

Chapter 5

Handling Natural Social Groups

We now turn to three properties of values — identity, social group, and energy — which have been barely touched upon as yet. The notion of developing values, that is to say, of determining what is important or good for us, suggests a focus on both personal identity and social life. When we do something, the social group is a contextual factor. But in regard to who we are, the social group is a dominant factor. We can barely imagine ourselves apart from the identity of a variety of social groups with which, like it or not, we are deeply involved.

The term ‘social group’ is restricted here to collectives which are natural in that they emerge more or less spontaneously around values which all in the group implicitly or explicitly freely recognize and share. So I am excluding groups formed haphazardly (e.g. people in a ticket queue), or defined statistically (e.g. males aged 30-40 years), or based on categories or classes (e.g. all unskilled labourers, all widows) In this context, organizations are individuals constructed for a task, and their work groups (teams and hierarchies) are special cases.

The notion of common values invites a link between social groups and the hierarchy of values. The aim of this chapter is to make that link by describing the distinctive forms of social group generated by each level of value. I will also examine the way that values are used by these social groups to release and channel personal energy. This exploration will offer a perspective on the development of personal identity.

INTRODUCING NATURAL SOCIAL GROUPS

The Assumption of Social Existence. I would like to be able to take it as self-evident that the growth of the self depends on developing values. I would also like to take for granted that there is an interacting relationship between the identities of social groups and their members. However, this would be to pretend that such matters are not the subject of intense speculation and debate. Even the idea that values need to be developed so that a group knows what it stands for, and so

that people know who they are, is not commonly accepted.

Social scientists share a focus on social life, but differ sharply on the relation of social groups to the self. Most psychoanalysts follow Freud in minimizing the significance of the social group in their theorizing about the self. At the other extreme are sociologists who regard the notion of the individual and individual morality as a mistake: the social group is all. Social psychologists and socially-oriented psychotherapists occupy a middle ground. Varied pictures are offered by cultural theorists attempting to reconcile the individual and the group. Mead viewed the social group as a cooperative and generalized ‘other’ which naturally gave rise to the self. Marx viewed the social group as inherently conflicted and demanding a struggle for genuine existence from each person. Writers in the modernist and post-modernist tradition emphasize the fragmenting effect of society on self-hood.

We do not need to enter these complex academic debates on the self and its social context. Yet some brief orientation to identity and social groups is needed before we plunge in. Elsewhere, I have concluded that there is a need for a variety of approaches to the self-conscious development of identity, and we will need to explore them in due course.¹ One of these approaches to identity is central to the framework and directly relevant to the creation of social groups. I call it: social being or social existence. To introduce the notion of social being, I will summarize the basic assumptions which most people find acceptable and useful in thinking about social life.

(A) *People exist in social groups which they create and maintain.* Social life is all around us. To ignore this does not make any sense. We must assume that group formation is more than an interesting characteristic of people. Social life seems to be an absolute requirement for human development and is partially genetically programmed according to socio-biologists.² Many human potentialities, including language, are undeveloped in the absence of a social upbringing. It is obvious, too, that people put a great deal of effort into maintaining social life.

(B) *Both the person and the group, separately and in their own way, come to regard certain things as important and good — these are their values.* Values are all around us. People do develop common conceptions of what is good and do share with others aspirations to realize these. If people really had no values in common, then they would live utterly solitary lives. This way of life would not be propagated by offspring or fellows: so it would self-extinguish. It is assumed, then, that man has evolved as a social being who participates in groups through a capacity to develop, use and maintain values.

(C) *The recognition and assertion of values is an essential aspect of identity.* From the perspective of social existence and evolution, anyone's identity — who one is, what one thinks, what one does — is built on persistent and sustainable values. The creation of one's self as a social being is an active process that requires the deliberate choice and use of values available within a variety of social groups. In short, man has an identity as a social being.

(D) *The growth of personal identity interacts inextricably with the identity and evolution of social groups.* Each person is involved in a variety of social groups. To a greater or lesser degree, personal identity is moulded and shaped by the values dominant in those social groups; and to a greater or lesser degree, the identity of the social groups is shaped by each person's identity-based values. This fourth proposition will be developed and explored further in this chapter.

Summarizing the Groups

Each person is unique and yet people are like each other. Values are a typical expression of this paradoxical combination of identity and commonality. Put another way, values both distinguish people and unite people. Identity is, to use Freud's term, a primal word.³ Primal words convey two opposite meanings: 'cleave', for example, is primal because it means both 'to separate' and 'to attach'. Identity is primal because it means both distinctiveness and sameness. At each level of value, values held in common create a characteristic basis of sameness that permits formation of a distinct type of social group. These common values and social groups affect and express personal uniqueness.

Both individuals and social groups seek to promote the good (as they see it), and seek to prevent harm and reduce the bad (as they see it). The social group seeks to promote those goods which all in the group share, that is to say the common good. The social group also seeks to prevent or reduce the harms which all in the group share, that is to say the common bad.

If social groups are based on common values, then each type of value would be expected to constitute or correspond to a particular form of natural social group. This is indeed the case. The five types of natural social group are labelled as follows: *humanity* or *unions* (L-7), *tribes* (L-6), *communities* (L-5), *associations* (L-4) and *factions* (L-3).

Through examining the natural social groups and their constituting type of value, we can appreciate their relationship to a person's identity. It will become evident that values at every level lead to the person's identity being strengthened by the social group, the social group's identity being strengthened by the person, and the values themselves being strengthened by both.

Before examining the hierarchy of natural social groups in detail, a sketch of each type is provided below. The full picture is summarized in Master-Table 3.

L-7: Humanity and unions form around ultimate values. Existence as a human being generates the potential for experiencing, holding and sharing an ultimate value. Ultimate values break down boundaries between people and make harmonious unions possible. They liberate spiritual forces and permit reconciliation of differences.

L-6: Tribes form around value systems in order to preserve social distinctiveness. The tribe and its value system are perpetuated by socialization. Coexistence is required despite the negative attitudes which arise between groups. Tribes generate intense solidarity amongst members and demand and get their willing loyalty.

L-5: Communities form around social values in order to meet social and personal needs. The community depends on mutuality and fellowship. Communities tend to share many social values, so they can cooperate and feel positive towards each other. The force released by communities is belonging: an emotional sense of attachment to the community and its values despite any undesirable features.

L-4: Associations form within tribes and communities around principal objects in order to promote an interest formally. Members create the association through their commitment to its objects. Associations with similar objects compete for members and resources; but they may form alliances to pursue common goals. Associations release and channel enthusiasm.

L-3: Factions form within associations around internal priorities in order to ensure a particular view prevails. Members create such groups by taking sides in particular situations demanding choice. Factions define each other by their opposing viewpoints. Whenever

opposition is unnecessary or undesirable for the association, members coalesce or a coalition is formed. Factions release passion which can degenerate into fanaticism.

Properties. The bulk of this chapter is taken up by an exploration of the *nature* of the characteristic form of social group at each level of value, together with examples. As is evident from the above summaries, all types of social group share certain properties. These properties, with the key term italicized, are listed here in the order they will be considered in the descriptions to follow.

First, the essential *function* of the type of social group will be identified. When people in groups are energized by values, extraordinary social forces are released. Social forces depend on non-physical human energies which accompany and power the various motivations already identified. These human energies are released and channelled by activation of the values in the group context.

The various modes of *group formation* will be examined, and then the type of situation which is *antithetical* to group existence will be described. Under the heading, *group relations*, we will examine the nature of cohesion within the social group. We will note how such groups interact with each other both when they deliberately link up and when they develop separately in parallel. Social groups based on value imply or aspire to equality, but some form of *leadership* is needed, and *status* issues are invariably a concern: again, the expression of both varies according to level. Turning to the individual, the method of *entry* to, participation, and *exit* from the group will be described at each level. Then the relation of the type of social group and values to *identity formation* will be clarified. Finally the *limitation* inherent in social groups at that level provides a logic for moving down a level to a new type of social group.

Caveat. The subject of social life and its organization is so vast that the very limited aim of the present analysis needs to be kept in mind. The aim here is to heighten awareness of the different sorts of value, to demonstrate that these distinctions amongst values are not merely conceptual but parallel important forms of social organization, and finally to link values and social groups to identity development. With this aim, let us commence the account starting once again from the source of all value, ultimate values.

HUMANITY, UNIONS AND ULTIMATE VALUES (L-7)

Nature. Ultimate values reflect and sustain a social group that involves all *humanity*. Humanity includes not

only all people in all cultures, but also all people across all time. The notion of the oneness of humanity expresses a sense of a deep and fundamental commonality between people. This commonality must be at root biological, but it is recognized in practice as experiential. The social manifestation of commonality stems from ultimate values which are able to unite us all precisely because they are experiential states. Because ultimate values define each of us as part of a single social group and are used to define God, they invite the view that all are equal in the sight of God.

There is nothing abstruse about recognizing the unity of humanity as a genuine social group. When a father says to his son that 'one day we will fly to the stars', he is recognizing their joint participation in the human race. John Donne expressed the same idea in a poem: "no man is an island, entire of itself.....any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind."⁴ The joke that 'I love mankind, it's people I can't stand' has a kernel of truth. It seems that the further one grows spiritually, the more people one loves, and the fewer people one likes. This is because liking is based on superficial features like charm and similarities of habits and interests, whereas loving depends on respect and acceptance of an essence beneath these.

Being part of humanity is not an organizational or intellectual matter, it is defined in terms of an experience of relatedness which is permeated by ultimate values. In other words, membership of humanity is experiential, rather than a matter of social certification. Awareness of this membership powerfully affects the operation of social groups at lower levels. Ultimate values define sought after states of being. When ultimate values and a deep sense of common humanity are operative in a particular group or relationship (at lower levels), the group may be termed a union. Commonality within a union is sometimes described as a 'sense of genuine relatedness'. So union heightens the unique identity of each and precludes primitive psychological fusion between people or with the group. Such fusion, often mistaken for union, fragments and destroys identity.

Function. The recognition of our common humanity within any social group has an important function. It facilitates union within that group and between that group and others. Union involves a sensitive attunement between people so that all interact in a way that expresses and activates ultimate values. Attuning allows interaction to be peaceful, truthful, harmonious, just, and loving. These ultimate values are completely shared values and such sharing creates a bond so deep that it invokes a sense of oneness: hence the term union. The notion of humanity and the possibility of union aids us in relating better, not only to

people of alien cultures in distant places, but also to our intimates and neighbours.

Humanity as a whole is not, at present, characterized by union. However the recognition of the possibility of union within other smaller social groups is a worthy goal pointing in the right direction. Just as social values contain the potential for worthwhile activity, so ultimate values carry the potential for worthwhile group life. Much of this section will focus on groups in which ultimate values are activated, and which can therefore be described as unions. Buber has described “that rightness which... is expressed as revelation... and... cannot be realized in the individual, but only in human community”.⁵ To this must be added the rider — ‘only in the state of union’.

The effect of union is to release and channel spirituality. This force may not be recognized as such. It may be identified as a realization of a particular ultimate value like trust, peace or love, or be felt as an experience like lightness, illumination or release, or appear as charisma attached to some member, often a leader figure. The experience of union is felt to be given from outside the group, although it is dependent upon the efforts of members of the group to recognize and be guided by ultimate values. Union leads to an evident unification of the group. Spirituality within a union strengthens and enriches people. In particular, it supports whatever other values the members may hold or purposes they may be pursuing.

AA: Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) is an association which operates through a group process that generates union and uses spirituality. Its twelve steps are: “1. We admitted we were powerless over alcohol — that our lives had become unmanageable. 2. We came to believe that a Power greater than ourselves could restore us to sanity. 3. We made a decision to turn our will and our lives over to the care of God as we understood Him. 4. We made a searching and fearless moral inventory of ourselves. 5. We admitted to God, to ourselves and to other human beings the exact nature of our wrongs. 6. We were entirely ready to have God remove all these defects of character. 7. We humbly asked Him to remove our shortcomings. 8. We made a list of all persons we had harmed, and became willing to make amends to them all. 9. We made direct amends to such people wherever possible, except when to do so would injure them or others. 10. We continued to take personal inventory and when we were wrong promptly admitted it. 11. We sought through prayer and meditation to improve our conscious contact with God as we understood Him, praying only for knowledge of His will for us and the power to carry that out. 12. Having had a spiritual awakening as the result of these Steps, we tried to carry this message to alcoholics and to practise these principles in all our affairs.” Atheists cope with the dreaded word ‘God’ by referring to ‘group power’ instead. **Ex. 5.1**

Group Formation. A social group may enter a state of union in a variety of ways. Recognition of a common humanity may emerge relatively readily in times of crisis. Total strangers, when involved in a catastrophe, will bond together spontaneously; and the capacity for tragedy and war to bring out the best in people is well-recognized. The popular response to relieve a distant outbreak of famine is another expression of participation beyond nationality or community. However, the union generated in these ways tends to dissipate rapidly.

For many, union breaks through only in moments of apparently altruistic sacrifice. Only apparently altruistic, because altruism implies an other — from L. *alter* = other — and the other is one with the self in this mode. A person explaining an apparently altruistic act will say ‘I could not have done otherwise’, or ‘I could not have lived with myself if I had done otherwise’. People who have spontaneously and heroically risked their life for another have referred to an inexpressible and puzzling sense of connection.

