and involve students than many traditional techniques of social control. Teachers therefore try to preserve the advantages and overcome the limitations of personal leadership by developing charismatic appeals to supplement their limited personal resources. Teachers at Group High and Ethnic High nurtured certain collective symbols and fantasies which helped to maintain excitement, interest, and mutual attraction. These sources of charismatic leadership, unlike easily expendable reserves of personal influence, could be sustained and renewed by the vitality of collective life.

Both charisma and personal influence create difficulties for organizations. In the first place, they are unreliable. Personal influence is hard to generate when it is needed, and in organizations, like schools, that involve relatively fixed roles, those who need influence may find that they cannot mobilize charismatic appeals. (One of the accomplishments of both Group High and Ethnic High was to find charismatic personalities among the students and incorporate them into the influence structure of the school.) Second, personal forms of influence are hard to control. They tend to be the possession of individuals and to escape organizational regulation. This fact, I believe, is one of the major sources of disruption and disintegration in alternative organizations. Organizations that have enough of other sorts of resources try to suppress charisma because it is so destabilizing. It is testimony to the weakness of free schools that they have to rely on it.

In the absence of stable routine and established authority, personal influence and charismatic legitimation provide a flexible, if costly, mechanism for coordinating social life. What may be opportunism on the part of particular teachers, who use personal appeals, tell private secrets, and stimulate affection in students just to get through the day, is at the same time a way of creating social control in organizations without authority.

4

IDEOLOGY AND COMMUNITY

COLLECTIVE SENTIMENTS—feelings of solidarity, identification, and dependence on a group—are among the most powerful motives in social life. For alternative organizations such incentives provide the primary replacement for authority. But collective coordination, though it is the goal of virtually all alternative organizations, is fraught with difficulties. In the absence of authority, group spirit develops easily, but a complex set of organizational controls is required to sustain and harness this energy.

Ethnic High and Group High prized community, devoting tremendous energy to forging and deepening collective ties. Although the two schools differed in their approach, both illustrate the enormous appeal and the complex dilemmas of a flourishing collective life. They also exemplify the central role of ideology in making collective controls effective.

Unlike traditional schools, where school life is focused on classroom relationships, Group High and Ethnic High concentrated their energies outside the classroom in meetings, parties, and other collective gatherings. This emphasis on group life provides one of the most striking points of convergence between the two schools. Although they differed greatly in the style of community they encouraged, both consistently gave priority to collective activities that would promote school solidarity. The failures as well as the successes of these efforts at community illustrate the intimate link between collective sentiments and the problems of social control in organizations without authority.

Group High devoted what seemed to an outside observer an amazing amount of time and energy to meetings. A research team studying the school in the early 1970s reported:

> At frequent intervals during the first two years, the total school would meet for as long as necessary (half days to two days) for self-evaluation sessions. Discussions called for expressions of opinions about how things had been going (what was good, what was bad, analysis of the strategies, tactics and values) and then drawing up, on the basis of the evaluation, plans for change. There was always controversy as to how [Group High] should meet as a whole school for these discussions (as a whole? in small groups?) because of the continuing concern about large-scale participation and involvement . . . BHS [Berkeley High School] people were shocked that [Group High] changed the school so drastically from semester to semester.[1]

Although such time-consuming meetings may be necessary to preserve the values of direct democracy and to assure broad participation in decisions, Group High's meetings were drawn out far beyond the time required for actual decision making. Since meetings served an expressive, solidarity-building function, teachers took every opportunity to prolong discussion, suggest new complications, and turn practical decisions into occasions for exploring basic values, goals, and commitments. At one all-school meeting, when the issue was the school district personnel office's seeking jurisdiction over the alternative schools' noncredentialed "consultants," Group High's director interrupted a discussion of the immediate crisis to ask students to consider what they really wanted from their educations and what the school stood for, whether they saw it as a way to change Berkeley's whole system of education or only as a means to better schooling for themselves.

This attempt to link a decision at hand to issues of larger significance and to make every discussion an airing of basic principles illustrates both the school's emphasis on building a community and its assumption that everything it undertook mattered and must be taken seriously. It is impossible to understand how Group High members found the time, patience, and energy for so many meetings unless one sees how much they valued (and enjoyed) community. That school meetings were effective in engaging students and making them take school seriously is evident in a note one college-bound student passed to a friend during a particularly heated school meeting (the issue was whether the school had become "racist"): "Let's not go to college next year. This is where life is really happening."

The collectives at Group High were created explicitly to preserve a sense of intimate community as the school grew in size. By adopting colorful names, decorating their collective spaces, and sharing activities, they sought a sense of group identity. The collectives went on outings, developed projects, and met to discuss plans for activities, hear speakers, share feelings, and make policy suggestions for the school as a whole. Students cared so much about collective efforts at building community that when asked how well they liked school, or whether one collective was better than another, they answered in terms of each collective's success in this sphere. A collective with a lively atmosphere and a room adorned with full-scale drawings and photographs of each member was envied because it had "gotten it together," while students in a less "together" collective were depressed by their collective's lack of community spirit. During the first semester Riots and Roses, the largest collective, held a long series of meetings and ultimately hired an outside consultant to help them decide how to decorate their collective space so that it would be expressive of their sense of community. To seduce back into the group students who had not been attending collective meetings, Riots and Roses instituted weekly communal breakfasts to which students brought homemade bread, granola, and organic dried fruits, while students telephoned the absentees the night before to encourage them to come. The collective also tried for a time to deepen the sense of community by holding meetings of "counseling groups"—small groups of students and staff who gathered each morning to share ideas and feelings. Other collectives held picnics, outings, retreats, and parties as they ferociously pursued the goal of developing a community.

1. Citation omitted to preserve anonymity.

Community was equally important at Ethnic High. When teachers feared the school was faltering, they sought to involve students in a continual round of parties, festivals, retreats, and other outings to try to regain what they perceived as a lost sense of group cohesion. At one low point during the year, the Ethnic High staff decided to institute regular Friday lunches for which the school would provide refreshments. The way to remedy the doldrums, or to capture the school's best moments, they felt, was to have a party. At the first meeting of the school year, for example, one of the teachers suggested a party to inaugurate the year—an ice-cream-making party, in which a shared activity would strengthen school solidarity. This suggestion was not immediately taken up, and by the second week teachers were pressing even more urgently for a school social event. Gloria proposed celebrating Mexican Independence Day with a party on Friday night and a day-long outing on Saturday. The director tried to add to the significance of such festivities by pointing out that they embodied the school's special political commitments: "When there's a celebration like this [Mexican Independence Day celebrations in San Francisco] we should go. If we don't turn out for this we're being sort of hypocritical. At this thing they need people who are serious and understand, since a lot of people there are going to be on a tourist trip." Gloria sought to involve students by asking them to volunteer food for the Friday night party, and a sense of sharing was created as students told something of themselves while they offered food: "My father has lettuce and tomato in our garden. I could bring them," "My mother could cook those beans," and so on. In a final effort to ensure solidarity, the director offered to pay for film and prints if students with cameras would take pictures at the party. He wanted visible evidence that Ethnic High was a community. Like the rest of Ethnic High's teachers, he took community

building much more seriously than he did the school's more academic activities.

Students shared the view that Ethnic High was a collective enterprise rather than simply a school. There were, for example, a large number of "social attenders"—students who came to school every day to see their friends and chat with the teachers, without attending their own classes. When the school planned a retreat during the first semester, the director teased the students by saying, "What do you want to be going on a retreat for? You haven't even started school yet." A student answered, "You need a vacation. Then you really start working." Another said, "You go away, get to know everybody, and then you can work." When the director jokingly asked whether teachers were invited on the retreat, the students laughed and said, "Yes, that's the whole point, for everybody to get to know each other."

