan's sought both to stamp out perfectionistic separatism and to limit man's natural tendency toward self-interest. This seems to say that a limiting of individual freedom is necessary if people are to live in a community, but this is to miss the fundamental issue. As the political theorist Sheldon Wolin instructs us, the classical liberals, who have become today's conservatives, misunderstood the fundamental problem:

They conceived the issue as one of reconciling freedom and authority, and they solved it by destroying authority in the name of liberty and of exposing freedom to society's controls. To the nineteenth and twentieth centuries fell the task of stating the problem more correctly: not freedom versus authority, or man against the state, but authority and community.
It is out of this union that freedom is born and preserved. Though his wisdom was soon lost, John Winthrop clearly understood these issues.

Winthrop realized that people both want to be led and they want to be free. A vital ingredient to the success of the Puritan community was an insistence on the establishment of a political covenant between the people and the government. Individual freedom may have been limited by the authorities, but the people had the responsibility to establish limits for the government and to insist on the maintenance of their civil liberties. Freedom for the individual member of the community thus resulted from the sense of possibility that was provided by the structure which it was their duty to maintain, and by the ideals and goals established and nurtured by the elected authorities.

Summary of Chapter II and the Implications for Action by the Counselor

What then are the lessons of community to be learned from the Puritan experience. Winthrop demonstrated that the search for community can easily lead to a form of separatism that can result in the creation of many little utopias each seeking their own brand of perfection. It seems that the desire for what people call community often grows out of a dissatisfaction with their current situation in life. The search is usually for an alternative to their unhappy state of affairs. Most commonly this search ends up in some
variation of a utopian venture, while very few people actually reach their stated goal of establishing a community.

The lesson of separatism seems to be that in an effort to find perfection by convincing yourself that you are right and the rest of the world wrong, one is likely, at best, to form a little utopia in a search for impossible goals. Winthrop avoided this dilemma by providing his followers with common goals. That is to say, they were not goals that an individual could attain alone, rather they were common goals that all the members of the community must seek together.

The importance of Winthrop's leadership role is undeniable. He was convinced that people left to their own devices would likely fly off in a hundred different directions each chasing their own private version of the truth. To avoid this he established limits for the members of the community by presenting goals which they must pursue together. Thus, the necessity of an authority to establish limits and set goals which the people can then work toward together seems to be an important ingredient of community.

Finally, according to the Puritan experience, community is only possible in a defined environment where the basic structure is established by a covenant between the people and the government, with a sense of freedom resulting when an authority in the form of a government sets limits or establishes common goals. Community thus becomes the coming together of people in a political covenant with the realization
that since man cannot achieve perfection he must join together in the pursuit of the common goals that are sustained with the aid of an authority within the context of their covenant.

There are important lessons here for the counselor. As people are searching for what they call community, the counselor, in addition to pointing to the importance of both "natural" and political community, needs to be aware of the central position that authority plays in any community building effort. People need a guide to lead them out of their natural state of self-interest and to include the responsibility of the covenant of political community. It remains a problem to find areas of shared common belief. There are examples of this in our history which are illustrative. Abraham Lincoln and the Populist movement of the late nineteenth century are two of the most prominent examples and will be discussed next.

The counselor is in a unique position to serve as a guide on the search for community. This can be done both in terms of providing the knowledge that "natural" and political community are essential ingredients of the search, and in terms of serving as the authority that demonstrates that freedom is both a result of the search for community as well as a necessary pre-condition, but not the adversary of authority.

The role of the counselor is to assist people who are
searching for community to reach their full potential. This is only possible when both the "natural" and the political sides of the issue of community are confronted and integrated into one's life. It is here that the counselor can be of invaluable assistance as a guide on the search for community.
Footnotes


4. Ibid., p. 48.

5. Ibid., p. 75.

6. Ibid., p. 93.


9. Ibid., p. 54.

10. Ibid., pp. 57-58.

11. Ibid., p. 61.

12. McWilliams, Fraternity in America, p. 190.


14. Ibid.

CHAPTER III

ABRAHAM LINCOLN AND THE COVENANTAL IDEA OF COMMUNITY

The Puritan experience in New England, as we have seen, established the roots for the idea and experience of covenantal community in America. As Tocqueville describes, this idea of covenantal community continued to be a force in American history in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In the late eighteenth century he sees the New England town­ship, which evolved from the initial Puritan experiment in community building, to be the foundation of political life in America. This is so because it provided the prime example of the importance of the political education of the people in a democratic society. The sovereignty which New England­ers cherished and protected at the township level is central to the covenantal idea of community.¹

The Art of Associating

Tocqueville sees that the "right of associating," or the right of combining one's actions with those of other people and then acting in common with them, is the "...the most natural privilege of man," with the exception of "... the right of acting for himself."² It is the right of
association that was encouraged and practiced at the township level in New England. Tocqueville explains the importance of having such a freedom in America by saying:

There are no countries in which associations are more needed to prevent the despotism of faction or the arbitrary power of a prince than those which are democratically constituted. In aristocratic nations the body of the nobles and the wealthy are in themselves natural associations which check the abuses of power. In countries where such associations do not exist, if private individuals cannot create an artificial and temporary substitute for them I can see no permanent protection against the most galling tyranny; and a great people may be oppressed with impunity by a small faction or by a single individual.3

Thus, Tocqueville is saying that associations have to be created in America. If democracy is to survive, the people must be free to form political associations to defend themselves against possible despotic action, and civil associations of a non-political nature for commercial, religious, moral, or completely frivolous reasons. Moreover, this freedom must be maintained by constant participation at the local level, for it is here that people are educated about the techniques and the necessity of forming political associations, which is referred to in this paper as political community.

As we have already seen, Tocqueville feels that man's natural tendency is toward self-interest or "natural" community. This tendency must also be combated if political communities are to be created. This is best done with the idea of
the covenant, or a common commitment to a set of founding principles that serve to give people a basis for common action. In America, the Primary Covenant, to use the terms from the discussion of the Puritans, is the Declaration of Independence, while the Second Covenant, between the people and the government and designed to preserve the Primary Covenant, is the Constitution and our laws.

Tocqueville realized that local freedom helps men feel the need for mutual dependence. Since the natural tendency is toward self-interest, then the exercise of political freedom reminds people of their need for co-operation and in the process teaches them how to create political communities. So, while observance of the Primary Covenant is important, people must be educated about how to preserve their role in the Second Covenant. The beauty of the New England township was that it provided people with this education. Once again, this was the legacy of the Puritan search for community.

**Nineteenth Century America**

In the nineteenth century, Tocqueville sets the scene very clearly for the entrance of Abraham Lincoln onto the stage of American politics. As we shall see Lincoln too falls into the tradition of covenantal community in America. First, however, it is useful to briefly turn to Tocqueville to gain a sense of the state of the Union prior to Lincoln's presidency.
Writing in the 1830's, Tocqueville predicted the civil war and explained some of the more important dynamics that would help to create it. He was convinced that the various states in the Union were perfectly capable of separating, but for both material and immaterial reasons they chose not to. On the material side, the Northern, Southern, and Western sections of the country were each interested in maintaining the union because of the tremendous commercial and military strength it provided. On the immaterial side, Tocqueville saw that the states chose to remain united because the people shared a wide variety of common interests and opinions on political, religious, moral, and philosophical matters.

In Tocqueville's eyes the threat to the American Union did not originate in conflict of material interests or in a diversity of interests or of opinions. Rather, the threat was to come from the variety of "characters and passions of the Americans." He stated that:

The men who inhabit the vast territory of the United States are almost all the issue of a common stock; but climate, and more especially slavery, have gradually introduced marked differences between the British settler of the Southern states and the British settler of the North. In Europe it is generally believed that slavery has rendered the interests of one part of the Union contrary to those of the other, but I have not found this to be the case. Slavery has not created interests in the South contrary to those of the North, but it has modified the character and changed the habits of the natives of the South.

If two men are united in society who have
the same opinions, but different characters, different acquirements, and a different style of civilization, it is most probable that these men will not agree. The same remark is applicable to a society of nations.

Slavery, then, does not attack the American Union directly in its interests, but indirectly in its manners.

Tocqueville thus surmises that the Union may well perish if the differences in "character and passion" become so great that the states choose not to continue their confederation. However, the possibility also existed for him that "...the Federal government may be gradually lost by the simultaneous tendency of the united republics to resume their independence."8

Tocqueville could see that the Federal government was losing strength. When the Constitution of 1789 was signed, the nation was extremely vulnerable to anarchy. The Union, while not welcomed with open arms, was warmly accepted because it served to reduce tensions and provide a sense of stability and security. The states and the townships did, however, maintain a great deal of their independence, which, as we have seen, was vital to the idea of covenantal community.

The Federal government established its authority and the nation became quite prosperous in a relatively short time. In the midst of this new found prosperity, the people tended to forget the cause which had made it all possible.
Once the danger of anarchy and foreign intervention had passed, it was easy to forget the commitment that had been made to the founding principles of government of, by, and for the people. Relieved from the threat of oppression, it became all to easy to totally abandon the responsibilities of a political community in favor of the pursuit of a "natural" community. The need for a federal government was no longer readily apparent, and it soon became a burden, just as John Winthrop had predicted it could in seventeenth century America. The principle of the Union was still recognized, but the trend was toward independence on the part of each state.\(^9\)

Thus, with the loss of respect for the Primary Covenant, the existence of the Second Covenant became perverted. The Declaration of Independence became a thing of the past, and the Constitution became a mere convenience that made it easier to reap the material benefits that the Union provided. The Constitution was used as a tool rather than an important part of our national covenant. We were at best just pretending to base our government on first principles, while the unmistakable trend was toward a civil war. Tocqueville warns that:

> If ever America undergoes great revolutions, they will be brought about by the presence of the black race on the soil of the United States; that is to say, they will owe their origin, not to the equality, but to the inequality of condition.

> When social conditions are equal, every man
is apt to live apart, centered in himself and forgetful of the public. If the rules of democratic nations were either to neglect to correct this fatal tendency or to encourage it from a notion that it weans men from political passions and thus wards off revolutions, they might eventually produce the evil they seek to avoid, and a time might come when the inordinate passions of a few men, aided by the unintelligent selfishness or pusillanimity of the greater number, would ultimately compel society to pass through strange vicissitudes. In democratic communities revolutions are seldom desired except by a minority, but a minority may sometimes effect them.

As we shall see later, one of the primary responsibilities of the counselor engaged in someone's search for community is to help to point out and devise ways of avoiding this "fatal tendency" of totally neglecting one's public concerns in favor of one's private interests. A constant theme of this paper is that the search must be for both "natural" and political community.

Abraham Lincoln

Lincoln is vital to the discussion of covenantal community in America because he recognized the importance of the covenantal idea. But, he was forced to confront a world in which this principle was being dramatically challenged. As we have just seen, there was a tendency for the people to forget their covenantal roots both in the general terms of the covenantal example established by the Puritans and in the specific example of the founding of the United States based upon the principles set forth in the Declaration of
Independence.

Lincoln believed that America was a nation formed by a covenant. This covenant was based on a political idea that was set forth in the Declaration of Independence. It was the dedication to these principles that constituted the founding covenant for Lincoln.

Lincoln discussed his conception of the American covenant on a number of occasions. Just prior to assuming the Presidency for the first time, he spoke at Independence Hall in Philadelphia:

I am filled with deep emotion at finding myself standing here in the place where were collected together the wisdom, the patriotism, the devotion to principle, from which sprang the institutions under which we live. You have kindly suggested to me that in my hands is the task of restoring peace to our distracted country. I can say in return, sir, that all the political sentiments I entertain have been drawn, so far as I have been able to draw them, from the sentiments which originated, and were given to the world from this hall in which we stand. I have never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence. I have often pondered over the dangers which were incurred by the men who assembled here and adopted that Declaration of Independence— I have pondered over the toils that were endured by the officers and soldiers of the army who achieved that Independence. I have often inquired of myself, what great principle or idea it was that kept this Confederacy so long together. It was not the mere matter of the separation of the colonies from the mother land; but something in that Declaration giving liberty; not alone to the people of this country, but hope to the world for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that all should have an
equal chance. This is the sentiment embodied in that Declaration of Independence.

Now, my friends, can this country be saved upon that basis? If it can, I will consider myself one of the happiest men in the world if I can help to save it. If it can't be saved upon that principle, it will be truly awful. But, if this country cannot be saved without giving up that principle—I was about to say I would rather be assassinated on this spot than to surrender it.

Now, in my view of the present aspect of affairs, there is no need of bloodshed and war. There is no necessity for it. I am not in favor of such a course, and I may say in advance, there will be no blood shed unless it be forced upon the Government. The Government will not use force unless force is used against it.

My friends, this is a wholly unprepared speech. I did not expect to be called upon to say a word when I came here—I supposed I was merely to do something towards raising a flag. I may, therefore, have said something indiscreet, but I have said nothing but what I am willing to live by, and in the pleasure of Almighty God, die by."

In this speech Lincoln made it perfectly clear that the Primary Covenant for him was the Declaration of Independence. He continued to develop this theme that America is based on a political covenant. In 1861, he attempted to explain his notion of the connection between the covenant and the people by discussing the relationship between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution:

All this is not the result of accident. It has a philosophical cause. Without the Constitution and the Union, we could not have attained the result; but even these, are not the primary cause of our great prosperity. There is something back of these, entwining itself more closely about the human heart.
That something is the principle of "Liberty to all"—the principle that clears the path for all—gives hope to all—and, by consequence, enterprise, and industry to all.

The expression of that principle, in our Declaration of Independence, was most happy, and fortunate. Without this, as well as with it, we could have declared our independence of Great Britain; but without it, we could not, I think, have secured our free government, and consequent prosperity. No oppressed, people will fight and endure, as our fathers did, without the promise of something better, than a mere change of masters.

The assertion of that principle, at that time, was the word, "fitly spoken" which has provoked an "apple of gold" to us. The Union and the Constitution, are the picture of silver, subsequently framed around it. The picture was made, not to conceal, or destroy the apple, but to adorn, and preserve it. The picture was made for the apple—not the apple for the picture.

So let us act, that neither picture, or apple shall ever be blurred, or bruised or broken.

That we may so act, we must study, and understand the points of danger.12

Thus, Lincoln returns to his belief of the importance of the Primary Covenant while stressing the need for a Second Covenant based on the Constitution. In his warning that the Constitution should not become more important than the Declaration of Independence, Lincoln is recognizing Tocqueville's warning about the need to form a bond that will somehow unite the various "characters and passions" of the people.

Another example of this line of thinking can be seen in a speech Lincoln gave entitled "the perpetuation of our
He began this speech by reminding his audience that men fought the Revolutionary War for the right to live by the political ideas of liberty and self-government. These principles remained intact after the war because the victors were there to vividly remind others about the price that had been paid. However, these stories of the struggle for freedom were now long past in the time of Lincoln. His worst fears were coming true before his eyes. People were forgetting the covenantal bonds that gave them their freedom.

Lincoln went on to warn his audience that certainly the Primary Covenant with the Declaration of Independence was being lost, but so was the Second Covenant which was represented by the Constitution and the law. Passion was replacing reason and in general the law was being disregarded. Savage mobs were taking justice into their own hands. Whites and Blacks alike were being hanged. Indeed, the premonitions of Tocqueville were coming true. Wild and furious passions were pervading both the slaveholding and the non-slaveholding states.

Lincoln pleaded for a return to the covenant of the Declaration of Independence and with it a return to respect for the Constitution and the Laws. He asked that the political education of the people in support of our Covenants become our "political religion." His message was that the story of our struggle for freedom should be constantly retold, and each new generation should be taught about the principle
of our founding as set forth in the Declaration of Independence.

**Lincoln and Winthrop**

The similarities of this last speech with the Puritan experience in New England are striking. Lincoln realized, as Winthrop had two hundred years earlier, that after the period of crisis was over a covenant would be the essential element leading to a true sense of community. In Winthrop's era the challenge of the separatists relaxed when they stopped coming to New England. In Lincoln's day the challenge had ended with the increased prosperity of the nineteenth century. However, Winthrop's and Tocqueville's warning became a reality for Lincoln.

Community is least apparent, they had said, when there is a lack of external threats. To maintain a sense of community, the founding covenant must be continually recreated as the times change and people forget their foundations or beginnings. In Lincoln's view, this had not been done and as a result the country was falling prey to its passions and the Second Covenant of the Constitution and the law was being violated as a result of not having a Primary Covenant to support.

Another similarity between Lincoln and Winthrop revolved around the idea of "earned membership." In Puritan New England, individuals became members of the community only
after they had accepted the Primary and Second Covenant. Thus, they had to "earn" their membership in the community by proving their loyalty and commitment. Lincoln strongly supported this idea of "earned membership" as we saw in his belief that our "political religion" should be the political education of each new generation about their responsibilities to the Covenants. However, Lincoln's worst fears came true. First, the New England township which as we have seen provided the foundation for the political education of the American people, was rapidly replaced by the cities of recent immigrants. Second, and most importantly, the forgetting that Lincoln so dreaded became a reality. People lost touch with the source of the freedom and became involved in "getting ahead." The private life replaced the public life. The need for a balance between "natural" and political community was lost.

Thus, Lincoln is a part of the tradition of covenanted community in America. He felt that we gain our sense of community from a political idea and not from kinship ties, religion, tradition, or territory. This political idea takes the form of a covenant whereby we promise ourselves that we will live by a set of principles, ideals, and commitment that we set forth first in the Declaration of Independence and secondly in the Constitution. So, the conception of the covenant as developed by Lincoln implies that in a country as diverse as America, people can only achieve a sense of
community through the development of the political ideas set forth in the founding covenant. Political community thus becomes an active process involving a constant search for ways to renew the covenant during rapidly changing times.

**Summary of Chapter III and the Implications For Action by the Counselor**

This discussion of covenantal community does add some new knowledge for the use of the counselor who is engaged in a search for community. The idea of covenantal community is central to the discussion of community in America. We continue to see the importance of both "natural" and political community for anyone engaged in a search for community. People's natural tendency seems to be toward the satisfaction of self-interest. This means that for the most part political community must be artificially created in America. To do this people must develop the necessary skills. This is best done by fostering the "art of association" which Tocqueville so fondly prescribes. By joining together with other people in a wide variety of joint efforts, both serious and frivolous, we learn how to work with others toward a common goal.

The art of political association or political community is best practiced at the local level in one's town, school, or college. Here one begins to refine the lessons about community building that are basic to the idea of the covenanted
community. With the skills that are learned in these ways, people will be able to fulfill their part of the Second Covenant, which is their relationship with the government as established in the constitution.

This Second Covenant needs to be fulfilled at the local, county, state, and national levels, but we learn the fundamentals of political community at the local level. Since we are naturally self indulgent, the experience of political freedom at the local level helps to remind us of our need for dependency. One of the roles of the counselor is to help people recognize and overcome what Tocqueville has called this fatal tendency to neglect one's public concerns in favor of one's private interests.

We shall see in more depth as the paper progresses why it is so important for the counselor to realize the importance of these lessons of political community. Let it suffice at this point to say that in addition to being an essential ingredient in the search for community, the ability to form political communities is vital to the development of a healthy personality in the American social context.

The idea of the covenant is important because it gives people a legitimate basis for common action. With such diversity of races and cultures in this country, we must find the basis of our unity in our dedication to founding principles and the active support of a covenant with the government. Commitment to founding principles is important, but people
must be educated about how to preserve their role in the Second Covenant. Part of their education involves a search for ways of renewing founding principles in new contexts. Counselors are often in a position to assist people with this search if they are aware of the issues involved and the importance of having access to a body of knowledge that will help explain this search. As I have said earlier, one of the purposes of this paper is to attempt to provide part of that body of knowledge.

It is often too easy to turn the covenant with a government into a procedural instrument for attempting to settle differences in character, passions, and manners, such as ethnic and racial differences. But, in attempting to transform the Second Covenant into a Primary Covenant, people are merely made equal. They are not truly independent to follow and develop their own way of life based on their own system of beliefs and ancestry. The Second Covenant with the government can help to equalize people's interests and opinions, but it cannot win over their souls. Lincoln had learned this lesson and was desperately trying to restore a fundamental belief in the founding covenant.

Ultimately the goal of political community is to unite the various "passions" of the country into some sort of a whole. This can only be attempted with the belief in a covenantal framework. However, even on the smaller scale of an individual's quest for community, there must be commitment
to something beyond one's self and one's family. I believe that one cannot talk about political community in America without reference to the idea of covenanted community. There must be a loyalty to a set of ideas or principles that initially brings a group of people together, and then there must be a commitment to a plan of action that will help them reach their common goal.

As was stated at the outset of this chapter, a sense of community is most apparent when it is most threatened. It is in more relaxed times that the search for community takes on added difficulty. Political community must be artifically created under any circumstances; but with the absence of an external challenge, community building must be based on the renewal of founding principles in new contexts.

America's founding covenant as seen in the general principles of the Puritans and in the specific goals of the Declaration of Independence must be constantly renewed in rapidly changing times. The role of the counselor is to help individuals finds ways of renewing the covenant that will lead to a search for community involving a balance between the private and the public, and not merely an escape into some private realm.

The role of the counselor as a political educator may seem extreme to some, but I will continue to maintain in this paper that unless the counselor helps individuals take the "political" into account in their lives, then the search for
anything resembling a sense of community will be a hollow one. Without something in common for people to unite around, they will fall prey to their own passions and prejudices. The counselor can assist people in finding these common threads.

As we have seen, community must be created in America. People must earn their membership in a community. Or, to put it in another way, the sense of community is based on a political idea and not on kinship ties alone. The idea of a covenant applies most directly to the concept of political community, but the covenantal idea of community also stresses the importance of taking people's natural interests into account. There must be a balance between "natural" and political community. The counselor can assume an important leadership role as an educator and a guide on the search for community.
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CHAPTER IV

POPULISM AND THE IDEA OF COVENANTAL COMMUNITY IN AMERICA

Unfortunately, the Civil War occurred as Tocqueville had predicted and as Lincoln had feared. One of the results of the war was the rise of urbanization and industrialization in the North. This led to an expansion into international markets in an effort to sell the glut of new products in addition to agricultural products. The farmer, however, did not benefit from these changes.

Economically, the American farmer became vulnerable in the late nineteenth century to the fluctuations of the international market as well as to the more predictable plights of weather and dependency on single crops. Politically, the farmers of the Middle West in particular became isolated from the centers of power in the East. This did not mean that the farmers were unaware of the changes being created by urbanization and industrialization. But, it did mean that the Easterners for the most part did not understand the problems of the farmer.¹

The midwest rural world did not have the power or the political tradition of some of the Eastern states to combat the strength of the railroad and other businesses. As a
result, the western states were often controlled by outside railroads and corporations. It was in part the inaccessibility of the outsiders controlling their lives that caused the farmers to begin making radical demands. But, this "elite inaccessibility" was indeed only part of the farmers outrage. The conflict for the farmers seemed to revolve around the issues of community, freedom, and authority, much as it did for the Puritans.

The farmer was accustomed to having mobility and independence, while at the same time having to cooperate with each other along the frontier in order to survive. Out of this background the "grass roots" organization of a political party, which became known as the People's Party or Populism, came quite easily. The farmers were willing to unite against the neofeudal world they saw springing up around them. The railroad and corporate giants were controlling their lives while the effects of rapid industrialization and a depression were literally leaving them in the dust. Thus, the farmers of the midwest were accustomed to freedom, but realized that in order to maintain it they would have to unite in a political community.