The post-war use of groups for personal development — therapy groups, sensitivity groups, T-groups, therapeutic communities, support groups, community-building seminars and the like — has led to a realization that union is a necessary preliminary. As a psychoanalyst, I found that union was a prerequisite for analysands to relive and rework childhood traumas. I called this state ‘primary relatedness’.⁶ The implication of these findings is that any work of deep personal significance, or work involving the use of the self, requires union to overcome the defensiveness, idealization and inappropriate competitiveness which hamper effectiveness.

Marriages and families are the natural entities which society expects to foster union over the long term. All societies place great value on the integrity of the family, and religions invariably invest marriage with a deep spiritual significance. Husband and wife at first, and progressively the children too, are expected to foster feelings of mutual respect and understanding. The work needed to ensure that a union actually develops and that exploitation, manipulation, distance and hardness do not drive out love is not given enough attention in modern society. The present gap between the rhetoric of union and the reality of much family life seems to reflect an inability for people to be fully open and honest with themselves and with each other.

Larger communities fostering union have existed amongst monastic orders and religious groups led by radical charismatic leaders. Spiritually-driven utopian communes were common in the USA in the 19th century, but are relatively unusual at present. These were never easy alternatives to modern society, and few of

them survived longer than a generation. In the case of modern anarchist communes, where the main urge is escape from the burden of social living, degeneration and collapse is rapid. Union only survives in communities when the search for spirituality is a positive driving force for the members.

Oneida Community: The Oneida Community was founded in 1848 by John Noyes from his bible class after he lost his license to preach. It consisted of 200 people who were organized around the early Christian principle that 'the believers possessed one heart, and one soul and had all things in common'. Equality and communalism characterized all arrangements: the family was replaced by a complex system of free love in which men and women approached each other through third parties; children were raised communally; almost all property, work and leisure was communal; government was provided by numerous committees on which all had a chance to serve. Mutual criticism was used for social control, to foster union, and to ensure the development of virtue. The members felt that their community was a shining example of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth, and viewed the outside world as spiritually contaminating. The community eventually dissolved in 1881 and became a business manufacturing silverware. **Ex. 5.2⁷**

Antithesis. The antithesis of union is anti-social or anti-human behaviour driven by negative ultimate values. Such behaviour is often associated with psychological states of fusion in which personal identity is lost. Then violence and coercion, disrespect and denigration attack identity and block union directly.

Genocidal policies reflect a direct attack on humanity. These policies incite hate and dehumanize the victims in order to overcome any reluctance to deprive or kill them. Killing is called extermination to generate a resemblance to the slaughter of pests. Victims are given numbers rather than names or simply herded without discrimination. In wartime, the humanity of the enemy is not so much denied as viewed as an obstacle to victory by the political and military authorities. The dehumanization of the enemy may be overcome, as in the Christmas in the trenches episode at the onset of World War 1 when, to the dismay of the authorities, British and German soldiers fraternized. Alternatively, dehumanization may degenerate into mindless massacres of civilians, as in the My Lai episode in the Vietnam war.

More insidious, but equally significant in modern life, is the absence of union generated by a lack of effective contact with positive ultimate values. People seek union in social settings of all sorts: in their family, in their workplace, in their church, in their sporting club, in their neighbourhood, in their charitable efforts. But, too often, union is not found.

The modern denigration of spirituality, the scientific devaluation of values, the academic flight from wrestling with the idea of God, the professionalization of everything, the dead hand of convention, all these combine to block contact with ultimate values and their affirmation in relatedness. But without a certain level of communion, isolation fragmentation and insensitivity is inevitable. From here it is a short step to the release of antagonism and loss of respect, in short to social breakdown.⁸

Violence within families, mindless vandalism, a drug-abusing underclass, squalid living, depersonalized sexuality, such phenomena when widespread are symptomatic of the loss of a sense of humanity in a modern society. Unity may be vaunted in repressive societies based on a leadership cult, informers, secret police, torture and detention without trial, but humanity and union are absent there as well.

Group Relations. The development of a sense of deep commonality depends on a process of communion. This communion is a communicative mode, verbal and non-verbal, which provides cohesion for the group and enables containment of tensions and disagreements amongst its members. Freedom and harmony are the observed and felt state of affairs wherever union genuinely exists. (Even if, to the outsider, the group atmosphere and arrangements appear to be austere, strict and controlling.) Differences between members of the group are recognized, but these do not become a reason for disconnection or rejection.

A union is self-contained in that there is no need for the group to identify with anything outside of itself. However, the nature of union and the method by which it is achieved generate an urge to include others. Boundaries are not just overcome with other people or groups, but also with animals, plants, and even things. All these may come to be felt to be part of a unified interconnected whole. "Blessedness" said Spinoza "is the knowledge which the mind has of its union with the whole of nature". This phenomenon, seen purposively, is given a variety of names like Destiny, the Hand of God, Dharma or Tao.

Because ultimate values and humanity are inclusive, the artificial creation of enemies is inhibited. Union requires a process of reconciliation amongst groups of different sorts. This implies positive efforts at contact and communication no matter how difficult or painful the relationship. For example, without condoning their brutal invasion of Tibet, the Dalai Lama in exile publicly forgives the Chinese. By contrast, bickering and suspicion rather than understanding and trust seem to be the rule within and amongst most states and their political leaders.

In our world of nations, union can be fostered by activities and events which transcend the individual and the state. The creations of science, music, sport, art and architecture, being products of inspiration and imagination, can sometimes break through the barriers of culture and language and provide us with the certainty of a deep identity of all.

Leadership and Status. In a union, status differences are minimized and leadership is diffused throughout the group. Equality is deeply felt but it exists alongside a sensitivity to differences and an awareness of the uniqueness of each person. Leadership is based in charisma. Charismatic leadership is inspired by a transcendental force that compels recognition. It is assumed to be an expression of grace given by God. Charisma is free-floating in a union, whereas in lower level groups it tends to fix on someone able to affirm and uphold ultimate values.

So leadership in a union need not be prominent or permanently attached to one member. Communion fosters a consciousness that each person needs to choose responsibly for the sake of the group and each other, and yet each needs to submit to the way the group is developing. This mentality leads to choices being made in a realistic and highly effective fashion: something which is obvious to those who have experienced union, but which is puzzling to others.

Governing the Society of Friends: The Quakers hold that the Bible is secondary in authority to the Spirit of God which is available to all and known directly. They use unprogrammed and mainly silent worship in which anyone, man or woman, may speak to the congregation or offer a prayer on its behalf. The congregations govern their society using meetings for church affairs. At each meeting every Friend may attend and should do so if possible. It is believed that the Light in each person will lead into union and the right choice if faithfully followed. The meetings begin and conclude with worship, and worship may be introduced during them. Discussion proceeds but no vote is taken. At the conclusion of an item, the clerk records the judgement of the meeting and this must be accepted, perhaps with agreed modifications, before further business is taken.

Ex. 5.3

Entry and Exit. Membership of humanity is open to all. Being human suffices and, by definition, there can be no bar to entry. Exit is not possible — not even through death. What is possible is a failure to realize the significance of humanity as a transpersonal group. People forget or deny their own essence. Realizing the significance of a transpersonal identity is the first step to developing the capacity for union with others.

To enter into and maintain union via communion requires activation of one's 'true self'. The process of

entering union involves acceptance of vulnerability, recognition of imperfection, direct communication, experiential openness, and mutual respect and acceptance — as well as commitment to the aims of the group (cf. Ex.s 5.1 to 5.3). This is only possible by attuning to one's deep experience or listening to one's soul. Recognizing and activating being is part of spiritual growth. It has been described by all the major religions. Yet the path is repeatedly rediscovered anew — especially by psychologists in modern times.⁹ Somehow pure being seems metaphysical and mysterious, even mystical, although its properties are straightforward and the process of reaching it has been documented so often and so well.

Once being has been solidly recognized by a person and found in a group, exit from that state or that group is rarely sought. If union is lost by accident or for practical reasons, re-creation of the state of union is attempted again or elsewhere with others. Union is unambiguously good, despite all the trials, tribulations and conflicts that need handling while sustaining the group.

Identity Formation. Ultimate values call for union of oneself with others around and with all humanity. Such union is never fusion. Union depends on the operation of an unambiguous and distinct sense of self, and is not a regressive or primitive loss of self, or projection of the self. The self that exists here is not an ego, isolated by trappings of status or childhood distortions or fantasies of self-sufficiency, but a self which is pure being and which recognizes a transpersonal and transcendent reality.

Being and communion is impossible for those dominated by postures that generate a false self and a collusive form of relatedness. It is utterly blocked by antisocial behaviour. Most people are blocked by their own rigid and inappropriate self-assertiveness — colloquially referred to as their ego — and by the excessive use of institutions and authorities to buttress their views and decisions. The way to enlightenment, as every sage knows, is to abandon the ego. This occurs by recognizing the superficiality and transitoriness of memories, desires, prejudices and expectations. It is often described as emptying the self, or as dying to be reborn. Once this is done, the spiritual self is released and union becomes possible.

Being creates union, and union affirms being. The conception of human nature that exists in any culture or era limits what any particular individual can be. Conversely, the conception that can be realized by any particular individual may succeed in redefining what human nature can be for others. This process is evident

in the evolution of awareness or consciousness over the past 2,000,000 years.¹⁰ For instance, the recognition that the fertility of the fields and the seasonal cycle did not depend on human sacrifice was an extraordinary development in awareness. The Greek originators of our civilization lacked any concept of will, so the development of individuality in the West during the Renaissance was a redefinition of being.¹¹ The enlightenment of Siddartha Gautama as the Buddha was yet another. Conscious recognition of what man can be clearly requires an extraordinary degree of imagination and inspiration. People like Socrates, Jesus and Siddartha obviously were extraordinary. By being themselves, they defined what humanity could be.

Membership of humanity implies that the responsibility for changing the world lies with each person recognizing the truth of the spirit and following it. At present, people appear to be becoming aware of the interconnectedness of mankind, and of man and nature, and the need for peace and harmony in these relations. This is an important step towards union. Till relatively recently, it seemed esoteric to emphasize mankind's interconnectedness. Not to recognize this today takes some effort given global communications, the worldwide inter-relations of commodities and finance, and the actual and potential destructiveness of our technologies.

This modern awareness of interconnectedness is not equivalent to its precursor, the harmony of man and nature known in primitive cultures. The loss of that harmony was a necessary step in the individuation of human awareness which allowed scientific creativity and the technological control of many natural phenomena. Primitive man could not intervene in nature to cause much harm: but modern man can. So our personal responsibility for union is of far greater significance.

Because we are each part of humanity, it follows that "no one can be perfectly free till all are free; no one can be perfectly moral till all are moral; no one can be perfectly happy till all are happy".¹²

Limitation. Humanity and union are necessary for all, but they are not sufficient. Union recognizes but does not regulate the myriad of individual differences generated by social life; and union, alone, cannot deal effectively with evil intent or anti-social behaviour. Differences need to be fostered. People seem to need to develop, affirm and celebrate their uniqueness. And each particular social domain can only thrive if distinctive values are identified for it, and then used to attract, guide and bind people.

In short, union is but a context for social life. The

family is the obvious example of this. Although children need to grow spontaneously and uniquely in the beneficial atmosphere that union creates, they also require guidance of a very specific sort about what to value. This guidance will inevitably differ from family to family as well as from community to community and nation to nation.

The expression of union and the realization of ultimate values depends on the creation of different types of social group which emerge from values at lower levels. We turn now to the pre-eminent and most problematic type of social group.

TRIBES AND VALUE SYSTEMS (L-6)

Nature. Value systems reflect and sustain social groups which, for lack of a better term, I will call *tribes*.

Tribes are created by socialization and generate a social classification or categorization of people which is felt to be of the utmost importance. A tribe in the classical sense is typically endogamous, that is to say marriages must occur within it. So tribes based on race or culture come first to mind. From the present perspective, marriage and reproduction within a tribe is not so much about passing on genes, it is more a mechanism for ensuring transmission of the value system. A nation is a numerous tribe based on a language, tradition and culture. Any group that shares a history or territory may develop a culture, a way of doing things including a value system. It then takes on tribal characteristics. Students of prehistory suggest that the earliest tribes were extended families or clans. In modern societies, social classes based on rigid socio-economic barriers, may become tribal.

Tribes in the extended sense are not restricted to family, ethnic or cultural groups. Tribes are here defined as groups which possess a long-standing recognizable value system. For example, they may form from those holding distinctive religious beliefs, or be generated by sharply defined professional and other occupational roles, or emerge as those working within a school of thought in an academic discipline. In other words, it does make sense to speak of the tribe of economists or journalists or behaviourists or Marxists.

Tribes and Sects: The Jews of the diaspora are united by their Judaic value system even though this means including people with a wide range of very different cultural beliefs and practices. The same is true of Muslims and Christians. Despite their common origin in the Old Testament revelation of Abraham, Jews Muslims and Christians are in practice utterly separate. Within religions there are sects with their own distinctive value systems: the early

Roman Catholic Church generated Carthusians who emphasized manual labour and renunciation of the world, Franciscans who were committed to teaching and serving the poor, and Dominicans who were dedicated to the intellectual presentation and defence of the faith. So value systems can exist within value systems and sub-tribes may sustain a distinctive identity so long as it is within that of the encompassing tribe. **Ex. 5.4**

Tribes, in the extended sense, have become numerous in modern societies because religious exclusivity has diminished, ethnic migrations have flourished, social activities and roles have diversified and specialized, and schools of thought have proliferated.