Group social ties were important at both Ethnic High and Group High as a way of attaching students to the school and involving them in its activities. At Ethnic High students mobilized considerable group spirit several times during the year for some collective project. During the fall they organized a large, successful food sale to raise money for the school retreat; and in the spring the students put on a fair for the rest of Berkeley High at which they played music, folk danced, and presented skits. But despite these successes, Ethnic High suffered from a sense of lost community. People spoke mournfully of how the school had been a much more warm, energetic, cooperative place the year before. Even these complaints, however, indicated the continuing importance of shared group life at Ethnic High.

Dilemmas of Collective Control

Collectively coordinated organizations are torn between exploiting the attractions of community and trying to decrease its dangers. In the following sections, I describe some of the ways Group High and Ethnic High tried to put community to work and the difficulties of implementing collective social control. By comparing free schools to other collectively run organizations, I try to outline the circumstances under which community can provide an effective source of social control.

EMILE DURKHEIM (1922) long ago noted the ecstatic renewal, the "collective effervescence," that can be produced by collective ritual. More recently Victor Turner (1969) has extended this insight, pointing out the common features of those "limnal periods" when the normal boundaries and distinctions of social life are broken down and a kind of psychic fusion reaction provides new sources of social energy. These rituals of transition or release remain special occasions, set against a background of "normal" social life. When organizations try to sustain regular group life using the emotional bonds of community, the limitations of the latter begin to emerge.

In an antiauthoritarian community, collective energy is an uncertain substitute for the assignment of regular responsibility for tasks. Group High, for example, relied on contagious enthusiasm to produce enough volunteers to do the necessary work for any popular event, and such a system was often effective in the short run. Even Ethnic High was able, with a burst of student enthusiasm, to organize and pay for its school retreat. However, as both schools rapidly discovered, when voluntary participation fails, the losses can quickly become devastating. As people see that enthusiasm is waning they withdraw support, and a depressed community lacks the energy to get started again. Those who do volunteer risk accepting responsibility for failure alone; those who sustain commitment to a group event begin to suffer from a sense of exhaustion and exploitation.

Collective sentiments are unstable, leading to cycles of enthusiasm and despair that are ultimately debilitating to the group. Communities dependent on collective energy can become both depressed and exhausted as they anxiously await another period of elation or struggle to reawaken group feeling. Benjamin Zablocki (1971) observes how the Bruderhof, a religious community, await unpredictable periods of "joy"; in antiauthoritarian countercultural communities, Guenther Roth (1975:155) notes, "members wait for the *pneuma*, for the spirit that will overcome everybody and create a universal consensus. This may involve continuous communication, interminable discussion and endless meetings." A research report on Group High conveys the dependence of the school on this unpredictable waxing and waning of community:

> The over-all effect varies from day to day depending on what is happening, shifting from a feeling of warmth and comfort to a worn and grubby chaos. One student said of the mood swings: "My image of [Group High] is that it's like a ball that goes up and down, never even stopping. It's best when the ball is up and shitty when it's down." The school seems empty and dull on days when fewer students attend. These are days when students don't get together and are crashing in corners or reading on cushions. Everyone is off on "their own thing." A teacher might be working individually with a student or might be off by himself. There is no sense of belonging or of cohesion; no apparent reason for the school's existence. Other days there is a warm nesty-like feeling in a particular [collective], a group warmth, a sense of group identity.[2]

Oscillations between elation and depression can be considerably more extreme than those at Group High and Ethnic High. In two smaller (and therefore, perhaps, more intense) free schools, early periods of euphoria were followed by dramatic descents into despondency (Deal, 1975). At the

2. Citation omitted to preserve anonymity.

Community School, there were frequent outbursts of tears, regressions to childish behaviors such as baby talk, and one suicide attempt. At the Urban School, a boarding school, "students often complained of insomnia, backaches, nightmares, and headaches. Drinking and drunkenness increased, as did crying and other emotional outbursts" (p. 13). Two risks of reliance on collective sentiments, then, are anxiety and depression. The desire for community can make group members tense—anxious to withdraw from potential failures of community. And since intense collective feelings are hard to sustain, the community is subject to alternations between involvement and withdrawal.

Evidence of both the importance and the dangers of community can be found at Group High and Ethnic High. In contrast to traditional schools, where the disruptive behavior that signals anxiety appears in relation to individual classroom performance, at Group High and Ethnic High anxiety was occasioned by the school's (or collective's) being put to the test as a community rather than by concerns over individual success or failure. Rebellion occurred not in classroom conflicts between students and teachers, but in disorderly behavior at group meetings. When Free Fall, a Group High collective explicitly dedicated to exploring community, planned a picnic (to improve faltering group spirit), a half-hearted response indicated the project was likely to fail. At the collective's meeting, as the group's enthusiasm began to slacken, disruptive, distancing behavior broke out. Students played cards, threw paper wads, made loud jokes, and started jeering and calling out, "Who's going to bring the food?" "I ain't bringing nothin' "; "Is the food free?"

Similar disruption plagued Riots and Roses when students sought to reanimate their community by decorating their collective's room. Although an outside "group facilitator" was encouraging members of the collective to share their fantasies about an ideal space, the group meeting was almost drowned out by a lone student off in a corner playing a deafening rhythm on Indian finger-cymbals. The facilitator finally stopped the meeting to say that if students could not deal with disruption in their own midst, she did not see how she could help them reach a group decision about what kind of environment they wanted.

The symbolic issues that concerned students at Group High and Ethnic High were problems of community, not authority. Rather than debating whether a teacher was being "fair" or how hard students would have to work, students were concerned about symbolic dimensions of participation: involvement versus apathy, giving versus taking, and community versus individual rights.

The problem of thefts at Ethnic High (see chapter 3) reflected a more general concern at both schools with issues of giving and taking. Discussions often turned to the problem of some people "ripping off" the community, benefitting from others' efforts without contributing anything. As in the unruly debate about the Free Fall collective's picnic, anxiety over the

sustaining versus the debilitating aspects of community often surfaced in discussions of food. Riots and Roses students expressed this symbolism when they tried to lure back less involved students with communal breakfasts, and Ethnic High employed the same solidarity-building symbolism in the shared Friday lunch. During discussion of Ethnic High's Mexican Independence Day party, a teacher made clear the link between sharing food and building community. Challenging students to show their involvement, she asked sarcastically, "Of course the staff could get together and cook a big dinner and charge you for it. Is that what we should do?" Only half joking, a student replied, "I don't mind the first part of what you said, but I didn't like the last part!"—acknowledging that he wouldn't mind taking from the school, but was less sure about giving. Students finally offered food, but the symbolic issues of giving and taking kept reappearing. A group of boys came late to the party (so there was no chance for them to help with the preparations) and made a great show of heading straight for the food. Later, one ostentatiously feigned stealing from the candy-filled piñata. At the culmination of the festivities the piñata was broken open, and students surged forward, toppling in a laughing heap, grabbing for the pieces of candy.