The Populist Movement

The Populist movement generated what is perhaps "...the most intense and widespread political involvement in American history." As the historian of the Populist movement in
Texas describes:

Populism sprang from the soil. It came into being in many sections of the state within the space of a brief period almost as if by prearrangement, yet there was no relation between the various local phases of the movement aside from that provided by the common conditions from which all grew. It was, then, in its incipient stages a spontaneous, almost explosive force.5

Populism was a mass movement. Farmers and their families would travel great distances to attend large meetings. There was a proliferation of Populist newspapers and pamphlets that were widely read by the farmers. Local schoolhouses became meetinghouses for lively political activity at the county level throughout the Great Plains and the South. In sum, the Populist Party was a grass roots movement.6

Because the farmers were accustomed to having mobility and relying on self-help, while at the same time seeing the necessity of cooperation along the rugged frontier, they were able to organize politically without much difficulty. They valued their independence and their freedom, but they quickly learned the necessity of a political community if they were to preserve their "natural" community.

The Populists sought specific economic solutions to grievances being voiced by their fellow farmers. They relied heavily on newspapers as their basic organizing tool. Tocqueville recognized the importance of the newspaper in
the creation of political communities. He observed that the newspaper is often the only available vehicle in a democratic society that is able to convince people that it is in their self-interest to participate in a political community. Often the only way to preserve one's "natural" community is through participation in a political community. A newspaper can provide many people with the same information and furnish the means for common action. This is particularly true at the local level where the newspaper serves to reinforce political community. If the responsibility for upholding a Second Covenant with the government belongs to the people, then they require a means of keeping track of the government as well as their own public will. As Tocqueville says:

...within the great national association lesser associations have been established by law in every county, every city, and indeed in every village, for the purpose of local administration. The laws of the country thus compel every American to co-operate every day of his life with some of his fellow citizens for a common purpose, and each one of them requires a newspaper to inform him what all the others are doing.

The Populists responded through their newspapers to what they saw to be a social crisis brought on by rapid industrialization and a depression. They did not resent the process of industrialization itself, but they saw themselves as victims of its effects. As one Populist newspaper
described, "The people do not want to tear down the railroads nor pull down the factories...They want to build up and make better everything." Another Populist newspaper explained that they "shall make of this nation an industrial democracy in which each citizen shall have an equal interest."

In general the Populists held that technology was being used to enslave men, but it could also be used to liberate him.\(^9\)

The Populists opposed the capitalists who were industrializing the United States, but they did not oppose industrialization per se. They did, however, fight against the control of railroads, the power of monopolies, the falling process of crops, the benefits and dangers of inflation, and big business control of politics. Populists demanded:

...a graduated income tax, government ownership or regulation of the railroads and the telegraph, control over monopoly, a lower tariff, increased education, direct election of senators, the secret ballot, the initiative and the referendum, an eight-hour day on government work, support for the labor movement, the free coinage of silver, a plan for government loans to farmers at low interest rates, and restriction on alien and corporate landholding.\(^{10}\)

It is important to emphasize that these issues were all generated by grass roots politics at the local level by farmers. The significance of this fact is that it helps to place the Populists in the tradition of covenantal community in America.
Covenantal Community

The Populist Party or the People's Party believed that a unique type of political society had been created in America. To the Populists America was based on ideals that no other nation or state had ever attempted to live by. As with Lincoln, the basis of these ideals was the American Revolution. They believed that America was a society where people were given the responsibility to govern themselves while at the same time agreeing to be governed as long as their rights of life, liberty, and property were being protected. Also, the Populists believed that the nation's wealth should be equally distributed among a people with equal opportunity to share in the abundance and resources of America. However, it was the absence of these ideals in the reality of American life that led to the formation of a political covenant and the evolution of the political party that became known as the Populist or People's Party.

Thus, the Populist view of society was based on a primary and a secondary covenant. Their primary covenant which served as the bond for their community was based on the ideas, principles, and beliefs set forth in the Declaration of Independence. Their second covenant was their belief that a community should be controlled by the laws of men. In general they believed that competition should be replaced by cooperation and that men should shape their own history.
Specifically, they held the position that poverty is not inevitable but is the responsibility of men and, as such, is reversible.¹²

The farmers' anger at being denied values which they saw as their democratic rights led to their organization into the People's Party. Their intent was to renew the founding covenant by attempting to create a political covenant that would insure their right to a "natural" community.

The covenanted community for the Populists meant the guarantee of their local communities. As they increasingly saw that their lives and fortunes were being controlled from the "outside," the People's Party acted in ways that would put them back in charge of their own lives. This in turn contributed to the sustenance and even the salvation of their natural communities, for it taught them the importance of the interrelationship of "natural" and political community.

The Agrarian Myth

The Populists were not anti-industrial, although they did want to control the effects that industrialization and technology were having on the self-sufficient farmer. Contrary to what Richard Hofstadter wrote, they did not want to return to a "rural utopia."¹³ Hofstadter is probably the best known proponent of the position that sees the Populists as a natural outgrowth of the American "agrarian myth." This myth represented a view of life that was unable to con-
front the reality of industrialism and instead longed for the return to the golden age of the past. In fact, Hofstadter feels that:

The agrarian myth encouraged farmers to believe that they were not themselves an organic part of the whole order of business enterprise and speculation that flourished in the city, partaking of its character and sharing in its risks, but rather the innocent pastoral victims of a conspiracy hatched in the distance.14

Thus, the Populists are seen as a group of utopians who while longing for the past feel that they are victims of a conspiracy to undermine and eventually to destroy their way of life.

However a reading of the Populist literature of the late nineteenth century does not substantiate Hofstadter's thesis. It was not industrialism that the Populists were against, but rather the social context that permitted poverty in the midst of a technology that had the potential to produce conditions of abundance.

The Populist Party...would have the government, that is, the people, assert their rightful dominion over the same, and as the philosophic basis of its claim it prescribes at least two political formulae: One that it is the business of the government to do for himself and which other individuals will not do for him upon just and equitable terms; the other, that the industrial system of a nation, like its political system, should be a government of aid for and by the people alone.15
The Populists were not searching for a return to a utopian vision of the past. They believed that society needed a basic alteration, but they were not against progress.

The people's party...is a grand new party which shall bind together the people for mutual help as well as defense, a party organized to dethrone the money kings, the monopolist despots, the ruling class; and which shall make of this nation an industrial democracy in which each citizen shall have an equal interest, and his own home secured.16

Philosophically the Populists were attempting to transcend the existing social conditions by means of the development of an alternative conception for the future of America. Populism was not the retrogressive social force that Hofstadter would have us believe. It was not searching for a lost utopia resulting from a romanticized notion of the past. Nor did it believe in the "agrarian myth" of the necessity of remaining self-sufficient in the face of industrialization. In fact, the opposite was true. They looked to the past, but they saw a set of political principles in the form of a founding covenant and not a static pre-industrialized idyllic community.

"The Dangers of Factions"

The idea of covenantal community, as we shall see in the next chapter, has certainly not been in the mainstream of American thought. The Puritans, the Lincoln presidency,
and the Populists are several of the limited number of examples of covenantal community in our history. The problems that the Populists faced go back to the debate that occurred at the time of the writing of the Constitution of the United States.

In writing Federalist Paper Number Fifteen in support of the recently completed Constitution, Alexander Hamilton charged that "the defects in our nations system" can be corrected only by increasing the authority of the federal government and decreasing the authority of the states and local communities. Basically he wanted individuals to be primarily responsible to the federal government and to their state and local governments only secondarily. As Hamilton put it, "we must extend the authority of the Union to the persons of the citizens—the only proper objects of government."17

Hamilton saw that the function of government was to force the passions of men to conform to the dictates of reason and justice. In his view it was easier to constrain men acting alone than in groups. Therefore, he, like Madison, spoke out against the dangers of factions. He wrote:

A spirit of faction, which is apt to mingle its poison in the deliberations of all bodies of men, will often hurry the persons of whom they are composed into improprieties and excesses, for which they would blush in a private capacity.18
Hamilton made his case for the centralization of power under the Federal government and against the sovereignty of individual states and local communities, which had been the case under the Articles of Confederation, by warning of the dangers of political community. He wrote that:

...in every political association which is formed upon the principle of uniting in a common interest a number of lesser sovereignties, there will be found a kind of eccentric tendency in the subordinate or inferior orbs, by the operation of which there will be a perpetual effort in each to fly off from the common centre. This tendency is not difficult to be accounted for. It has its origin in the love of power. Power controlled or abridged is almost always the rival and enemy of that power by which it is controlled or abridged. This simple proposition will teach us, how little reason there is to expect, that the persons intrusted with the administration of the affairs of the particular members of a confederacy will at all times be ready, with perfect good-humor, and an unbiased regard to the public weal, to execute the resolutions or decrees of the general authority. The reverse of this results from the constitution of human nature.19

Hamilton is right about human nature being geared toward individual self-interest, but his solution to this problem was to dismiss the concept of the covenantal community. Since the thirteen states were not able to work together as a Confederation, Hamilton assumed that the alternative was to create a Union. This Union would centralize power in a way that would remove the temptation from each State to act primarily in its own self-interest. Under this
system the people would be far removed from their government and any sense of participation. There would virtually be no evidence of a Second Covenant between the people and the government because the idea of political community would be discouraged. People would be free to develop their "natural" communities, but they would not have the independence that can only be won by participation in a political community.

It is for this independence that the Populists were fighting. They were indeed searching for community, but they understood the importance of both "natural" and political community. They knew that the only way to be truly free at home in their local communities was to begin to organize politically at the grass roots level. These various grass roots organizations eventually joined together with enough shared common beliefs to become a substantial political force in the late nineteenth century. But the key to their success was their high degree of local participation and their commitment to a common set of beliefs; or, if you will, the promotion of a secondary and a primary covenant.

The Role of Government

Government, in the Populist view, must be more than a neutral observer protecting the status quo. They saw government as having a great untapped potential that if used could bring about a state of equality. Its mission was to serve man, and not merely to protect individual citizens and their
property. A Populist governor of Kansas spoke to this theme in 1899:

The trouble has been, we have so much regard for the rights of property that we have forgotten the liberties of the individual.... I claim it is the business of the Government to make it possible for me to live and sustain the life of the family.... I say now, it is the duty of the government to protect the meek, because the strong are able to protect themselves.... The People's party has stepped into the breach between the classes to demand justice for the poor as well as to the rich and for every man. 20

Thus, the Populist's contended that government must be an active force working in behalf of the underprivileged and for the equal distribution of the nation's wealth. Or, to put it another way, the government has the responsibility to assume a sufficient amount of authority to insure the existence of free, "natural" communities. However, the people can only be sure of the maintenance of this freedom through the participation in political communities at the local, county, state, and federal level. It is through the union of "natural" and political community under an authority that encourages both that freedom truly emerges and people can say that they have found a sense of community.

**Political Education**

The Populist Party was not a typical political movement. The Populist's were constantly trying to arouse and organize public opinion. They did not rely exclusively on the excite-
ment of an election to encourage the discussion of issues. Populism became an important educating force at a time in American history when the Democratic and Republican parties were avoiding the discussion of the major issues of the day. Populist newspapers were the primary means for keeping reform issues visible to the public. Basically, Populism was a political movement of tremendous intellectual excitement. Farmers were constantly meeting in groups to discuss issues, and newspaper editors worked diligently to help events of national importance before their public while offering commentary on the policies of the government and the economic condition of the nation. Even though the Populist Party was short lived, ending with the presidential election of 1896, it provided a level of commitment and purpose that gave its members a sense of community that has rarely been matched in the history of America.

Progressivism

With the defeat of the Populist Party in 1896, a new political philosophy called Progressivism arose. Like the Populists, the progressives realized that they could not return to the rural homogeneity of pre-Civil War America. They saw too that urbanization and industrialization were fragmenting the country into the rich and the poor. New immigrants and new bureaucracies were creating urban political machines, private interest groups, and giant corpora-
Progressivism, however, turned out to be a perversion of Populism. The Progressives used procedural reform in the tradition of Madison and Hamilton to replace community. They attempted to beat big business with big government, but at the expense of community.

Realizing that there was no going "home" again to the rural past, the Progressives sought to create the lost sense of harmony by the use of a neutral, administrative state. Or, as the political theorist Michael Rogin states:

...while the progressives may have been fearful of organizations and bureaucracies, they bureaucratized the reform impulse. Society left to itself could not be trusted to preserve the consensus; reform must be removed from the concrete social struggles of deprived groups. Thus is the desire for the lost harmony of the preindustrial America made contemporary. Reform was seen as the outcome not of conflict but of consensus management. American liberals and the pluralists themselves owe too much to this progressive legacy. The progressives were quite relevant to the future of America; unfortunately, relevance is not the only virtue.

There was a loss of confidence in people's ability to organize themselves into political communities. The progressives no longer believed that conflict would lead to change. Rather, they placed their faith in maintaining a consensus among the people. They believed that this consensus was the basis of the lost harmony of pre-industrial America. In this way they thought they were preserving the tradition of "natural"
community in America by taking over the tradition of political community.

The Progressives proposed a version of direct democracy as an alternative to the grass roots organization of the Populists. They realized that it was impossible to return to the town meeting democracy of the New England townships, but the Progressives nonetheless idealized the citizen participation of the Populists without an appreciation for its dynamics. The result was that the people were only asked to elect expert and efficient leaders to run the government for them.

Let us return briefly to the discussion of "mere democracy" that involved Winthrop, Madison, and Tocqueville. The factions that Madison was so worried about had become a reality in the form of special interest groups and political parties. The Progressives were doing exactly what Madison prescribed and Winthrop and Tocqueville warned against, i.e., letting people feel that they are involved in the protection of their private rights by electing leaders to take charge of their political obligations.

Tocqueville warned against the democratic tendency to emphasize "natural" community over political community. He felt that once there was a split between democratic people's public and private worlds, they would be too vulnerable to a form of "democratic despotism." He meant by this the tendency of democratic people to too easily become equal and
alike, each pursuing their own private interests. Tocqueville warns that:

In modern society everything threatens to become so much alike that the peculiar characteristics of each individual will soon be entirely lost in the general aspect of the world. Our forefathers were always prone to make an improper use of the notion that private rights ought to be respected; and we are naturally prone, on the other hand, to exaggerate the idea that the interest of a private individual ought always to bend to the interest of the many.

The political world is metamorphosed; new remedies must henceforth be sought for new disorders. To lay down extensive but distinct and settled limits to the action of the government; to confer certain rights on private persons, and to secure to them the undisputed enjoyment of those rights; to enable individual man to maintain whatever independence, strength, and original power he still possesses; to raise him by the side of society at large, and uphold him in that position; these appear to me the main objects of legislators in the ages upon which we are now entering.

It would seem as if the rulers of our time sought only to use men in order to make things great; I wish that they would try a little more to make great men; that they would set less value on the work and more upon the workman; that they would never forget that a nation cannot long remain strong when every man belonging to it is individually weak; and that no form or combination of social polity has yet been devised to make an energetic people of a community of pusillanimous and enfeebled citizens.

Tocqueville goes on to stress that if individuals remain weak and the state remains strong then there will be increasing movement toward a condition of equality or uniformity. The ties of race and class will be relaxed and
"the great bond of humanity" will be strengthened.\textsuperscript{26} But, this is not community.

The possibility of universal uniformity both "saddens and chills" Tocqueville.\textsuperscript{27} He sees this as a distinct possibility if a balance between "natural" and political community is not achieved by the individual. People cannot give their government the total responsibility to lead, expertly and efficiently, in their behalf and still hope to remain free.

The Progressive alternative to the grass roots organization of the Populists failed to heed Tocqueville's warning. Theodore Roosevelt was one of the Progressives who felt that the government needed to be protected from the various pressures of special interest groups for the people's own good. The result was that people were encouraged to elect and then trust experts to run their government. The Progressives in general were attempting to recreate a harmony of interests, or a consensus, among the people which they felt was being lost. However, they made no distinction between people acting for themselves and elected experts acting in their behalf. They lost sight of the need for the covenant of political community as the necessary companion to the search for "natural" community.\textsuperscript{28}

Questions of social reform for the Progressives became matters to be solved objectively by considering the facts. Whereas, similar questions had been seen as conflicts between opposing values by the Populists. For example, in a rate
dispute between the railroads and the shippers in 1910, Louis Brandeis, using principles of scientific management declared that their need not be a conflict at all. If the railroads would only be more efficient, he argued, there would be no need for a rate increase. As Rogin so nicely puts it, "Reform...became a technical question. Good and evil corresponded to knowledge and ignorance, not to the struggle of one class or group against another." In this way, the Progressives made "social engineering" more important than political community.

Progressive faith in a neutral government, run by experts, was intended to preserve the people's right to control their government in a time when the bureaucracies of a rapidly industrializing America were making more and more of the decisions. However, as we have seen, there is a big difference between making decisions for oneself and having decisions made in your best interest by someone else. The covenant of political community is lost as soon as we place our faith in neutral and efficient decisions that are made in our behalf. The individual is too easily removed from the public arena under these circumstances. The implicit assumption soon becomes that no one would want to do anything that is inefficient, so how in the world can the government be criticized.

The problem was not, however, that the consensual dream of the progressives became an authoritarian impulse.
On the contrary, there was an absence of authority. There was no one to hold up any standards or principles beyond "efficiency" to serve as the basis of a primary covenant. Then on top of this, any hope of a second covenant between the people and the government was being destroyed by the people's faith in experts.

The Progressive preoccupation with the search for a lost sense of harmony, or what Rogin also calls the "Lockean consensus,"\(^\text{32}\) blinded them to the fact that norms of efficiency and expertise could not supply values. In doing so, they separated themselves from the tradition of covenantal community and the Populists.

As we shall see in the next chapter, the problems which led to the break up of the Populist Party and the creation of the Progressive philosophy are a part of the Lockean liberal tradition in America. It is this liberal tradition in America that is most responsible for the existence of so relatively few examples of covenanted community in America.

**Summary of Chapter IV and the Implications for Action by the Counselor**

What then are the lessons for the counselor in this section on the Populist and the Progressives? The belief in covenanted community has been strengthened and its dynamics continue to become a little clearer in this section of the paper. The discussion focused on the issues of community, freedom, authority and their interrelationships.
The farmers in the midwest were accustomed to freedom, but they realized that political community was necessary for the maintenance of their "natural" communities. They understood that freedom truly emerges through the union of "natural" and political community under the leadership of an authority that encourages both. It is under these circumstances that people can say that they have found a sense of community.

This is a lesson that counselors would do well to keep in mind. All too often people who are searching for community either settle for "natural" community as their goal, or are ignorant of the role that political community must play in the search for community. For example, as we shall see in more detail in the next chapter, there is a tradition in America of people attempting to escape the responsibilities of political community in favor of the comforts of "natural" community.

The Populists realized the importance of grass roots politics. They knew that the only way to be truly free at home in their local communities was to begin to organize politically at the grass roots level. It was their high degree of local participation and their commitment to commonly held sets of beliefs that led to their success in establishing a community.

Because the Populist Party grew out of a well organized set of local communities, it contributed to the sustenance
or even the salvation of these localities. Local organization is important as an educating force. It teaches people the importance that a set of shared common beliefs reinforced by a political community have for the creation of a sense of community. This, of course, forms the basis of the primary and secondary covenant of a covenantal community.

The counselor can help people realize the importance of learning how to form political community for the purpose of preserving a set of beliefs that are shared in common with others. It is the political community that represents the basis for establishing a second covenant with the government in America. But, these lessons must be learned first at the local level and then carried into the larger political arena. The counselor can, if necessary, help to create opportunities for this political education. For example, in an educational setting such as a school or a college, one of the roles of the counselor should be to encourage students to make sure that opportunities exist for them to experience the struggle for political community as well as the comforts of "natural" community.

The Populist critique of industrial America went beyond economic conditions to include the alienation of the individual farmer and worker from a system of government that had promised freedom from oppression and a sense of human dignity. The farmers' anger at being denied values which they saw as their democratic rights led to their organization
at the local level. Their intent was to renew the founding
covention by attempting to create a political covenant that
would insure their right to a "natural" community.

The existence of a strong "natural" community is cer-
tainly a prerequisite for a sense of community. But, the
Populists experienced the importance of political community
as well. Although their interest in covenantal community
meant first the guarantee of their local communities, the
Populists learned the importance of the interrelationship
between "natural" and political community.

The counselor can help people understand the need for
this interrelationship. This can best be done, as the
Populists demonstrated, through encouragement to participate
in political communities which are initiated at the local
level. This can take the form of encouraging people to get
involved in local, school, or college government or other
political organizations. It is here that the lessons of
political community are first learned.

It is important to understand that counseling in America
takes place in a political context that cannot be ignored.
It is the position of this paper that living in a democratic
society, and specifically in America, means that one must
understand the influence that this system has on any search
for community. Counselors need to take this into considera-
tion when they are engaged in such a quest.

Tocqueville warned against the tendency in America to
emphasize "natural" community over political community. Strong leadership is needed to prevent an extreme split between people's public and private concerns. The counselor is often in an ideal position to encourage people to take an interest in their public world as well as their private world. Often individuals need to set limits so their task of balancing "natural" and political community is a manageable one. Then within these limits they need to experience a person in a position of authority who will encourage them to reach their full potential. The counselor can be just such a person. It is perhaps difficult for some readers to think of the counselor in terms of being an authority figure. But, I will continue to enlarge on this theme as the paper progresses.

The idea of covenantal community stresses the primary need for shared common beliefs if a community is to exist. The Progressives demonstrated the difficulty in trying to renew a covenant in rapidly changing times. It is dangerous to try to recreate the past, but they made the mistake of dismissing the tradition of covenantal community in the process. This left them without an authority in a position of leadership to encourage both "natural" and political community while constantly pointing to the need for a primary covenant of shared common beliefs. Once again, the counselor can serve in this role as an authority. When there is a leadership void, the person searching for community can
too easily get lost in the procedural traps of Hamilton, Madison, and the Progressives. In these instances a covenantal philosophy was traded for a belief in expertise.

The Populists showed that it is possible to renew the idea of covenantal community in changing times. In doing so, they are an important educating force in our own history. Hopefully, counselors working with people searching for community can learn from these lessons in our history. We, as counselors, need to help people find suitable bases of shared common belief and then create political communities that will help to support these beliefs. It is possible to have a better life through the use of political communities and a more comfortable life through the pursuit of a "natural" community. But, it is only through the search for both that a sense of community can be found.

Covenantal community does not literally mean that we have to believe in the ideas of the Puritans, Lincoln, or the Populists. But, they have established a model that is very useful for the counselor. It is a successful model because it is able to combine "natural" and political community into a working whole. Another look at Figure 5 may be helpful in explaining the model of covenantal community.
The desire for a "natural" community must be combined with the obligations of a Primary Covenant that revolves around a set of shared common beliefs. Then, a Second Covenant establishes as a set of rules or laws in the form of a political community to insure that man in all his imperfection will indeed attempt to live up to the stated beliefs. It is through participation in a political community, with the assistance of a leader or an authority, that people can confront their tendency to pursue their own private interests and get involved in the public protection of their "natural" community.