Primitive societies show relatively little differentiation of skill and interest. Social groups within these societies recruit through birth, and membership (which is based on age, sex, kinship and neighbourhood) is usually compulsory. Withdrawal or change of group or society as a whole is not possible, so social identity is extremely restricted. By contrast, people in modern societies are dedicated members of a few tribes: usually one associated with their culture, another associated with their work or socio-economic status, possibly another associated with their religious or political beliefs. They can, with effort, alter their memberships. The rule of endogamy is not strictly upheld, but it still applies in modern society. Such endogamy is partly opportunistic, partly demanded by social convention, and partly a personal preference for a partner similar to oneself.

Function. The function of the tribe is to provide for and preserve social distinctiveness. Within a particular domain, each member of a tribe holds a similar set of ideas to fellow members. These ideas are felt to be utterly distinct from the set of valued ideas held by members of other tribes. Tribes celebrate and affirm their own value systems, which they see as the best way, or even the only way, to realize certain ultimate values. Scientists, for example, might accept that journalists, artists and theologians seek and communicate truth and knowledge, but the gulfs separating life within these four tribes is immense.

Tribal membership activates and channels loyalty. Loyalty is the crucial force that enables a person to uphold the virtues of the group and to defend it vigorously against criticism and attack. It is a powerful force for tribal continuity and contributes to its persistence through hard times. Hard times include those periods when members are ashamed of the views or behaviour of the tribe as a whole or of members acting on its behalf. Loyalty is particularly poignant when a person who is selflessly serving the group is rejected or even persecuted by other members or group officials. This

sometimes happens with espionage or undercover agents.

Loyalty in a nation-state is often called patriotism. Exaggerated and bellicose loyalty has come to be known as chauvinism after Nicolas Chauvin of Rochefort, a veteran soldier of the First Republic and Empire in France. Loyalty reaches its extreme where, as in the military, loyalty is itself specifically part of the value system. Some churches take the same view.

Church & Dissent: In 1989, the Vatican, disturbed by dissent, attempted to impose a loyalty oath on Catholic priests and theologians. In 1990, it published a document approved by the Pope which asserts clearly that theologians do not have any right of public dissent from the official Church teaching, even when such teaching does not pretend to infallibility. The document argues that 'standards of conduct appropriate to civil society or the workings of a democracy cannot be purely and simply applied to the Church'. In taking this line, the Church is no different from any other organization determined to maintain its cohesion. The following phrase in the document is identical to the military demand for unquestioning obedience: 'Appealing to the obligation to follow one's own conscience cannot legitimate dissent.' The Vatican cannot be accused of equivocating, or letting a long-standing element of its value system be modified. **Ex. 5.5**¹³

As noted earlier, individuals usually have multiple loyalties. These can lead to inner conflict. The theologians affected in Ex. 5.5 suffer precisely because loyalty to their society's value system requires them to assert their right to freedom of thought and inquiry, while loyalty to their church demands some sacrifice of their independence of thought. A much commoner loyalty conflict in modern society results from the division between loyalty to the family and loyalty to the firm. The in-law problem is a loyalty conflict between the family of origin and the family of procreation. During wartime, there may be conflicts between the loyalty owed to one's nation of birth and one's nation of residence.

If a tribe's importance is excessively exalted, for good or bad reasons, without concern for wider society, loyalty conflicts become externalized as tribal warfare. For example, the UK print workers were a well-integrated tribe organized into trade unions which often seemed to show little concern for the demands of newspaper production. Their stance culminated in the 1980's in complete exclusion from one newspaper group and pitched battles with police.

To avoid such things and capitalize on the power of loyalty, national leaders desire to make the main tribal memberships coterminous. A territory with a single established religion and a unitary culture is relatively easy to govern. For this reason, conquests have been

regularly followed by efforts to destroy the local culture and religion.

Tribes and Conquest: 1. 'On the same day, Joshua captured Makkedah and put both king and people to the sword, destroying both them and every living thing in the city. He left no survivor..... Then Joshua and all the Israelites marched....to Libnah and attacked it.....and they put its people and every living thing in it to the sword; they left no survivor there..... From Libnah....to Lachish.... they took it on the second day and put every living thing to the sword....'. Moses was more practical, and he advised: kill the men and mature women, but breed from the virgins.¹⁴ 2. Zoroastrianism was the state religion of various Iranian empires until the Arabs conquered Iran and imposed Islam in the 7th century. Zoroastrians declined more rapidly after the 9th century due to successive conquests of Iran by Muslim Turks and Mongols. In the 10th century a group fled to India and became known as the Parsis. By the 13th century, only a persecuted minority survived in Iran around two desert cities of Yazd and Kerman and Islam was the overwhelmingly dominant religion. 3. In 1949, China invaded Buddhist Tibet. It is estimated that 1.2 million Tibetans were killed. 7.5 million Chinese were moved in so making the remaining 6 million Tibetans a minority in their own country. Virtually all the 6000 Buddhist temples were destroyed and the spiritual leader, the Dalai Lama, was forced into exile in 1959. **Ex. 5.6**

Any established minority in a community is a natural scapegoat because of the inherent negativism between value systems. The persecution of minorities serves as a ready outlet for hostility and a relief from frustrations generated by the difficulties of social life.

Within the tribe, altruism is a manifestation of loyalty. In other words, self-sacrifice occurs for the value system or for symbols or individual representatives of the value system. Altruistic acts for another tribe are regarded with grave suspicion, and considered to be expressions of disloyalty and betrayal. 'The essential characteristic of a tribe is that it should follow a double standard of morality — one kind of behaviour for in-group relations, another for out-group'.¹⁵

Group Formation. As we have seen, tribes form in response to social, linguistic, religious, occupational, theoretical or other enduring distinctions. The incompatibility of beliefs, interests, activities, customs or modes of communicating leads to those of a like mind congregating and distancing themselves actually or psychologically from others. This congregation, combined with the desire to perpetuate the value system, produces the tribe.

Value systems which emerge over time in relation to activities or communal interaction cannot be designed. The tribe and its value system, and hence the definition

of a social identity for a person, evolves over a considerable period — usually more than one generation. Emotional, historical and geographical factors all influence the result. Other things being equal, the longer the history, the more secure the tribe and the more intense the tribalism.

Social and environmental changes may lead to tribal modification or weakness and extinction. Genetic extermination, the mainstay of early man, has been replaced by cultural evolution and social selection. Nowhere is this more evident than in the field of religions. To illustrate the diversity needed for evolution: over 10,000 new primal religions are said to have developed in Africa in response to the impact of Christianity.¹⁶ To illustrate relatively sudden major change: cult worship of the Mother Goddess which dominated Brahmanism in ancient India was rapidly displaced by Jainism and Buddhism whose founders emerged around 550BC.

Value systems which are pure theories or scientific paradigms are capable of deliberate design. However, the tribe itself remains beyond design because it requires the development of personal belief and must adapt to the social context. So scientific disciplines and theories also show evolutionary patterns and are affected by psychosocial pressures.

Loyalty generated by tribes encourages people to define and preserve the value system through socializing others into the tribe. Socialization efforts are intensified by groups that demand a great deal of their followers. This may take the form of indoctrination at work, use of schooling to drive home a message, exhortations in speeches and writings, and privileges for those who demonstrate their devotion to the tribe's ideals.

Antithesis. A tribe experiences itself as beset by two types of seemingly antithetical behaviour. The first is disbelief. Those who tolerate or even respect the tribe's value system, but are not members of the tribe potentially weaken both the tribe's external influence and its hold on its own members. Tribes vary in their efforts to convert or exclude such people, but non-believers generally play a useful role by being cast as inferior, ignorant, unenlightened or harmful.

The most undermining and dangerous force for any tribe comes from betrayal. Adherents who reject the tribe's value system in part or whole become susceptible to the ideas of alternative tribes, and may act on their behalf against their original tribe. Tribes are intolerant of lapsed members because of the trust, hope and effort invested in them. Free-thinkers, traitors and apostates are also reviled because they set a bad example.

One thinks of betrayal in relation to nation-states. However, the term can equally include a person who marries out of their community or class; a feminist who becomes a full-time wife and mother; a doctor who defends the validity of alternative medicine; an academic who rejects the foundation assumptions of his discipline; or a priest who rejects a key element of dogma. Such people tend to be punished, persecuted or rejected by their tribe. If the tribe is well-organized, ways exist for such members to be formally expelled. For instance, a person may be exiled from a country, excommunicated from a religion, or de-registered from a profession.

When the tribe is oriented around a well-defined school of thought, as in the case of psychoanalysis, Marxism, or Roman Catholicism, betrayal takes the form of revisionism, deviationism or heresy. Such tribes may tolerate differences and dispute within the value system, but direct criticism can only be allowed in the most marginal way. Tribes handle internal differences by forming sub-tribes (see Ex. 5.4). If differences between the sub-tribes are too great, then painful schism results.

Group Relations. The socialization process provides all adherents of the value system with much in common. For a tribe and its value system to persist, it is necessary to ensure that socialization is periodically reinforced and that new recruits are sought and systematically socialized. Value systems are assimilated via identification, so a full and thorough conversion is required. Often it has the element of an ordeal in the sense that an old self must die and a new self be reborn.

Membership of the tribe generates a solidarity or brotherhood which enables the group to sustain itself against outsiders. A sense of unity is essential. Group unity and identity is revealed in the way that all members defend the value system, affirm its central features, and proclaim its inherent goodness — typically using almost identical phrases and arguments.

The group looks after its members by looking after itself. Sometimes this involves keeping the numbers restricted while increasing the amount of resources put at the disposal of the tribe: professions usually try to take this approach. In other situations, it implies expanding the tribe and its sphere of influence to enable others to benefit. So accountants colonize universities, psychotherapists get involved in cancer care, and media people infiltrate political party machines.

Making Universities Businesslike: The tribe of academics has been united by a value system captured by the metaphor of the ivory tower. In the ivory tower, reputation is pursued through scholarship (even if only a tiny esoteric

research community appreciates it), adaptation of ideas for public consumption is shunned (even if it would benefit the community), the general public is treated as ignorant (even if academics would benefit from listening), a boundary between work and social action is maintained (even if social needs are evident), academic freedom is supported (even if lines of research are fruitless over many years), and research which is not rigorous is opposed (even if it is useful or lucrative). The introduction of a business approach to Universities can be seen as an attempt to alter this value system. However academics have generally opposed changes aimed at making Universities more business-like. **Ex. 5.7**

A diverse variety of tribes is often to be found within any single domain. They naturally come into conflict over values adopted in that domain and the allocation of resources. In a health service, for example, doctors, nurses, paramedics and managers cooperate reasonably well in the handling of patients, but fight bitterly over money for developments. Doctors as individuals may be altruistic guarantors of the patient's interests, but as a profession they are a powerful tribe affirming the pre-eminence of their values and pursuing their own advantage.¹⁷

Although variety is usually desirable from a practical or humanistic standpoint, adherents of any value system have an urge to reject and denigrate, if not utterly annihilate, different value systems. Negativity between tribes seems unavoidable. Within churches and utopian communes which explicitly foster union and where tolerance and acceptance might be expected, epithets for outsiders range from ignorant at best, through contaminating, to pernicious and evil. The most that can be realistically expected of tribes is that they should be expected to co-exist in a state of quiet non-pejorative negativity. Coexistence refers to the right for all tribes and their members to be allowed to function. Negativity refers to the sense of social distance and division between tribes. Tribes may grow towards each other over time, especially if sharing a common goal or faced with a common enemy, but inter-tribal unity is impossible. Inter-faith initiatives, for example, usually expect too much. Professionals, ideologues and religionaries find the limited aim of peaceful coexistence spoiled by deep drives of each tribe to assert pre-eminence. If coexistence is deeply hostile, social life is invariably harmed in some way.

Leadership and Status. All within a tribe are equal and yet tribes invariably generate an informal but widely recognized hierarchy. Over time, these status differentials may become sharp, rigid and immensely complex as in the Hindu caste system. In tribes based in occupations or political ideologies, the hierarchy develops in relation to the degree of dedication to the

value system, the significance of the contribution of the adherents, and their power in society. For example, the hierarchy within adherents of a political ideology depends on the degree of commitment, ideological purity and political ability; the hierarchy in academia reflects the quality of the academic contribution and service to the discipline.

The tribe desires, above all, for its value system to survive. It therefore organizes to defend its own distinctiveness and means of perpetuation. Membership-centred associations may be set up which are open only to the tribe and dedicated to its defence and promotion. The leadership needed by tribes and tribal bodies is quite unlike dynamic merit-based leadership needed in organizations. Tribal leaders are required for symbolic purposes and to perform ritual functions which signify the truth and power of the value system. They represent and endorse the value system internally to adherents and externally. So leadership is embodied in official or quasi-official positions e.g. presidents and councils of professional associations, general secretaries of trade unions, founding fathers of new disciplines or theories, heads of state or of world churches. Whoever is in these positions is treated deferentially, irrespective of their personal qualities.

Although those in leadership positions may play a role in handling social pressures and tribal changes, leadership here is intensely conservative in respect of the value system. There is little or no room for pragmatism or compromise by the leader, because such things are about what to do — not about what to be. The tribe exists to affirm a distinctive identity and value and the leadership symbolizes that existence and identity. Members of the tribe must be able to recognize themselves unambiguously in whoever is in the leadership position. Ideally that person should be recognized as being one-of-us and reflecting the best-in-us.