The burdens and benefits of community became a critical issue again during the planning of Ethnic High's fall retreat—originally designed to start the year with a rush of collective energy. The retreat was postponed again and again because, as the teachers saw it, students were unwilling to contribute enough time and energy to organize it. Finally, the codirector said bitterly that she assumed there would be no retreat since students were obviously unwilling to work for it. This challenge shocked students out of their apathy. When one student called for volunteers, about twenty-five others raised their hands, and by the next day they had organized a fund-raising project (selling special ethnic lunches to students in the regular high school) and were busily at work. This event became one of the most successful community-building efforts of the year, since enthusiasm stimulated effective cooperative effort. Yet there were still conflicts over giving and taking: some students who normally held themselves aloof became involved in the food sale and then upset other students by pretending to steal part of the proceeds.

Students at Group High expressed similar concerns about participation and sharing, complaining that some students "put energy into the school" while others "ripped off" the community. They worried about whether their fellow students would come to meetings, arrange activities for their collectives, or commit themselves eagerly enough to class participation. Part of a Riots and Roses meeting was spent in an emotion-filled discussion of group commitment: students who had brought plants to decorate the school wanted to know whether other students cared enough to water the plants regularly.

For both Group High and Ethnic High community was an important,

though problematic, issue shaping symbolic discourse. As we have already seen (for example, in the case of the Ethnic High meeting described in chapter 3 where Raymond asked students to respond as a community to the hotwiring of Gloria's car), when under pressure students at Ethnic High were likely to shrug off the obligations of community, to conclude that, as one student said, "some people always do the work while others take advantage." Their ideology did not explicitly legitimate the demands of community life. Although Group High was somewhat better able to call upon an ideology of community, the common symbolic concerns of the two schools —sharing versus taking food, stealing, contributing to school events versus getting a "free ride"—indicate that neither school resolved the dilemmas of participation. Because Ethnic High was unable to mobilize as much group effort as Group High, the risks of participation seemed greater there, and it was easier for students to withdraw or become indifferent. On the other hand, precisely because community was so valued at Group High, members were particularly subject to bouts of shared depression and self-doubt, and those who played a central role in the community were often plagued by exhaustion from doing too much, guilt for not having done more, and resentment toward those who did not do enough. Although community had great rewards—periods of near euphoria and the continuing attraction of a multitude of social events—both schools continually wrestled with the danger that the burdens of community would be unequally distributed or that periods of collective vitality would give way to vicious cycles of selfishness, failure, and withdrawal.

Preventing Flight

What do organizations that rely on collective incentives do to counteract problems of emotional instability and unequal participation? Or to put the matter differently, how is the powerful enthusiasm of group life harnessed for effective social control? The first answer, of course, is that few organizations overcome these difficulties. For example, the consensus of reports of countercultural communes is overwhelming: such ventures are carried aloft for the first month or two by a tremendous outpouring of emotion, energy, and enthusiasm, after which they abruptly crash as precisely those problems of work distribution, flagging energy, and cycles of despair and withdrawal become apparent. Marguerite Bouvard (1975), reporting on a wide range of contemporary communal ventures (particularly rural communes), concludes that communities committed to realizing religious ideas have the best chance of survival, while "inadequate structure and the lack of goals has frequently spelled the death of anarchist communities" (p. 195). Similarly, Lawrence Veysey (1973) reports on a series of anarchist rural communities most of which quickly failed after initial enthusiasm declined, selfishness reemerged, and inexperience compounded the difficulties of rural life.

Yet some organizations do overcome the pitfalls and dangers involved in using collective sentiments as a source of organizational control. By comparing Group High and Ethnic High with more cohesive, totalistic collective organizations, it is possible to show how free schools dealt with the dilemmas of community and to explain why they were unable to do so more effectively. The studies of intentional communities (communes or utopias) by Rosabeth Kanter (1972) and Benjamin Zablocki (1971) and Philip Selznick's study (1952) of the inner workings of the Bolshevik party provide useful insights and some striking points of contrast with the use of community in alternative schools.

The collective organizations studied by Zablocki, Kanter, and Selznick have a set of extraordinary mechanisms for intensifying the power of the community over the individual and counteracting (or compensating for) tendencies to depression and fragmentation of collective life. A primary strategy is to make it very difficult for people to leave the community, thus curbing the disintegrating effects of the downswing in the cycle of group life (Kanter, 1972). If people must stick it out through hard times, incentives for withdrawal are reduced. The group can survive while awaiting a reawakening of collective emotion, and the danger of contagious flight from group participation is blocked. Effective collective organizations also set steep barriers to admission, so that new members will be strongly committed to the organization. The Bruderhof, a Christian religious community which has lasted more than three generations, requires a long period of probation and a painful transformation—"death of the old self" and "rebirth"—before new members are admitted to the community (Zablocki, 1971). Kanter, in a careful comparison of long-lived versus short-lived nineteenth-century intentional communities, argues that the successful communities were much more likely than the unsuccessful ones to demand sacrifices such as celibacy and austerity and to require that members "invest" in the community by surrendering their property. In effect members burned their bridges behind them upon entering these communities. Similarly, joining the Bolshevik party, Selznick argues, was a powerful commitment; since the party was illegal and membership entailed enormous risks, the requirements of secrecy automatically cut off the party member from open intercourse with the outside world.

Collective organizations also try to intensify their members' commitment by enclosing the individual and all his attachments within the organization, making him completely dependent upon and responsive to the collectivity. "His potential for satisfaction within the group increases as his options for relationships elsewhere are decreased, and he must make his peace with the group because he has, in fact, no place else to turn" (Kanter, 1972:83). The Bolshevik party and the Bruderhof also isolated their members from outside attachments, making approval and acceptance by the group all-important for the individual.

Although both Group High and Ethnic High made attempts to rely on collective motives to regulate group life, neither school was able to employ the drastic methods of some utopian communes and social movements to create commitment in their members. Free schools could not impose sacrifice and renunciation as preconditions for membership, nor could they create a total community cut off from outside ties. These were serious limitations. Group High began with a more ideologically committed student body than did Ethnic High, but both schools had many students who, attracted primarily by freedom and lack of supervision, had little interest in the school as a community. Even for those students who participated in meetings and other group events, it was easy, when the demands of community life became too great or the satisfactions too few, to withdraw into apathy or to turn toward other sources of satisfaction. At Group High, where there was often a vital, exciting sense of community, only about half the students regularly participated in the school's collective life. In a sense, then, Ethnic High and Group High were attempting to use group cohesion as a source of social control in the absence of the initial mechanisms of investment and commitment that make such control most effective.

Healing Divisions

The best cure for apathy and withdrawal is, of course, intensification or revitalization of the emotional bonds in a group. Ritual and ideology (which are mutually reinforcing) help to counteract the instabilities of collective emotional life. The multitude of meetings, meals, parties, and retreats at Group High and Ethnic High were designed to reawaken collective energies and maintain mutual attachment. The relative success of religious and mystical communities in achieving stability comes in large part from their having shared goals and a ritual life which can sustain bonds of solidarity in the group (Kanter, 1972; Bouvard, 1975).

But such remedies applied to the problems of collective life in turn create their own dilemmas. There is danger in the very collective intensity such groups seek: divisiveness and schism may occur, because the life of the group arouses very strong feelings. It is therefore imperative that a group have available some mechanism for bringing disagreements out into the open, for forging consensus, and for enforcing the collective mandate on recalcitrant individuals. This possibility is the crux of effective collective coordination. Intense communities require some form of "group-situated" ideological discussion in which disagreements can be voiced, decisions can be worked out, and individuals can come to accept and internalize community goals. Both Group High and Ethnic High attempted to create such a forum. And although ideology and the preexisting level of collective attachment were more conducive to success at Group High, at Ethnic High as well teachers persistently sought to create the kind of intense, confrontational group life that could make collective control effective.