So, there is a four step process that begins and ends with the desire for "natural" community. The role of the counselor in this process is:

- to let people know that there is indeed a successful model of community building in America's history;
- to recognize people's tendency toward self-interest;
- to remind people of the primary need for shared common beliefs in any search for community;
- to understand that a means of enforcing these beliefs must be established;
- to educate people about the importance of political community as being just such a vehicle;
- to encourage the need for both "natural" and political community;
- to attempt to create opportunities for successful community whenever possible;
- to help people on their own unique searches for community.
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PART THREE

ANTI-COMMUNITARIAN TRENDS

IN AMERICA
There are strong anti-communitarian trends in America that have prevented the growth of the covenantal idea of community. As was stated in Part Two there are only a few examples of covenantal community in America. The examples of the Puritans, Lincoln, and the Populists are the exceptions rather than the rule. Chapter V will discuss the Lockean liberal tradition as being the source of anti-communitarian tendencies among the American people. The use of the concept of community in this paper refers to covenantal community. So, something that is anti-communitarian is in opposition to the development of the idea of covenantal community.

This section will also discuss the tradition of utopian community that developed in response to this classical liberal tradition, which today is known as the conservative tradition. Utopian community has tended to act as an escape from the demands of the liberal society. Although the Populists were not attempting to establish a "rural utopia" as Hofstadter charged, there is indeed such a tradition in our history.

Finally, the effects of the liberal tradition on the field of counseling will be discussed. This has most visibly
taken the form of various human relations techniques. A wide variety of scientific management techniques, "sensitivity" techniques, and "human potential" techniques have found their way into the field of counseling. These developments are also part of the anti-communitarian trends in America.
Footnotes

CHAPTER V

THE LIBERAL TRADITION IN AMERICA

America has been called a great experiment in the working out of the liberal tradition.\(^1\) The roots of the liberal tradition in America lie in the conditions created by the absence of a feudal tradition. The political theorist Louis Hartz feels that this void is what accounts for our national uniqueness when compared to our European roots. He writes that:

> When the Americans celebrated the uniqueness of their own society, they were on the track of a personal insight of the profoundest importance for the nonfeudal world in which they lived shaped every aspect of their social thought: it gave them a frame of mind that cannot be found anywhere else in the eighteenth century, or in the wider history of modern revolutions.\(^2\)

Tocqueville agreed with this line of thinking. He had observed that America never had a royalty to serve as the focus of our national dignity and unity. Lacking a king as well as the need to struggle against a privileged class, the Americans, he wrote:

> ...were never divided by any privileges, they have never known the mutual relation of master and inferior; and as they neither dread nor
hate each other, they have never known the
necessity of calling in the supreme power
to manage their affairs. The lot of the
Americans is singular: they have derived
from the aristocracy of England the notion
of private right and the taste for local
freedom; and they have been able to retain
both because they have had no aristocracy
to combat.3

This state of affairs was responsible for creating the social
condition of equality, which united Americans in a manner
that dramatically affected the development of our nation.

As Tocqueville says, the Americans are unique because
they were "born equal". For the most part the early emigrants
had no history of superiority among themselves. People of
power and influence generally do not voluntarily go into
exile. However, in the few cases that they did, laws were
created to limit their influence. With the land naturally
being broken up into small pieces for the owner to work him-
self, the formations of a landed aristocracy became impossi-
ble. Also, strict control of the laws of inheritance pre-
vented the gradual accumulation of land in any one family.
This helped to create a sort of mentality of equality in
America.4

In fact, the drive for equality became obsessive.

Tocqueville instructs us that:

There is...a manly and lawful passion for
equality that invites men to wish all to be
powerful and honored. This passion tends to
elevate the humble to the work of the great;
but there exists also in the human heart a
depraved taste for equality, which impels the weak to attempt to lower the powerful to their own level and reduces men to prefer equality in slavery to inequality with freedom. Not that those nations whose social condition is democratic naturally despise liberty; on the contrary, they have an instinctive love of it. But liberty is not the chief and constant object of their desires; equality is their idol: they make rapid and sudden efforts to attain liberty and, if they miss their aim, resign themselves to their disappointment; but nothing can satisfy them without equality, and they would rather perish then lose it.

Americans might have been willing to endure slavery or servitude in order to preserve their equality, but they would not endure aristocracy. The break with the feudal traditions was clean and final. However, this left them without any of their traditional cultural supports. In an attempt to fill this void in a strange land, the Americans turned inward to the development of individualism.

The Growth of Individualism

Tocqueville makes an important distinction between selfishness and individualism. Selfishness is basically a "love of self" that causes man to place his own self-interest above everything else; while individualism "disposes each member of the community to sever himself from the mass of his fellows and to draw apart with his family and his friends, so that after he has thus formed a little circle of his own, he willingly leaves society at large to itself." As social conditions became increasingly more equal in America, indi-
individualism continued to develop at the same rate. The class-
less society meant that there were no superiors and no in-
feriors and no socially prescribed dependencies. Under these
conditions people can begin to rely totally on their own
resources. The effect of this is often that people become
so engrossed in their private affairs that they have no time
left for public business.  

The concept of America as a land of unlimited opportun-
ity for the strong, ambitious, self-reliant individual to
fight his way to the top emerged out of this social condition
of equality and individualism. In brief, this process can be
referred to as the liberal tradition in America.

Classical Liberalism

To understand America we must understand liberalism.
But, it will be helpful to think in terms of classical liberal-
ism to distinguish it from the liberalism of today. Classical
liberalism has with some changes become the conservatism of
today. Classical liberalism was the social philosophy that
was developed to assist Western man in the transition from
an agrarian to an industrialized society. Its chief proponent
was the English philosopher John Locke. For Locke the indi-
vidual stands alone. All associations, from the family to
civil society, are seen as artificial rather than natural in
origin. There is no notion of a community of people united
by a bond of sociality and co-operating for the purpose of
achieving certain common ends.
According to Locke's goals of political community, men choose to leave the state of nature and enter the political association "for their comfortable, safe, and peaceable living, one amongst another, in a secure enjoyment of their properties, and a greater security against any that are not of it." Elsewhere he describes man's motive for leaving his "natural" condition of isolation in even simpler terms: "The reason why men enter into society is the preservation of their property", it being the function of society's to make laws and establish rules "as guards and fences to the properties of all the society, to limit the power and moderate the domination of every party and member of society". Locke further speculated that the mind was a "tabula rasa", a blank slate, upon which the individual experienced the world without a responsibility to respond. As the contemporary political philosopher Sheldon Wolin tells us, "Locke had confined man to a middling sort of condition, incapable of omniscience or perfection, a state of mediocrity, which is not capable of extremes...."

Classical liberalism established a theory of "opposition" between society and the individual. It assumed that individuals have an existence that is quite separate from the society in which they live. The "social contract" theory of eighteenth century liberalism held that the state is the product of a contractual agreement among rational individuals who are not naturally dependent on society.
Locke's concept of free individuals in a state of nature was used to separate people from the various associations of class, church, guild, and location that defined their lives in European feudal society. However, when Locke's philosophy was brought to America, which had no feudal traditions, his concept of the free individual in a state of nature virtually became fact. The American frontier represented the state of nature, and agreements such as the Mayflower Compact and the covenants of New England served as social contracts. Locke even went so far as to write, "Thus, in the beginning, all the world was America."\(^\text{13}\)

**The Lockean Consensus**

Hartz argues that Locke's philosophy fit so well in America that it was not recognized for what it was, liberalism. Hartz maintains that the absence of feudal institutions created not only a condition of equality but a basic social homogeneity.\(^\text{14}\) In fact there was "...no extended family, little landed aristocracy, no peasant class, no nobility, no national established church, no hereditary officer caste."\(^\text{15}\)

As a result of the social condition of equality and homogeneity, there was, according to Hartz, a consensus on "Lockean liberalism" in America. This Lockean consensus was created by the middle-class character of America and by the absence of a struggle against feudalism. Hartz never clearly defines Lockean liberalism, but Rogin is most helpful. His
summary of Hartz' views on Lockean liberalism describe a:

...dominance of notions of individualism, property, natural rights, equality before the law and equality of opportunity, and the absence of strong attachments to social institutions of a *gemeinschaft* character [see Chapter VIII below]. This was a society of individualists who lacked an emotional and moral attachment to prescriptive social institutions. The aim was mastery of the environment, with success the result of individual effort not special privilege.16

The impact of classical liberalism in America was powerful. With individualism being equated with success, there was an emphasis on means rather than ends, and efficiency virtually became an end in itself. Indeed, it was the "Lockean consensus" that eased the way for industrialization in America. Industrialization became inevitable as a result of what Rogin calls "the Lockean entrepreneurial ethic:"

In a Lockean society, the dream of individual success made common class action both difficult and apparently unnecessary. Hartz' analysis suggests the importance of a consensus in muting social conflict. With no basic conflict between powerful classes and traditional institutions in America, there was relatively little opposition to industrial change. Although the social and economic homogeneity of the early republic became diluted, the consensus that it has produced remained powerful.17

The classical liberal tradition has nearly reached perfection in America today. It has become more sophisticated, but it is still with us. What began as an industrial age encouraged by liberalism has now become a full fledged
technological society. The liberal tendency toward consensus or uniformity has reached awesome efficiency in the form of a unified society in America. It has become a way of life.

Tocqueville had seen that the tendency toward unanimity was the chief problem facing the future of America. He wrote that:

When the inhabitant of a democratic country compares himself individually with all those about him, he feels with pride that he is the equal of any one of them, but when he comes to survey the totality of his fellows and to place himself in contact with so huge a body, he is instantly overwhelmed by the sense of his own insignificance and weakness. The same equality that renders him independent of each of his fellow citizens, taken severally, exposes him alone and unprotected to the influence of the greater number. The public, therefore, among a democratic people, has a singular power, which aristocratic nations cannot conceive; for it does not persuade others to its beliefs, but it imposes them and makes them permeate the thinking of everyone by a sort of enormous pressure of the mind of all upon the individual intelligence.18

Thus, while there are no apparent bonds uniting people who live in a condition of equality, there is indeed the potential for extreme uniformity. Tocqueville attempts to clarify the paradox:

Equality urges [men] on, but at the same time it holds them back; it spurs them, but at the same time it fastens them to earth; it kindles their desires, but limits their powers.
This, however, is not perceived at first; the passions that tend to sever the citizens
of a democracy are obvious enough, but the hidden force that restrains and unites them is not discernable at a glance.  

People were held together in America originally by the knowledge that they were similar participants in a uniform way of life. There was mutuality in America, but it was based on uniformity and conformity to what we have called "Lockean liberalism." This inspired a peculiar sense of community. As Hartz so nicely puts it, "men began to be held together, not by the knowledge that they were different parts of a corporate whole, but by the knowledge that they were similar participants in a uniform way of life." However, Hartz cautions us that "a sense of community based on a sense of uniformity is a deceptive thing." It encourages equality and individualism while firmly holding people to a common standard that discourages diversity. As a result, people were swept into a quest for consensus rather than being encouraged to search for community. Uniformity carried to its extreme means the atrophy of the desire among people to bond together in a sense of mutual commitment to a political cause. This effectively means the end of the desire to search for political community and thus the breakdown of covenantal community.

There is a psychological as well as a political danger posed to America by the condition of unanimity that has led to the breakdown of covenantal community. The dream of individual success makes it difficult and apparently un-
necessary for people to join together in active pursuit of a common cause. The Lockean consensus in America has the effect of subduing social conflict. As Hartz explains, this creates an "absence of opposing principles" that settles any philosophic questions in advance. This in turn creates what Erik Erikson calls "the machine ideal of 'functioning without friction.'" This leads to a general state of political apathy that originates "in a general feeling that, after all, matters of apparent choice have probably been fixed in advance—a state of affairs which becomes fact, indeed, if influential parts of the electorate acquiesce upon it because they have learned to view the world as a place where grown-ups talk of choice, but 'fix' things so as to avoid overt friction."21

The psychological danger is that it can become very tempting to accept solutions offered by the technological society, that the liberal tradition made possible, rather than engaging in the search for community, that in Erikson's terms is a necessity for the development of a healthy personality. Basically, Erikson holds that the development of a healthy personality must be supported by a healthy society; and that a healthy society must value and encourage both "natural" and political community. This theme will be developed in considerable detail in Chapter IX.
Summary of Chapter V and the Implications for Action by the Counselor

The role of the counselor is to try to understand the process whereby political apathy is created in America and attempt to regenerate the desire for political as well as "natural" community as he joins people on their individual searches for community. The Lockean liberal tradition which was accepted as fact in America, is very useful in explaining this condition of political apathy.

As we have seen, conditions were ripe in America for the acceptance of Locke's philosophy of liberalism. The lack of a feudal tradition created a condition of equality where both the private rights and the local freedom of the English aristocracy were maintained. In fact, in an effort to permanently rid themselves of any trace of the feudal tradition, the early American emigrants valued equality even more than freedom. There was tremendous social pressure for people to act the same and even think the same, with no one being better than anyone else. This mentality of equality created a tendency toward uniformity or consensus. Even though everyone was equal to everyone else, individually people were very vulnerable to the opinions of the majority, or what Tocqueville called "the tyranny of the majority." Under these circumstances, people readily adopted the common social standard.

The counselor may need to encourage people to be different when the pressures of the desire for uniformity in
America seem to be inhibiting the development of their full potential. Diversity is an important ingredient of the search for community because it forces people to form political alliances to protect their private interests. When there is only uniformity, the need for political community is not as obvious. Tocqueville had warned us about the dangers of uniformity in a democracy:

> Whenever social conditions are equal, public opinion presses with enormous weight upon the minds of each individual; it surrounds, directs, and oppresses him; and this arises from the very constitution of society much more than from its political laws. As men grow more alike, each man feels himself weaker in regard to all the rest; as he discerns nothing by which he is considerably raised above them or distinguished from them, he mistrusts himself as soon as they assail him. Not only does he mistrust his strength, but he even doubts of his right; and he is very near acknowledging that he is in the wrong, when the greater number of his countrymen assert that he is so. The majority do not need to force him; they convince him. In whatever way the powers of a democratic community may be organized and balanced, then, it will always be extremely difficult to believe what the bulk of the people reject or to profess what they condemn.23

As social conditions became more equal in America, people began to rely on their own resources because there were no prescribed dependencies. The resulting form of individualism meant that people were able to withdraw into their own "natural" communities where they became so engrossed in their private affairs that they had no time left for involvement in political communities. It is here that
the seeds of political apathy are sewn. The counselor needs to intervene at this point to educate the person searching for community about the needs for both "natural" and political community. However, to do this effectively the counselor needs to have an understanding of the liberal tradition in America. Figure 6 may help in this process.

The Liberal Tradition

Equality → Individualism → withdrawal into "Natural" Community

↑

Uniformity ← Loss of Political Community

↓

Fig. 6. Illustration of the liberal tradition in America.

The basic ingredients of equality and individualism lead to a withdrawal into "natural" community and the quest for individual success. This in turn means that there is little time or energy left for political community. With a lack of social conflict or opposing principles and a general consensus about the goals of life, a uniformity developed among the people that led to the further development of equality and individualism. Now this is not to say that equality is not a noble goal; but, there are different routes to its realization.

The liberal tradition insisted that equality was more
important than freedom. In fact, one could only be free after he had achieved a state of equality and thus thrown off the shackles of feudalism. This was to be accomplished by the development of a social conformity that would insure this state of equality. The only problem being that one had to give up the right of political community in the process.

The tradition of covenantal community holds that freedom is the result of diversity and not uniformity. One is truly free only when he has the right to be different. Covenantal freedom requires both diversity and equality, and is a product of the interrelationship of both "natural" and political community.

Along with the development of the ethic of individualism grew the American dream of individual success. This made it unnecessary for people to join together in the active pursuit of a common cause; which, in a nutshell, defines the liberal tradition in America. Liberalism, or the conservatism of today, discourages social conflict, encourages consensus, equates individualism with success, emphasizes means rather than ends, and values efficiency as an end in itself. The consensus around liberal ideals and the resulting social homogeneity created a situation in America where it was very tempting to accept experts' solutions to the problems of political community so one could more "freely" engage in a search for a "natural" community. As a result, there was little emphasis on political community. Generally, political
community was seen as a waste of time and energy that usually did not "pay off." It is out of this process that political apathy has become a problem in America.

The counselor can begin to attack the problem of political apathy by attempting to understand the American social-political context and then looking for a solution to the problem of community that meets the individual counselee's unique needs for community. People caught up in the quest for consensus or uniformity can too easily become totally involved in their private world to the neglect of their public world. One must feel that he belongs to both a "natural" and a political community. "Natural" community is essential in that it provides the context for the foundation of the development of a healthy personality. But, as we have seen, an individual can reach his full potential only through active participation in a political community. However, the desire for uniformity can prevent the organization of political communities.

The role of the counselor in this situation becomes once again that of the educator and the guide. People must understand what is happening to them in their social-political worlds as well as in their personal-familial worlds. The counselor can be in a position to provide people with some of the knowledge needed for a quest for community and to assist them in their unique search.

It is certainly fair to say that a peculiar sense of
community has emerged out of the liberal tradition in America. A bond is created among people, but it is a product of a search for consensus rather than a search for community. As Tocqueville reminds us:

> When social conditions are equal, every man is apt to live apart, centered in himself and forgetful of the public. If the rules of democratic nations were either to neglect to correct this fatal tendency or to encourage it from a notion that it weans men from political passions and thus wards of revolutions, they might eventually produce the evil they seek to avoid.\(^{24}\)

This "fatal tendency" of the liberal tradition toward individualism causes the atrophy of the desire to create political community and thus destroys any hope of regaining a sense of covenantal community.

This loss of covenantal community has created a void in our society that is reflected in the number of people who are searching for something they call community. It is clear that the liberal tradition has not led to a sense of community. The efforts to fill this void have for the most part been unsuccessful. The prime example of an effort to create what I call substitute communities, i.e. substitutes for the consensus of the liberal tradition, is the tradition of utopian communities in America. The individualistic society that has been produced by the liberal tradition has seemingly created its opposite in the form of these utopian communities. But, as we shall see in the next section, utopian community
can no more be called communitarian in the covenantal sense than can the liberal consensus.
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CHAPTER VI

THE TRADITION OF UTOPIAN COMMUNITY IN AMERICA

Utopian thought in America has defined much of our continuing search for community. People's dreams for the perfection of society and the establishment of the ideal living situation have included visions of living and working closely with other people in a social order that is created by its inhabitants, rather than being externally imposed by some outside authority. Utopians generally assume that by creating the perfect society man's natural cooperative instincts will become apparent; because it is only in imperfect societies that man is competitive. Thus, utopians generally believe that it is liberal society and not people that are the cause of human problems and thus people are basically good while it is society that makes them evil.

Utopians represent an attempt to escape from the evils of an existing society in an attempt to create a better one. They represent the rejection of the established social order and the search for the perfect human existence. Most often when people have decided that their ideal of social unity could become a reality, their vision of Utopia has included
the concept of community as the organizing theme. So, for many people in America, the concept of community is virtually synonomous with the utopian community.

As we shall see, there is a long history of utopianism in America. I am concerned here with the negative or escapist portion of the utopian tradition, and not with what Keniston, Slater, and Cohen and Hale refer to as "the tragedy of the decline in utopian impulse in America."\(^1\) There may indeed be a need for a positive utopian vision in America, but the utopianism that has served as a substitute for and an escape from the liberal tradition of equality, individualism, and conformity has not had such a vision.

The liberal tradition is very much with us today. Erikson feels that the "increasing demand for conformity, uniformity, and standardization which characterizes...our 'individualistic' civilization" has caused many people to escape into a private utopia.\(^2\) Certainly the technicism, instrumentalism, and methodology of much of life in America has given reason for people to feel that someone or something else is in charge of their lives. The reaction of man being ruled by the technology of his day is often nostalgic yearning for a simpler life that leads to utopianism. Utopias are a mechanism of escape, and as such are an important tradition in our culture for the counselor to understand.
Nineteenth Century Religious Utopian Communities

Hundreds of utopian communities have been founded in America including religious sects as early as the seventeenth century and the contemporary commune movement. The sociologist, Rosabeth Moss Kanter, cites three traditions of utopian communities: the religious, the socialistic, and the contemporary commune movement. The utopian communities in early nineteenth century America were based on religious ideals. The Bible was used as the source for creating utopian societies based on the ideals of harmony, cooperation, and a community of people with common beliefs. Most of these early utopias were separatist in nature in that they were composed of Europeans seeking freedom from oppression by the powerful churches and freedom to establish communities based on their own ideals. They believed in a literal interpretation of the Bible and a rejection of the teachings of the established churches. For example, William Keil founded the Bethel and Aurora communities based on the belief that the traditional teaching of the church hierarchies were unnecessary in order to be a moral christian. He required "no title but Christian" and "no rules but the Bible".

The early religious utopian communities were searching for a perfect society and rejected the established social order. An example is the Zoar Community which viewed itself as "a refuge from the evils of this world, as the Biblical Zoar had been from the wickedness of Sodom." A common
theme was the desire for perfection here on earth by means of a more spiritually pure life offered by the utopian community. John Humphrey Noyes, believing that an individual's soul would converse directly with God and thus free itself from the sins of the world, founded a community which eventually became the Oneida Community. It began in the late 1830's in Putney, Vermont as a community committed to following Perfectionist ideals through the principles of shared common beliefs, shared property, and shared sexual relationships.

Religious utopian communities often were organized under a charismatic leader who served as their intermediary with God. He represented the living example of the possibility of perfection on earth. Growing out of this tradition of utopian communities were the Shaker Communities with their leader from England, Mother Ann Lee; the Harmony Society; Amana or the Society of True Inspiration; and Zoar -- which all were separatists groups from Germany -- and Oneida, an American Perfectionist community. Brook Farm written about by Hawthorne in The Blithedale Romance, was also a religious utopian community which followed the theory of transcendentalism or the belief in a direct communication between the spiritual and the natural worlds as taught by their leader and founder George Ripley who was a Unitarian minister. There are still religious utopian communities existing in America today. The Hutterian Brethren have about 150 communities of about 17,000 people, and the Bruderhof or Society
of Brothers has three communities and approximately 800 members. There are also contemporary communes which follow in the religious utopian tradition with their belief in Eastern mysticism as well as Christianity.

Socialistic Utopian Communities

Kanter's second tradition of utopian communities in America is socialistic in character. It began as a reaction to the Industrial Revolution with the establishment of socialist communities. Their purpose was to escape from the de-humanizing influence of the powerful new factory system. In contrast to the competition and poverty of the industrial system the socialist utopian communities believed in cooperation that led to a more equal sharing of profits. These political and economic utopians were also searching for the perfect human community here on earth.

While the religious utopian communities were following charismatic leaders, the socialistic utopian communities were held together by ideology. The social ideas of Horace Greeley were quite influential in the socialist utopias of the 1840's:

There should be no paupers and no surplus labor; unemployment indicates sheer lack of brains, and inefficiency in production and waste in consumption of the product of a national industry that has never worked to half its capacity have resulted in social anarchy; isolation is the curse of laboring classes, and only in unity can a solution be found for the problems of labor; therefore, education is the great desideratum, and in association the future may be assured.
Other ideas were imported from England and France in the poems of Robert Owen, Charles Fourier, and Etienne Cabet. Owen's socialist ideology led to the establishment of New Harmony and other Owenite socialist utopian communities. They were dedicated to the improvement of the human condition:

In the present system of human concerns... strife and contention are unavoidable. The man who does not prefer his own interests falls necessarily into poverty. In the round of trade and commerce all are exposed to the danger of either gaining too great an advantage or of falling short of securing their own. In this state of the world it is impossible to establish the love of good will which are necessary to the comfort and happiness of the human race. Hence, we have evidence that some other and different course is imperiously called for and must be adopted.