Entry and Exit. In the case of race and religion, people qualify for a particular tribe through their birth, and are socialized during their upbringing. University undergraduates are educated into accepting certain schools of thought and rejecting others. If their career is in academe or based in its teachings, they become voluntary converts. People often accept indoctrination voluntarily: for example, when joining a professional group or adopting a particular political ideology. They then obtain the needed socialization through self-disciplined effort, participation, and responding to exhortations. Acceptance by the group is granted via formal or informal qualifications. Religious membership and citizenship may be changed in later life through a voluntary conversion.

Entry to a tribe is charged with emotional significance because it means subordinating oneself to the values and needs of that tribe. In all cases, lengthy periods of initiation and adaptation in childhood or adulthood are required before full membership of the tribe is granted. Where a tribe has formally constituted itself, an investiture into full membership may take place when the individual is deemed ready. Because language unconsciously, implicitly and uncontrollably expresses values, the learning of a language (or a lexicon of specialized terms — jargon to outsiders) is encouraged if not enforced during the entry process. Such verbal and non-verbal language differences help to demarcate tribes. The resulting barriers to communication foster negativity.

The person whose innate or deliberate identity development leads to growth away from the value system of the tribe cannot stay within it. A process of mutual rejection commences, until either the tribe or member takes the final step to sever connection. Exit is generally viewed as positively undesirable by the tribe, and it may be impossible in the view of outsiders: Hitler, for example, persecuted Jews who had abandoned the faith.

Families and Family Therapy: A family is a tribe in this context, but a most unusual one because it is impossible to deselect either our parents or our children. Membership of the family is more permanent than membership of nations, religions, professions or ideologies. When society was less individualistic, wider tribal values were a sufficient guide for family life. Now, each family requires the development of its own value system in which fairness and reciprocity as well as the meeting of emotional needs are worked out. The frequency of marital break up suggests that many fail in this task. (Perhaps too much is being expected.) Marital partners have to socialize each other and the children in order to create the necessary loyalty to the family unit, but such socialization involves loyalties to value systems in the families of origin. Family therapists have found that disturbance often results when there are unadmitted or unconscious loyalty conflicts. A family member may be treated as a traitor when all that is happening is a socially appropriate search for autonomy.

Ex. 5.8¹⁸

Exit from a tribe is an emotionally difficult matter. Joining another tribe is equally difficult because it means undergoing a conversion to that tribe's values, often in the face of suspicion about loyalty. As a reaction, converts are known to become over-zealous and develop a 'holier than thou' attitude. Membership of two competing tribes is viewed with the deepest suspicion: a scientist who becomes a philosopher may never be fully accepted as a proper scientist or as a proper philosopher.

Identity Formation. Value systems demand an identification with the values and with the relevant tribe. So the tribe now defines the individual. Identification occurs in the socialization process, and roots the sense of obligation and loyalty to the tribe. The tribe's values and needs become indistinguishable from the individual's, and are held by the tribe to be more significant than any values or needs that the individual may have which are unrelated to the tribal identity and well-being. So death in the service of the tribe and its value system is regarded with favour. (Socio-biologists explain that parental sacrifice for a family, the earliest tribe, protected the germ line and so must have been selected for during evolution.²)

Limitation. Socialization gives a sense of attachment which is too theoretical for everyday use. The tribe's value system makes no specific provision for differences between people or for the needs of particular situations. So it feels too demanding and too controlling of the individual at times. People need to be part of a social group which is more practical and flexible. They need a group which allows for some personal recognition, some regular physical and emotional contact, and which allows each person to have some influence over the group's identity. This takes us to what most people immediately think of when imagining a social group: a community.

COMMUNITIES AND SOCIAL VALUES (L-5)

Nature. Social values reflect and sustain actual organic *communities*. By calling the community actual and organic, I am attempting to avoid confusion with the metaphorical extension of the term to natural social groups at other levels — as in 'community of mankind' (L-7) or the worldwide 'community of feminists' (L-6). The community built around social values is a social group where people meet and interact continuously or periodically on a regular and public basis in respect of an undefined range of activities. Such a community is expected to meet the full range of needs of its individual members so far as this is possible. It seeks to accept personality differences and individual quirks and preferences. Any community is perceived to be a coherent and evolving entity with needs of its own.

The *primary* form of community, the focus in this section, is *territorially* defined. The size of the territory and number of people determines the quality and extent of the interaction. Community, as most people understand it, is realized in a shared household or in a neighbourhood or small town where personal recognition is possible and where mutual informal assistance

is natural and desirable. Such communities have been idealized: Rousseau, for example, felt that only in a community simple enough to be intelligible and small enough to allow effective participation could man be free, happy and on good terms with others.¹⁹

It is essential to recognize that there are discrete levels of territorial community and that each of us is potentially a member of seven progressively encompassing communities requiring government in quite distinct ways.²⁰ The household is the smallest territorial community which requires to be governed. A neighbourhood or small village within which children play and people walk about is the next territory, and here parish or village councils are found. (Most utopian community experiments and primitive societies are not organized beyond this level.) At the next level is the town or rural district in which most community services are available. This is the arena of local government. Above this is the region or province based on geography or history, and requiring laws to maintain its distinct subcultural characteristics. Finally there is the nation-state which is usually culturally defined by such things as a common language, common religion, common ethnic origin. It enforces unity by social arrangements like a common monetary system, common defence and free passage. Multi-national regional groupings, like the Organization of African Unity or the European Community, form the sixth territorial level of potential community; and finally, at the seventh level is the world community of nations where government is reflected in a body like the United Nations.

Although larger communities are impersonal and extremely complex, individuals still have the potential to exercise an influence over their values and operation. The advantage of large communities lies in their capacity to provide for a great variety of social values, and so cater for an enormous range of individual differences. The claustrophobia and sense of intrusion in neighbourhoods or villages is avoided by the possibility of finding soul-mates whilst retaining anonymity.

The *secondary* or *non-territorial* form of community is one which emerges when any set of people interact physically and personally over time for any reason at all. This may occur at work, or in a club, or in tribal activities. People in such situations interact physically and emotionally in parallel to whatever their main purpose is. They need to get to know and deal with each other as individuals in order to pursue their primary purpose. In doing so, a form of community is created.

Community in a Firm: A firm is not a territorial community, but people within it must get on with each other. If the firm wishes its employees to consider themselves as part of a community, it must imitate territorial communities by delib-

erately catering to the social values and social needs of staff. For example, it might fund a staff association, offer its facilities for out-of-hours functions, allow for personalization of the office decor, set up and subsidize a high quality cafeteria, provide medical care, support further education, enter staff teams in competitive sports, encourage charitable giving, provide relaxation rooms for people to meet, only move people around the firm after consultation, and institute policies which minimize staff turnover. The specification, introduction and organization of such initiatives should not be driven by line-managers but should depend on the staff association and voluntary participation by staff. **Ex. 5.9**

Anthropological studies show that networks of social relations catering for the same needs — economic, legal, political, kinship, religious — are to be found in all societies however disparate their value systems. The tribal value systems affect these community activities, but whereas the value system is an abstraction floating above external reality, values governing activities must suit actual local needs and circumstances. In other words, the system or network of social values which defines a community must be distinguished from the value system.

Function. Intrinsic to any community is the notion that personal needs (like privacy) should be a group concern and that communal needs (like clean streets) should be a personal concern. The community should provide a robust context for regular daily social life, one within which all that is necessary for living is available. Its function is, simply, to meet social needs. The first and overriding requirement seems to be ensuring social order and maintaining the community as an entity. The more interconnected the members of a community feel, the more effective is the informal social control which can be exerted during daily interaction by members on each other.

Such things like the provision of food and water, work and leisure activities, housing and travel, buying and selling, education and welfare, and resolution of disputes are essential in territorial communities. Beyond that, the richness of any community is expressed by the variety and depth of the activities which it regularly supports.

To achieve its ends, any community demands a degree of adaptation and compromise amongst people in the light of the realities of the situation. This give-and-take is most difficult in regard to areas where value systems are battling for dominance. Adherents of the various groups then have great difficulty in co-operating.

By focusing on shared social values, differences in value systems can be overcome without needing to

meet the more stringent demands of union. For example, the community in Jerusalem between the wars consisted of Jews, Muslims, Christians, the Druze and others. Despite their markedly different value systems, they were able to share social values like worship, social order, friendship, tolerance and work. A community formed in this way develops common understandings, habitual patterns of interaction, physical routines, and customary resolution of difficulties. People become attached to these ways of doing things as well as to the people and to the place.

A community is home: it permits togetherness, abolishes loneliness, and releases and channels belonging. The camaraderie and security of belonging, though less intense than the fire of loyalty, still engenders a comforting warmth. Belonging is felt directly as an inner personal force, a drive which defines a physical and a psychological attachment to the community. Belonging leads to members doing things voluntarily for the community or for particular people within it: voluntarily rather than obligatorily as loyalty might require (Ex. 5.5); and voluntarily but not necessarily enthusiastically as personal interest might allow (Ex. 5.11). Involvement in a community depends both on what a person is willing to give and what he is content to receive. Belonging is associated with a feeling that the community is an extension of the person and that the person is an essential element of the community.

Group Formation. A community forms if people are required by circumstances to interact over time. Sometimes a new community is set up because a group of people wish to share a social life together. Many non-utopian communes develop from friendships and resemble extended families. Larger whole communities may be deliberately established. They may simply be an over-spill from an overpopulated area; or they may be based on a utopian value system, like the Oneida community (Ex. 5.2) or Findhorn (currently thriving in Scotland²¹); or they may realize a principal object, like the early penal colonies in America and Australia or a future colony on the moon.

Whatever the reason for a new community, its evolution will depend heavily on the qualities, values and participation of the people within it. The more distinctive their value system and the more idiosyncratic their social values, the more isolated from surrounding communities the new community is likely to become.

Antithesis. Isolation and alienation are the antithesis of community. A community, being an enduring network of social interactions based on social values, demands sharing of goals and communal activities. If those living in a neighbourhood or housing estate do not

get to know each other, fail to recognize that they have common needs, and act intolerantly on the basis of tribal differences, then the quality of social life deteriorates and the potential for anti-social activities escalates. Anomie develops as the social values within each person fail to resonate with the social values evident in their environment.

Group Relations. Everyone is born into a community. Some stay in that same community for their whole life, others move to new communities. Only very rarely does a person become hermitic. People must relate to others in their communities, and take them as they happen to find them. This calls for mutuality and dialogue.

On the one hand, differences, in particular tribal distinctions, must be tolerated; and on the other, the views of any single person must not be allowed to determine the shape of the community. Individual differences must be recognized and built on to ensure that all members are valued. Personal strengths must be harnessed, and everyone must be allowed some say and enabled to play some part in community development. Dialogue is essential to discover what the shared social values actually are, what the needs and capabilities of members are, and what challenges and needs the community is facing and should meet.

The greater the degree of cooperative interaction among people, the stronger the cohesion of the community, the more intense the feeling of belonging, the more social values are reinforced and realized, and the stronger the community identity.

There are two obvious extremes in the balance between dominance by individual or community needs. At one extreme are anarchist communities in which there is a minimum of sharing and cooperation due to the notion that a group should interfere minimally with the freedom of the individual. The result is transient membership, weakly defined boundaries, and a short life-span for the group. At the other extreme are utopian experiments which value social control over personal identity. Communes based on the ideas of people like Owen and Fourier ensure control by strictly valuing communal equality, cooperation and fairness; while social control in a convent of cloistered nuns may be equally strict but so hierarchical that no two are equal.²² Most of us live in communities lying somewhere between these extremes.

Cohesion and warmth within communities are experienced and expressed as fellowship. Social values, being inclusive and integrative, serve as a suitable basis for fellowship and provide the main opportunity to overcome internal differences in value systems. Social

values can also generate cooperation and positive feeling between communities which have different value systems.

Altruism comes into its own in communities because it is tacitly regarded as a reciprocal matter. In a community, people allow themselves to be changed, and hope to change others and the community as a whole. Altruism is therefore tightly linked to an expectation that the sort of community that is worth living in is one in which each treats the other without allowing immediate self-interest to intrude excessively. If, in the event, altruism is not repaid, it ceases — unless it meets masochistic needs for self-sacrifice. Altruism for distant people in communities unknown is weak and unreliable, because reciprocity is impossible. Hardin argues that biological selection operated to favour tribal groups characterized by reciprocal altruism and inter-tribal aggression.¹⁶

Altruism is impractical on a large scale because scale generates impersonality. It is difficult to know whether something beneficial in one community will be beneficial in another. Much supposedly altruistic foreign aid — food, money, equipment, medicines, building — seems to have disrupted cultural life and imposed alien values (as well as propping up regimes that persecute their own people).

Leadership and Status. People in a community have to deal with each other directly, and so tribal status differentials may be reduced. Because the rationale for community lies in meeting needs and because all in the community share these needs, a sense that equality is desirable may be strong. However, any community at any point in time manifests social inequalities. These inequalities may be informal and unenforced, but they are widely recognized and sometimes difficult to escape.