Franz Schurmann, in *Ideology and Organization in Communist China* (1970), argues that the Chinese Communists, because they could not mobilize people through the traditional social order, used ideology as a major tool for coordinating social life. But ideology could direct action only because it was brought to bear in organized groups where principles and directives were discussed, interpreted, and applied to concrete situations. Full acceptance and identification with the ideology were enforced through sessions of "criticism and self-criticism" where disagreements could be voiced and behavior brought into line with party policy. The same reliance on regular meetings where conflicts can be expressed and both personal and organizational tensions brought to a head can be seen in contemporary countercultural organizations—from regular "house meetings" in communes to mutual criticism sessions in political collectives. Like criticism and self-criticism among the Chinese, such activities are often designed to intensify conflicts and bring them into the open rather than simply to resolve disagreements or make pragmatic decisions. These meetings enhance emotional engagement in group life as well as subjecting daily practice to the control of ideology.

Observers of alternative organizations agree on the prevalence of group settings designed for mutual criticism and emotional exploration. However, different researchers emphasize different functions of such meetings. Based on a study of several alternative organizations, Joyce Rothschild-Whitt (1976:82; 1977:141-155) argues that legitimate forums for criticism help to preserve participatory democracy by allowing broad input into decisions and creating a situation in which leaders may be evaluated and held accountable to the group. Jane Mansbridge (1973), on the other hand, emphasizes the interpersonal benefits of conscious attention to the dynamics of group life in the highly charged atmosphere of face-to-face participatory groups. Both researchers agree that it is not simply emotional openness or free expression of disagreements that is at issue. Unregulated criticism, they argue, is destructive to group functioning, but participatory groups are strengthened by regular, consciously controlled forums where mutual criticism and conflicts are expressed.

Intentional communities offer clear evidence of the role group-situated ideological discussion plays in collective social control. Benjamin Zablocki (1971) notes that the Bruderhof enforced continual scrutiny of self and others and public confession of both motives and actions. For Bruderhof members, it was selfish to keep an opinion from the group, "wrong to conceal misgivings, even if nobody else agrees with you" (p. 59). Similarly, Rosabeth Kanter (1972:106) notes that successful nineteenth-century communities used systems of "confession, self-criticism, and mutual criticism . . . The individual "bared his soul" to social control, admitting weaknesses, failings and imperfections . . . No part of his life was left unexamined and uncriticized, since all belonged to the system. The group might probe and

pry into the most intimate matters, indicating its right to be a significant presence in the internal life of the individual."

Both Group High and Ethnic High sought occasions for strengthening collective attachments and bringing group life under the guidance of ideology. Yet for both schools this development was incomplete, and at Ethnic High the absence of a group context where ideological commitments could be linked to concrete decisions and individuals brought into line with group ideals fatally weakened the effectiveness of collective controls. Group attachment was still important to the life of the school, but it lacked the power to regulate behavior.

At Group High students listened to one another with patient attentiveness in both classes and school meetings. They wanted everyone in the group to share ideas and feelings, and an egalitarian ideology prevented them from ignoring or excluding their fellows. Although criticism and self-criticism were never so intense at Group High as in the communities Kanter and Zablocki studied, Group High placed great value on (and exerted considerable informal pressure to produce) full sharing of thoughts and feelings. I have already mentioned Group High's predilection for long, passionate discussions of basic goals and principles, discussions made even more passionate by the ideology that one ought to share one's feelings with the group. These meetings and discussions, like the even more intensive forums for voicing disagreements and working through conflicts in other countercultural groups such as communes and work collectives, were an attempt to make collective attachments into an effective system of social control. That countercultural institutions, despite their libertarian anarchist impulses, should so frequently have created intensive, even mildly coercive settings for ideological discussion, reminiscent of more authoritarian collective enterprises like nineteenth-century communes, indicates how important such a mechanism is for collective coordination and control.

Ethnic High also sought to harness collective sentiments by submitting group life to ideologically self-conscious analysis. When, for example, the codirector felt that morale and commitment were faltering, she made a direct attempt to drive conflicts out into the open. At a meeting in late October, Denise suggested that many students were dissatisfied with the school. She said that there were some serious problems at the school and she thought they should all talk them out together. "I hear a lot of people saying they don't care anymore, that [Ethnic High] is just going to fall apart. Is that what's going to happen?" Some students muttered yes, but Amanda volunteered that she wasn't satisfied with her classes, that they weren't working out. Several other students then said that the problem with the school was that the classes seemed boring, that there wasn't enough happening. But Denise wanted to turn the discussion toward problems of community. She said, "Classes? Is that the major thing you do at [Ethnic High], go to classes?" A student cooperatively suggested that there was also education outside of the classroom, and Denise wrote this on the board. When, however, students volunteered examples such as learning by working in the office, Denise probed again: "Is that all? Is that all you learn at [Ethnic High]? What about personal relationships? Do you think you get to know people the same way here that you do in other schools?" Students responded, stressing the advantages of Ethnic High as a community. Some said that one could get to know people better in a smaller school. For others, Ethnic High was said to be better than the "common school" where if students asked questions, "the teacher look at you like you crazy." But Denise did not want students simply singing Ethnic High's praises. "Okay, I'm hearing a lot of positive things, but I know there are real problems here that aren't coming out. I hear a lot of things against teachers and between students and I'm wondering what we are doing here. Why are we together?" Denise then suggested that there were tensions in the school because some people felt they were "putting a lot of energy into the school," while others were riding along for free. She offered as an example the fact that some students had worked hard to raise money for the retreat while others expected to go without working. Denise thus actively sought to stimulate conflict among students. An open confrontation might have created pressure to equalize participation, and a release of anger or resentment might have heightened emotional involvement in the school. But the students resisted her pressure for greater involvement (as they had resisted collective responsibility for Gloria's hot-wired car). A student concluded the discussion philosophically: "But that's just life. Some people always do the work while others take advantage. That's the way it would be anywhere." Ethnic High's initial level of apathy made it difficult to mobilize group controls, but, as we shall see, the presence of a relatively traditional ideology about the obligations of individuals to the group created an additional barrier, which, despite repeated efforts by the teachers, inhibited control through group discussion.

Systems of group criticism are found wherever organizations attempt to replace traditional social control with collective controls. Although unregulated criticism may be destructive, regular airing of opinions and grievances in an ideological framework bound by clear procedures for debate is a central regulatory mechanism for group life—as the prevalence of systems for mutual and self-criticism in communes and other collective ventures testifies. Even free schools, which begin with less member commitment and a less clear sense of shared purpose than many countercultural experiments, nonetheless attempt to create settings for group discussion where collective control can be made effective. In a sense the core dilemma of group life involves regulating the intensity of members' involvement: if collective life is too intense, it explodes, and individuals are propelled apart by the heat of their emotional conflicts. Yet if collective life is milder, individuals easily slip away from group control—into apathy or into other, more satisfying

relationships. Ideologically regulated collective discussion serves to harness intense collective feelings and to make grievances and conflicts group property, subject to group mediation. As we shall see, collective pressure can also serve to pry individuals loose from private concerns, driving them to open themselves to the group's influence.