Fourier's concept of community attempted to find an alternative to dehumanizing institutions of the day. He was translated in America by Albert Brisbane and Horace Greeley and this led to the establishment of about forty socialist utopian communities in the 1840's. Perhaps the best known were the North American Phalanx, the Wisconsin Phalanx, and Brook Farm which eventually became a "phalanx" or community also. Today there are a number of communitarian experiments that are attempts to redefine their economic life by establishing utopian communities where everything is jointly earned and where political decisions are made by the entire community.
Kanter's third tradition of utopian communities in America is the contemporary psychosocial emphasis. This growing tradition is a reaction against what is seen to be the alienation and loneliness that is caused by modern society. It maintains that people are isolated from one another as a result of the competitive and achievement oriented classical liberal value system that keeps us from realizing our true nature. To combat these trends of modern life, the psychosocial utopian communities stress "self-actualization" or "personal growth". These communities attempt to create living situations where intimacy and psychological health are possible and where people can "grow" or "do their own thing". In general this movement is a rejection of a Lockean liberal society which has permitted the development of institutions that prevent people from achieving their full human potential.

A variety of philosophical viewpoints are followed by these contemporary utopian communities. They range from Timothy Leary's "turn on, tune in, drop out" hippie-view of the world, to the humanistic psychology of Abraham Maslow, to the theories of positive reinforcement of B. F. Skinner. Hippie communes totally reject the "establishment" and its evil institutions but do not offer an alternative society. Several communities modeled after Skinner's Walden Two have been started relying on the principles of positive
reinforcement. Maslow is represented by the utopian communities of Synanon which was established in 1950 for former drug addicts. They self-consciously are trying to create a better society that includes plans for new towns. There are also numerous extended-family communes that are part of the psychosocial utopian community tradition. They attempt to establish communities where there is greater sense of intimacy and personal development. Finally, the encounter group movement and the related personal growth centers can be considered part of this tradition, as we shall see in the next chapter of this paper.

Retreat Communes

In discussing these contemporary utopian communities, Kanter divides them into two groups: "retreat communes" and "service communes." Retreat communes are anti-establishment, escapist communes that value isolated locations, reject technology, and have a romantic desire for a return to nature and a simpler more pastoral life. Basically, they do not want to live with the complexities of modern life, and they withdraw to farms in the country often without modern conveniences such as electricity and indoor plumbing. Retreat communes are searching for a more natural existence in several ways:

We all wanted to have a simple, primitive existence. We all were content to live without rules, electricity, power tools, or running water; in fact, we felt it was strongly a
necessity for our emotional, spiritual, economical, or political survival.\textsuperscript{21}

Examples of these retreat communes include Oz in Pennsylvania, Tolstoy Farm in Washington, and Morningstar Ranch in California.\textsuperscript{22}

There are some common themes which run through the descriptions of these communes. City-life and its accompanying technology are rejected for the pastoral vision of a return to nature. There is a common house where people gather to cook and eat organic food that is raised in their own garden as much as possible. Political discussions or actions related to the outside established social order are absent. Natural childbirth is encouraged. Their goals consist of personal discovery and growth and a philosophy of doing one's own thing that means that no one has the right to make demands on anyone else in the commune.

The desire to return to nature seems to be much more in evidence today than it was in nineteenth century utopian communities. Living with nature has become an end in itself rather than the means of financial and material support it used to be. While technology was used in the nineteenth century whenever it proved to be helpful, today's retreat communes seem to reject almost anything that reminds them of modern American society.

This act of rejection often gives them a fleeting sense of identity as a group. But it does not seem to be enough to
sustain the commune, for most of the retreat communes disband after about a year. While they are together they are dependent on the outside society for any sense of unity they may have. For example, a retreat commune may totally reject capitalism while proposing no alternative structure to live by themselves. It seems that many of these communes take on the appearance of a group of friends who get together for the summer. They provide a lovely retreat in the country for a brief period of time and as such serve the function of providing a good place to spend a vacation. However, they certainly cannot be considered communities by any stretch of the imagination.

Retreat communes are in reality more concerned about individual freedom than with the development of a community. They also are referred to as anarchist communes because of their complete rejection of modern American society. They seem to be searching for a return to the Garden of Eden with its unencumbered natural order rather than living by what is seen as an externally imposed social order. Spontaneity is often the reigning "philosophy" guiding the actions of the commune's members. This usually translates into complete freedom and permissiveness with a conscious effort not to impose one's authority on anyone else. The only organizing and unifying force seems to be the needs of their farm animals and the change of seasons.
Unlike retreat communes, the service communes believe that it is impossible to escape from modern American society. Instead, they define themselves in terms of a specific mission and proceed to attempt to serve society. Most service communes are involved in educational projects of one sort or another. There are communes which organize around the creation of a free school; and there are communes which view themselves as learning communities which have grown out of the human potential movement and the revival of spiritualism. Many of the human relation centers that have sprung up in the last decade are self-consciously communal in nature. There are also a number of pseudo Zen monasteries in which the Zen macrobiotic life style and diet are taught. And there are utopian communities which care for the mentally handicapped and attempt to rehabilitate drug addicts.

Synanon is perhaps one of the best known service communes. It began as a form of group therapy for drug addicts and developed into a utopian community with its own schools and businesses. It is utopian in that it espouses a concept of the "Synanon life-style" that they hope will eventually reform mankind. Basically Synanon is a kind of therapeutic community which hopes to create a better society by increasing human potential. However, unlike retreat communes, it sets a number of limits. Synanon expects that its "life style" will be followed by members of the community.
Appropriate behavior is defined, rules are created, and there is strong leadership, all of which have elicited a variety of responses to the Synanon way of life. Maslow has called Synanon a "eupsychia" or psychological utopia, while Friedenberg sees that it brainwashes its members and undermines our free society.27

**Freedom Versus Authority**

Friedenberg and Maslow's radically different views of the same utopian community sum up the paradox of the contemporary commune movement. Retreat communes believe that no rules or limits should be imposed on their members while service communes often impose a rigid sense of order and discipline. The paradox is that people, searching for utopian community in an attempt to escape from what they see as the authoritarianism of modern society and in an attempt to gain individual freedom, discover that the survival of a community seems to require the establishment of another system of authority.

The difference between the idea of covenantal community and the concept of community that is held by the contemporary commune movements are striking. While both the service communes and the idea of covenantal community are based on the same organizing principle of a shared common belief, which John Winthrop referred to as a primary covenant,28 they differ in their approaches to the role that authority
plays in responding to the issues of "natural" and political community.

The service communes seem to neglect "natural" community in favor of an emphasis on political community. In their enthusiasm to serve and reform mankind, they often create a strict regimentation that prevents any natural diversity to emerge. Winthrop, however, realized the need for an authority to help maintain a balance between "natural" and political community. He was not in the business of protecting people from their natural human needs. Rather, he saw that people, with the assistance of a leader or an authority, need to confront their tendency to pursue their own private interests and get involved in the public protection of their "natural" community.

Retreat communes, on the other hand, erred in the direction of having too little authority. In the void created by a lack of authority and leadership, people do indeed follow their private interests to the neglect of their public obligations to protect their private rights. As we saw throughout Part One of this paper, the idea of covenantal community stresses that people need to be reminded by an authority that the right of individual freedom depends on the fulfillment of one's public or political obligations.

Nineteenth century utopian communities also faced this apparent paradox between authority and freedom that demonstrated that authority was necessary if people were to be free.
However, some of them went to the other extreme and provided too much authority. In fact, the nineteenth century utopian communities that survived for a number of years, which was their criteria for success, had strong central authorities and ideologies that proved guidance and justification for the decision making process. People were asked to submit to the authority of the community which ultimately even had control over their thoughts and feelings. They were willing to do this because they were promised in return the fulfillment of the needs that led them on their search for community. These included primarily the need to belong to a family group with the accompanying sense of security that gave them a sense of identity and a sense of active participation in a life that had both direction and meaning. Once again, this demonstrates an unfortunate emphasis on "natural" community to the neglect of political community within a covenantal framework that stresses the need for both private rights and public obligations.

The religious, the socialistic, and the contemporary traditions of utopian community have led to a variety of experiments in the working out of their various ideas. However, there is much that they have in common that points to the nature of utopian communities in general. They reject the established social order. They strive for perfection by creating alternative social institutions. They are searching for a lost sense of unity whether it be between man and God,
man and Nature, man and man, or man and himself. They seek immediate solutions to their views of the problems within the American social condition. They often use a return to nature as their method of creating perfection. And, of course, their means of finding utopia is the creation of identifiable communities with both physical and social boundaries outside the established social order. Thus, the three traditions of utopian community have similarities in ideology even though there are differences in the conditions of their origin.

Summary of Chapter VI and the Implications For Action by the Counselor

The liberal tradition in America has nearly reached perfection in America today. It has become more sophisticated, but it is still with us. What began as an industrial age encouraged by liberalism has now become a full fledged technological society. The liberal tendency toward consensus or uniformity has reached awesome efficiency in the form of a unified society in America. It has become a way of life. With these problems of liberalism still present today, the counselor must understand the paradoxes and false directions that they have generated in the search for community.

The tradition of utopian community in America represents some of the false directions that have been taken in an effort to escape from the liberal anti-communitarian forces in society. The nineteenth century utopian communities consisted of European emigrants seeking freedom from oppression by powerful
churches and freedom to establish communities based on their own ideals. However, with no opposing forces to combat once in America, the religious communities developed an unnecessary authoritarianism that led to neither freedom nor community.

There were also Americans in the nineteenth century who were reacting against the de-humanizing influences of the Industrial Revolution. The powerful new factory system may have caused a loss of the homogeneity of the past, but it was creating a new consensus around the emerging technology. However, the socialistic utopian communities merely created another consensus in their efforts to avoid the first one.

While the nineteenth century utopian communities were in part reacting against the liberal trends of the day, their attempts to establish a counter movement resulted in their succumbing to the temptations of "natural" community. The sense of unity that occurred was very comforting, but it was based on a requirement of conformity. In the case of the religious communities, the leaders demanded obedience to their philosophy. This meant that the public or group needs of political community were taken care of by these leaders, while the more private needs of the newly created "natural" community were left to the members at large. In the socialistic communities a system of "mere democracy" also produced a type of conformity. With political decisions being made by the entire community, and with cooperation and equality serving as their ideology, there was a consensus over the needs
of "natural" community and a neglect of the concerns of political community.

The contemporary utopian communities have attempted to combat the competitive and achievement orientation of the liberal tradition in America. However, in the case of retreat communes, political community was sacrificed for various forms of "natural" community. And, in the case of service communes, "natural" community seems to have been neglected in favor of their emphasis on political community.

Underlying the questions of "natural" and political community for both contemporary and nineteenth century utopian communities are the issues of freedom and authority. Retreat communes are more concerned about individual freedom than with the development of community. They yearn for a return to a "natural" community of the past which they interpret as not needing any kind of authority. The result is not only a lack of community, but it is anarchy. Service communes see the need for strong leadership for their political communities, but the result is a strict regimentation that prevents any natural diversity to emerge. The nineteenth century religious communities sacrificed freedom for the security of a "natural" community that obedience to a strict authority could afford. And, the nineteenth century socialistic communities distributed authority amongst all their members in the spirit of cooperation and equality. The result was an absence of authority and a conformity to the common standard imposed by
a consensus of private interests.

As we have repeatedly seen, a true sense of community cannot exist without both "natural" and political community. The price of having either one without the other seems to be a lack of freedom and diversity. The paradox is that in order to have freedom in the context of a community, there must first be an authority to set limits. However, an overemphasis on either public obligations or private rights to the neglect of the other will not lead to a sense of community. Perhaps the primary lesson of the tradition of utopian community in America is that authority is essential for the development of community, but it must foster the growth of both "natural" and political community if people are to be truly free.

The counselor working with someone searching for community must be aware of these various false directions and paradoxes. They are both tempting and confusing as one attempts to create a reasonable alternative to the general absence of community in contemporary American life. As we observed earlier, Erikson feels that the "increasing demand for conformity, uniformity, and standardization which characterizes... our 'individualistic' civilization" has caused many people to escape into a private utopia. The reaction of people being ruled by the technology of their day is often a nostalgic yearning for a simpler or more orderly life. Utopias are a mechanism of escape from the problems of establishing a sense of community during rapidly changing times, and as such are
an important tradition in our culture for the counselor to understand.
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CHAPTER VII

THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN RELATIONS TECHNIQUES

As we have seen, the libertarian ideals of John Locke, which were opposed to the European system of feudalism, were readily adopted in America. But, this occurred without having to rebel against the institutions of feudalism, or to use Tocqueville's terms, without having to "endure a democratic revolution." The result has been a system of federalism as explained by Madison and Hamilton in The Federalist Papers that sets up a rhetorical defense against feudalism in America. The concepts which are the goals of this mock battle include individual rights, economic liberty, inevitable progress, free enterprise, laissez-faire, and equal opportunity. However, without the necessity of defending these ideals against opposing feudal institutions, it became possible to actually create what we were trying to avoid. Or, as the political scientist Henry Kariel states:

In parceling out sovereignty, in preserving a wildly complicated, interlaced federalism, we have actually accepted the ground for a community structure which in many revealing ways resembles that of previous, seemingly remote societies, notably the Western European society of the Ancien Régime.

...Unlike eighteenth-century continental
Europe, we have never had to concentrate power in the hands of one man in order to upset an outworn corporate system... We were never compelled to strengthen the state in order to dissolve the old corporate order... Nor did we have to formulate a coherent ideology to challenge the defenders of those decadent feudal institutions which survived in the Ancien Regime. In the realms of practice as well as theory, we could leave well enough alone.3

Indeed, a type of feudal order has been created in America. It takes the form of a vast decentralization of power, states' rights, private corporatism, local autonomy, and home rule. In our efforts to keep any remnants of a sovereign monarchy out of power, we have established this system of private checks and balances to oppose these tendencies of public government. The result has been what Kariel calls a "two fold pluralism:"

a tremendously complex governmental apparatus--diffuse, unintegrated, centrifugal--and, second, a prodigious cluster of innumerable groups buoyantly, chaotically seeking to achieve privately and voluntarily what we have forbidden ourselves to do publicly.4

The corporate nature of America's industrial, technological society perhaps best represents the result of the battle against a non-existent feudalism and the growth of pluralism in America. In our rush to decentralize power, we have created private corporations with considerable independence and power. With the help of technology, these powerful private organizations have quietly built up institu-
tions resembling those of the feudal order. As we shall see, it is in this context that human relations techniques were developed.

Technological Society

The impact of technology in America has not only affected our way of life but our way of thinking. Having been shifted from rural life to urban life, from small communities of workers to large industrial centers, from attachments to local belonging to attachments to an ever changing industrial order, many people spend energy looking for ways to find substitutes for this loss of "community."

A search for smallness seems to be the most common response to the bigness and the complexity of technological society. Generally, the search for community becomes a search for a return to a simpler world, as we have seen in the discussion of the tradition of utopian community in America. Erich Fromm was perhaps one of the most outspoken proponents of this view. He saw that where the conditions of a feudal society make people feel oppressed but secure, the condition of modern America made people feel free but insecure.

Fromm maintained that Western man, and particularly the American people, had been:

freed from the bondage of economic and political ties...which used to give him security and a feeling of belonging...He
is threatened by powerful suprapersonal forces, capital and the market. His relationship to his fellow men...has become hostile and estranged; he is free—that is, he is alone, isolated, threatened...Paradise is lost.5

Basically Fromm believed that Americans were intimidated by the increasing size and impersonality of nearly all the institutions which affected their lives. He argues that a faith in the possibility of personal spontaneity can help preserve the individualism that modernity is threatening to undermine.

Fromm's dream was to help people regain their autonomy by showing the way to what he called "the sane society." He stressed "a socialist vision which is centered around the idea of workers' participation and co-management, on decentralization and on the concrete function of man in the working process...." He wants to return to the idea of the small community by organizing "the whole population into small groups of say five hundred people...." These small communities would then function on the order of the New England town meeting with the leadership provided by only the most virtuous members.6

Fromm's communitarian ideas include each individual being politically involved in the processes affecting one's life. Collaboration rather than conflict should determine one's relation to others at work as well as in one's daily activities. The "sane" society is one "in which the indi-
The individual is not subordinated to or manipulated by any power outside himself...."7

The problem with this concept of community is discussed by the political theorist John Schaar in his extensive critique of Fromm's ideas:

The main point of my critique is that Fromm's solution to the problem of authority does not offer these positive conceptions [of duty and goodness]. His solution reads simply; liberate men from irrational authorities. But if you liberate men in this way, that is, without helping them toward a conception of what liberty is for, you only lead them into deeper slavery, the slavery of the social. The man of today is led, to be sure, but he is led by fashion and opinion, by the taste and desire of the many at the moment.8

Thus, with the ultimate goal of Fromm's small "community" being individualism, his search for community was doomed from the start. For, as we saw in Chapter V, individualism leads to a withdrawal into "natural" community and a neglect of political community which in turn results in the kind of consensus or uniformity that Schaar is suggesting.

The French sociologist Jacques Ellul has observed that our technological society in general has also attempted to smooth over this conflict between individualism and "community" with the development of what he calls "human techniques."9

According to Ellul,

The term technique...does not mean machines, technology, or this or that procedure for attaining an end. In our technological society,
technique is the totality of methods rationally arrived at and having absolute efficiency (for a given stage of development) in every field of human activity. Ellul traces the development of techniques which relate directly to the human being as well as the development of more purely administrative and economic techniques. He provides the following background information:

It is said (and everyone agrees) that the machine has created an inhuman atmosphere. The machine, so characteristic of the nineteenth century, made an abrupt entrance into a society, which from the political, institutional, and human points of view, was not made to receive it; and man has had to put up with it as best he can....

...The machine could not integrate itself into nineteenth century society; technique integrated it....

Technique integrates everything....Man is not adapted to a world of steel; technique adopts him to it....Technique thus provides a model; it specifies attitudes that are valid once and for all. The anxiety aroused in man by the turbulence of the machine is soothed by the consoling hum of a unified society....

...when technique enters into every area of life, including the human, it ceases to be external to man and becomes his every substance. Human techniques have been developed, according to Ellul, to help people adapt to the increase in human tension, the modification of milieu and space (at work and in the home), the modification of time and motion (man now lives by the clock), and the creation of a mass society. All of these conditions of modern life mean that the individual
no longer feels in harmony with nature. He feels like a stranger in a new world. The purpose of human techniques is to help the individual accept his new environment. The danger in this approach, however, is that the need for acceptance is often substituted for understanding of technological society. There is an attempt to recreate the rights of the "natural" community of pre-industrial society, but without a proper appreciation of the necessity for the obligations of political community that permit one to maintain a degree of control over his life.

The counselor is in a position to assist people in understanding the need for both the rights of "natural" community and the obligations of political community. Too often the field of counseling uses the human techniques of human relations, sensitivity training, organization development, and the personal growth movement, which will be discussed in this chapter, in an effort to free the individual by focusing his concerns on himself. The theory of much of psychotherapy seems to be, to quote Ellul again, that: "Man, freed and returned to himself, will be much better adapted to life and to the mastery of the difficulties with which the modern world confronts him."\textsuperscript{13} We have seen the folly of this view of freedom throughout this paper. An individual is truly free only in the context of a community that is both "natural" and political.

It is a reality, however, that as our society becomes
increasingly technically complex and "community" is supposedly destroyed, people are unable to maintain the quality of human relationships. This becomes a problem not only for the individual but for industry which depends on good human relations to increase productivity. And productivity after all is the primary goal of psychological techniques. As Ellul says:

The only thing that matters technically is yield, production. This is the law of technique, this yield can only be obtained by the total mobilization of human beings, body and soul, and this implies the exploitation of all human psychic forces.  

Thus, the technique of human relations was created to remove the tensions of modern life by helping people adapt to the new technological society and to keep production as efficient as possible.

**Human Relations Techniques**

In discussing the origins of the field of human relations, it is useful to look at the pioneer work of Elton Mayo of the Harvard Business School. Mayo proposed the development of a science of social engineering to correct the imbalance in modern society that prevents individuals and groups from communicating effectively. He believed that modern problems were technical in nature and thus must be approached with the needs of industrial man in mind.

Mayo saw that without our being aware of it, industrial organizations had begun to satisfy a wide range of personal
needs that had previously been met by "natural" community. He recognized the need for human relations experts to make sure that this trend was able to reach its full potential. These experts with the support of management would use sociology and psychology to help people learn how to work together and cooperate in a common task within the realities of the emerging technological society.  

He viewed the industrial world as being ideally apolitical. There would be no further need for political community once industrial organizations learned how to become more responsive to their community of workers. The goal was to eventually bring about a condition of complete cooperation between management and the workers. In order to achieve the understanding of human relations necessary for this condition to develop, the human relations expert must learn to "secure the effective participation and cooperation of everyone;" "to help society to unanimity;" and to achieve "the maintenance of spontaneous cooperation."  

For example, in his famous experiments at Western Electric's Hawthorne plant, Mayo found that people who understand the goal of their particular role in industrial production will work much more efficiently. He believed that ideally what the individual wants and what is expected of him will be the same. The ideal situation is when "...the social code and the desire of the individual are, for all practical purposes, identical." His idea was that in the
true democracy people would work without the need of limits, with total commitment and spontaneity. The ultimate goal was to create a sense of unanimity throughout society.13

Mayo, thus, was concerned with the development of a new form of "community" that, unlike Fromm's, was natural to the technological age. He solved Fromm's problem of how to return to small community life by creating human relation techniques that theoretically would help the individual and the corporation exploit the new technology and achieve "spontaneous cooperation." However, the goal of this new "community" was uniformity, not the diversity of political community. Mayo was apolitical because he truly believed that once people understood the potential and the goals of industrial organizations there would be no further need for political community.

The science of public administration, personnel management, or human relations was created to remove the tensions of modern life by helping people adapt to the new technological society. Harold D. Lasswell saw the function of this new field as a form of "preventive politics" very similar to "general medicine, psychopathology, physiological psychology, and related disciplines." He explained this by saying that:

the time has come to abandon the assumption that the problem of politics is the problem of promoting discussion among all the interests concerned in a given problem. Discussion frequently complicates social difficulties, for the discussion by far-flung interests arouses
a psychology of conflict which produces obstructive, fictitious and irrelevant values. The problem of politics is less to solve conflicts than to prevent them; less to serve as a safety valve for social protest than to apply social energy to the abolition of recurrent sources of strain in society.  

The work of Mayo had established a model where harmony of interpersonal relations and the efficiency of communication replaced power and authority in the search for community. The problems of community were now seen in technological terms that demanded technological solutions. It became more important to devise techniques for having people accept the realities of this new corporate society than to worry about the distribution of power and authority.  