Different people or groups in the community experience certain needs more intensely than others (e.g. needs for emotional support, for health care, or for education) and these people tend to suffer or feel inferior. Certain communal needs may be more prominent because of circumstances (say, the need for computerization) or tradition (say, the need for religion), and this raises the status of those involved. Communities deliberately elevate or depress status by allocating money or prestige, and people can take advantage of this. For instance, enhancing the prestige of soldiers in wartime helps ensure a steady flow of recruits. Similarly, a shortage of computer experts leads to higher salaries which encourage people to enter this occupation. Differences in inherent and learned capabilities (e.g. in intelligence, in self-expression, in social

skills, in making money) emerge at different ages and alter over the life-span under the influence of illness, opportunity and circumstance. These are further sources of social differences.

For all these reasons, inequalities are endemic and continuously fluctuating in a community. Communities permit a degree of individual distinctiveness, allow multiple statuses and foster integration. The result is social fluidity and mobility. Unfortunately for some people and for the community as a whole, tribal allegiances and mentalities may inhibit use of the potential for personal benefit that a community can offer.

Leadership in a community is provided by public figures. These emerge in two ways: formal-political and informal-relational. Communities need government and the politicians are formal leaders. In a free society, members of the community are nominated and elected to govern by all in a secret ballot. Political parties form around a value system, but voters are rarely members of the party, so at election time, politicians of opposing parties appeal to identical social values like economic well-being, national security, control of crime, and better welfare services. In the event, the realization of most promises is rather rare. Nevertheless, the public seems to be satisfied with hearing their social values proclaimed and affirmed.

Informal leadership emerges from the processes of interaction and fellowship. On the one hand, all members are typical of the community. So the views of the community may be obtained by opinion polls, invited phone-ins on the radio, or letters to newspaper editors. On the other hand, it soon becomes apparent that certain individuals are particularly able to appreciate and articulate the social values of the community, and desirous to do so. These are usually people with the time, capability and material resources to be concerned for the well-being of the wider community. They may be businessmen, professionals, church leaders, journalists or intellectuals. Such community leaders may achieve considerable influence without any formal responsibility so long as they recognize, like politicians, that they can go no further than the community as a whole is prepared to accept.

Entry and Exit. Within a free society, joining and leaving communities is an informal matter. Subject to particular problems of space or resources and the local ethos, communities readily allow their members to move between them. Migration becomes problematic if there are differences in value systems, and if large numbers of migrants are involved. Although newcomers are expected to adapt to the existing social values (because it is presumed that these were an

inducement to come), they are also expected to introduce their own social values. In organizations, this is described as bringing in new blood.

Exit from a community is not traumatic, but even so it may be an emotional wrench. So people staying a short time in a community may avoid getting too involved with it. This is the danger posed by excessive mobility in a society. If a person's social values change relative to their current community, then leaving is positively desired, and exit is a relief.

Identity Formation. Social values are felt as personal needs, and the community's values are experienced as community needs. Calls for political self-determination by a community are not just about asserting community identity, but also about the freedom for personal development. Those who assert the need for each and all to discover meaning in their life and to be open to experience are usually arguing for the significance of social values. The implication here is that potentials within the self have to be developed within an available community sympathetic to those needs. Each of us needs to recognize that we are physically located within communities and must find ourselves in relationships available there. In other words, identity is relational in character.

The growth of identity depends on a sense of personal freedom. Personal freedom is expressed within community life and depends upon the handling of relationships. If the potentialities and freedom of others are not to be infringed, such relationships need to be characterized by mutuality. The control of others is particularly unsatisfactory, even when strong leadership is valued. Control interferes with the inclusiveness of social values, and with the openness to different ways of interpreting and realizing them.²³

The person and the community shape each other because the social values of one are the social values of the other. The development of both relate to the same needs: the individual needs health, the community thrives if its members are healthy; the individual needs to be educated, the community develops if its members are knowledgeable; the individual needs to trust and be trusted, the community thrives on mutual trust.

People who see their community neglecting the needs of some or all within it can and should push for change. Changes in social values and community identity always start with a radical minority in favour.

Social values are open-ended and require ever new modes of realization. The regular reinforcing of social values in community life strengthens personal identity, and feeds back into a diversity of communal activities

whereby these values are lived. Such participation creates a more wholehearted involvement and further strengthens the community as a whole.

In focusing on one's needs and determining social values, the use of intuition is essential. There is no other way in which a sense of ourselves, a sense of others, and a sense of any relationship or community feeling can be obtained.

Limitation. Communities are too diffuse to allow focused endeavour. Mutuality and fellowship are sustaining, but do not provide a way for individuals to use their particular interests and aptitudes to the full. Neither belonging (nor loyalty nor spirituality) are sufficiently dynamic and organized to promote a particular endeavour. Like-minded people within a tribe or community need to band together in a different way if something good is to be achieved for the group and for themselves.

ASSOCIATIONS AND PRINCIPAL OBJECTS (L-4)

Nature. Principal objects reflect and sustain *associations*. An association is a social group which people voluntarily and deliberately join to affirm and promote an interest in a formal way. The association has a valued and achievable goal, the principal object, which is the activity required to forward that interest. Associations may construct and staff a more or less complex enterprise based on that goal. Association is the means whereby the abstraction of ultimate values can be converted by a person into something which can have an impact. So freedom to associate for social, political or commercial purposes is fundamental in free societies.

Democracy in America: "They have not only commercial and manufacturing companies, in which all take part, but associations of a thousand other kinds, religious, moral, serious, futile, general or restricted, enormous or diminutive. The Americans make associations to give entertainments, to found seminaries, to build inns, to construct churches, to diffuse books, to send missionaries to the antipodes; in this manner they found hospitals, prisons and schools." De Tocqueville also observed that "in aristocratic societies (like England) men do not need to combine in order to act", and claimed that "Americans are much more addicted to the use of general ideas than the English and entertain a much greater relish for them."

Ex. 5.10²⁴

Cooperatives, partnerships, sports clubs, professional bodies, churches, charities — all these are associations which depend on communities for their existence. Although they seem to flower spontaneously, they must be deliberately set up by people using their

initiative. Such associations stem in part from the community's background support and encouragement of endeavours, but mainly from the existence of common interests amongst the people involved. It follows that whatever is in the interest of the association is felt to be in the interest of the members.

Some Associations: A motorway is planned: one person has an interest to oppose it and sets up an association with all those of like mind. An inventor gets an idea for a new sort of car which will be a one-seater, and forms an association of those who are prepared to invest in the idea. When a disaster occurs, a few victims form an association for those involved in it with the object of providing emotional support and legal assistance which all will find relevant. People working on a new theory in mathematics form an association to exchange ideas and produce a newsletter. Some drama enthusiasts in a neighbourhood form an association to present amateur theatricals. All these groups are built around principal objects and are motivated by interests.

Ex. 5.11

Function. The examples in Ex. 5.11 make it clear that an association is a grouping of individuals formed in order to promote the achievement of something specific. Each person in the association must deeply value the endeavour defined by the principal objects, feel it is good to work for it, and put their resources (time, money, effort &c) into it.

Associations may consist of members who do no direct work at all but solely contribute money. Most large businesses are constituted by shareholders in this way. In many other associations, members prefer to offer their own unpaid work as a resource. For example, neighbourhood associations generate wholly voluntary endeavours like Christmas parties, summer fetes, and jumble sales. Voluntary associations with more ambitious aims like organizing regular concerts, providing sports facilities or producing amateur theatricals may need to employ a few staff to do things for the members. Associations which represent the interests of doctors in the nation, or promote spiritual values, or relieve the plight of the worst off in society are promoting a far bigger enterprise. Such enterprises invariably need an extensive paid executive body to carry much of the responsibility for pursuing the principal objects.

Staff in a firm may think of themselves as a community (cf. Ex. 5.9), but they more often feel like an association of people with a common interest. Mission statements, for example, are typically aimed at staff on this basis. It is natural that people work best for organizations whose rationale fits their interests.

Principal objects release people's active enthusiasm and natural ardour. Zeal is the old-fashioned word for

it. Associations are necessary to channel zeal and human energies of all sorts in the service of some practical achievement. Without principal objects, energies become diffused and ineffective. Without an association, the full variety of possibilities for realizing the principal objects cannot be properly appreciated. Enthusiasm enables persistence, perseverance and initiative.

Group Formation. A person should be able to set up an association easily as long as two criteria are met: the value being asserted must be one in which others are interested, and it must accord with the social values of the wider community. Tribes and communities proliferate associations, because only by associating and pursuing a delimited set of principal objects can anything be achieved. Associations themselves proliferate subsidiary associations either within their control or at arms length.

Associations are important as a way that different and potentially antagonistic tribes and their organizations can pursue common ends in parallel or jointly. For example, an inner city development trust might be constituted by different churches, businesses, trade unions and voluntary agencies.

Antithesis. The strength of the association is determined by the significance of the principal objects to the participants. When the association is dominated by apathy and disinterest, its core value, the principal objects, cannot flourish. A person may join a particular association with the hope of making business contacts, earning money, gaining prestige, or making friends; but these cannot substitute for the main interest as defined by the objects. The more important such ancillary reasons are to members, the less effective the association will be.

Shareholders comprise the legal association of any incorporated firm. However, their principal concern is with profit-taking and they have little interest in the business. As a result, shareholders (unlike proprietors in the past) have little constructive influence. Firms thrive only because (or if) the board and top management are deeply identified with the principal objects. Not surprisingly, this anomalous situation leads to problems including urges to replace the shareholders through a buy-out.

Group Relations. It will be recalled that principal objects were defined as the *raison d'être* of a business. They are also the *raison d'être* of an association. The identity of any association is determined partly by its principal objects and partly by the preferences of those signed up to it. The people in the association form a

dedicated band or partnership who support each other in relation to the pursuit of the principal objects. The association thrives in direct proportion to the degree of commitment of the members to it.

Each association should have its own distinctive objects and social niche within a community. This minimizes destructive competition. Merging between very similar associations is possible and sometimes desirable if it enhances effectiveness. In the UK, the Writers's Guild and the Society of Authors periodically consider and reject a merger because of subtle differences. Nevertheless they work together.

Inter-association relations to enable such joint work are called alliances. But the basic relation between associations is one of competitiveness because each seeks resources for its particular endeavour from a common pool. This resource may be money, clients/customers, sponsorship, new members, public attention, political favour, or press coverage.

Competition for resources between associations does not imply or require negativity, so hostility is less justifiable. But principal objects are exclusive and divisive, so full positivity is not possible either. When public interest groups feel 'column inch envy' for each other and avoid sharing skills and resources, they harm their own cause. Proper market-place competition amongst charities for donations can activate different types of donor. Unseemly or unfair competition amongst charities generates distrust and suspicion in all donors.

Strong alliances and networks regularly develop as temporary or permanent phenomena to handle the common needs and joint work of different associations in the same domain. Networking can also help mitigate unnecessary and inappropriate hostility. Associations may link to form a new association to pursue a common aim, or provide common services. For example, two businesses may set up a third business with joint ownership; or a variety of charities might form an association to coordinate lobbying or campaigns.

Indeed strategic alliances can be highly beneficial for all parties. For example, they may lead to the market or community niche being systematically expanded. Very large enterprises, like the tunnel under the English channel or space exploration, may be financially and technically impossible without the use of alliances.

Alliances within a particular domain may be buttressed by the formation of an association of associations with objects defined to strengthen their identity. Over 170 different Christian church organizations — but notably not the Roman Catholic and Russian Orthodox Churches — formed the World

Council of Churches in 1948 to work for the unity and renewal of the church, and to be an instrument for the churches to talk, pray and work together in a spirit of tolerance. Similarly, businesses, trade unions and voluntary agencies each have umbrella organizations in most countries (and sometimes internationally) representing their common interests and perspective.

Leadership and Status. Status differences exist in associations largely according to the enthusiasm, commitment and circumstances of members. Inequality here is overt, logical and assignable. It attempts to match particular rights and duties of categories of association membership with characteristics and preferences of people. The membership structure needs to be designed to suit the precise nature of the association but may include categories like: life, full, associate, preferential, employee, honorary, affiliate, absentee, retired, overseas, week-day, working, student.

Leadership of the association is provided by its governance structure. Even the smallest voluntary association needs a governing body in the form of a small executive committee made up of two or three elected posts like Chairman or President, and Honorary Secretary or Honorary Treasurer. Where an enterprise is dominated by its association (rather than by the executive), the governing body tends to have a complex structure of committees, sub-committees, working parties, panels, special interest groups and so on in order to involve as many members as possible, and to cater for all the sub-interests and factions.

In an association created by other associations, membership of the governing body is usually arranged by nomination or appointment. Where the association requires a complex executive bureaucracy, it may be appropriate to put top executives and non-members with relevant expertise on the governing body. The risk here is that such people may lose sight of the values of the association. Whatever the form of association, the chief function of the leadership is to decide priorities and handle internal factionalization.

Entry and Exit. To participate in the association and have a degree of control over the enterprise as a whole, a person must enrol or register in some fashion. The chief concern of the association when a new member applies to join is whether a genuine interest exists and whether a proper commitment is likely. To test commitment, barriers to membership are frequently set up. The barrier might be a playing-in test for a tennis club, a substantial entry fee for a prestigious country club, committing a murder for the Mafia, an academic qualification for a learned society, a demonstration or presentation for a special interest club,

attendance at events or meetings on several occasions, or simply purchase of a share. If there is concern to ensure the applicant's interest is genuine, recommendation by other members and an interview may be required.