Socializing Affection

Ties of community—of peer loyalty and solidarity—develop in all organizations. Yet in many organizations, although peer relations may attract members to the organization (workers may come to a factory or students to school largely to see their friends), collective solidarity also pulls members away from the organization's control by defending them against its demands and competing for their loyalties. From informal work norms in factories (Roy, 1952; 1954) to the teen culture in high schools (Coleman, 1960), loyalty and community among subordinates may frustrate organizational control. Even when organizational demands are not so threatening as to drive subordinates to "solidary opposition" (Street, Vintner, and Perrow, 1966), an organization that wishes to use group sentiments as a positive source of motivation must ensure that emotional ties among members do not weaken the emotional dominance of the group as a whole.

A description of the early days of an alternative mental health clinic testifies to the energizing, yet potentially disruptive, power of peer ties. Based on their analysis of several alternative counseling centers, Gordon Holleb and Walter Abrams (1975:41) argue that "without the energy that was generated by the feelings of community, these programs would have failed. They had no supports other than those the staff could give one another." A staff member of Project Place, a collectively run alternative clinic, is quoted as saying, "Things were chaotic, but that meant there was an incredible amount of personal contact. A lot of searching, a lot of exciting things that were happening between people . . . It might be precisely that chaos that makes it such an incredibly fertile ground for people to go through changes and explore" (p. 40). Yet certain kinds of intimacy, although they were among the attractions of these alternative programs, could also be destructive of wider collective solidarities:

> Alternative programs were places to find new friends and lovers. They provided one of the few settings outside the university campuses for urban young people to find others who share similar lifestyles. Much of their need for intimacy was expressed through sexual liaisons. In the early days alternative programs took on a dating-bar atmosphere . . .
>
> Often the sexual intrigues made it difficult for people to work together well. Sexual allegiances would intersect with other power blocs and cliques. Broken affairs sometimes left bad feeling, and those feelings would be indirectly expressed in organizational issues. (p. 39)

Certain organizations, such as intentional communities and some social movements, reverse the usual relationship between peer ties and organizational control. These organizations manage to harness peer loyalties so that they contribute to organization goals. To do this the organizations must effectively make ties among group members collective property, available to the group as a whole. In the Bruderhof religious community, for example, love and the ecstatic joy of community are a major goal of group life, but it is love of a very special type: "Bruderhof love . . . is not eros but agape. That is, it is love based not on attraction to personal attributes of another person, but on a shared feeling of partaking in God's all encompassing love. 'Likes and dislikes of people are not part of this life. They can be no part of it,' said the wife of the Servant of the Word at Woodcrest" (Zablocki, 1971:169). Among the utopian communities studied by Rosabeth Kanter (1972), the ones that had lasted longest had blocked emotional attachments that might draw members away from the community, and she notes that "exclusive two-person bonds within a larger group, particularly sexual attachments, represent competition for members' emotional energy and loyalty. The cement of solidarity must extend throughout the group" (p. 86). All the long-lived communities (defined as those lasting more than thirty years), as compared with only 29 percent of the unsuccessful communities, "discouraged couples in one of two extreme and experientially opposite ways—either through free love, including group marriage, in which every member was expected to have intimate sexual relations with all others, or through celibacy, in which no member could have sexual relations with any other. In both cases, private ties were structurally minimized and cohesiveness of the total group was thereby emphasized" (p. 87).

We have already seen in the democratic friendliness of Group High a similar, though much moderated, "socialization of affection." Students in classes and group meetings were expected to be attentive to one another. A budding encounter group ethos required that everyone be listened to and their ideas and feelings taken seriously. This ethic of openness extended beyond the classroom as well. Although the students at Group High still had their private friendships and subgroups, they were inhibited from practicing the extremes of clique formation and cruel exclusion so characteristic of traditional adolescent society (see Hollingshead, 1949; Gordon, 1957; Coleman, 1961). Group High teachers even made some direct efforts to undermine, or at least call into question, the legitimacy of exclusive student friendships. Two female students at Group High, who had one of those "best friendships" typical of teenagers, became objects of concerned discussion and eventual interference by the teachers. At graduation time one of the students suddenly found herself threatened with not graduating and was told that she had not achieved anything worthy of academic credit in four of her five courses. Although she was able, in a frantic week of work, to

make peace with all her teachers and graduate on time, she felt that this sudden concern with course work was a kind of special persecution. In some ways she was right. She had done no less work in her classes than other students, but she had shared less of herself psychologically, and her exclusive friendship was an open affront to the school's collective spirit. Group High implicitly asked that at least during school hours all students treat one another in an intimate, friendly way—considering, including, listening to others because they were part of the school. The school tolerated many breaches of this norm, but since student friendships were the stuff out of which community could be built, teachers (and some students) made persistent efforts to broaden these attachments, to socialize affection for the use of the school as a whole.

The attempt to penetrate students' private emotional attachments, to make them part of the school's public life, can be seen even more clearly in the case of Ethnic High. Like many of Ethnic High's efforts to intensify community, this one failed. But the failure itself is revealing. Group ties at Ethnic High were strong, and they certainly helped attach students to the school. (Teachers were aware of this fact, seeking, for example, to recruit new students through current students' friendship networks.) Members of the leading student clique at Ethnic High identified with the school and occasionally mobilized their friendship group for school business. The food sale to raise money for the school retreat, for example, was organized almost entirely by the four core couples of the school's dominant clique. These central friendships both provided the school with a symbolic center and made these core students independent of the school, weakening it as a community. It was precisely the members of this inner circle who spent the most time in class chatting and laughing together, and who were most often absent, off on business of their own. The core group attracted other students with its glamor and prestige, but it also excluded them. Students' personal ties remained personal; they could not be redirected outward to the community as a whole. Peer ties did not contribute to schoolwide community. As one student analyzed the school's difficulties, "Oh, I don't know. Everybody's just cliqued off this year."

One might speculate about the relationship between the failure of charisma and the failure of community at Ethnic High. From the nostalgic descriptions by Ethnic High students and teachers of the regime of the directors Ruby and Tom, it was clear that with exciting leaders the school had seemed more of a community. The dominance of the school's leading clique was in part a result of the charismatic vacuum among the teachers. Philip Slater, in "On Social Regression" (1963), has proposed that social groups permit charismatic (what he calls narcissistic) figures to emerge when these figures pull psychic energy out of private ties, making it available to the collectivity. Although the functionalist teleology of this argument may be a bit strong for our purposes, it would suggest that charismatic teachers might

have competed more effectively with the attractions of the ruling clique and might have forced the leading students to make more of their affections available to the school as a whole. At Group High, one of the ways in which teachers' impact was felt most strongly was in the steady pressure they exerted to keep students' energies focused on the community, to prevent students from being slighted or excluded by each other, and to lend their own prestige to the democratized affectional style that dominated the school.

Ethnic High's teachers made heroic efforts to "collectivize" the emotional links among students. Earlier I described the school meeting at which Denise attempted to force a confrontation between students who had been contributing to the school and those who had been looking for a "free ride." On another occasion, several teachers organized a discussion of interracial dating and marriage. They thought that some of the school's problems resulted from certain resentments and disappointments connected with interethnic and interracial sexual relationships. As the teachers saw it, some Chicano students had been dating white female students, exploiting their white-liberal guilt to obtain easy sex. The white women were bitter about their treatment and, at the same time, Chicana students were resentful that "their" men were dating white women. The teachers felt that student alienation and indifference might be overcome by an open airing of these conflicts: the topic certainly had all the elements of exciting interpersonal drama. A teacher carefully planned a panel discussion in which various teachers talked about their own ideologies and experiences (a black woman teacher expressed the view that interracial dating was a betrayal of black identity, Marion discussed her feelings as a white woman married to a black man, and Don discussed his interracial marriage). But all this failed to draw students' feelings into the open. Although there had indeed been a number of unhappy love affairs and some jealous rivalry between whites and Chicanos, students were unwilling to make these part of the school's public life. During the panel discussion, a few students proffered general remarks about whether people of different backgrounds should marry, and one of the students least involved in the school, a white woman, volunteered proudly that she loved a black man. But rather than producing a confrontation that might have intensified emotional involvement in the school, the discussion ended with students expressing the platitude that if two people really love each other neither race nor anything else should be an obstacle. This was hardly the collective release of feelings for which the teachers had hoped.