Leadership in this technological setting thus became "...the capacity to influence people to act in ways that they came to realize are good for them." This meant that leaders had to devise methods that would lead to the acceptance of their objectives. The question became: "By what means can he persuade his employees to want to do what he wants to do?" and "How can employees be stimulated to put loyalty to the company above their own self-interest?"  

The focus of the field of human relations became one of means rather than ends. As the social anthropologist, Burleigh Gardner, explained:

By developing an atmosphere in which changes and improvements can be generated from within the organization rather than imposed from
above, the skilled executive can eliminate much of the organization's resistance to change without forfeiting any of its stability.  

Experiments based on Kurt Lewin's important studies in the field of human relations were used to demonstrate that "the more 'democratic' the procedures, the less resistance there is to change, and the greater the productivity." For example, it was shown that it was possible to overcome worker opposition to changes in production methods "by the use of group meetings for which management effectively communicates the need for change and stimulates group participation in planning the changes."  

The group dynamics work of Lewin had shown how to:

produce not only direct benefits in the form of better results in influencing attitudes, but a feeling of participation on the part of employees in planning programs which can, in itself, contribute to successful achievement in moulding and modifying attitudes and in improving motivation and morale.  

The means used by Lewin was the "democratic" participation of employees in decision-making. Coercion could also be used to produce change, but:

the use of group participation permits smoother "locomotion" to the same "goal" without the creation of "tensions" which may lead to industrial strife. Participation in decision-making in industry is generally viewed as an experience wherein attitudes favorable to change are taken on by the workers...The potential for industrial strife is lowered,
since the change in group perception associated with group participation tends to bring the production "goal" closer to the standard desired by management. Furthermore, "emotionality" is lowered since workers playing the "role" of planners tend to keep discussion at a relatively depersonalized level.²⁴

Lewin's methods for achieving consensus on goals relied on morale, on the "style of living," the "social climate," and the spirit pervading the "dynamic field."²⁵ This approach was decidedly apolitical. People were to be directed to the good life. They were not supposed to participate in the search. The object was to smooth man's way in the industrial, technological society by clarifying what was good for him in these rapidly changing times. To lead the good life was to acknowledge and loyally follow whatever goals were necessary for the efficient operation of the organization. The theory of the human relations experts was that this approach would relieve people of the anxiety and ambiguity that technology was causing. In this way people would once again be able to find "community" in their new social context.

This new kind of "community" was to be composed of individual workers each voluntarily performing their own tasks. As long as these workers felt they were an integral part of a unified whole, then they were both individually free and members of a new industrial "community." It was stated the "freedom is only possible for an individual in so far as he genuinely identifies his own satisfaction with
the general well being." Democratic communities that were in tune with the technological changes were thus supposed to naturally emerge from this new industrial model.

The human relations experts, as the leaders of this new form of "community," used techniques such as mood engineering, need manipulation, and economic sanctions to achieve their goals of unity. However, they appeared to be paternalistic and benevolent in the process. After all, the use of human relations techniques were for the "people's own good," for they did not know how to cope with the impact of the new technology on their sense of community. Given this confusion, the field of human relations in industry seized upon the opportunity to calm this general state of anxiety among the workers by making many meaningful choices in their behalf. The object was to provide a comfortable environment in an attempt to find a replacement for the sense of "community" that was supposedly lost with the rise of the industrialized society. By removing many of the burdens of this new way of life, the individual would then be free to resume his more natural, communal character.

However, by assuming their paternalistic role, the human relations experts demonstrated their lack of understanding of the political elements of community, including the need for political authority. Schaar is helpful in delineating the various elements of political life.
Political life occupies a middle terrain between the sheer givens of nature and society on the one side, and the transcendental ends toward which men aspire on the other. Political action is that type of action through which men publicly attempt to order and to transform the givens of nature and society by the light of values which are above or outside the order of givens. Political authority is that authority which defines the ideal aims of the community and which tries to shape and direct nature and society in accordance with these ends. Just as the father in the family has the twofold task of restraining the children from regressing to the comforts of infantilism and of urging them upward toward the acceptance of mature human standards and obligations, so the authority in the polity has the twofold task of restraining the citizens from regressing to nature and society and of urging them upward toward the achievement of ideal ends. Within the ordered human space established by the laws and guaranteed by authority, men can live together in trust and friendship and can cooperate in the give-and-take of political activity properly so-called. Through this political activity, men come to realize themselves by working out their destinies with others. And that leads to the third task of authority, which is that of enabling men to order their lives toward ideal aims. This function of authority is completely captured in Aristotle's two deepest ideas: man is a political animal; and men form societies not just to live but to live well.

Thus, the role of an authority in creating community is one of political education as opposed to the various subtle methods used by human relations experts to achieve a consensus around a corporation's goals. Community is achieved by people working together toward the realization of ideal aims. It is in this process of searching for a route to the creation of a better life that community is formed. It cannot be handed
down from above by benevolent "experts."

**Sensitivity Training**

The T-group or what has become known as sensitivity training grew out of the trend toward the use of human relations techniques in industry. Sensitivity training was the result of a search for new techniques of human relations training in and through groups. It reflected the desire for a return to a life based on small groups and cooperation that technology had supposedly destroyed. Lewin's theories provided a conceptual base for handling groups as units and for seeing the individual as part of a group. In Lewinian theory, groups and men can work in harmony; and man is seen as being ideally suited to group life, at least life in certain kinds of groups, like the T-group.

The T-group movement began in the summer of 1946 when a group of adult educators, public officials, and social scientists, including Lewin, held a workshop designed to explore the use of small groups as a vehicle for personal and social change. Lewin's theories helped lead to the establishment of another workshop the following summer at Bethel, Maine which became known as the First National Training Laboratory for Group Dynamics or NTL.²⁸

Two of Lewin's theoretical principles provided the foundation for the development of the T-group as conducted by NTL. The first is the theory of encapsulation within a
group, which said that the changes in the individual have to be part of his group membership. The second is the theory of channeling and feedback. The object here was to try out a new idea in the context of a controlled group and then to act out the idea. The individual would then be given feedback on this action for group analysis and evaluation. The combination of these two principles formed the basic theory of the T-group.29

The goal of the T-group was to have individuals become more cohesive group members and able to act more effectively as individuals. The T-group process encouraged people to establish a new identity within the group by creating an ambiguous situation composed of strangers. This goal grew out of Lewin's general theory of change which resulted from the initial workshop in 1946. He believed that in order to change a person with any degree of permanency, the person's group situation must be changed in its entirety. For, if the basic group was not changed, an individual who was removed from a group and convinced to change his behavior will return to his previous behavior upon returning to the basic group. Lewin developed a three stage process for changing groups and individuals within the groups. He called these stages "unfreezing," "change," and "refreezing." The object was to alter what he called the basic equilibrium of a group, change the structure of the group, and then reform the group into a new state of equilibrium.30
The initial workshops were based on this theory. For example, the first workshop was an attempt to make people more efficient in intergroup relations and to change their standards of behavior if necessary. The Bethel workshop was also organized to create changes in people's behavior and to improve the level of effectiveness of both group leaders and members.31

Lewin's workshop was designed for professional educators and community workers. They all seemed to be searching for ways to improve their ability to deal with important social problems of the day. The technique offered was the development of group consciousness. The Bethel workshop had similar goals, but it attempted to create a sense of community as well as the promotion of group development.32

The search for "community" has become an important theme in the popularity of sensitivity training. People seemed to be eager to use group experiences to create a sense of "community" that was lost with the isolating influences of technological society. According to Kurt Back, professor of sociology and psychiatry and critic of the sensitivity training movement, the social conditions that helped to make sensitivity training popular were not new. In brief, the conditions created by our technological society have a tendency to stifle individual development and social solidarity or a sense of "community." With groups no longer being an automatic part of our society, some people turned to the use
of "techniques" to regain this sense of an intensive group experience. In Back's view the techniques were found by many people in sensitivity training.\textsuperscript{33}

To use Ellul's term, sensitivity training is pure "technique." An artificial group experience has been created to replace the "community" experience that many people assume was once a natural aspect of life in America. Sensitivity training offers an opportunity for total involvement that, to use Alvin Toffler's terms, the "modular man" rarely experiences today. The "modular man" only involves a part of his personality in any relationship and virtually never has an opportunity to involve his whole self.\textsuperscript{34}

Warren Bennis and Philip Slater anticipated this theme by seeing sensitivity training as a technique that will eventually produce democratic organizations that will be essential in our new "temporary society." However, Slater is not quite so optimistic in a more recent book. He says that for the most part people change locality rather than attempting to deal with local problems. In this context, he sees sensitivity training as a technique that can be used to overcome the impulse to escape the social problems of the day. Sensitivity training thus becomes what I call an attempt to find a "substitute community" for a people who have lost the meaning of community but not its sentimental appeal.\textsuperscript{35}

Carl Rogers also joins in support of the use of sensitivity training as a "substitute community:"
I believe there will be possibilities for the rapid development of closeness between and among persons, a closeness which is not artificial, but is real and deep, and which will be well suited to our increasing mobility of living. Temporary relationships will be able to achieve the richness and meaning which heretofore have been associated only with lifelong attachments.36

The danger in creating artificial or substitute community experiences that speak to the needs of our "temporary society" is that the real opportunities to find community may be overlooked. The meaning of community most certainly has been lost in contemporary America, but community has not been lost. There are many opportunities to experience both "natural" and political community, but they are usually ignored.

The loss of "community" usually refers to a form of community that people assume was once a natural part of life in America. Techniques such as sensitivity training are then used in an attempt to fill this void. "Natural" community can exist but it requires a great deal of work both within the family and the local community. Also, "natural" community can only lead to a sense of community with the cooperation of a political community. Sensitivity training seems to avoid both. The result is a movement in the tradition of human relations that is anti-communitarian in character. Without a focus on political community, the sensitivity training movement becomes just another form of escape to a "community" that was never natural to man, but is more closely related to
the utopian tradition in America. Lewin's goal of integrating the individual and society is an admirable one, but there are many issues that his apolitical stance does not confront. Erik Erikson's political theory of the need for both a healthy society and a healthy personality addresses some of these issues and will be discussed in considerable detail in Chapters IX and X.

The Field of Organization Development

Much of the theory of the National Training Laboratory has evolved into a method of producing change and training people who can initiate change in individuals, organizations, and the larger society. It is an outgrowth of the original T-group ideas of Lewin, who used the group to disrupt old behavior patterns and to create new ones. The encounter or personal growth movement also developed from Lewin's work; but, as we shall see, it has gone in the direction of individual enjoyment of the group experience.

The use of sensitivity training in industry has resulted in several approaches to organizational change. Some trainers see that organizational problems of companies can be corrected through a focus on group process and the improvement of group interaction. Then there are the NTL trainers who use group techniques but with a knowledge of the problems of organizations. Finally, there are the trainers who have specialized in the problems of organizations first and use whatever tech-
niques seem appropriate. This later group have become known as organization developers. The evolution of these approaches of sensitivity training reflect a gradual change from the use of human relation techniques to the development of the field of organization development.

Organization development (OD) is an attempt to simultaneously change an organization and train people in personal skills. Warren Bennis, one of the pioneers of OD, defines it as "an educational strategy adopted to bring about a planned organizational change." Basically, organization development remains in the tradition of human relations techniques for it too is an attempt to help people adapt to the rapidly changing technological society.

As Bennis observed in collaboration with Slater, organizations will have increasingly "temporary" structures. According to this theory, people will have to learn to develop quick and intense relationships in the work situation, and learn how to live with ambiguity. The role of organization development is to attempt to make the inevitable trends of industrialization and complexity less of a problem by creating more humane and democratic organizations.

Organization development is an attempt to find an alternative to the social institution known as bureaucracy. The bureaucracy was developed during the industrial revolution as a means of organizing, directing, and coordinating the business of industrial, governmental, educational, mili-
tary, and all other human organizations. According to Chris Argyris, a human relations expert in the Lewinian tradition, bureaucratic values tend to emphasize the rational, task oriented aspects of work while ignoring basic human factors. This results in shallow and mistrustful relationships or what he calls a state of "decreased interpersonal competence." This in turn leads to mistrust, intergroup conflict, rigidity, and a decrease in overall organizational effectiveness.¹⁴¹

The social philosophy of organization development that provides a set of alternative values includes:

1. Improvement of interpersonal competence.

2. A shift in values so that human factors and feelings come to be considered legitimate.

3. Development of increased understanding between and within working groups in order to reduce tensions.

4. Development of more effective "team management," i.e., the capacity...for functional groups to work more competently.

5. Development of better methods of "conflict resolution." Rather than the usual bureaucratic methods which rely mainly on suppression, compromise, and unprincipled power, more rational and open methods of conflict resolution are sought.

6. Development of organic rather than mechanical systems. This is a strong reaction against the idea of organizations as mechanisms which managers "work on," like pushing buttons.¹⁴²

One of the basic problems which organization development
addresses is how to integrate the inevitable conflict between individual, or more human needs, and organizational, or more bureaucratic needs. In attempting to resolve this conflict, OD has sometimes used sensitivity training techniques in an attempt to create a "family" situation within an organization. The goal seems to be the development of a substitute for the loss of "community" that has been generated by our technological advances. In this way, individual needs will theoretically be met while maintaining the organizational structure. The problems with this approach is that there is a lack of what Back calls a "pre-existing solidarity"\(^{13}\) that a real family situation relies on to overcome the periods of conflict that intense emotional evolution inevitably create. Lacking this basic foundation of "natural" community, the use of sensitivity training techniques in organizations seems to be more artificial and manipulative than a source of integration of individual and organizational needs.

Also, notions of the "political" are generally absent from the goals of organization development. Growing out of the apolitical beginnings of Lewinian theory and the establishment of the National Training Laboratory, OD has seriously neglected the consideration of the need for political community. Thus, OD not only has a misconception about "natural" community, but it lacks an understanding of the "political."

Organization development seems to be most successful where there is a consensus about organizational goals.\(^{44}\)
This is frequently the case in an organization with a strict hierarchical structure and centralized power and authority. In these situations a sense of uniformity can almost be enforced and people can be subtly required to join the organizational "family." However, the problem here, as we saw in Parts One and Two of this paper, is that people cannot be required to join a community. While there must be an authority or leader who defines the ideal aims of the community, people must be gently urged toward the achievement of these ideal ends. The process of building community is one of education, not coercion.

Bennis emphasizes that organizational change is only possible by changing the "culture" or the "climate" of an organization. This means that the system within which people work and live, and not necessarily the people themselves, must be changed. In this way the conflict between individual and organizational needs will be resolved by OD. The difficulty, however, is that the model of "community" offered by OD lacks any significant recognition of the need for political community. In fact, change must come from the top of the organization down to the workers. This leaves the workers without an opportunity to become politically involved. The result is a form of consensus or uniformity that, in the spirit of the liberal tradition, does not lead to a sense of community, but rather to an increase in competition and individualism. The only difference is that people are now
competing to see who can be the best "company man" rather than who can be the "rugged individualist."

**The Personal Growth Movement**

Another outgrowth of the human relations and sensitivity training movements has been the encounter or personal growth movement. While organization development has attempted to produce a sense of harmony between individuals and society, the personal growth movement has focused on individual experience in a group. OD and the personal growth movement represents two attempts to resolve the inevitable conflict between the needs of individuals and society. OD has attempted to adapt both the individual and the organization toward each other in an effort to make them both open to change. The personal growth movement while recognizing the conflict between the needs of individuals and groups, has chosen to use the intensive group techniques of sensitivity training for the individual alone.

Although the emphasis of the personal growth movement is basically on the personal experiences of the individual in a group, Carl Rogers and William Schutz attempt to provide a theoretical framework for looking at encounter groups. Schutz developed a system of interpersonal relations as a result of his experiments with small groups. He theorizes that interpersonal relations consist of three primary areas: inclusion, affection, and domination; as well as their
opposites of exclusion, aggression, and submission. He was particularly concerned with the physical expression of these psychological concepts. For example, an exercise on inclusion would involve persons trying to break into a circle formed by the rest of the group, or trying to break out of it. Theoretically, the physical acting out of these aspects of interpersonal relations help people to change their patterns of relating in such a way that they become more creative and free in their relationships with other people. Rogers had the idea that a new kind of a society with different requirements and expectations of interpersonal relations would develop in the United States by the year 2000. He sees that the society of the future will continue to show increases in density and mobility. This will require an ability to relate quickly and deeply to other people and then to let go just as easily. Thus, these brief encounters will become the common form of interpersonal relationships. Rogers sees the encounter group as an ideal setting for learning to live with limited intense relationships.

The encounter group movement stresses the philosophy of the here and now. These groups consist of people who are usually complete strangers to each other and will most likely remain so in the future. The focus is definitely on the experience of that one group and that one group alone.

The personal growth center is perhaps the clearest example of Schutz and Rogers' philosophy. These Centers
were established as a new type of leisure-time activity with weekend and week-long sessions. Most of these encounter centers have a variety of programs, including the combination of group experiences with dance, various art forms, philosophical lectures, and seminars on family problems. The encounter experience is viewed as recreation in the literal sense of the word, i.e., an opportunity to be re-created. Most of the centers are in beautiful settings and advertise the experience and the stimulation that their particular program offers.

One such center in California is known as Esalen. The Esalen system, unlike the T-group, does not train people for group activity. It emphasizes personal growth, the expansion of human potentiality, and personal encounter. However, the group activities are only one part of Esalen's program. They also teach art, dance, Chinese gymnastics, and religious problems. More recently Esalen has created a residential community that caters to interests in organic food, mysticism, and meditation. One of the basic premises of Esalen has been the introduction of Eastern modes of thought into Western science. In fact, the group experience is now less important than working with individuals in a search for exact, scientific measurement of changes within an individual after various forms of treatment, such as the physiological and psychological effects of meditation.48

So, the personal growth movement seems to deal with the
conflict between the individual and society by ignoring society. It is almost as if the individual is told that he can live without society, or at least he should prepare for the society of the future by learning the necessary skills in an encounter group. At least there is no pretense that a community is being created. Rather, it is individualism taken to its extreme form. This focus on the individual for the purpose of expanding human potentiality is perhaps the ultimate creation of the liberal tradition.

There is seemingly no interest in community, either "natural" or political. The individual is encouraged to reach his full potential by becoming individually more competent. In this way one will be prepared to meet the inevitable future where the brief encounter will become the way of life. This type of consensus on means rather than ends, and on the efficiency of interpersonal relationships is the worst possible kind of political apathy. The search for community seems to be at an end, or to put it another way--abandoned.

**Summary of Chapter VII and the Implications For Action by the Counselor**

The development of human relations techniques began, as we saw in the work of Fromm, from the desire to return to the image of the village or the small community. This desire was incorporated into the reality of our technological society with the use of human relations techniques. It became necessary, to people like Mayo and Lewin, to compensate for
man's incapacity to sustain human relations in a technological society. This was done not only for man's benefit but also because human relations were seen as vital for the progress of industry. It was necessary, therefore, to create groups in these industries that were responsible and committed to the common end of productivity. It was also necessary to artificially reproduce the conditions of "community" that were thought to have been left in small town America. This was seen as essential if human relations were to be established within the industrial setting. The technique of human relations was developed to adapt the individual to the technical milieu.

The tendency to return to small groups in search of community is very much a part of the classical liberal tradition, and in that sense human relations techniques are anti-communitarian in nature. As Tocqueville realized, the principle of equality naturally divides people into a multitude of small groups or associations. This is so because:

In democracies, where the members of the community never differ much from each other and naturally stand so near that they may all at any time be fused in one general mass, numerous artificial and arbitrary distinctions spring up by means of which every man hopes to keep himself aloof lest he should be carried away against his will in the crowd.

This can never fail to be the case, for human institutions can be changed, but man cannot; whatever may be the general endeavor of a community to render its members equal and alike, the personal pride of individuals will always seek to rise
above the line and to form somewhere an inequality to their own advantage.49

The condition of equality has helped to create a consensus in America that virtually equates individualism with success, emphasizes means rather than ends, and highly values efficiency. This condition if perpetuated would, in Tocqueville's eyes, eventually create a condition of uniformity in America. The resulting homogeneous mass of men would then become vulnerable to having their political lives controlled as they pursued their self-interests in their private lives. Tocqueville put it this way:

Above this race of men stands an immense and tutelary power, which takes upon itself alone to secure their gratifications, and to watch over their fate. That power is absolute, minute, regular, provident, and mild. It would be like the authority of a parent, if, like that authority, its object was to prepare men for manhood; but it seeks, on the contrary, to keep them in perpetual childhood; it is well content that the people should rejoice, provided they think of nothing but rejoicing. For their happiness such a government willingly labors, but it chooses to be the sole agent and the only arbiter of that happiness; it provides for their security, foresees and supplies their necessities, facilitates their pleasures, manages their principal concerns, directs their industry, regulates the descent of property, and subdivides their inheritances--what remains; but to spare them all the care of thinking and all the trouble of living?50

Human relations techniques were able to succeed in industry precisely because of this set of dynamics in America.
People were not only vulnerable but eager to have someone or something smooth the way for them in the perplexing new technological era. Human relations techniques in industry were developed in the name of "community," but perpetuated the liberal consensus in technological terms. The difficulty was that human relations experts such as Mayo and Lewin, were equating community with the small group.

Lewin's methods for achieving consensus on goals relied on morale, on the "style of living," and on the "social climate." This approach was decidedly apolitical. People were to be directed to the good life. They were not supposed to participate in the search. The object was to smooth man's way in the industrial, technological society by clarifying what was good for him in these rapidly changing times. To lead the good life was to acknowledge and loyally follow whatever goals were necessary for the efficient operation of the organization. The theory of the human relations experts was that this approach would relieve people on the anxiety and ambiguity that technology was causing. In this way people would once again be able to find "community" in their new social context.

The small group is an essential ingredient of community, but it must pursue public as well as private interests. The difference between covenantal community and the "community" of human relations techniques is the recognition of the importance of political community by the former and the near
total emphasis on "natural" community by the latter. Covenantal community stresses a "grass-roots" form of community that encourages widespread participation in groups for the purpose of influencing political elites. The "community" of human relations, on the other hand, is an "elite" form of community that originates with the leadership of an organization and filters down to the workers. The purpose of the "elite" community was to recreate a sense of "community" that was presumably lost with the introduction of technology on a massive scale. Mayo's science of social engineering and Lewin's efforts to achieve a consensus on goals are prime examples of this "elite" community.

The tradition of human relations in industry and the use of small groups led to the creation of sensitivity training techniques and eventually to organization development techniques and the personal growth movement. The philosophy of the sensitivity training movement became popular as it became clear that traditional religious and cultural values no longer affected a great part of the population. In our science and technology dominated society, many experiences important to individual development and social solidarity had been forgotten. When groups were no longer an automatic part of our society, techniques for intensive group experiences were used instead of relying on an intricate system of beliefs. This meant that the shared common beliefs that are so important to a covenantal community were replaced in part by
sensitivity training techniques. These techniques maintain that an individual who can express his own feelings has a chance through sensitivity training to create his own society. According to this view, there is no difference between the needs of society and the needs of the individual.