Because entering and leaving an association is based on a person voluntarily giving or withdrawing commitment, it is generally non-stressful. If the person's interests have changed, then departing is natural. If interests have not changed but the association has altered its focus, then another association which is more closely aligned to the person's interests can be joined. However, if the association has also become the person's community and is tribal in nature, then departure may be problematic. Retirement from work, for example, may mean an opportunity to change interests. But if work was identity-defining, as is common amongst professionals, then membership of the relevant professional organizations may well be maintained, and the person keeps reading journals and pursuing activities which maintain contact with fellow members.

Identity Formation. The locus of control has now shifted decisively to the person. People define or relate to the identity of their associations in the light of their own identity. Everyone must determine which associations will get their full commitment. Associations therefore are tools to support and develop personal identity. In other words, the channelling of energies is, at last, in the hands of the person. When commitment is long-lasting, the identity of the person locks into the identity of the enterprise and irritating or boring or disliked elements — paperwork, annual dinners — are tolerated.

We are all the principal shareholder or proprietor in our own life. We must invest in ourselves and be committed to our well-being. A rich life is one in which a person deliberately develops a wide range of interests and commits himself wholeheartedly to these. The limit is defined by the ideas and interests a person is capable of holding, and the resources at his or her disposal. Such things change as circumstances change and as a person matures.

A range of interests is desirable for another reason. When people band together and harness themselves to a common enterprise, the enterprise starts to take precedence over their needs. Because no particular enterprise can ever satisfy all their needs, people need to join or become involved with several associations for their own protection.

Limitation. Partnership in a joint endeavour is gratifying. But people also feel the need to ensure that, in any particular decision, the association espouses the val-

ues that they prefer. Associations themselves need to decide what is best in situations where the available facts are debatable, irrelevant or absent. To determine and implement such internal priorities, the formation of a different sort of social group is required.

FACTIONS AND INTERNAL PRIORITIES (L-3)

Nature. Internal priorities reflect and sustain temporary sub-groups or *factions* within an ongoing association. Such sub-groups are sometimes called cliques, coteries, cabals — or simply sides. When values are completely polarized, an issue only has two sides: the good and the bad. So the most intense form of factionalization involves just two sides. However, an issue may have as many sides and as many factions as there are relevant valid values or choices.

Taking sides in a particular choice situation is the most concrete expression of value and self-definition. In common parlance, it is ‘being for it or against it’, or ‘standing up to be counted’ or ‘putting your money where your mouth is’.

Sides and factions are explicitly created by the way people feel in particular situations. So this social group is fully subordinate in its identity to the immediate perceptions of the people constituting it.

Common foci for temporary factionalization include support for a particular person as a leader of the association, or support for a particular allocation of a resource. Factions seek to sway important decisions where the correct choice is obscure. Transient factions do not usually contain sub-factions because these would dissipate their energy. The same is not true if factions are long-term or permanent.

Common foci for permanent factionalization include legitimate sub-interests within the association (e.g. doctors in training, hospital specialists, general practitioners and public health doctors within a medical association), community allegiances (e.g. competing towns sharing a local government council), and tribal loyalties (e.g. academic disciplines within a research institute).

Function. Internal priorities are by nature transient and heavily dependent on situational factors, timing and the actual people involved. Internal priorities therefore correspond to the simplest social group: a collective of transient membership forming around a temporary preference. The function of a faction is to define sharply the best orientation or emphasis which the immediate issue demands. The faction seeks to ensure that its

particular view prevails. The members’ desires, convictions and personal power are the resources that must be won over during the formation of factions.

Because internal priorities are a matter of brute assertion of value, the association needs factions to create the strongest possible debate. Only in this way can it discover which value should dominate. Freedom to have opinions and to express these feelingly are essential to this process. Priorities, it should be recalled, are integrative and inclusive. All sides are equally valid and the process and final result should clearly recognize this.

A particularly testing time is during constitutional change when the uncertain status of the principal objects temporarily removes the prime force binding opposing factions. Then the traditionalists, who wish to minimize change, and the radicals, who wish to push change through, disagree for long periods on every tiny detail. As a result, the work of the association may grind to a halt.

Factions foster contact with inner conviction and channel the release of passion. By passion, I mean raw emotional energy. Without passion, associations and their enterprises can achieve little. Passion is needed to overcome the obstacles to change presented by inertia, apathy and the sheer difficulty of it all. But passion is potentially disruptive and divisive and the faction must contain it. Passion in a permanent faction may be particularly intense if the faction is based around a community or tribe. The situation is even worse if community and tribe coincide. In a country, such cases can lead to disintegration because territorial ethnic groups become driven by urges for full autonomy — as recently witnessed in Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.

In firms, factions are often oriented around domains of expertise (general management, finance, information technology, public relations &c). If these departments become geographically isolated, coordination and cooperation frequently suffer.

Factions and Government. The situation is confused in the case of government where political parties are commonly described as factions. Within parliament, representatives of the different parties do indeed form factions. Such factions are relatively permanent, voting en bloc on most issues. However, voting may occur occasionally with members of the other side. This is not about leaving the party, but about a different factional split on that particular matter. Factionalization is inevitable even if one party sweeps to power. When party-based opposition is weak, factionalization is stimulated within the leading party so that the needed debate around value conflicts may take place.

The political parties, themselves, are not factions but associations. The difference is not trivial and is the source of criticism of elected representatives by party activists. The purpose of the party is to win office and to introduce changes in accord with party ideology. The purpose of the elected government is far more complex. Above all, it must act as custodian of the common good in society. In other words, party activists need to recognize that government is more than just a party in power. Political systems may provide checks in the system to buttress this awareness. For example, the US Presidency and Congress are not necessarily controlled by the same political party.

For a long time, UK local government was minimally politicized. In the 1970's and 1980's, factions constituted themselves as 'groups' aligned with the national political parties. Many saw the introduction of groups as a bad thing, preferring the councillor to use common sense and be aware of local feelings. However, from the present perspective, it seems an inevitable development. Local government is an enterprise which aims to represent and serve a territorially-defined community (L-5), and there is a vacuum for associations (L-4) to compete for control of this government on behalf of the community. Political parties naturally fill this vacuum.

Factions within a party tend to persist if they are about cultural or territorial matters; and they are transient if they are about personalities or a current controversy. However, if the faction is ideological, then party schism is possible. Faction members may feel impelled to set up a distinct political party. The UK's Social Democratic Party was formed in this way in the mid-1970s, when an ideologically centrist faction defected from the increasingly leftist Labour Party.

Group Formation. The two or more sides of an issue are the foci around which members of the association coalesce and rally in support or opposition. Transient factions supporting a particular internal priority must be able to come into being rapidly, and subsequently be able to dissolve equally rapidly. These give the truest sense of a pure faction, and make it evident that this form of social group is little more than a vehicle for the expression of the individual's feelings and assessments for the issue of the moment. Such a faction has little life of its own. Persistent factions required by value-based subdivisions in the association have greater influence on their members on a wide range of matters.

Antithesis. Factions fail when their members refuse to recognize that political aims or priorities are means to an end all share — the furthering of the asso-

ciation. Factions have no independent ends and should regard the integrity of the association as paramount. So fanaticism based on adherence to certain values is inappropriate and destructive.

Fanaticism is revealed by the existence of a permanent faction which refuses to accept association decisions or parasitically attempts to take over the association. Then every debate becomes skewed around the same issue, and valid views and interests are denigrated. Chronic internecine warfare and personal antagonism begin to fester within the association, and artificial compromises which uneasily paper over the divisions are created. The fact is that it is not possible to have a fully independent faction following its own rules and policies at variance with those of the association. This state of affairs can usually be traced to value system conflicts i.e. arguments over ideas or doctrines. It is appropriate for value systems to generate associations dedicated to their propagation; and so the proper course is for the faction to constitute itself as a new association and promote its members' preferences directly.

Splits in Psychoanalytic Societies: Psychoanalytic factions are often based on particular theories (i.e. value systems). The early deviant theorists like Adler and Jung left with their factions to form their own associations. Followers of more recent deviant schools of thought, like that of Melanie Klein, have tried to remain with classical Freudians in the same organizations. In many cases, as in Argentina, this proved impossible. Each theoretical group developed itself within its own independent society under the auspices of the International Psychoanalytic Association. In the UK, three factions (called 'groups') emerged: Freudian, Kleinian and a third 'middle' group of 'independents' influenced by the ideas of Winnicott and Balint. The attempt to contain three somewhat fanatical factions has been draining. It has led to the group issue dominating the political life of the society. Decisions have to be scrutinized for any favouritism towards one of the groups. Issues which require factionalization across groups are poorly debated because everything must be subordinated to the need to support the group. Fresh theoretical work is difficult because this might undermine the status of the existing groups. Negativity and snide remarks often spoil the atmosphere. **Ex. 5.12**

Internal priorities assume that people are committed to the association within which the faction is defined. The interests of everyone are served by accepting whatever final decision is reached. This means that partisanship should not be personalized. Indeed friendship between members of different factions should be fostered as the norm. Any overt conflict should be recognized as a conflict of ideas or values or perceptions, not a conflict between particular people.

Unfortunately, tribal negativities often emerge when internal priorities are being decided. This reflects

poorly on the value system and reduces the likelihood of discovering the best outcome. It is unambiguously destructive. Little seems to have changed over the past two centuries since Adam Smith observed the atrocious conduct of factions: the weaker groups made to suffer and regarded as heretical; and those expressing balanced views treated with contempt, derision and detestation by furious zealots of both parties.²⁵ So it is worth insisting that abuse, denigration and other expressions of hostility are totally out of place. All are members of the same association, and adherence to the principal objects and the need for strenuous value debate should unite the opposing factions.

Group Relations. If an association is united on the values underlying a particular choice, then an internal priority is set but no factions form. A faction only forms when people who are of a like mind on a particular issue spontaneously come together because they recognize that others are doing likewise on the other side of the issue. In other words, factions define and create each other through an opposition of values.

Despite appearances, factions are integrative, not divisive. They contain opposing but equally valid values. The necessary relation between factions is one of dialectical opposition. One view may be the deadly enemy of the opposing view metaphorically speaking, but the groups are not deadly enemies. Each faction should be viewed as a valued and integral part of a whole.

Because opposition is dialectical and exists to forward agreed principal objects, coalition must be possible. If partisanship goes so far that coalition becomes impossible, then the association is damaged and full-fledged schism is not far away.

Factionalization within Local Government Associations:

Local governments in the UK have formed themselves into associations like the Association of District Councils. The remit of these bodies is to speak up for their sort of local government. Out of habit, ignorance or lack of self-control, they have factionalized along ideological lines. Such factionalization is not related to their function and it has hampered the defence of local government. In the case of London, two associations eventually formed: the Association of London Authorities which is constituted wholly by Labour councils, and the London Boroughs Association which is constituted wholly by Conservative councils. Again the corrosive effect of unmanaged tribalism is evident. The net result has been an irretrievable weakening of the cause of London and local government in debates with the national government. **Ex. 5.13**

Each faction needs to develop a position and an approach to handling the debate on the issue, and the group members are then expected to support what the faction decides. Adherence to the factional line creates

partisanship. Partisanship develops as much from opposing the positions taken by others as by proclaiming the faction's own preference. Linkage between opposing factions is maintained to ensure that procedures for debate and other transactions are effectively developed. Argument tends to be through the exchange of value assertions between partisans of the various sides. Facts are marshalled and manipulated to support the preferred value position.

Leadership and Status. Members of a faction are equivalent. Each person has an equal vote, and therefore equal power when the time comes to exert it. So equality is impersonal and not related to personal identity. In practice, it is best to minimize status inequalities in order to enable debate within and between factions.

Leadership is naturally accorded to someone who can fight effectively for the factional view. Such a person must feel strongly about the issue and should be able to articulate the members' passion clearly and forcefully. The factional leader is usually powerful in other ways, including by virtue of wealth, prestige, authority or capability.

Factional leaders typically require skills in negotiation and compromise in order to ensure that there is due recognition and some payoff for the faction. The governing body of the association is expected to take a balanced view and weigh up the claims and powers of various factions. Members on the governing body who wish to have the freedom to press their viewpoint sometimes stand down temporarily.

Entry and Exit. A faction is created by a spontaneous coalescence in which people naturally find themselves opposing others in regard to a particular matter. Joining and leaving factions is therefore not usually a problem, unless one is expected to be a member of a permanent faction which pushes for unity on most issues. The discipline of a faction may be irksome, and the intensity of feeling generated may be uncongenial. However, refusing to join a faction and not adhering to the partisan line may mean being quite powerless within the association.

Identity Formation. Passions rise in factional debate. The pressure on the individual to adhere to the line taken by the group may feel intense, but the impact on identity should be negligible. Nevertheless, factional choice should feel entirely personal. Joining the social group is now a matter of personal preference. Factions and internal priorities are a way of asserting an identity established by higher level values. They go wrong when the choice feels like an identity issue. If a choice seems to determine personal identity, then inappropriate expectations and attitudes come into play.

Factions and the process of setting internal priorities demand that a person own up to a particular orientation when faced with a decision affecting the good of the association to which he belongs. A person joins a faction in order to exert an influence, but he may do so tactically in order to win support on a separate issue. Not uncommonly, a member of an association will be unsure as to which side to choose. This internal conflict mirrors the external conflict once the choice is made. Repeated abstention is a way of avoiding involvement.