By comparing free schools to more intense collective organizations such as intentional communities, I have outlined three ways in which such organizations can overcome the limits of collective social control: mechanisms of sacrifice and renunciation can counteract the instability of collective emotions and prevent withdrawal from the group during periods of apathy or depression; structured occasions for mutual and self-criticism can

counteract tendencies toward fragmentation and be used to hammer out shared commitments and goals; socialization of affection can redirect members' psychic energies away from private satisfactions and toward the group as a whole. In examining each of these mechanisms of collective control, I argued that Group High and Ethnic High reflected in much weaker form the same attempt to make collective control effective that emerges more clearly in communes and intentional communities. But I also showed that Ethnic High, much more often than Group High, failed in its attempts to make the demands of collective life effective. Of course, the failures of the three kinds of attempts are clearly interrelated. A group's inability to intensify collective ties in competition with private friendships undermines its capacity to counteract periods of apathetic withdrawal, since group members have alternative satisfactions easily available. Without a forum for emotional exploration and mutual criticism it is difficult to enforce the demand that group members maintain their major loyalty to the group as a whole, suppressing private attachments. Weak initial commitments and low barriers to leaving the community clearly undermine all efforts to intensify collective controls. But there is another important element underlying the contrast between Group High and Ethnic High, whose role I have not yet considered explicitly: the difference in ideology.

The Uses of Ideology

Group High and Ethnic High both had ideologies, that is, general world views locating their own goals in a larger historical framework. Group High took satisfaction from defining itself as a beleaguered outpost of a new, radical, and more egalitarian and humane way of life. Students could be quickly aroused by the argument that they ought, for example, to see themselves as the vanguard of a broad social transformation rather than simply as students at an especially enjoyable school. Similar inspirational themes were occasionally employed at Ethnic High, where students took great pride in the school's conscious affirmation of the value of minority cultures, its superiority to the "common school," and its principled condemnation of American politics and culture. But such "ideologies," although useful as occasional rallying cries, were largely ways of defining the school vis-à-vis the outside world rather than of regulating it from within.

For the kind of world view I wish to examine here, the much abused term *ideology* may not be the most appropriate label: *Legitimating assumptions* or *terms of debate* might be more accurate. In any case, the aspect of ideology most relevant for collective control is the one that determines the publicly legitimate language of debate about individual behavior and group direction. Every social group, I would argue, has some such legitimate language, some set of shared assumptions about what demands people can make on each other. In some families, for example, the argument that a parent "said he would" do something may be decisive, while in another family a child can get his way only by showing that he is sufficiently angry or grief-stricken. Very often in political organizations there is some norm—like the ideal of "democracy"—which, while it may be violated repeatedly in practice, is irresistible when posed clearly in debate. Ideology in this sense is the set of arguments which, if acknowledged by both parties to a debate, would be accepted as decisive. It provides the framework in terms of which people try to influence one another and the language in which they make claims and appeals.

Although neither Group High nor Ethnic High possessed anything so formal as a set of standards for conduct or even an explicit ideology about what members owed to the group or to one another (but explicit, systematic ideologies of this sort, I believe, *are* characteristic of the most effective collectively coordinated organizations), they did differ greatly in the leverage provided by their implicit ideologies of individual conduct and of the relation between the individual and the group. One aspect of this implicit ideology is what C. Wright Mills (1940) has called vocabularies of motive, which constitute the distinctive language in which a social group expresses and interprets motives for action. It is in their vocabularies of motives that the ideologies of Group High and Ethnic High provided very different resources for social control.

Mills argues that motives can be seen as cultural labels for behavior rather than as internal psychological states that "cause" action. Motives are structures through which actors in social situations integrate expectations of their own and others' behavior into a coherent framework. They are also historically conditioned: cultural interpretations of behavior seen as legitimate during one period may no longer seem plausible explanations of conduct in another; they are no longer "real" motives. Mills offers the following example: "A medieval monk writes that he gave food to a poor but pretty woman because it was 'for the glory of God and the eternal salvation of his soul.' Why do we tend to question him and impute sexual motives? Because sex is an influential and widespread motive in our society and time. Religious vocabularies of explanation and of motives are now on the wane" (p. 910).

Group High and Ethnic High clearly differed in their preferred explanations of behavior, in the kinds of motives members expected in others and attributed to themselves. Group High's ideology emphasized individualism, autonomy, and self-actualization—values in manifest tension with collective responsibility. Ethnic High, on the other hand, accepted a more traditional interpretation of motives, emphasizing responsibility and laziness, "goodness" and "badness." The paradox is that the individualistic ethos of Group High gave the community greater leverage over individual behavior than did the more traditional ethic of obedience at Ethnic High.

Both individualism and community were enshrined in the countercultural ideology of Group High.[3] But when it came to acceptable motives, only individualism counted. The first principle was that all individuals were presumed to have weighty, significant motives for their actions, and all motives were to be taken seriously. We have already seen how earnestly Group High's members approached collective decisions, probing each to reveal a full range of social and moral choices. In the same way, students were taken seriously and made to feel that their actions were the product of significant motives. Students were gratified by this attention and enjoyed exploring their own conduct: as a mechanism for involving students in school, presuming that they had serious motives was good strategy.

In the following example from my observations of Group High, a student is in the process of learning to express serious motives, and we can note in this incident the relationship between the interpretation of students' motives and social control: Sandra was going over her math workbook in the women's studies class. Instead of chiding Sandra, Alice (the teacher) asked why she was angry at the group, what they had done to displease her. Sandra seemed confused at first, but finding herself the focus of concerned, sympathetic attention from the whole class, she finally started talking about what had annoyed her in an earlier class session. Encouraged to talk about anger, she also described in vivid detail her usual style of getting angry at her friends. Whether or not Sandra's original behavior signalled some underlying resentment of the group, during this encounter she came to feel that she was an important member of the group, that people took her and her feelings seriously, and that if she brought emotional or practical needs to the group they might be met. Furthermore, the motives imputed to explain Sandra's conduct were assumed to be feelings about the class itself. Encounter groups, on which Group High modeled much of its interactional

3. The entire issue of individualism in contemporary culture is a difficult one. Individualism, whether thought to be an ideology, a psychological trait, a structural fact of our economic life, or a set of norms implicit in our institutions, is widely regarded as one of the salient and enduring features of American culture. But its meaning is ambiguous. The same social ethics that intensify the sense of individual responsibility can also generate repressive social order, full of constraints on individual freedom. This, indeed, is the paradox of the Protestant ethic (see Weber, 1904-1905; Walzer, 1972). Contemporary movements endorsing individual freedom from social constraint present new puzzles. Philip Slater (1970), echoing traditional "mass society" arguments, claims that increased individualism produces great uniformity in the goals individuals pursue. David Riesman (1954) makes a parallel argument that increased individual freedom from internalized constraints has meant a decrease in "inner-directedness"—the ability to resist pressures for group conformity. These complex relationships between individualism and social constraint serve as a reminder that apparent increases or decreases in individualism may not be what they seem. Thus in the counterculture, as in its sectarian offshoots in the 1970s (Tipton, 1979), an ethic of autonomy and self-actualization may provide new levers for social control.

style, also create involvement by focusing members' attention on processes within the group itself (Back, 1972:78-79). A member who is silent or indifferent will be alternately encouraged to overcome fears of the group or accused of expressing hostility toward the group until, finally, the group has an emotional impact on even the most recalcitrant member.