As technology continues to satisfy more and more of our physical needs, it has not met our social needs. Sensitivity trainers have tried to help people adapt to these changes by paying attention to their need for intense experiences through the creation of sensitivity training techniques. They seem to be saying that social problems can be solved by avoiding them. The result may be the creation of a "community" that provides short term relief from the pressures of living in the technological age, but it neglects the necessity of having a tension between "natural" and political community.

Individual needs and social needs are sometimes contradictory. What is good for the individual and what is good for the group cannot always be identical.

Organization development techniques and the personal growth movement grew out of the sensitivity training movement. OD uses a variety of techniques for producing changes in organizations and for encouraging participatory leadership. Personal growth groups or encounter groups promote sensual awareness and the expanding of human potentiality. On the surface these two approaches seem to have very different aims. However, they have much in common.
Both OD and the personal growth movement lack a political ideology. They were both born out of the sensitivity training movement with its reaction against ultimate aims as seen in their focus on the "here and now." Also, they both emphasize change, whether it be organizational or personal. However, an ideology or system of beliefs cannot be based on change for change's sake. These outgrowths of sensitivity training seem to see change as a good in itself and thus produce an ideology for the sensation of the moment.

Other ideologies, religious and secular, first assume a direction or an ideal state, and then outline the changes that will be necessary to achieve this state. We saw this to be the case in the search of a covenantal community. The covenant or shared common belief was central to the political ideology of the Puritans, Lincoln, and the Populists. In fact, Lincoln said that the renewal of our founding covenant should become a "political religion" in America. This need still exists in America. We have yet to fill the void that is created when there is an absence of ultimate aims. This void leaves the need for commonly shared beliefs, found in the group experience of political community, to be filled by substitute communities, such as those fostered by the sensitivity training movement. The search for "community" for some people has been taken over by these various techniques, but the emphasis is on means rather than ends.

This ideology of change has created encounter group
techniques that neglect the concerns of political community. Likewise, organization development implies a constant search for change for its own sake without the development of a political ideology. OD may be attempting to humanize bureaucracies, and personal growth centers may be trying to create a more humane life for the individual in the midst of our technological society, but neither speaks to the issue of political apathy.

The problem as seen by organization development and personal growth groups seems to be that man has been divided into a public and a private self in relation to the technical world. People, whom Ellul calls "psychotechnicians," have taken it upon themselves to correct this dichotomy by attempting to restore man's lost sense of unity which technical advances have disrupted. However, the assumption seems to be that only technical means can be used to restore what technology has separated. Reintegration has come to mean that "man is to be smoothed out, like a pair of pants under a steam iron." Man's unity is restored, but "only by virtue of the total integration of man into the process which originally produced his dismemberment."\(^{53}\)

In the case of OD this has meant helping people adapt to the rapidly changing technological society by creating humane and democratic organizations that integrate individual needs with bureaucratic needs. In the case of the personal growth movement it has come to mean the use of scientific
techniques to discover the most efficient treatment for an individual trying to reach his full potential, but without the worries of social problems.

I maintain that it is naive to replace political community with human relations techniques. If nothing is done to encourage people to become actively involved in understanding and controlling the social-political forces which are shaping their lives, political apathy will become so widespread that the search for community could be doomed. Human relations techniques, sensitivity training, organization development, and personal growth groups may, to use Ellul's terms, "...alleviate the rigors of the human condition—but only by forcing man to submit to them more completely....They are a kind of lubricating oil, but scarcely a means by which men can recover a sense of worth, personality, and authenticity." The techniques of human relations may make people more comfortable, but they do not aid in the search for community.

Certainly human relations techniques, sensitivity training, organization development, encounter groups, and personal growth groups have found their way into the field of counseling. Carl Rogers, one of the main theorists and practitioners of counseling psychology, helped to develop the Western Behavioral Science Institute in La Jolla, California. It became a center for encounter groups that followed some of the principles of Roger's techniques on client-centered counseling.
The underlying theory of client-centered counseling, like that of human relations, was that man is basically healthy, but is obstructed by various social restraints. The function of the counselor is to give the client the opportunity to express himself freely, by remaining as passive and supportive as possible. The client-centered counselor never forces his own therapeutic convictions on the client, but rather helps him to reach his full potential.

This theory was readily adapted to the human potential movement. Perhaps the characteristics and goals of the La Jolla Institute can be best expressed by quoting Ralph Keys, a resident fellow. Keys maintains that a "national obsession" has developed for a return to a more intimate sense of "community" resembling small town America. His approach emphasizes a return to these romantic ideals of the past through sacrifice, commitment, and a reverence for the ideal of the family as the symbol of belongingness. This can best be accomplished, according to Keys, by not getting "hung up on obsolete notions about what a community should be." He feels that "seeking community in the abstract dooms the search," and that "the problem of community is relatively modern." Furthermore, he maintains that the number of self-help groups forming across the country demonstrates that "community is people," and that "the ideal community is like a good family: the group from which you cannot be expelled."56

This demonstrates the division between "natural" and
political community that has emerged out of the human relations tradition in this country and in the field of counseling. The emphasis is on family life and the pursuit of private goals. What is lacking is the political community to teach people how to break out of their cells of individualism and learn the art of politics.

The role of the counselor working with someone searching for community is to realize that the tradition of human relations is an anti-communitarian trend in America that developed from the liberal tradition. Like the tradition of utopian communities, it must be understood by counselors who wish to avoid the false directions that so temptingly await the search for community.
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PART FOUR

THEORIES OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR AND

THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNITY

IN AMERICA
The search for community in America has reflected both the traditions of covenantal community and the anti-communitarian trends that were discussed in Parts Two and Three of this dissertation. This section of the paper will discuss the need to integrate the concepts of political community as well as the concept of "natural" community into a theory of human behavior. This need is demonstrated in Chapter VIII with a discussion of the development of the science of human behavior as an extension of anti-communitarian trends. The science of human behavior reflects the vacuum caused by the absence of any notion of political community from most theories of human behavior.

Chapter IX discusses Erik Erikson's theories about the development of a healthy personality as an example of the successful integration of the concepts of political and "natural" community into a theory of human behavior. The implications of this theory for the counselor as an educator, and specifically a political educator, are then discussed in Chapter X.

The dichotomy between "natural" and political community has been reinforced by the human relations tradition dis-
cussed in Chapter VII and the science of human behavior in America that will be presented in Chapter VIII. This makes it even more tempting to talk about "natural" community and to neglect any consideration of political community in the development of a theory of human behavior that addresses the problem of community. It is certainly easier to understand the concept of "natural" community because we all have experienced the needs for security, belongingness, and basic material satisfactions that are usually met in the life of a family. However, the primary issue throughout this paper has been the discussion of the need for political community because it is usually avoided in discussions of community.

Community is most often thought of in terms of being a natural human need that has somehow been lost in America. But, as we have seen, community is a "natural" process that must be created with a lot of hard work both within the family and the local neighborhood. The notion of political community is an important addition to "natural" community because the quality of life must be improved as well as made more comfortable. As we saw in Part Two of this paper, the idea of covenantal community maintains that the private rights of "natural" community can only be achieved through the public obligations of political community.

In an ideal world political life is an intermediate force—neither private nor public. It insists that people have a sense of obligation to deal in both public and private
worlds and it represents a world that is not limited by material needs. Or, to quote from John Schaar's critique of Erich Fromm:

Political life occupies a middle terrain between the sheer givens of nature and society on the one side, and the transcendental ends toward which men aspire on the other. Political action is that type of action through which men publicly attempt to order and to transform the givens of nature and society by the light of values which are above or outside the order of the givens.¹

However, in reality there is a split between public and private worlds for most people. The public world of political community is seen at best as a mere necessity for reaching the true goal of a private, "natural" community. As a result, the individual often views himself as being in competition with society. One of the purposes of this section of the paper is to show that there are ways to accommodate a private self in a public world, or to be public and still have a private space.

The contemporary political theorist Sheldon Wolin addresses these issues in the context of his discussion of the Lockean liberal tradition. He states that the liberals misunderstood the fundamental problem:

They conceived the issue as one of reconciling freedom and authority, and they solved it by destroying authority in the name of liberty and replacing it by society, but only at the cost of exposing freedom to society's controls. To the nineteenth and twentieth
centuries fell the task of stating the problem more correctly: not freedom versus authority, or man against the state, but authority and community.2

This section of the paper is also concerned with how to transfer the respect for natural authority into the political world so that we can do what Wolin suggests—combine authority and community, i.e., to define an authority as being creative and innovative rather than punitive and privatizing. Our notions of authority often develop from natural authorities in "natural" communities. Natural authorities mainly emerge out of parenting contexts. They are usually associated with the satisfaction of physical needs, nurturance, respect for experience, advice, and guidance, and an understanding of the need for all of these things. Unfortunately these ideas seem to be limited to the world of the family. When we begin to talk about public and political arenas, authority suggests something very different indeed. Here it usually symbolizes prohibitions, punishments, and a world where each individual reacts as an individual against the authority, or sees the authority as crucial only as it punishes the individual.

As we saw in Chapter VII, Schaar provides a useful definition of political authority:

Political authority is that authority which defines the ideal aims of the community and which tries to shape and direct nature and society in accordance with these ends.
Just as the father in the family has the two-fold task of restraining the children from regressing to the comforts of infantilism and of urging them upward toward the acceptance of mature human standards and obligations, so the authority in the polity has the twofold task of restraining the citizens from regressing to nature and society and of urging them upward toward the achievement of ideal ends. Within the ordered human space established by the laws and guaranteed by authority, men can live together in trust and friendship and can cooperate in the give-and-take of political activity properly so-called. Through this political activity, men come to realize themselves by working out their destinies with others. And that leads to the third task of authority, which is that of enabling men to order their lives toward ideal aims. This function of authority is completely captured in Aristotle's two deepest ideas: man is a political animal; and men form societies not just to live but to live well.

But we are still left with the question of how to create a world in which this is accepted, i.e., where the importance of both authority and community is realized. How do we get back to the world of the covenantal community where public authorities are not seen as people who are trying to invade our privacy and limit our freedom, but rather as people helping us to reach our full potential.

These questions will be explored in psychological as well as in political terms. The question of authority and community is a question that must unite public and private concerns. To put this in Erikson's framework, there is a need for healthy individuals and a healthy society. As we shall see in Chapter IX, there must be a state of tension
between the individual and society for the development of a healthy personality, but the existence of a state of conflict is not healthy. As we shall see in Chapter X, the counselor can assume an important role as a "humanly significant authority," to use Schaar's terms, and as a "caretaker" and "representative of society," to use Erikson's terms, in an effort to help people understand that the solution to the problem of community lies in a supportive rather than an antagonistic notion of authority.
Footnotes

In an effort to stop the advance of technological society and its destruction of "natural" community, the science of human behavior was created to reestablish this lost sense of natural harmony that was theoretically once a part of American life. As a result of the liberal tradition and the development of human relations techniques, it became more possible to view man and his ideas as a function of the group and thus to understand him by understanding the group to which he belongs. Theories of social behavior were developed into sciences of human behavior. An example of this trend can be seen in the field of social psychology where empirical studies were used to show that an individual's behavior is regulated by the groups that shape his perceptions and patterns of knowledge.

The tendency of this science of human behavior was to emphasize the behavior of small groups and to focus on what were thought to be natural social relationships, such as those found in the family and the local community. It was theorized that our complex industrial society was disrupting
these natural social relationships and creating many of the social ills of the day, such as individual neuroses, community disruption, complicated politics, and various factional crises.\textsuperscript{2}

In an attempt to regain what technology had destroyed, it seemed essential to take advantage of the increase in knowledge of social skills and human relations. It became reasonable to argue that psychologists should "seek to provide a basic science of human thinking, character, skill learning, motives, conduct, etc., which will serve all the sciences of man (e.g., anthropology, sociology, economics, government, education, medicine, etc.) in much the same way and to the same extent that biology now serves the agricultural and medical sciences."\textsuperscript{3}

The goals of this science of human behavior were to recapture a sense of equilibrium that was thought to have existed in America before the industrial revolution. Theirs is a faith in the ideal of some harmonious whole that was inherent to American life but had been lost. This emerging profession used the techniques of social engineering that were discussed in Chapter VII in an attempt to regain a sense of uniformity, stability, and "community" in America.\textsuperscript{4}

The research of these human behaviorists was designed to identify a basic social structure in America and to search for the prerequisites of stability as well as the conditions of instability in society. Sociologist Robert A. Nisbet
offered a valuable perspective on the function of this re-
search:

Research projects tend to center increasingly on problems of individual assimilation within groups, classes, and culture. The astonishing spread of the study of group structure, group dynamics, interpersonal relations, and of associative components in economic and political behavior bears rich testimony to the change that has taken place in recent decades in the type of problem regarded as significant. The social group has replaced the individual as the key concept... and it is almost as apt to observe that social order has replaced social change as the key problem. Beyond count are the present speculations, theories, and projects focused on the mechanics of group cohesion, structure, function, and the varied processes of assimilation and adjustment....

Nisbet concedes that while the methods of this social science are analytical they also "reflect a set of deep moral urgen-
cies" that are "given meaning and drive by moral aspirations toward community." 

The Search for Community

The search for community within the science of human behavior was really a search for a liberal consensus. Their's was an attempt to reveal basic harmonious universals in American society which they were sure were there. They seemed to believe in a natural order of man and his society that needed only to be understood and then protected. This underlying harmony of parts led to variations on the theme of human relations techniques and their attempts to engineer
harmony for the purpose of gaining a consensus on a common goal. In this case the common goal was the notion that men find fulfillment in "congenial and creative interpersonal relations."³

The search for the most direct route back to what was seen as a natural condition of harmony led to a focus on the group nature of society. Basically, it was thought that the individual could only be understood by understanding the various groups which regulate his life. The goal of course being to create groups which would reestablish the lost sense of harmony. The model for this search for community seemed to be the family and local community of a once rural America, to the neglect of any consideration of political community.

The political scientist, Henry Kariel, expresses concern over this political void in his critique of American pluralism:

In the field of social psychology it has become possible to conclude empirically that the individual knows the world and acts within it primarily through his associations, that his associations produce those patterns of knowledge which regulated his behavior. "These patterns," David B. Truman has written, "are, or are rapidly becoming, the primary data of the social scientist. To identify and interpret these uniformities...is the most effective approach to understanding a society—or a segment of it such as its political institutions." Such understanding, it is affirmed, need not depend on any knowledge of a common good or a public interest independent of a compromise of group interests. The governmental process
can be seen simply as group warfare. Governmental phenomena are a function of groups freely interacting. So, the search for community in America that has grown out of the science of human behavior is a search for a sense of harmony or uniformity within freely interacting groups. In general there is the feeling that a loss of the traditional community ties of family and local neighborhood have resulted in the loss of a sense of belongingness. This traditional stability or sense of community is thought to have been destroyed by industrialization. In fact, most studies of community by human behaviorists define community as the local community with its local government, schools, factories, and families.

Maurice R. Stein analyzes some of these approaches to the study of community. He interprets the problems of American community life using field studies conducted by sociologists during the past half century to explore how the processes of urbanization, industrialization, and bureaucratization are continuing to reshape the idea of community in America. He cites the community studies of Robert Park on the urbanization of Chicago, of the Lynds on the industrialization of "Middletown," and of Lloyd Warner on the bureaucratization in "Yankee City" to support his thesis of the "eclipse" of traditional community ties, or what has been called "natural" community in this paper.
Community and Society

Perhaps the source most often cited by human behaviorists as the classic study in this dichotomy between the lost sense of "natural" community and our technological society is Ferdinand Tonnies' sociological treatise Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft or Community and Society. Gemeinschaft translates quite directly into the word community, while the common translation for Gesellschaft is the somewhat less comfortable word "society". The archetype of Gemeinschaft is the family and represents what I have referred to as the "natural" view of community. Kinship, neighborhood and friendship are the three components of Gemeinschaft, but the importance of the idea of the family always remains central.

The prototype of...Gemeinschaft is the family

...The three pillars of Gemeinschaft—blood, place, and mind, or kinship, neighborhood, and friendship—are all encompassed in the family, but the first of them is the constituting element of it.11

Gesellschaft, on the other hand, symbolizes the absence of both kinship and friendship, as well as the presence of modern capitalism and rationality. Tonnies makes the following distinction between the two terms:

The theory of the Gesellschaft deals with the artificial construction of an aggregate of human beings which superficially resembles the Gemeinschaft insofar as the individuals live and dwell together peacefully. However,
in Gemeinschaft they remain essentially united in spite of all separating factors, whereas in Gesellschaft they are essentially separated in spite of all uniting factors. In the Gesellschaft, as contrasted with the Gemeinschaft, we find no actions that can be derived from an a priori and necessarily existing unity; no actions, therefore, which manifest the will and the spirit of the unity even if performed by the individual; no actions which, insofar as they are performed by the individual, take place on behalf of those united with him. In the Gesellschaft such actions do not exist. On the contrary, here everybody is by himself and isolated, and there exists a condition of tension against all others.  

The concept of Gemeinschaft has come to symbolize all that is morally "good" in society - e.g. love, honor, friendship, and loyalty. Gesellschaft is not an absolute evil, however. It has made most conveniences of our modern culture possible, including the rise of the city as the center of business, industry, and culture. But, Tonnies makes it very clear that he believes the rise of Gesellschaft means the decline of Gemeinschaft. This interpretation has, in fact, become the most widely accepted explanation for the lack of a feeling of community in modern America. It is the evolution from Gemeinschaft to Gesellschaft that accounts for the rise and growth of technological society and thus the loss of "natural" community.

Robert Nisbet, as a sociologist, follows in the tradition of Tonnies by establishing the family as the archetype of man's communal aspirations. In discussing the problem of
community he cites the absence of "natural" forms of community such as family, church, and local community as the basis for the difficulty of satisfying our needs for psychological security and identification. It is commonly assumed, according to Nisbet, that as the traditional forms of community become more scarce new forms of community will appear to take their place. However, this is not the case. In fact Nisbet maintains that in our large cities there are very few modern replacements for "natural" community. However, he also sees the need to go beyond mere local community in order to achieve some understanding of community in modern times. He offers the following definition of community:

The word...encompasses all forms of relationship which we characterized by a high degree of personal intimacy, emotional depth, moral commitment, social cohesion, and continuity in time. Community is founded on man conceived in his wholeness rather than in one or another of the roles, taken separately, that he may hold in a social order. It draws its psychological strength from levels of motivation deeper than those of more volition or interest, and it achieves its fulfillment in a submergence of individual will that is not possible in unions of mere convenience or rational assent. Community is a fusion of feeling and thought, of tradition and commitment, of membership and volition. It may be found in, or be given symbolic expression by, locality, religion, nation, race, occupation, or crusade. Its archetype, both historically and symbolically, is the family, and in almost every type of genuine community the nomenclature of family is prominent. Fundamental to the strength of the bond of community is the real or imagined antithesis formed in the same social setting by the non-communal relations of competition or conflict,
utility or contractual assent. These, by their relative impersonality and anonymity, highlight the close personal ties of community. Thus Nisbet clearly remains in the camp of "natural" community although he has broadened and deepened the concept of community significantly.

Nisbet is important to any study of community because his is one of the few modern studies of the concept of community. He sees that the quest for community has become one of the dominant social tendencies of the Twentieth Century. The problem of community is seen by Nisbet to be a major theme of modern literature, philosophy, social science, and of popular thought and behavior. He argues that the centralization of power and the resulting bureaucratization of function and authority are the cause of the contemporary quest for community. What he describes as political forces have thus weakened more traditional forms of community making the creation of new forms of community much more difficult. In addition to Nisbet's studies, there are relatively few other modern studies of community.16

The Myth of Gemeinschaft

Human behaviorists have seen the small group as the means for recreating the lost sense of harmony in American life with the family serving as the archetype for community. However, while they have maintained that a sense of community that was once natural to man has been lost, they have also
realized that human relations are by no means automatic or natural. The concept of blood kinship, on which the theory of Gemeinschaft is based, implies that one's kindred are created automatically by virtue of being born into a particular family. But, even within the family and most certainly in an artificial "family" such as an industrial group, human relations require a great deal of effort. So community is seen as being "natural" because it must be created among people by a lot of hard work and attention to the quality of their human relations. However, "natural" community alone cannot lead to a sense of community.

Wilson C. McWilliams speaks of the "myth of gemeinschaft" in his exhaustive study on the idea of fraternity in America. While "natural" community provides one with an essential sense of security, McWilliams maintains that Gemeinschaft is based on a denial of individual personality and separateness. Citing the sociologist Georg Simmel, he shows that groups which are necessary, stable, and secure tend to lack meaning for their members. Group stability often means a lack of individual differences within the group. So, the price of the security of blood kinship can be personal indifference toward an individual. In other words, one may be accepted as a member of a family, but ignored as a specific personality.

"Natural" community thus leads to a certain sense of security, belongingness, and affection which meet some of
man’s basic needs. For example, James S. Plant in his book *Personality and Culture*, stresses the importance of a feeling of belonging based on the security of one's place in the family. He sees this as a prerequisite for the development of a healthy personality.\(^{19}\) Also, Abraham Maslow explains this need for belongingness in his famous need hierarchy. According to his theory, human needs seem to fall into a kind of hierarchy, with those of a strictly physical or self-preservative nature being least important while the needs of a social and spiritual nature are most important. When people are most concerned with satisfying the lower order needs, such as rate of production and distribution of material goods, the higher order of needs remain virtually unattended by the majority of people. However, when the basic, material needs are met, those of a social and a spiritual nature assume a position of priority. Desires for cultural participation, social belonging, and personal status then become all important. Thus, Maslow refers to natural human needs that must be met before higher levels of human development can take place.\(^{20}\)

However, as Simmel has instructed us, there is also the danger that the security of the uniform identity of a family can discourage the development of individual diversity. Unless the "natural" community of the family is balanced by the search for a political community, the family can assume a privatizing influence over its members and
thus become anti-covenantal or anti-communitarian in character. That is to say, it can stifle any desire to challenge the forces which are controlling one's life and to establish a clear sense of individuality. As was seen in Parts One and Two of this paper, the desire for the rights of "natural" community must be combined with a sense of covenantal obligation in any attempt to improve the quality of life. The strength of each individual is necessary to the covenant. It is a strength which allows him as a distinct individual to choose to enter into a covenant with his fellows each of whom is an individual himself. The strength of the resulting collectivity or community is dependent on the strength of each separate individual and therefore is dependent on diversity.

Private Versus Public

The focus of human behaviorists on the need for "natural" community encouraged the dichotomy between "natural" or private and political or public needs in America. The concept and the problem of community is generally discussed in terms of an incompatibility between individual self-interests and the evils of modernity. This in turn creates an artificial differentiation of the individual's private and public life, as if one ceased to be a political animal when alone or with his family.