Because choices here may relate to interests and desires relevant to the person's wider situation, conflicts of interests become possible. In other words, a person pushes the association to do something of personal benefit irrespective of whether or not it is in the best interests of the association. Most public bodies now recognize and deal with conflicts of interest, but businesses and charities too often tend to turn a blind eye.

Limitation. Factions and internal priorities reflect the lowest and most tangible level of value clarification and assertion. As described in Chapter 3, the issue of what can actually be done in the situation still remains open. This needs to be resolved by setting objectives which are strategic (L-2), and then setting tactical objectives (L-1) to produce the required outcome. Purposes in these implementation levels are the responsibility of individuals rather than groups — even though their development and pursuit often requires the construction of groups.

REVIEWING NATURAL SOCIAL GROUPS

We have now examined the levels of value and the relation of value and identity to natural social groups. There are two topics — identity and work-life — that deserve mention in relation to these groups before this initial clarification of purpose and value is brought to a close. Keep in mind that the ideas in this brief review will be examined in more depth in the remainder of the book.

First, we must over-view the whole hierarchy to see how the identities of individuals and their social groups are linked.

Linking Personal and Group Identities

Personal Uniqueness. The proper appreciation and handling of the five distinct types of natural social group depends on recognizing that each emerges from and is attuned to the nature of a corresponding level of

value. Everyone deals with all these social groups and develops and establishes a personal identity as a social being through participation within them. So personal identity is developed across the full set of group identities.

It seems very possible that the *function* of the hierarchy is (a) to ensure the dominance of natural social groups in the integration of values within the identity of persons; and (b) to ensure the progressive emergence of personal responsibility for those groups as the hierarchy is descended.

People must be responsible for their social groups and be able to master them. In this process, they must not deny the essential qualities of each sort of social group. Success in this endeavour has not been marked to date. The notion of social group identities being linked with personal identity deserves some further exploration. It seems that the handling of individual differences by groups, and the choice of personal identity by individuals, are each reflected in clusters of types of social group and corresponding value. Table 5.1 diagrams these two sets of clusters. (The clusters parallel those within the lower five levels of purpose as shown in Table 3.5 in Ch. 3; and cf. Master-Table 4.)

Social groups depend upon the similarity of values held by people. In other words, group identity is intra-level. However, personal identity is not aligned with the levels but crosses them. So people within groups may hold dissimilar values. In the case of humanity (or unions), tribes and communities, group cohesion and sustenance demands active efforts to transcend, minimize, overcome or control differences between people. These social groups accept that differences do exist, but see these as being principally provided for at lower levels. The groups do not allow themselves to be defined in terms of the qualities of any particular person. This higher cluster tends to limit personal freedom and is challenged by uniqueness.

By contrast, the formation of associations and factions with their associated freedoms of association and expression depends on individual differences and the value of uniqueness. This lower cluster provides the means for asserting and realizing individual identity in a social context.

Choosing a personal identity is more problematic and reveals a different clustering. It will be recalled that tribes deliberately socialize their members to view their value systems as real, true and right. Ultimate values, too, cannot be shaped by each person because they define our common human quality and the potential for handling values. Often the articulation of ultimate values is handled by the tribal value system.

Table 5.1: How values link the individual and the social group. The way individual differences are handled and the scope for identity choice by a person reveals clusters of levels. Note that group identity is intra-level, whereas personal identity crosses levels.

INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES	TYPE OF VALUE	NATURAL GROUP	INDIVIDUAL IDENTITY
Group formation depends on overcoming individual differences.	Ultimate values	— Humanity	Identity choice is unconscious or forced by the group.
	Value systems	— Tribes	
Group formation depends on fostering individual differences.	Social values	— Communities	Identity choice is developed or chosen by the person.
	Principal objects	— Associations	
	Internal priorities	— Factions	

Memberships of humanity and tribes impose an identity which a person has little choice but to accept. Even where the tribe is chosen, entry is difficult and the value system is virtually unmodifiable. The compensating factor is that each person’s identity is securely stabilized.

Communities, associations and factions, by contrast, may be self-consciously chosen and used to develop personal identity. Social values require self-exploration and the recognition of one’s inner needs; and communities may be chosen which suit one’s needs and which allow one to exert a degree of influence. Associations require development of personal interests and activation of a commitment to pursue certain objects. Priorities allow for the expression of identity and the assertion of one’s own views and desires, so factions should be freely and passionately chosen.

Group Multiplicity. For each of us, our personal identity is one, but our social groups are many. Each form of value releases a powerful form of human energy within us which in turn engenders an intense social force in a group setting. In accord with the inherent nature of values, this energy and force has potential to be used either for good or harm.

Social groups at higher levels properly need to influence the functioning of social groups at lower levels in order to manage the social energies and forces. A degree of reverse influence by each group on its group context is also evidently needed.

Recognition of our basic humanity and emergence of union is of especial importance in this regard. When union is activated, tribalism and blind loyalty can be partially transcended and a force for tolerance is

released. In the absence of union, the negativity of tribalism potentially interferes with cooperation within communities, and inhibits formation of inter-tribal associations.

It follows that a state or sovereign society — defined to include families, local communities, organizations, institutions and government — must be built on ultimate values as well as the other varieties of value. Otherwise it could not reconcile internal tribal differences, consider posterity or work constructively in a pan-national or global context.

Note that a sovereign society is not a natural group. Many originate from conquest or colonization. Sovereign societies are a rather modern invention and few work as well as they might. They must seek to weld together natural groups for reasons acceptable to those groups, but usually based around the need to protect natural communities. The cohesion of society is therefore potentially problematic, and the maintenance of membership and identity requires continuing effort. By the end of the book we should be in a position to appreciate the values, obligations, institutions, authorities and intentional processes required to create a viable and strong society.

Turning back now to natural social groups, we must recognize that, despite its dangers, tribalism dominates social life. Sometimes this is evidently beneficial. When a community is a true nation with a common language, culture and tradition, then a dominant value system ensures a stable society. In the present time, given the neglect of ultimate values, it creates a sense of despair.

Tribalism is difficult to manage. When a state is constituted by an empire of territory-based nations, as in the former USSR, there will be persistent dissatisfaction, coercion and disintegrative forces generated by tribal loyalties. If a society is multi-cultural but without territorial divisions, then social discord is also liable to be endemic — at least until a unifying value system develops or people become more generally capable of union and the pursuit of ultimate values.

Unfortunately, the stability that comes from uni-cultural societies also has its price. When a tribe and a community are territorially coterminous, the potential for negativity towards outsiders seems to be enhanced. Nation-states enable the social forces of loyalty and belonging to mix and form a dangerous brew that is easily whipped into war-fever.

Tribes, as conceived here, are not limited to ethnic or national varieties. Tribes operate in all domains — religious, cultural, scientific, occupational. They produce structures and loyalties that have the potential to transcend territorial boundaries and inhibit war. The current growth of international meetings of chemists, linguists, finance ministers, sportsmen, farmers, churchmen, union leaders, businessmen, editors, engineers, poets and others is to be fostered and welcomed. Even religious pluralism and cultural mixtures in society, temporarily problematic though they are, may well serve the long term good.

Communities cannot control tribes and their values, but they can control the activities of their members. Communal living and social values have a binding and healing quality for people because of their rationale in meeting personal needs and their capacity to foster personally desired associations. Communities are able to limit and control associations formed within them. Indeed, they must do so. Associations get their resources from the community and act to affect the community. So an association can only thrive if the community broadly supports and tolerates its endeavours.

For associations to thrive in the face of uncertainty, they need factions within them to generate debate on controversial issues. It follows that the association must be capable of handling the factionalizing process. If an association allows factions to disregard its needs, then its progress may come to a standstill and, at the extreme, it is torn apart.

This hierarchical influence of one group on another which harnesses personal energies and provides some control over social forces, also leads to efforts to make the different forms of group coterminous.

Some alignment of social groups is possible and appropriate. Indeed it cannot be stopped.

For example, it is natural that a degree of fellowship and community (L-5) should develop amongst those most involved in an association (L-4), or amongst people who work closely together (L-2/L-1); or that members of a faction (L-3) of a particular association should associate themselves formally with outsiders and create new independent associations (L-4); or that tribes (L-6) should create small communities (L-5) so believers can live together, and should set up associations (L-4) in order to promote their interests.

If full coterminosity were possible, then membership of just one social group could provide for all our needs and concerns. This is the dream of dictators. It leads to tyrannical control, suppression of dissent, weakness of associations, and sterile uniformity. To imagine only one tribe implies conquering the world. Within a tribe to imagine only one community would be to deny cultural and historical differences. Within a community to imagine only one association would be to centralize all activities in one bureaucratic governmental organization. Within an association to imagine only one faction would be to deny individual differences.

The converse of this scenario, a multiplicity of diverse social groups, seems to be inherently good. The energies of spirituality, loyalty, belonging, enthusiasm and passion can then be released and properly deployed as each person and group sees fit. The invisible hand operates benignly and in the long run each and all will benefit. Progress may be slow and halting, and the cost may sometimes be appalling, but to speed it up by imposing uniformity is not a dream but a nightmare. Mankind needs diversity. Tribes need communities which adapt to people and situations. Communities need many competing thriving associations. Associations need regular intense factionalization. Pluralism is positive — at least over the long term.

Utopia. There is however one unique group which does offer a high degree of coterminosity: the family. In the family there should be union; there can be a single value system; the household should form a community; and the members are an association dedicated to nurturance and socialization of the children and emotional support of the adults. Desirably, the family factionalizes in various ways in response to inner controversies. In any case, the need for inter-generational boundaries means that parents and children will set up permanent factions. The family is the breeding ground for human energy in all its forms. It should foster spirituality, inspire loyalty, provide for belonging, create enthusiasm and engender and contain passion. No other social group can or should aspire to be so versatile.

But utopian communities do so aspire. The urge to

recreate in community life the unity and spirit of the family as it desirably ought to be seems to be at the root of past and modern utopian experiments. Many communes are no more than six or seven members, smaller than some conventional families, and the majority have less than thirty members; rarely, a commune reaches the size of a village. (None can begin to be compared to a sovereign society.) Such communes may explicitly call themselves families, or refer to the leader as father or mother and the members as brothers and sisters. Like families, they serve their own members and benefits for outsiders are secondary; and, again like families, internal relations are more significant than external relations.

Utopian communes have one great advantage over the family — joining and staying is a matter of choice. Perhaps this is why few last longer than a generation. Entry to a commune is invariably contingent on adherence to a value system emphasizing harmony, mutuality and cooperation. Because the commune is the domestic unit, the production unit, the political unit and the religious unit, it provides principal objects to which all must enthusiastically subscribe. Disagreement may be permitted, but permanent factionalization is avoided because it leads so easily to break-up.

Values and Social Life in Organizations

Finally, it may be helpful to introduce something here about the way values relate to work and social life in organizations.

Work groups differ markedly from the natural social groups just described because they are about organizing activity in order to implement given values. We noted earlier that implementation involved strategic objectives and tactical objectives which cannot themselves be regarded as values. Pursuing such objectives is executive work, and groups constructed around such objectives are task-focused.

Work groups and executive organization are linked to social groups by common social values and principal objects. The social values reflected in any activity must accord with social values in its territorial community and wider social network. The principal objects of an organization must be set by a constituting body which is essentially an association. This link is illustrated in Master-Table 4.

It was emphasized that when people work together over time they come to think of themselves as a natural social group — typically an association or a community. So something needs to be said here to indicate the role of values in organizations. I will start with responsibility for the work to be done.

Responsibility for Work. Determination of strategic and tactical objectives is primarily a matter for an individual prepared to be responsible for the outcome. Nevertheless people need to work together in groups to progress large-scale tasks. Such large groups are typically organized into a work hierarchy and called organizations — or, more precisely, executive-led organizations. Within an executive hierarchy, smaller work groups are common. Management teams, project groups, working parties, planning fora, consultative meetings and the like proliferate.

The executive organization and its smaller work groups differ from value-based social groups in that the determining factor in their creation and operation is the *work to be done* and activities to be performed. Groups are constructed with people who are able and authorized to do the work and expected to achieve. In other words, issues of social identity remain secondary.

Strategies and tactical objectives are not primarily about expressing social or personal identity, and these identities are not altered by such objectives. Aspects of identity are, of course, expressed through work. Indeed they are essential for its success. Work must take account of purely personal things like aspirations, talent, inner feelings and convictions about social life if it is to be fulfilling. However, if identity drives intrude inappropriately, the work group becomes dysfunctional. For example, a work group may then persist beyond its useful life, or it may start operating outside its brief, or inappropriate people may insist on joining it.

Work and Identity. Here we are focusing on identity as a social being (not identity in general), and on how organizations harness that identity and enable its expression through work.

Social values and principal objects affect whether a person enters the employ of an organization, and they remain the primary stable protectors of the person's identity within it. Staff are aware that results must be produced and that they must adapt themselves when deciding, accepting and pursuing strategic and tactical objectives. Having said that, how well any person works and adapts depends greatly on the congruence between their values and those of the organization. It follows that managers must simultaneously deal with three dimensions to maximize achievement: managing the results; managing the culture (i.e. the internal community); and managing each person.

Managing the community and individuality demands recognition of values — and this comprises the identity factor in management.

The identity factor is currently being influenced from two directions. External pressures on organizations to respect their staff, maintain their health, and foster their personal development exist but tend to be resisted. A greater impetus comes when managements recognize the potential energy which can be liberated by activating values in the service of the firm. The popular management literature now speaks endlessly of vision, culture, commitment, values and beliefs. Implications of such an approach to work can be understood by using the hierarchy we have delineated. (What follows here is merely illustrative: further elaboration is provided in later chapters.)