But Group High students rarely needed to be reminded that what they thought or felt was important. Being privileged, middle-class young people, they valued self-expression and were eager to communicate their thoughts, feelings, and wishes. The ethic of self-actualization led to self-assertion and stimulated vigorous participation in group life. Self-expressiveness, however idiosyncratic, was the supreme virtue. So, for example, at a dramatic all-school meeting in which both students and staff passionately declared that they would rather dismantle the school than sacrifice its radical principles, a few students defiantly asserted that they were interested in their own futures, that they wanted legitimate diplomas, and that they wouldn't jeopardize their interests for some matter of principle. Other students listened attentively and then thanked the speakers for their willingness to share their feelings with the group. And in classes as well as in meetings, students spontaneously worked to engage one another. They participated enthusiastically, and demanded that others do the same, in part because they took it for granted that what they thought or did in school was a matter of great significance.

Taking one's own motives seriously, believing in oneself, was not simply an implicit ideology at Group High: in some sense it was the central virtue the school sought to instill. As a teacher described his philosophy of teaching, "Students can do whatever they want, as long as they are willing to defend it. If it is really part of themselves. When I was teaching at Berkeley High some kids put dirty words in a mural. I told them I wouldn't take it off the wall. I told them I would stand by them and their right to do anything they wanted as long as they believed in what they did." Students learned to make use of the school's ideology: they rapidly learned that, when negotiating for a schedule change or special privileges, they could get virtually anything they wanted as long as they claimed it with conviction. The ideology of self-actualization was the ticket to freedom and support from Group High's teachers.

But the ideology of individualism had further implications. Students were expected, and expected one another, to have "honest" motives—and honest motives were selfish motives. I learned this to my chagrin at an early meeting of the women's studies class when I respectfully asked if I might observe the class. I promised, with what I took to be polite deference, to try not to disrupt the group's normal interaction and said I would understand if the class said no. But students were offended. They wanted self-assertion, not deference, which they took to be a sign of indifference. A student spoke up: "I think you could contribute a great deal to the class and I could learn a lot

from you. But if you don't need to be here for yourself, if you don't feel you will get something out of it for your own good, then you shouldn't join." Once assured that I too would learn something from the class, that I would both contribute to and profit from the group, the students welcomed me warmly. This exchange was interesting in two respects. First, the only motives students would accept were self-centered or self-developmental ones which at the same time implied commitment to the group (the self-centered motive of doing sociological research did not seem to appeal to the group, though they might have given in if I had put the issue strongly enough in those terms). Second, the incident showed that the insistence on personal, selfish motives operated as an equalizing force between adults and students. Each person in the class (including the teacher) was there because she could learn something from sharing her feelings with the others in the group. Teachers and students met on equal ground: they were bound by reciprocal rights and obligations, grounded in an egalitarian interpretation of motives, rather than by a traditional authority relationship.

This selfish vocabulary of motives had important consequences. Students were expected to be assertively individualistic, and they could also be very hard on one another. Since people were supposed to have good reasons for doing what they did, it was proper to challenge others and expect them to defend themselves. In the women's studies class Peggy announced that she would have to miss the first half hour of each hour-and-a-half class meeting because of a required Spanish class in Berkeley High. Another student objected, "But if you come in late we have to stop the discussion to tell you what's going on." Peggy pondered and said, "Okay, I'll come in and just sit until I figure out what's going on, and you won't have to explain it to me." But a third student objected, "Yeah, but still you might make a comment that someone has already made, and you'll just be covering the same ground." Peggy thought again and said that she would wait to talk until a new topic had been introduced so that there would be no danger of repetition. Then someone else objected that it would still be disruptive, that they might be talking about something very personal so that if Peggy came in late it would disrupt the emotional flow of the group. At this Peggy was stymied. She said, "Well, I really want to be in the class, and I think I could get a lot out of it and that I can contribute, but if you really don't want me to come then I won't." The class then relented, saying they did want her and she should come. In this example one is struck by the relentless way the other students pursued Peggy, giving her a hard time, making her stand up for herself, before they let her into the class. In a more traditional school, such direct and persistent challenges would reduce most students to tears. But Peggy was expected to fight back, and her self-assertion was considered proof of her desire to participate in the group.

On its face, the extreme individualism of the counterculture does not seem very promising material for constructing group life. The passionately

individualistic students I have described resisted authority and rules, felt obliged to question everything, and might well be expected to have had considerable difficulty becoming responsible participants in a community. But we should not underestimate the potential for collective control that existed in the vocabulary of motives at Group High. Despite its emphasis on selfishness and self-direction, it was at bottom a participatory ethic. One owed it to the group, first of all, to express her ideas and feelings. As the mystical or religious ethics of many communes abolish the individual's defense against group scrutiny (Zablocki, 1971; Veysey, 1973), so the counterculture, in its gentle way, opened the individual to collective demands.[4] The ideology of self-actualization breaks down the usual separation between the private sphere in which one is free to think and feel what one wishes and the more circumscribed sphere of the rights of the group. Furthermore, the emphasis on self-actualizing motives implied respect and tolerance for the motives of others: that students listened patiently and responded to even the most boring or irritating of their fellows was testimony to the school's collectivist spirit. Each person had enormous claims on others in the group. Finally, by generating a deeper level of personal involvement, by eliminating much of the distance between the "true" self and the self that participated in school, Group High's implicit ideology engaged people more deeply in the life of the community than most traditional institutions are able to do.

If Group High's vocabulary of motives appeared individualistic while actually encouraging collective involvement, nearly the opposite was true of Ethnic High. Students at Ethnic High applied to themselves a traditional vocabulary of motives: they could be either good, obedient, and hard working or bad, uncooperative, and lazy. Usually, Ethnic High's students saw themselves as bad or lazy. Although occasionally they tried to be better, in a nonauthoritarian setting their "good-bad" vocabulary of motives provided few openings for group controls. With teachers who demanded more of them students at Ethnic High might have acknowledged the necessity of working harder and being more cooperative. But as long as teachers made few claims on them, Ethnic High's students were left free to be bad.

Episodes from my first days of field work at Group High and Ethnic High convey the different views students had of themselves at the two schools. On my first day as an observer at Group High, a student leaned over to me during a school meeting to ask if I were a student teacher. When I replied that I was not a teacher but an observer, he smiled and said, "Don't worry. You'll be teaching something soon." Like his fellow Group High students, he welcomed adults as equals and expected to benefit from their presence as

4. Basil Bernstein (1975) and Rachel Sharp and Anthony Green (1975) emphasize that social control in flexible, open, or progressive classrooms may be more thorough and more effective than in traditionally organized classrooms.

they shared themselves with the community. At an early Ethnic High meeting, a student sitting next to me asked, "Are you an observer? Wait until you find out about this school!" When I asked what I might find out, he said, "You'll see soon!" in a tone implying that I would certainly be shocked and dismayed by my discoveries.