John Schaar, the contemporary political theorist,
maintains that what is needed in this situation is a return to the Aristotelian vision of community. This vision, as we saw in Chapter I, attempted to reconcile the differences between the public self and the private self by insisting upon participation in public things as an essential activity in the individual's quest for self-fulfillment. This vision has in general been lost.21

Much of the science of human behavior seems to base the goal of self-fulfillment on the ability to experience "congenial and creative interpersonal relations."22 Perhaps the ultimate expression of this vision of the goals of community can be seen in the popular writings of Charles A. Reich. Reich is probably the most popular preacher of this gospel of self-fulfillment. "Consciousness III," he writes, "says for the present, all that is necessary to describe the new society is to describe a new way of life. When we have outlined a different way of life, we have said all that we can meaningfully say about the future. This is not avoiding the hard questions. The hard question - if by what is meant political and economic organization - are insignificant, even irrelevant." In effect, Reich avoids the painful search for what I have called political community. In fact, he ends any need for a search for an alternative to modernity with his belief that the "conversion" from "false" to "true" consciousness, i.e. from a belief that economic and material wealth can solve all problems to an understanding
that it cannot. "But the whole Corporate State rests upon nothing but consciousness," he writes. "When consciousness changes, its soldiers will refuse to fight, its police will rebel, its bureaucrats will stop their work, its jailers will open the bars, nothing can stop the power of consciousness." Consciousness III seeks to recover the "radical subjectivity" of the personal "self" that the technological state has neutralized. Yet in doing so it orchestrates an escape into the very privatism that Reich maintains that technology has created. For example, he holds that "most of the Consciousness III people are notably unaggressive, nonviolent, uninterested in the political game, absorbed by their new culture and its possibilities, and mainly ask to be left alone...."  

If Reich were correct and the modern discovery and celebration of the self and the drive towards private self-realization were indeed forming the basis of a new consciousness, then the only role of political community would be to assist in the search for a private sense of self-fulfillment. However, as we have seen, political community calls for the union of an individual's public and private interests through an active commitment with other people to a common goal. As we have seen throughout this paper, the private search for "natural" community is an essential ingredient of community, but a public search for political community is also needed.
Community and Identity

Political community tends to give the individual a sense of self-fulfillment, to unify one's life, and to create a sense of stability. However, the point I want to make here, and that I will enlarge upon in the next chapter, is that this form of unity is very different from the uniformity that is created by the search for "natural" community alone. The sense of unity that results from participation in a political community comes much closer to what Erik Erikson has called "the search for an inner sense of identity." 24

Identity formation is an active process that can only take place within the context of a community. We need to discover who we are and what our place in the world is, but the paradox is that this cannot be done alone. Identity formation depends upon an endless play of inner and outer forces in one's life. We begin by copying or identifying with other people in our environment, but identity requires both internal development and external learning. We may identify with our external world, but we must individually interpret what we see.

Erikson makes just this point when he says:

It is this identity of something in the individual's core with an essential aspect of a group's inner coherence which is under consideration here: for the young individual must learn to be most himself where he means most to others, to be sure, who have come to mean most to him. The term identity expresses such a mutual relation in that it connotes
both a persistent sameness within oneself (selfsameness) and a persistent sharing of some kind of essential character with others.25

So, we are dealing with a process that attempts to form an identity, a sameness, out of an individual's private self and his public self. This process leads ultimately to what Erikson calls "an optimal sense of identity," which "is experienced...as a sense of psychological well-being. Its most obvious concomitants are a feeling of being at home in one's body, a sense of 'knowing where one is going,' and an inner assuredness of anticipated recognition from those who count."26 However, when and if this state of identity formation is experienced, it is usually not without great agony along the way.

The primary task of American youth is the achievement of identity. It is important to emphasize the word "achievement." One does not simply receive his identity from the society in which he lives. The individual is not "socialized" by societal norms into a well defined role. Rather, he must attempt, to create, as Keniston says, "a sense of innersameness and continuity, to bind together the past, the present, and the future into a coherent whole."27 This must happen, however, in a time of rapid technological change. It is no wonder that so many turn to the warmth and acceptance of family and "natural" community for a solution.

The problem of identity formation for youth then is to
attempt to achieve some sense of continuity as everything around them is in a constant process of changing. But the solution lies in the direction of a search for identity that seeks to recognize the realities of our technological age through the participation in a political community, and not in the direction of an exclusive search for "natural" community.

Although the search for community in America is in part an attempt to find substitutes for the lack of what has been called "natural" community, Erikson has said in his "reflections on the American Identity" that "in general Americans do not experience 'this country' as a 'motherland' in the soft, nostalgic sense of 'the old country'. 'This country' is loved almost bitterly and in a remarkably unromantic and realistic way."28

Tocqueville supports and explains Erikson's reference to this phenomenon of undefinable feelings and affection that people have for their birthplace as "instinctive patriotism":

This fondness is united with a taste for ancient customs and a reverence for traditions of the past; those who cherish it love their country as they love the mansion of their fathers. They love the tranquility that it affords them; they cling to the peaceful habits that they have contracted within its bosom; they are attached to the reminiscences that it awakens; and they are even pleased by living there in a state of obedience.29
At its core, patriotism means love of one's homeplace, and of the familiar things and scenes associated with the homeplace. In this sense, patriotism is one of the basic human sentiments. If not a natural tendency in the species, it is at least a proclivity produced by realities basic to human life, for territoriality, along with family, has always been a primary associative bond. We become devoted to the people, places, and ways that nurture us, and what is familiar and nurturing seems also natural and right.30

Largely because of our newness as a nation and our lack of a feudal tradition, we do not have this sense of "natural" community in America. The attempt to find it is not only futile but it ignores the tradition of covenantal community in our history that has demonstrated the importance of everyone taking an active part in the government of society.

The search for a sense of identity involves the attempt by an individual to create a sameness out of his private and his public self. This does not, however, mean that one must make them both conform to a model of society, such as the one proposed by the science of human behavior. The art of creating political community also relies on an understanding of associations or small groups, but the independence of each individual is recognized and encouraged. Common goals or a set of shared common beliefs are seen to be important, but each individual is encouraged to reach these goals in a manner that suits him best. As Tocqueville said, everyone maintains "the exercise of his reason and free will, but
everyone exerts that reason and will to promote a common understanding.  In this way, as we shall see in more depth in Chapter IX, the search for community can lead to a sense of identity or the unity of one's public and private selves, but without the creation of a stifling sense of uniformity or consensus that results from the exclusive search for "natural" community.

**Summary of Chapter VIII and the Implications For Action by the Counselor**

In an effort to stop the advance of technological society and its destruction of "natural" community, the science of human behavior was created to reestablish this lost sense of natural harmony that was theoretically once a part of American life. As we have seen, Tonnies is a strong force in this interpretation of community with his theories of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft. This classical sociological treatise written in 1887 enlarged on a theory of two different modes of thinking and behavior, and of two types of society that has been a recurring theme in philosophical literature since Plato and Aristotle. As with Aristotle, the family was central to the idea of "natural" or Gemeinschaft society. However, Plato's warning that the family could be a threat to political community was ignored. I am not so much interested in the specifics of Tonnies' theory in this paper as I am concerned with the popular use of his terms as a symbol of the Aristotlian view of family
and "natural" community to the exclusion of the Platonic view of family and political community. In other words, Gemeinschaft has become a symbol for "natural" community.

Tonnies theorized that it was the Gesellschaft with its high degree of individualism, impersonality, and governed by self-interest that led to the loss of Gemeinschaft with all of its family ties. In an effort to stop the advance of Gesellschaft or technological society and its destruction of Gemeinschaft or "natural" community, the science of human behavior was created to reestablish this lost sense of natural harmony that was theoretically once a part of American life. This is perhaps an example of taking a theory of community based on another cultural context too literally. There are indeed valuable lessons to be learned from Tonnies' work, but we have to be careful to make the translations to the American social and historical context.

Technological society in America has created a feeling of powerlessness in the individual which only serves to increase his tendency toward what David Riesman has called privatism and Slater has called the search for privacy. Also, Keniston thinks that this privatism has taken the form of a withdrawal into the family in America. It is the withdrawal into private life which is responsible for the decline in political involvement among youth in America.\(^3\)

In general, it can be said that people in America choose privacy and anonymity rather than an involvement in
political community. There is a great danger that the needs of community-craving men will be met in private. Tocqueville wrote of what he saw as the fatal tendency in America to emphasize the private over the public. Private interest indeed guides most of our actions, but we need public affairs or political life to remind us of our dependency on each other and of the need for cooperation. It is precisely this dependency and cooperation that is what I have referred to as political community.

However, Tocqueville has been misrepresented by some human behaviorists. He is sometimes cited as a primary source for the validation of the assumption that people are basically associational in nature and that human behavior and political behavior can be explained by studying these associations. If anything, Tocqueville challenged the notion that Americans are enthusiastic joiners of groups. He believed that through voluntary associations Americans could overcome their strong drive toward individualism by learning the art of politics. And, he spoke of a need for political community since he felt that the exclusive existence of "natural" community was neither possible nor desirable in non-feudal America.

As we have seen in this paper, individualism has become the dominant force in American society. As a result of this tendency, the individual, contrary to the opinion of
many human behaviorists, takes little part in "group life." For the most part, group membership in America is instrumental, i.e., the association is merely an efficient means for the achievement of individual goals and not an expression of a way of life which is itself valued. The family remains the center of the search for "natural" community with other associations being used for the pursuit of private goals that will lead to the ultimate goal of individualism—self-sufficiency. Once self-sufficiency is achieved, the individual usually abandons group life in favor of the comforts of a more private life. There indeed may be formal associations held together by the subtle arts of managerial psychology, but neither this nor the private life can be called community.35

Both Erikson and Schaar support this view that forms of community other than the family are for the most part pursued only insofar as they further one's private goals. Erikson sees that Americans are committed to achievement rather than local belonging. So, while there is "no place like home, it is important that you should be able to take it with you." Schaar has observed that Americans primarily are committed to the goal of self-sufficiency. Once this goal is achieved, most individuals withdraw from the group or communal endeavors that were necessary along the way.36

In this regard Erikson and Schaar are implicitly responding to a view advanced by the American science of human
behavior in the late 1950's and early 1960's.

The emphasis placed on the importance of small groups by the human behaviorists has reduced politics to nothing more than interacting power blocs. In essence, political community is replaced by human relations and the group is seen as the basic political form. As Kariel states:

The belief that society and politics are best understood by taking full account of man's affiliations has been entertained so broadly, fervently, and uncritically that, in application, its instrumental nature has not always remained clear. The casual facility with which the group hypothesis has come to be handled has made it easy to see politics as substantially nothing more than a process of interacting power blocs.

As this view becomes the only meaningful one, pluralism is in effect hypostatized. And as the immutable nature of political reality is presumed to be clear, all that remains necessary for its assessment is to extend and deepen one's knowledge of America by the rigorous application of that ultimate conceptual framework which allows one to behold a vibrant pluralism. To know America is to know it as a community within which those who care will struggle fraternal for public power. To have knowledge of America's political process is coincidentally to have knowledge of America's substantive goals as well. What had once been dealt with by an inexact political philosophy concerned with eliciting, juxtaposing, and sifting common opinions—a philosophy aspiring to discriminate between right and wrong conduct—is to become an amoral, natural science of human behavior.37

The purpose of the science of human behavior seems to be the creation of a public consensus by the use of a science of means. The danger is that the scientific methods will be
used to create a lost sense of harmony without consulting the people affected. As Kariel reminds us, "the definition of order is the business not of social engineers but the citizenry."\(^{38}\)

The thesis of this paper is that people can only reach their full potential and achieve a sense of self-fulfillment through participation in political community as well as "natural" community. As has been the case so often in our history, the study of human behavior neglects the need for political community in the search for community. The concept of political community needs to be integrated into our theories of human behavior. We need theories which help to view man in the fullness of his potentialities. The science of human behavior tends to reduce our world in theory and then unify it in practice. As we saw in the historical studies of covenantal community in America, the search for political community tends to reveal our possibilities as well as our limits.

Erikson has attempted to fill the void caused by the absence of political community from theories of human behavior. Chapters IX and X will show how political community as well as "natural" community can be integrated into a theory of human behavior, and what the role of the counselor is in this process.
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CHAPTER IX

THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNITY

AND THE

DEVELOPMENT OF A HEALTHY PERSONALITY

I believe that the concept of community has become the popularized term for what Erikson refers to as "wholeness." Something has, however, been lost in the translation. Popularizations of complicated, seminal thought are too often mechanistic reproductions bearing only superficial or formal relation to the original. It is true that the goals of people searching for community in the form of a commune, a religious movement, an ethnic or racial group, or a personal growth experience seem to meet the requirements of the definition of wholeness. However, the search for wholeness or community can and often has led to a form of "totalism." An excessive desire for unity, as the classics knew, can create a situation where the individual loses his freedom of diversity for the sake of a desired uniformity or totality. Wherever a genuine search for "wholeness" is present, the risk of "totalism" must be confronted. It is, in Erikson's terms, necessary to sustain the "tension" between the two lest "totalistic" solutions preclude the search for whole-
ness altogether.

The Psychological Need for Wholeness and Totalism

Erikson points to the psychological need for what he calls "wholeness" and "totality" in the development of a healthy personality. Specifically, as we shall see, the development of a healthy personality depends on the ability to face a series of psychosocial tensions between wholeness and totality that inevitably occur at each stage of the life cycle. As he explains, both terms mean entireness, but there are important differences.

Wholeness seems to connote an assembly of parts, even quite diversified parts, that enter into fruitful association and organization. This concept is most strikingly expressed in such terms as wholeheartedness, whole-mindedness, wholesomeness, and the like. As a Gestalt, then, wholeness emphasizes a sound, organic, progressive mutuality between diversified functions and parts within an entirety, the boundaries of which are open and fluid. Totality, on the contrary, evokes a Gestalt in which an absolute boundary is emphasized: given a certain arbitrary delineation, nothing that belongs inside must be left outside, nothing that must be outside can be tolerated inside. A totality is as absolutely inclusive as it is utterly exclusive—whether or not the category-to-be-made-absolute is a logical one, and whether or not the constituent parts really have an affinity for one another.

The psychological need for a totality usually means that the search for psychological wholeness has been abandoned in favor of a totalistic solution to one's problems. Or, as Erikson puts it:
When the human being, because of accidental or developmental shifts, loses an essential wholeness, he restructures himself and the world by taking recourse to what we may call totalism. It would be wise to abstain from considering this a merely regressive or infantile mechanism. It is an alternate, if more primitive, way of dealing with experience, and thus has, at least in transitory states, a certain adjustment and survival value. It belongs to normal psychology.

In the individual it is the "inner institution" called by Freud the "ego" which has the task of mastering experience and of guiding action in such a way that a certain wholesome synthesis is, ever again, created between the diverse and conflicting stages and aspects of life—between immediate impressions and associated memories, between impelling wishes and compelling demands, between the most private and the most public aspects of existence. To do its job, the ego develops modes of synthesis as well as screening methods and mechanisms of defense. As it matures through the constant interaction of maturational forces and environmental influences, a certain duality develops between higher levels of integration (which permit a greater tolerance of tension and of diversity) and lower levels of integration where totalities and conformities must help to preserve a sense of security. The study of those fusions and defusions which—on the individual level—make for a successful wholeness or an attempted totality thus belongs to the realm of psychoanalytic ego-psychology.²

The purpose of this paper is not to describe the field of ego psychology; but, at least a limited presentation of this field of study is necessary for an adequate understanding of the interrelationships of political community and "natural" community and the concepts of wholeness and totalism and their importance for the development of a healthy personality.
The Development of a Healthy Personality

Erikson's theory of ego psychology is based on a sequence of phases of psychosocial development which encompass the entire life cycle. Specifically, he describes the human life cycle as a series of psychosocial crises which are each characterized by wholeness or relative psychological health and totalism or relative psychological ill-health. These crises include: (1) basic trust vs. mistrust; (2) autonomy vs. shame and doubt; (3) initiative vs. guilt; (4) industry vs. inferiority; (5) identity vs. identity diffusion; (6) intimacy vs. isolation; (7) generativity vs. stagnation; (8) integrity vs. despair.

Erikson describes each crisis in terms of a tension or a duality that must be maintained between extremes of wholeness and totality. He states that "the original alternative of a 'whole' solution in the form of Basic Trust and a total solution in the form of Basic Mistrust...is followed on each of the successive childhood stages by analogous alternatives." In the initial psychosocial crisis, a wholeness develops between a mother's need to give and her baby's need to receive love, warmth, and nourishment. This sense of basic trust becomes "...the first and basic wholeness, for it seems to imply that the inside and the outside can be experienced as an interrelated goodness." Basic mistrust then comes to represent all those experiences that are not included in this initial sense of integration. However,
it is central to Erikson's argument that the mother be seen as a member of a family and a society with which she must also feel a wholesome relationship. Without this basic sense of well-being and trust the mother is likely to seem anxious to the new-born. In fact even given healthy family life, Erikson insists, only a "whole" society can insure that the infant will develop a sense of basic trust about his inner and outer worlds as communicated through the mother initially and then through the parents and other parenting figures. This is perhaps Erikson's major contribution to ego psychology and to the thesis of this paper.

Thus Erikson expanded on Freud's theory of ego psychology to include the role of social reality in a psychosocial theory of development. Erikson's theory is summarized very well by David Rapaport:

Erikson's theory...rests on the assumption of an inborn coordination to an average expectable environment. His concept of mutuality specifies that the crucial coordination is between the developing individual and the human (social) environment, and that this coordination is mutual. The theory postulates a cogwheeling of the life cycles: the representatives of society, the caretaking persons, are coordinated to the developing individual by their specific inborn responsiveness to his needs and by the phase-specific needs of their own....It conceives of the caretaking persons as representatives of their society, as carriers of its institutional, traditional, caretaking patterns, and thus it focuses attention on the fact that each society meets each phase of the development of its members by institutions (parental care, schools, teachers, occupations, etc.) specific to it, to ensure that the developing individual
will be viable in it... Thus it is not assumed that societal norms are grafted upon the genetically asocial individual by "disciplines" and "socialization," but that the society into which the individual is born makes him its member by influencing the manner in which he solves the tasks posed by each phase of his... development.

So Erikson argues that the leaders of our society and our political system—those who offer advice, direction, and guidance—cannot ignore the psychosocial crises of the life cycle. If they are to retain their positions as advisers, directors, guides, or authorities they must confront the reality of these crises. Once having established this necessity then but only then can we turn to a discussion of alternative substantive approaches to the search for commun-
ity. For example, Erikson offers the alternative arguments in _Childhood and Society_ of the possibly nurturant role of the political system, and the stultifying role of Hitler who recognized weaknesses in people and played upon them.

Perhaps the use of a diagram outlining the necessary tensions between totalism and wholeness would be helpful at this point. Figure 7 lists the attributes of each of these ingredients in the development of a healthy personality.
TOTALISM  <---------------->  WHOLENESS

Individualism                Association or Community
Uniformity                   Diversity
Exclusive                    Organic
Inclusive                    Mutuality
Absolute boundary            Open and fluid boundaries
Security                     need for tension

psychological
ill-health
mistrust
shame and doubt
guilt
inferiority
identity diffusion
stagnation
despair

psychological
health
trust
autonomy
initiative
industry
identity
generativity
integrity

Fig. 7. The state of tension that is present in a healthy personality.

I want to emphasize the importance of the tension between wholeness and totality which occurs at each phase of the life cycle. All too often only the first half of each tension is emphasized. Erikson makes this point extremely well:

One of the chief misuses of the schema presented here is the connotation that the sense of trust (and all the other positive senses to be postulated) is an achievement, secured once and for all at a given stage. In fact, some writers are so intent on making an achievement scale out of these stages that they blithely omit all the negative senses (basic mistrust, etc.) which are and remain the dynamic counterpart of the positive senses throughout life.

What the child acquires at a given stage is a certain ratio between the positive and the
negative which, if the balance is toward the positive will help him to meet later crises with a better chance for unimpaired development. The idea that at any stage a goodness is achieved which is impervious to new conflicts within and changes without is a projection on child development of that success ideology which so dangerously pervades our private and public daydreams and can make us inept in the face of a heightened struggle for a meaningful existence in our time. Only in the light of man's inner division and social antagonism is a belief in his essential resourcefulness and creativity justifiable and productive.7

The development of a healthy personality for Erikson depends on the ability to face the series of psychosocial tensions between wholeness and totality that recur throughout the life cycle while realizing that there is no such thing as absolute goodness or wholeness. "Whole" solutions to the psychosocial tensions of each phase must outweigh the "total" solutions, although they can never completely replace them. It is important to emphasize that one can never achieve a sense of wholeness in one's life. There must always be some degree of tension between wholeness and totality. To pretend that wholeness can be achieved at any phase of development is to expose man to a false sense of optimism that can only make him more vulnerable to the totalistic realities of the world. In fact, what is needed is a continuing search for wholeness throughout one's life with the realization that a duality must be maintained between wholeness and totality.
The Importance of a Healthy Society

As we have seen, an understanding of the concept of community requires a knowledge of "natural" community and of political community. But to understand how this relates to the tension between wholeness and totalism and the development of a healthy personality, it is important to understand that there is a similar and a necessary tension between political and "natural" community.

The healthy personality needs a foundation of wholeness that can only grow out of a good childhood and family life, and thus a healthy "natural" community. "Natural" community is essential in that it provides the context for the foundation of the development of a healthy personality. But, as the classical philosophers have instructed us, an individual can reach his full potential only through active participation in a political community. An individual acting in the family or "natural" community in isolation from political community can never reach his full potential. Life in a "natural" community makes one independent in the sense of being secure and comfortable, but true freedom is only reached when one joins in the pursuit of a common interest with others for the purpose of improving the quality of their lives. It is the position of this paper that without the support of a political community, "natural" community will not be able to encourage the development of wholeness at each of the phases of the life cycle.
The family must be supported by a healthy society, which is only possible if the members of the family both value and participate in a political community. And, likewise, a sense of political community can only be achieved when the individuals in society have come from "natural" communities that value and encourage wholeness over totalism. Thus, "natural" community must be supported by political community, and political community must be supported by "natural" community creating a tension necessary for the development of a healthy personality supported by a healthy society.

Once again the use of a diagram may be helpful. Figure 8 illustrates the set of dynamic tensions and interrelationships that must exist between the psychological needs that are necessary for the development of a healthy personality and the social needs that lead to the establishment of a healthy society. In a healthy society a tension must be maintained between "natural" and political community, and in a healthy personality a tension must be maintained between totalism and wholeness. However, there must also be the recognition of the potential interrelationships among all of these factors.
Fig. 8. The importance of a healthy society for the development of a healthy personality.

I also draw the support of this argument from Erikson. He maintains that the development of each of the positive senses, (trust, autonomy, etc.) must be supported by a political life which fosters a search for wholeness at each of the psychosocial stages of development. 8 Erikson's point is that without this political support, the battle between wholeness and totalism at each phase of the life cycle will more frequently be won by the totalistic forces. Indeed, without this tension between "natural" and political community, it is possible that "natural" community can lead to totalistic solutions to one's search for wholeness. Or, as the classics warned, "natural" community can preclude the search for political community. 9 For example, Kenneth Keniston, who is a student of Erikson's, warns of a "fantasy of fusion" that grows out of the yearning to replicate the sense of belongingness that one may have experienced or at least idealized in terms of his childhood life in a family. In an effort to recapture in adulthood the feelings of
warmth, communion, acceptedness, dependence, and intimacy which existed in childhood, it becomes tempting to turn to an idealized past where one was totally provided for. The ensuing "fantasies" can encompass a broad range of individual, social, and political phenomena such as participation in communes, "popular" religious movements, many growth group experiences, and the quasi-involved participation of much of the anti-war movement of the 1960's or the various environmental groups of the 1970's. So, without the necessary tension between "natural" and political community, the dangers of totalistic solutions to the search for community will increase. One's "natural" community certainly needs to be nurturant and to foster the development of a "whole" personality, but this cannot happen without the support of a healthy society that is searching for wholeness in the form of political community as well as "natural" community.