If firms are not to be soulless machines, they must provide for the humanity of those in their employ. Although ultimate values (L-7) are rarely talked about, people at work should seek to experience and express clarity, strength, patience, concern and joy. And a deep grounding of relationships in autonomy, respect, trust, fairness and harmony is obviously desirable. Such an atmosphere is essential to foster creativity.

A firm that wishes loyalty must develop and emphasize its own value system (L-6). This entails socializing its staff. Even if socialization is rejected as too difficult or improper, all firms need to recognize that certain essential ideas (e.g. efficiency, customer service) may be absent and may need to be instilled to maintain viability. In any case, an implicit value system always operates, and the various value systems of employees generate issues powered by conflicting beliefs, standards and loyalties. These issues must be positively managed.

A firm also needs to realize that it creates a community (L-5) in which a degree of equality, mutuality and personal relating is essential. To get external support and maximize internal support, the firm must recognize that staff share most of the values which are given importance in the relevant wider communities. In a firm as in any social group, people must deliberately work at participating and cooperating; and they should feel supported by others in general (and not just by their superior). Some firms may wish to go further and encourage a sense of belonging in the firm (cf. Ex. 5.9).

All staff should have a positive sense of participation through their personal interest in the firm's principal objects (L-4). At the very least all staff should experience a good match between their interests, occupational or professional training, and the objects of the post they hold. Senior managers, especially, need to be fully committed to their jobs and to the organization. High pay alone cannot achieve commitment, but participation can be enhanced through employee share-holder schemes which offer a degree of ownership.

Staff will press for priorities to suit themselves, and efforts may be made to accommodate these interests and preferences. Firms might even develop a full-fledged representational system (apart from any trade union arrangements) in order to foster staff input into controversial decisions on priorities (L-3).

The Firm as a Way of Life. The army, the church and the civil service are organizations which have long been recognized as defining the identity of those working within them. Socialization is given a high priority, and life-long security and community are provided in return for acceptance and obedience. Some firms take a similar view, especially in Japan (see Ex. 5.14).

Taking Identity Seriously: Large Japanese firms account for one third of the Japanese workforce. Building on feudal and militaristic traditions, they have taken identity-definition and social reinforcement to extremes. As far as possible, jobs are provided for life in return for devoted loyalty, and mutual support and consensus are prized above individual assertion. The result is that staff work late and on weekends, voluntarily take about one half of their two weeks annual leave, and socialize with work colleagues. There are hidden costs to such a regime: for example, managers spend on average less than 5 hours waking time per week with their families, death from over-work occurs, and women are necessarily precluded from work so as to care for children and the home.

Ex. 5.14²⁶

Designing the social life of an organization is not straightforward. It is obvious that different cultures and different types of organization will require different approaches to identity support. But effective and ethical management in all cases depends on recognizing the varieties of value and human energy available, and on accommodating to the different forms of social group generated by employment.

TRANSITION

From what has been presented so far, it must be clear that to have values without value conflicts is a nonsense. No community, no firm, no partnership, indeed no utopia is conflict free. Successful utopian experiments like the kibbutzim, monastic orders, and the Hutterites recognize and manage conflict. Denial of value conflict where it exists is counter-productive and the attempt to abolish value conflict entirely is usually evil (as defined in Ch. 4).

Total harmony demands destruction of values and the needless restriction of possibilities and human identity. Suppressing differences and promoting conformity may ensure stability, but it tends to breed stagnation. Exposure of conflicting viewpoints and debate

stimulates social life, but tends to create disorder. According to the ultimate values and value systems in a society, differential importance will be assigned to things like stability, conformity, dynamism, adaptability, disagreement, self-control and debate.

The argument in this chapter suggests that the aim for unity and consensus in respect of values needs to be confined to genuine states of union and based on ultimate values. At all other levels differences are of the essence. Sometimes value differences are integrative, sometimes divisive. To ensure that conflict based on exclusiveness and division does not get out of hand, each person, organization and society must make an effort to recognize and foster union and ultimate values in all areas of social life. Given this context, we need diversity and multiplicity of values and social groups, together with their appropriate coexistence, cooperation, competition, and synthesizable opposition. People must be expected to differ on the balance they seek in

society between community needs and individual interests. This is the basis for adherence to distinctive political ideologies.

The handling of value conflict depends on recognition of what is possible, on avoiding the injection of hostility, and on assigning responsibility for resolution appropriately.

Above all, the hope that mankind can be unified by a single value system or school of thought needs abandoning. The framework being presented in this book is total, but it is assuredly not a totalitarian system. It has been deliberately designed to provide for differences and to open up possibilities. It is no more a blueprint for social life, than Newton's laws are a blueprint for the London Underground. In the same way that Newton's laws govern the possibility of constructing and running a subway, it is proposed that the framework being presented here governs the possibility of working with values and designing social life ethically. ❁

Master-Table 3 The hierarchy of values and types of social group. The left-hand section contains definitions of values (purposes). The right-hand section identifies the associated natural social groups and some of their properties. For further details and explanations see text.

© Warren Kinston 1989, 1992

L	Type of Value & Definition	Type of Good	Social Group & Function	Energy & Antithesis	Participation & Cohesion	Relations: Linked and Separated	Leadership & Status	Group and Personal Identity
7	Ultimate value A universally accepted and eternally pursued state of being.	Absolute good	Humanity To enable union.	Spirituality : Anti-sociality	Being : Communion	Reconciliation and Harmony	Free-floating charisma : Equality and uniqueness	Humanity is the ground of all group and personal identities.
6	Value system Interlinked valued ideas ordering understanding within a social domain.	Theoretical good	Tribe To preserve social distinctiveness.	Loyalty : Betrayal	Socialization : Solidarity	Coexistence and Negativity	Symbolic ritual positions : Informal hierarchy	Tribal identity defines personal identity.
5	Social value A freely shared need-based value serving a specific community.	Potential good	Community To meet social needs.	Belonging : Isolation	Mutuality : Fellowship	Cooperation and Positivity	Public figures – elected or emergent : Fluctuating inequalities	The person and the community shape each other's identity.
4	Principal object An activity defining the identity of an endeavour.	Achievable good	Association To promote an interest formally.	Enthusiasm : Apathy	Commitment : Partnership	Alliance and Competition	Governance structures : Designed differentials	People define the identity of the association.
3	Internal priority A degree of emphasis among valid values or actions for immediate use.	Quantifiable good	Faction To ensure a particular view prevails.	Passion : Fanaticism	Siding : Partisanship	Coalition and Opposition	Powerful individuals : Impersonal equivalence	Factions enable assertion of personal identity.

Master-Table 4

Natural groups and organizations.

Natural social groups are the way people share and develop values, while work groups (quintessentially organizations) are the way that activities are pursued. The diagram shows the role of social values and principal objects in linking natural and work groups. Similar clustering of levels occurs in both cases, driven either by the value and social group, or purpose and responsible body. For further explanation and details on the clustering, see text Tables 3.5 and 5.1.

NATURAL GROUPS

INDIVIDUALS	TYPE OF VALUE	SOCIAL GROUP
Values/groups controlling differences L7	Ultimate values	Humanity contains Tribes living in
Values/groups reflecting differences L6	Value systems	
	Social values	Communities requiring
Values/groups reflecting differences L4	Principal objects	Associations which need
	Internal priorities	Factions

WORK GROUPS

RESPONSIBLE BODY	TYPE OF PURPOSE	FORMATION	RELATIONS
Wider society enables	Social values	Goals/bodies providing stability L5	Goals/bodies providing orientation L5
Constituting bodies who create	Principal objects	L4	L4
Governing bodies who appoint	Internal priorities	L3	L3
Top officers who appoint other	Strategic objectives	L2	Goals/bodies generating impact L2
Executants	Tactical objectives	L1	L1

NOTES

1. This framework is briefly presented in Ch. 7. It first appeared in: Kinston, W. *Being a Person: Psychoanalytic Theories and Identity Systems*. Paper presented for the British Council in Munich, 1989.
2. Wilson, E.O. *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis*. London: Belknap, 1975.
3. Freud, S. (1910) *The Antithetical Meaning of Primal Words*. Standard Edition, Vol. 11, pp.155-161, London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1957.
4. From: Donne, J. *Devotion XII*. In: *The Complete Poetry and Selected Prose of John Donne*. London: Oxford University Press, 1929.
5. Buber, M. *Paths in Utopia*. (Transl. R.F.C. Hull) Boston: Beacon Press, 1958.
6. This theory was developed with an American psychoanalytic colleague, Jonathan Cohen, in a series of papers and conference presentations. See especially: Kinston, W. & Cohen, J. Primal repression: Clinical and theoretical aspects. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 67: 337-355, 1986; Kinston, W. & Cohen, J. Primal repression and other states of mind. *Scandinavian Psychoanalytic Review*, 11: 81-105, 1988.
7. This example is taken from a study of communes in the USA in the last 150 years: Kanter, R.M. *Commitment and Community: Communes and Utopias in Sociological Perspective*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972.
8. Commentators with a religious background, make this point. See, for example: Bellah, R. et al. *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1985. Most secular commentators focus on social values and personal needs: maintaining a two-parent family, the relief of poverty, sustained primary school education &c.
9. Jung's analytical psychology broke with orthodox psychoanalysis on this account. Also see: Assagioli, R. *Psychosynthesis*. New York: Viking, 1965. In the USA, a so-called 'third force' psychology movement developed through theorists like Maslow suddenly discovering 'being' (*Toward a Psychology of Being*. (2nd Ed.) Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand, 1958). Other psychologists who have experienced this revelation include: Anonymous. *A Course in Miracles*. Tiburon, Calif.: Foundation for Inner Peace, 1975; Fowler, J.G. *Stages of Faith: The Psychology of Human Development and the Quest for Meaning*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1982; Peck, M.S. *The Different Drum: Community-making and Peace*. London, Rider, 1988. As evidence of the growth of these ideas, a *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology* now exists.
10. Such views are expressed in: Wilber, K. *Up from Eden: A Transpersonal View of Human Evolution*. London: Routledge Kegan Paul, 1983; Csanyi, V. *General Theory of Evolution*. Budapest: Akademiai Kiado, 1982; Curtis, E.S. *Evolution or Extinction: The Choice Before Us*. London: Pergamon Press, 1982; Chaisson, E. *Universe*. New York: Prentice Hall, 1988.
11. Dihle, A. *The Theory of Will in Classical Antiquity*. London: University of California Press, 1982.
12. Spencer, H. In: *The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations*. (2nd Ed.) London: Oxford University Press, p.508.
13. Cardinal Ratzinger. *The Ecclesial Vocation of the Theologian*. Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. Rome, 1990.
14. *New English Bible with Apocrypha*. London: Oxford and Cambridge University Presses, 1970. The first quote is from Joshua 10: 28-32; and the advice of Moses is provided in Numbers, 31: 17-18.
15. Garrett Hardin has written trenchantly on the subject of tribalism, altruism and social life. The quotation is from: *Stalking the Wild Taboo*. Los Altos, Calif.: Kaufmann, 1973. Also see: Hardin, G. *The Limits of Altruism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977.
16. Bishop, P. & Darton, M. (eds.) *The Encyclopaedia of World Faiths*. London: Macdonald and Co., 1987: New religious movements among primal peoples. pp.307-311.
17. See, for example: Freidson, E. *Profession of Medicine: A Study of the Sociology of Applied Knowledge*. New York: Dodd Mead, 1970; Berlant, J.L. *Professions and Monopoly: A Study of Medicine in the United States and Great Britain*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975; Larson, M.S. *The Rise of Professionalism*. San Francisco: University of California Press, 1977.
18. This line of therapy was developed by Ivan Boszormenyi-Nagy. See his book with G. Spark: *Invisible Loyalties*. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
19. Rousseau, J.J. *The Social Contract*. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1959.
20. Levels of community and government is a related framework developed to aid the restructuring of local government in the UK. The ideas have not been published, but see: Wilshire, D. & Kinston, W. A local revolution. *The House Magazine: The Magazine of the Houses of Parliament*, June 20th 1988, p.6.
21. Hawken, P. *The Magic of Findhorn*. Glasgow: Fontana, 1975.
22. An account of theories of utopia is provided in: Goodwin, B. *Social Science and Utopia*. London: Harvester, 1978; The example of the convent is taken from: Caplow, T. *Goals and their Achievement in Four Utopian Communities*. In: Kanter, R.M. (ed.) *Communes: Creating and Managing the Collective Life*. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
23. Such ideas are characteristically emphasized by theologians and philosophers rather than psychologists or sociologists. See, for example: Rossi, P.J. *Together Toward Hope: A Journey to Moral Theology*. London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983; Buber, M. *I and Thou*. (transl. W. Kaufmann) Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1971.
24. Tocqueville, A. de. *Democracy in America*. (ed. P. Bradley) New York: Vintage, 1948, Pt. II p.106. Tocqueville's notion that ideas are the basis for associating is consistent with the proposition that principal objects and interests link to ideas in the hierarchy of experience. Principal objects are not activities but ideas for activity (cf. Master-Tables 1 and 2).
25. Smith, A. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759 1st edition; 1853 New Edition), Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1969.
26. Horsley, W. *Nippon: New Super-power*. London: BBC Books, 1990.