Students could use their bad and lazy self-image to block teachers' efforts at control. During the second week of her Ethnic High geometry class, Denise probed to see how much background students had in the subject and how much she could expect them to learn. She had even raised the issue of homework, but the students treated the subject as a joke. One student boasted that she had taken geometry before but had "flunked." Denise asked, "Did you do homework?" The student laughed and said, "No! That's why I flunked." Another student said that she spent five minutes on her homework. Denise said, "Well, how much time did the good students spend?" Denise seemed to be looking for an opportunity to suggest that these students should do homework, while the students were trying to turn the issue into a joke pointing out what bad, hopeless students they were. Denise then wrote on the board a list of questions to stimulate student participation: "What do you want to learn in this class? Do you have suggestions as to how you want this class to be run? What do you think of homework?" A student said, "What do you mean, what do we want to learn? Geometry. That's the class, isn't it?" Another student said, "Are you sure you want to ask that last question with the students you got in this class?" Denise said, "Who is in this class? You see, you know that but I have to find it out." The student replied, "You'll find out. Before the year's over, you'll find out!" The students' very traditional view, according to which they were either good or bad to the degree that they conformed to the ideal student role, allowed them almost complete freedom once they acknowledged that they were bad. Students carried this image of themselves as difficult, lazy troublemakers like a shield, to deflect demands made upon them.

Their traditional vocabulary of motives hampered Ethnic High's students even when they sought to take greater responsibility for their own educational involvement: individual promises to reform—to be "good" from now on—were no substitute for an ideology that could mobilize sustained group pressure for individual involvement. During the evaluation (described in chapter 3) of Janet's academic skills class, students complained about being bored and not learning. Several of the most apathetic, uninspired students, who spent most class periods studiously avoiding involvement by staring off into space, thumbing through magazines, or chatting with friends, became animated and eagerly joined the discussion. Bonnie, who was chairing the meeting, challenged the other students, asking, "What are you doing to make it interesting?" Several students attacked the most disruptive boys in the class: "How can anybody teach with you all laughing and talking all the time? How could anyone teach you? You never pay any attention." Other

students complained that they could never hear Janet because of all the noise and talking. But this outpouring of energetic castigation occurred outside Janet's hearing, and back in class the same pattern of joking and disruption on the one hand, and passive indifference on the other, resumed without a ripple. There was no way to bring a system of mutual demands, mutual responsibility, and mutual criticism into the classroom. Furthermore, the good students felt that the bad students would inevitably be bad. The frustrated good students might tell off the troublemakers, but they didn't really expect them to change. At the end of the evaluation meeting, when the black students turned on a group of white boys, demanding to know why they never participated in class, LeRoy, one of the most disruptive black students, spoke forgivingly to the whites who had sullenly refused to answer: "You and I are doing the same thing. I'm talking and you're not doing anything, and neither of us is contributing anything to the class."

The striking contrast between students' normal lethargy and their animation in this critical discussion shows how much their usual apathy was a reaction to frustration with their classes; it was also, however, a way of warding off potential demands. Although students recognized their own parts in making the class boring, their alternative was to become good students who would then be forced to work. They wanted a more interesting class, yet they resisted Janet's feeble attempts to demand more of them. In their view it was Janet's responsibility to make them work and their right to evade her demands if they could. One of their recommendations was that Janet should "be harder on us," but when Janet announced an assignment for the next class, students talked her out of it by claiming that since it was Monday they were too tired to do anything. Despite the good will they had expressed during the evaluation, in the ensuing weeks they remained as uncooperative as ever. Furthermore, a stalemate was reached in Janet's class, also caused by students' view of themselves as bad students: although their self-criticism was not sufficient to make them reform, it muted their criticism of the class, since they felt they had no right to make demands for better teaching when they were at fault as students for sabotaging the class.

Comparing the implicit vocabularies of motive at Group High and Ethnic High illustrates the role of ideology in collective social control. At Group High an ideology of individual self-assertion encouraged group participation; a "selfish" vocabulary of motives made it difficult for students to evade demands for involvement in and commitment to the group. At Ethnic High, which also turned to collective sentiments as substitutes for authority, the vocabulary of motives was more appropriate to traditional teacher-student relationships. This vocabulary implied that although good students might comply with teacher demands, bad students would disobey, and all students were justified in taking advantage of lenient teachers who made few demands.

The more general point to be made is that ideology provides the neces-

sary support for the other aspects of collective control outlined above. Collective sentiments are powerful resources for group life, but before their power can be effective it must be harnessed and its dangers controlled. Ideology (or culture) obviously affects a group's capacity to generate collective attachment in the first place. Ritual, symbols, and other manifestations of a shared culture make group life meaningful for its members. But the very intensity of collective life creates dangers. Collective sentiments are unstable; they can flag or fail, sending the community into depressed withdrawal or triggering flight from the group. Alternatively, the very intensity of collective ties can generate passionate conflict, and fear on the part of individuals of being overwhelmed by the group. To counterbalance tendencies to either withdrawal or flight, communities may create real barriers to exit—from physical isolation to social insulation based on a distinctive language, dress, or way of life. Communities may also require that members "invest" in the community, making it difficult for them to leave (Kanter, 1972). In the absence of such enforced solidarity, a community must repeatedly seduce back members who begin to withdraw, pressure involved members to stay involved, and mute conflict and dissent so as to prevent fear and flight. But these strategies for making collective life less threatening conflict with those for deepening emotional involvement in the group and harnessing group sentiments for collective goals.

What I have somewhat awkwardly called group-situated ideological discussion and what others call criticism and self-criticism involves the use of ideology in a group setting to explore and resolve conflicts, to forge shared goals, and to bring individual conduct and thought into line with group decisions. Here ideology is a critical tool for translating collective feeling into collective control. Such forums can also provide the occasions for the socialization of affection—for making private ties group property and making collective attachments primary for all members of the group. All these techniques of collective control are legitimated by ideology, and ideology provides the central link for transforming the treacherous advantages of group sentiments into the more effective tools of collective social control. The effectiveness of collective social control in such diverse organizations as religious communities (Zablocki, 1971; Kanter, 1972; Veysey, 1973; Bouvard, 1975), political or social-movement organizations (Zald and Ash, 1966; Rothschild-Whitt, 1977), and therapy collectives (Mansbridge, 1973; Holleb and Abrams, 1975) may depend on the fact that each of these groups has an ideology and a specialized vocabulary—whether religious, political, or psychotherapeutic—in which to ground group coordination and control.

Group High and Ethnic High provide a partial illustration of the ways collective coordination can be used to replace authority. Both schools developed and utilized collective attachments; students were drawn into fellowship with their teachers and other students. However, collective sentiments do not always provide an adequate substitute for other forms of

social control. In comparing Group High and Ethnic High, and then in contrasting both these free schools with more intense collective experiments, I have attempted to point up the range of mechanisms of control necessary to make collective coordination fully effective. I have also tried to highlight the fledgling attempts Group High and Ethnic High made to implement collective controls. Neither Group High nor Ethnic High was able to utilize the strategies of utopian communes to weed out uncommitted members and, by requiring sacrifice and investment, to keep members from leaving the community. But both schools did seek to socialize the affections of their members, penetrating personal ties that could draw members away from the community and trying to drive these private feelings into the public realm. Both schools also sought to create a collective forum for discussion and criticism that could intensify community attachments and enforce obligations to the group. Group High was able, to some extent, to develop strong group sentiments and to involve its members in intense, revealing collective discussion, but Ethnic High had great difficulty in using its members' collective involvement to achieve social control and coordination. Although many factors contributed to Ethnic High's problems, the absence of a facilitating ideology and the traditionalism of students' implicit assumptions about motives and morals made its task particularly hard.