The Search for Identity and The Role of the Counselor

Every basic psychosocial conflict of childhood starting with the tension between basic trust and mistrust becomes part of the adult personality and indirectly of our political society. Erikson sees that the end of childhood in particular initiates a political crisis of wholeness. It is a political crisis because there is a danger that a political apathy will develop at this stage of the life cycle and make the individual more vulnerable to totalistic solutions to the psychosocial conflict between identity and
Adolescents are attempting to achieve a wholeness which Erikson refers to as a "sense of inner identity" and describes as follows:

The young person, in order to experience wholeness, must feel a progressive continuity between that which he has come to be during the long years of childhood and that which he promises to become in the anticipated future; between that which he conceives his self to be and that which he perceives others to see in him and to expect of him. Individually speaking, identity includes, but is more than, the sum of all the successive identifications of those earlier years when the child wanted to be, and often was forced to become, like the people he depended on. Identity is a unique product, which now meets a crisis to be solved only in new identifications with age mates and with leader figures outside of the family. The search for a new and yet reliable identity can perhaps best be seen in the persistent adolescent endeavor to define, redefine, and redefine themselves and each other in often ruthless comparison, while a search for reliable alignments can be recognized in the restless testing of the newest in possibilities and the oldest in values. Where the resulting self-definition, for personal or for collective reasons, becomes too difficult, a sense of role confusion results; the young person counterpoints rather than synthesizes his sexual, ethnic, occupational, and typological alternatives and is often driven to decide definitely and totally for one side or the other.\(^1\)

It is at this point in the life cycle that society and specifically the counselor has the role of helping the individual to define and limit his choices. For it is the establishment of a stable sense of inner identity that
enables the individual to leave adolescence and begin to approach adulthood. The specifics of this will be developed in Chapter X.

This sense of inner identity depends on the support which the individual receives from the various social groups that are important to him. When this group identity is threatened by historical and technological developments, individuals in the process of forming identities are particularly vulnerable to total solutions. For example, people who were taught in their childhood to anticipate a life full of individual autonomy and opportunity, which has always been a part of the American dream, will most likely be overwhelmed in adult life by large bureaucracies and institutions too complex to understand. Erikson's fear is that as the complexity of our modern technological society increases, people will turn to "excessive and irrational conformity" or totalism in an effort to understand and to cope with modernity.12

Thus the search for identity becomes more difficult because the tension between wholeness and totality is complicated by modernity. It becomes very tempting to seize upon totalistic solutions to the search for identity that are offered by technological society. Erikson feels that most young people in their search for identity are not alienated by modern technological society. Rather, many youths seem to have and always have had in every historical period the
ability to combine the technology of the day with the process of their identity development. As Erikson puts it, they "become what they do." This results in a familiar form of liberal conformity or consensus which he refers to as cultural consolidation around a state of technology.\textsuperscript{13} The result of this consolidation is that one becomes more vulnerable to what Erikson calls the normal psychological need for a totality. It becomes very tempting to opt for the totalistic solutions offered by the modern American technological society, rather than engaging in a search for wholeness or community.

For example, Western civilization has increasingly substituted a man-made world for the worship of God\textsuperscript{14} and the reliance on technology and bureaucracy for the more spiritual foundations of religion. People attempt to find personal "happiness" in the desire to "...function smoothly and cleanly, without friction."\textsuperscript{15} People expect to create wholeness in their lives with the help of technology and machines. In fact, we have witnessed in this process the loss of the means for determining "goodness," i.e. a sense of wholeness in one's life, and the substitution of techniques for creating efficiency. Without this sense of goodness or wholeness it is more likely that youth will be more vulnerable to totalistic solutions to their search for identity. Especially since the reality is that people are increasingly "...in need of a total system of beliefs in the
period of common technological change." The tension between wholism and totalism, an ancient human dilemma, is thus all the more intense in our age. The corresponding need to confront both personal-familial and social-political worlds with an understanding of this tension is in turn increased.

When the process of cultural consolidation around a state of technology convinces the individual that "functioning without friction" is the ideal to be followed, then there is indeed a political crisis of wholeness. As Erikson so aptly expresses, "much political apathy may have its origin in a general feeling that, after all, matters of apparent choice have probably been fixed in advance—a state of affairs which becomes fact, indeed, if influential parts of the electorate acquiesce in it because they have learned to view the world as a place where grown-ups talk of choice, but 'fix' things so as to avoid overt friction." This is particularly a problem in a democratic country like America where people are supposed to actively assert their free choice as citizens.

The American adolescent faced with this political crisis of wholeness must ask the question: "freedom for what, and at what price?" Erikson feels that the more concerned we become with being efficient, the less we will recognize what he calls native autocrats or "bosses." Theoretically Americans hate autocrats, but we often tolerate "bosses."
"'Bosses' are self-made autocrats and, therefore, consider themselves and one another the crown of democracy.... He (the "boss") looks for areas where the law has been deliberately uncharted (in order to leave room for checks, balances, and amendments) and tries to use it and abuse it for his own purposes." Needless to say, as we have seen recently in the Watergate crisis, "bosses" are a danger to the mental health of the nation. They represent to the adolescent the ideal of an "autocracy of irresponsibility." This apparently successful model values a single ideal— "if it works it is good." It encourages "bosses" to develop a technology that is deliberately complicated so they can remain in control as an "insider." If the adolescent in the midst of a political crisis of wholeness and searching for an inner sense of identity is taught to rely on these "insiders" and "bosses" for his sense of direction, then his chances of ever reaching the full potential of his identity are greatly diminished. 18

The adolescent does indeed face a political crisis of wholeness. Once he succumbs to the attractive totalistic alternative of the authoritarian "boss," he no longer has the potential for the wholeness that the search for political community makes available. For, it is by participating in a search for a political community that the individual stands the best chance of gaining a sense of inner identity and wholeness. This is not, however to suggest that the
adolescent is not in need of direction or guidance. On the contrary it is precisely the absence of such direction that maximizes the chances of success of the purveyor of "totalism."19

There is an implicit American ideology that states that technology will save us in the nick of time from any potential crisis. Therefore, it is commonly assumed that there is no need to set limits or boundaries, for the more opportunity that technology has to expand, the greater will be the chances that we will indeed be "saved." There is a danger of extending this argument to include the search for wholeness or community. Since wholeness should have "fluid and open boundaries," it may be argued that there is no need to set limits or boundaries in an individual's search for community. However, wholeness too must have defined boundaries and it is the role of the counselor to help the individual begin to establish necessary limits. This process of setting limits requires that the counselor relate the search for community to an individual's personal concerns as well as to what is real and realizable to him. The counselor, as opposed to the authoritarian nature of the "boss," must serve as what John Schaar calls a "humanly significant authority"20 in the life of the adolescent searching for wholeness, community, and identity. This concept will be further developed in Chapter X.

It is this political crisis of wholeness and the role
of the counselor in this crisis that I am interested in exploring further. Since we have established that the individual is in need of guidance in what is an often confusing search for community, it now remains to discuss precisely what kind of direction is needed.
Footnotes

8. Ibid., p. 73; Erikson, "Wholeness and Totality," p. 166.
9. For a discussion of this issue by Aristotle and Plato see Chapter I below.
15. Erikson, *Identity, Youth and Crisis*, p. 84.
16. Ibid., p. 85.
19. For example, Erikson in *Childhood and Society* (pp. 326-358) argues that Hitler's skill was as an "adolescent gang leader" whose object it was to play on the weaknesses of political adolescence (i.e., inexperience and lack of a political identity). His goal was not to strengthen them but to keep them weak.

CHAPTER X

THE ROLE OF THE COUNSELOR-EDUCATOR IN THE SEARCH FOR COMMUNITY IN AMERICA

Erikson's Psychosocial Theory of Development

As we have seen in Chapter IX, Erikson's view of the development of a healthy personality requires that a psychosocial tension be achieved between the psychological needs for wholeness and totality at each state of the life cycle, with a positive balance in the direction of wholeness. This tension must exist because the need for totalism is always present and we cannot deceive ourselves into thinking it is not. It is a psychosocial tension because there must be a healthy society in the form of an active political life which fosters a search for wholeness at each of the stages of the life cycle.

The explanation for this theory is seen in Erikson's contribution to the field of ego-psychology. He expanded on Freud's notion of the ego as an "inner institution" which has the task of mastering experience and guiding action. Erikson thought that the ego should create a wholesome synthesis "between the diverse and conflicting stages and aspects of life—between immediate impressions and
associated memories, between impelling wishes and compelling demands, between the most private and the most public aspects of existence.¹ To accomplish this the ego develops a certain duality between higher levels of integration that permit a greater tolerance of tension and diversity, which he refers to as wholeness, and lower levels of integration where consensus and uniformity must help to preserve a sense of security, which he refers to as totalism.

Erikson describes the human life cycle as a series of psychosocial crises which are each characterized by wholeness or relative psychological health and totalism or relative psychological ill-health. He sees each crisis in terms of a tension or a duality that must be maintained between the extremes of wholeness and totality, both of which are normal psychological needs. However, in order for the balance of this tension to favor wholeness or psychological health, Erikson insists that a "whole" or a healthy society must support a search for wholeness at each of the psychosocial stages of development.

Thus, Erikson expanded on Freud's theory of ego psychology to include the role of social reality in a psychosocial theory of development. He maintains that a crucial sense of mutuality must exist between the developing individual and the human or social environment. Specifically, as noted above:
the theory postulates a cogwheeling of the life cycles: the representatives of society, the caretaking persons, are coordinated to the developing individual by their specific in-born responsiveness to his needs and by the phase-specific needs of their own....It conceives of the caretaking persons as representatives of their society, as carriers of its institutional, traditional, caretaking patterns, and thus it focuses attention on the fact that each society meets each phase of the development of its members by institutions (parental care, schools, teachers, occupations, etc.) specific to it, to ensure that the developing individual will be viable in it....Thus it is not assumed that societal norms are grafted upon the genetically asocial individual by "disciplines" and "socialization," but that the society into which the individual is born makes him its member by influencing the manner in which he solves the tasks posed by each phase of his...development.2

I view the counselor, and specifically the counselor within an educational institution, as such a "caretaking person" and "representative of society." The questions that will be examined in this regard are: What is the role of the counselor as this "caretaking person?" Also, if the counselor is a representative of society, what is it that he is representing?

**The American Search for Wholeness**

Much of this paper has been devoted to documenting the necessity of the interaction between the individual and society. While Erikson's conception of ego development as a sequence of developmental phases, each characterized by a phase-specific crisis, is universal, the solutions to
these crises vary from society to society. This paper has focused on the search for community in America as an attempt to achieve a sense of wholeness and a balance between "natural" and political community.

"Natural" community has usually been the focus of the search for wholeness in America. There have been nearly continuous attempts to regain what was thought to be a lost sense of harmony in America. However, discussions of the classical liberal tradition, the tradition of utopian community, and the development of human relations techniques and the science of human behavior illustrated in considerable detail that an exclusive quest for "natural" community will not fulfill the psychosocial need for wholeness. In fact, the liberal consensus or sense of uniformity has generated the social condition in America that Erikson refers to as a "cultural consolidation around a state of technology."³ Erikson's fear is that as the complexity of our modern technological society increases, people will turn to excessive and irrational conformity or totalism in an effort to understand and to cope with modernity. This can be a perfectly normal response to a loss of wholeness because of rapid historical or developmental changes. The attempt to restructure one's world by taking recourse to totalism can be seen as a normal psychological response if it is temporary in nature. The danger is that the desire to rely on total solutions can easily become a way of life in America.
As a result of the massive acceptance of the liberal tradition in America, it is safe to say that there is a natural tendency toward self-interest. This has meant that the search for wholeness, or what has been called by these liberals the lost sense of natural harmony, has taken the form of a quest for "natural" community. This has often meant a withdrawal into private life and the development of a desire for stability, uniformity, and consensus, or what might be called the American version of a totalitarian ideology.

The Counselor as a "Caretaking Person"

Tocqueville warned of a danger of mediocrity in America. He saw that Americans were too quick to settle for the physical and moral rights of "natural" community, i.e., security, belongingness, basic material needs and life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, without insuring their existence in the future. As we have stressed throughout this paper, people need to be pushed to reach their full potential rather than remaining in what is a natural state of mediocrity under egalitarian conditions. This can best be accomplished by encouraging participation in a political community. The people who are in caretaking roles in our society thus have the responsibility of either encouraging the acceptance of or challenging this tendency toward mediocrity that exists in America. I believe that the role
of the counselor as a "caretaking person" is to educate and guide people into experiencing the importance of establishing both "natural" and political community for the development of a "whole" or healthy society and personality.

When men are no longer joined by lasting ties, as Tocqueville saw to be the case in America with our lack of what he called "instinctive patriotism," they cannot be expected to join together in anything resembling a political community unless their own self-interests are served. Tocqueville referred to this as the "principle of self-interest rightly understood." However, there is a need for people to be educated to view their desire for self-interest in a manner that leads to the development of wholeness or community.

Again it is Tocqueville that instructs us about the importance of political community as such an educating force. He maintains that it is through participation in political life at the local level that people are able to experience the need for mutual dependence. It is this exercise of political freedom that reminds people of their need for co-operation and teaches them how to create political communities.

So, the role of the counselor can be seen as that of a political educator. People must be taught to overcome their tendency of searching exclusively for "natural" community and to learn the importance of political community. As
the educator James Conant has instructed us:

\[
\text{Education must be regarded as a social process; it is related... to the current political scene, the social history of the nation, and the national ideals.}^8
\]

The Counselor as a "Representative of Society"

The counselor as a "representative of society" should understand and help others to understand the successful tradition of covenantal community in America and its commitment to our national ideals. That tradition is an example and a constant reminder that the balance between "natural" and political community is crucial for the development of a healthy society and a healthy personality. One of the reasons that this has been so difficult to accomplish in America is that the liberal consensus has defended individual rights, but has failed to provide any clear-cut obligations to the "common good" of other human beings.\(^9\) This has meant that people pursued their self-interests in the form of the private rights of "natural" community without the sense of public obligation that is needed to insure those rights. Or, as Tocqueville put it, people must be made to see that it is their duty as well as in their self-interest to help their fellow man.\(^10\)

As we saw in Parts One and Two of this paper the concept of political community must be seen within a covenantal framework. We gain our sense of community in America from
a political idea and not from kinship ties, religion, tradition, or territory. This political idea takes the form of a covenant or shared common belief. A model for this covenantal idea was established by the Puritan experience in America including the Mayflower Compact and the covenants of the New England towns, and later in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. The basis of this covenant or shared common beliefs has revolved around the rights of "natural" community. But, as we have seen throughout this paper, political community has been needed to protect these rights and to insure their continued existence.

We continue to need common beliefs in this period of common technological change, perhaps even more than ever. The question becomes whether the common beliefs will lead to an improvement in the quality of life that encourages the development of wholeness at each of Erikson's psychosocial stages of development, or whether the common beliefs will lead to an emphasis on totalistic solutions to these developmental crises with the primary goal being the attainment of a more comfortable life. As we have seen in Chapter I, it is the political community that leads to a better quality of life and the "natural" community that accounts for a more comfortable life. Much as a balance between wholeness and totalism is needed for the development of a healthy personality, so a balance is needed between political and "natural" community to maintain a healthy society.
This balance is needed because the psychological need for totalism is always present whether it be in the attempt to find solutions to the various psychosocial crises of the developing personality, or in the attractiveness of the comforts of "natural" community.

The Counselor as an Authority

Erikson makes the case for the necessity that caretaking persons support the development of both a healthy personality and a healthy society. This means the encouragement of whole solutions to each psychosocial crisis of the life cycle, or in terms of this paper, the encouragement of individuals to reach their full potential. In order for this to happen the forces of uniformity and mediocrity in America must be challenged with the creation of political communities. The physical and moral rights of "natural" community can only be maintained if the natural tendency toward self-interest is overcome with the use of covenantal obligations. As we saw in Parts One and Two of this paper, the desire for "natural" community must be combined with the obligations of a primary covenant that revolves around a set of shared common beliefs. Then, a second covenant establishes a set of rules or laws in the form of a political community to insure that man in all his imperfection will indeed attempt to live up to the stated beliefs. It is through participation in a political community, with the
assistance of a leader or an authority, that people can confront their tendency to pursue their own private interests and get involved in the public protection of their "natural" community.

The role of the counselor in this process is twofold. First, it is to serve as the authority or the guide that helps to define the ideal aims of the community; and secondly, it is to educate people that a sense of order must be established by the rules or laws of a political community before they can live together in trust and friendship. It is in such an environment that people can learn the art of political activity that assists them in their search for a sense of identity by means of the common pursuit of genuinely shared ends beyond the often narrow restrictions of the family and self.

People need a guide to lead them out of their natural state of self-interest and into the acceptance of the covenantal obligations of political community that can create the opportunity for reaching their full potential. The desire for "natural" community is very understandable and necessary. But, in the desire for a common life in the midst of the standardization, uniformity, and conformity which characterizes our individualist country, people do indeed conform to trivial or even contemptible ends lacking any attractive visions of the good life to fill the emptiness of much of modern life. However, as Erikson has said,
one does not "have to become a machine to master them." He calls for a "political rejuvenation" that will summon forth the potential intelligence of youth. The means to this end of the development of one's full potential (which as we saw in Chapter I is the definition of the good life and the goal of the search for community) for Erikson lies in the question of freedom, i.e., the freedom to pursue one's full potential or sense of wholeness. He strongly believes, as did the Puritan, John Winthrop, that one cannot have this freedom without authority.

I believe that the role of the counselor as a caretaking person is to provide the necessary amount of authority to push individuals beyond their natural state of self-interest to a sense of possibility that they might be able to approach their full potential. However, if counselors are to represent themselves as authorities, a new definition of authority is needed. Authority is a perfectly good word that has taken on bad connotations because it is often associated with authoritarianism. In the liberal tradition in America, freedom and authority are often conceived to be opposites. This in part grew out of the feudal tradition in Europe from which people had been escaping to come to America. The difference is that there is no feudal tradition in America. But, we have behaved as if there is. The problem becomes in America, not freedom versus authority, but how to unite authority and community.
The Need for Authority and Community

This view of the interrelationships among freedom, authority, and community, as noted above, is summarized very well by the political theorist Sheldon Wolin. He states that the liberals misunderstood the fundamental problem:

They conceived the issue as one of reconciling freedom and authority, and they solved it by destroying authority in the name of liberty and replacing it by society, but only at the cost of exposing freedom to society's controls. To the nineteenth and twentieth centuries fell the task of stating the problem more correctly: not freedom versus authority, or man against the State, but authority and community. 3

The authority that I have in mind for the counselor to embody is perhaps best represented by Schaar's definition of authority and his description of "humanly significant authority." According to Schaar an authority can be defined basically as:

...one whose counsels we seek and trust and whose deeds we strive to imitate and enlarge.... An authority is one who starts lines of action which others complete. Hence, he is, metaphorically the father of their actions. A man or institution becomes a father and augmentor of other's actions in one of two ways. First, by example: he shows others the way by going there first himself. Secondly, he has the ability to assure others that the actions he recommends are rightful and will succeed. Here, then, are two basic functions of authority: it provides counsel and justification, and it increases the confidence and sense of ability of those under it by assuring them that the actions it recommends will succeed and will enlarge the actors. Seen in this light, authority, far from confining and
depleting men, liberates and enriches them by bringing to birth that which is potentially present. ¹⁴

The question for counselors is not yet what theory or what techniques should be used in helping people reach their full potential. Rather, the prior questions of how should the counselor construe his function and what kind of knowledge is understood to be appropriate to his performance must be asked first. Schaar speaks to this issue so eloquently that it would be senseless to attempt to paraphrase. He outlines the knowledge needed to become what he calls the "humanly significant authority:"

Each man is born, lives among others, and dies. Hence, each man's life has three great underpinnings, which no matter how far he travels must always be returned to and can never be escaped for long. The three underpinnings present themselves to each man as problems and as mysteries: the problem and mystery of becoming a unique self: but still a self living among and sharing much with others in family and society: and finally a unique self among some significant others, but still sharing with all humanity the condition of being human and mortal. Who am I as an individual? Who am I as a member of this society? Who am I as a man, a member of humanity? Each of these three questions contains within itself a host of questions, and the way a man formulates and responds to them composes the center and the structure of his life. ¹⁵

The humanly significant authority is the person who helps others to seek answers to these questions in a manner which they can understand and integrate into their lives. The
counselor can be such a person by helping youth to also ask these more appropriate prior questions.

The Counselor as an Educator

Serving as an authority for the search for community during what Erikson calls the political crisis of wholeness or the search for an inner sense of identity that occurs at the end of adolescence provides a particularly difficult set of challenges for the counselor. The individuals involved in the search have both a desire for wholeness and a tendency toward totalism. The role of the counselor is to help the individual achieve a state of tension between these two psychological needs while attempting to establish a balance in favor of wholeness. To accomplish this the counselor must serve as an authority who helps the individual set limits in an effort to avoid complete totalism.

In the effort to achieve a sense of belongingness, security, or totality as well as a sense of unity or wholeness within oneself (which is popularly known as the search for community), there is a tendency to look for answers in the form of a totalistic solution to the search. This provides the individual with an immediate sense of unity, but it is at the expense of individual freedom. There is a difference between the need to have limits and what Erikson calls "total submission." As tempting as it is to let someone else organize your life, there is a real danger of
generating the feeling that "someone else is in charge." The counselor has to learn to help the individual on his unique search for community by attempting to achieve the delicate balance between setting limits and encouraging freedom that leads to the development of one's full potential. The difficulty is that the adolescent will ask for both, that is, to be limited and to be free. It is much easier to let someone else organize your life than to begin a difficult search on your own. At the same time, there is a strong drive to break away from one's roots and to become independent. The lesson for the counselor is that one cannot have the freedom to develop into one's full potential without the authority and guidance of a caretaking person and representative of society.

However, it is also important to remember that one's full potential is never achieved, it is not an absolute. There is a necessary tension with the need for totalism that must be recognized. Part of the counselor's role as an authority is to point out that because there is a necessary discomfort, tension, or anxiety that is created by the development of a healthy personality, the individual must be educated about the need for a healthy society to support the development of a healthy personality. Lacking this education, it often becomes very tempting to choose totalistic solutions to the various psychosocial crises of the life cycle.
The role of the counselor as an authority can be thought of in terms of political education. The problem of community is very definitely a political problem. The counselor needs to do more than just be able to explain the complaints of modern living. He must be able to understand the social and political safeguards of individual strength and freedom. As we have seen, the development of a healthy personality depends on a search for wholeness or community that must be supported by a political community within a covenantal framework. It remains a problem to find areas of shared common belief or covenantal obligation. I have presented the experiences of the Puritans, Lincoln, and the Populists as examples of the working out of the idea of covenantal community in our history. Using these examples, the counselor can be better prepared to serve as a guide and an educator for the search for community.

As I said in the Introduction, in his role as a guide and an educator, the counselor must ask what knowledge is crucial for the understanding of community. I have tried to provide the counselor with the framework of that body of knowledge that will be most helpful when he is engaged in a search for community.
Footnotes
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