COMMUNITIES IN TRANSITION

Change and Development in the Camphill Communities in Scotland

Andrew Plant 2008

Contents

FOREWORD

I am a member of a large and significant group of people who joined one of the Camphill communities in the late 1970s and early 1980s; people who are now in our 40s and 50s. Many of us have had similar experiences; we joined Camphill when we were relatively young, often after university and after travelling in those heady days following the hippie era. We were full of enthusiasm and idealism and believed that it was possible both to escape the worst of what we did not like in society and to build a better way for people to live together.

We joined Camphill, married, began our families and grew into the responsibilities of running house communities, workshops and teams of land workers. We learnt how to produce festival plays, we joined study groups, attended talks and went to lots of meetings. All of these were formative experiences.

We were moved by the inspirational example of our elders – the pioneers and those who came shortly after the pioneers – and internalised the ideals and the practices of community that they had created and nurtured.

Now, 20 or 30 years later - still in Camphill - we are older and more tired. We have become more realistic about what can and cannot be achieved in community in the 21st century. We have become less idealistic, and perhaps less confident in the philosophical principles that we had believed in so fervently. We have become the new generation of community leaders. We are professional care providers, managers, administrators, teachers, therapists, trainers and co-ordinators. We expect and need more time and space to ourselves and more security about our future when we retire. We are wondering where the next generation that will take our place is going to come from.

Our generation has had a particular destiny. We inherited an inspirational alternative community from the pioneers and have ended up with the responsibility of trying to manage a complex and increasingly differentiated organisation. We have been buffeted by a whole series of changes beyond our choosing and control but still believe that what we are doing is immensely worthwhile in many different ways. We are not too sure what the future holds and sometimes we are not too sure where we are meant to be taking all of this.

It is from this perspective that the following has been written. It is the particular story of a particular time in the development of a particular community impulse. This perspective will both inform and colour all that follows.

INTRODUCTION

The Camphill communities in Scotland are the home and workplace of some 1,000 people. The settings are invariably beautiful, the houses characteristically welcoming and there is a feeling of purposeful energy, dedication and commitment that make them exceptional places. They are very special places for all the people who live in them, work in them and are involved in them in one way or another.

There is a long and treasured history and a deeply appreciated tradition which still inform the ethos, values and culture of the communities. New ideas and innovative practice are constantly being developed. The magic of community is still alive and well in the Camphill communities in 2008.

Yet it would be disingenuous to pretend that there are not also some challenges facing the communities. The overall aim of this work is to attempt to throw light on the situations that the Camphill communities find themselves in at the beginning of the 21st century. More than 60 years after the inception of the Camphill Movement, for reasons that will soon become apparent, there seems to be a feeling of uncertainty as to the future development of the communities.

Through this work, I hope to stimulate and encourage a process of reflection and appraisal that will contribute to the process of discerning the way forward into the future.

Previously, I had conducted some research into the changes in the experience of the sense of community among people who live and work in the Camphill communities in Scotland. This research was entitled 'Experiences of Community: A study of the changing experience of community in the Camphill communities in Scotland' and was completed in February 2007.

I was motivated to conduct the research out of the realisation that the communities have had to absorb an unprecedented amount of both internal and external change over a very short period of time, namely the last 10-15 years. I wanted to assess the extent to which this change has affected the experience of community and to gather suggestions as to how to improve this community experience in the future.

What I ended up with, among other things, was a number of striking and significant paradoxes. It appeared that those people who had spent longest in the communities had the most intense experience of community, yet felt that it was on the decline. In contrast, those people who had spent less time in the communities, and most of the employees who responded, had a less intense community experience but felt that it was increasing. Many respondents said that they needed more time to themselves and yet many also wanted more community events.

Finally, even though the number of employees in the communities is on the increase, many people, especially the employees themselves, felt that employees were not valued and appreciated to the same degree as residential coworkers.

However, the dominant theme on the minds of most people who replied to the questionnaire was the quality of interpersonal relationships between community members. The paradox here is that these relationships were seen as both the best and worst aspect of community living.

Although the research and this work can be read separately they are in fact complementary and both are different aspects of a common endeavour. This endeavour is the attempt to combine what is known of the current experience in the Camphill communities in Scotland with models and theories of community development in general. The overall aim is to contribute to, and inform, the ongoing discussion in the communities as to the way forward.

What I hope to be doing in what follows is to try and make sense of all that has changed in the experience of community and to try and discern some patterns that might serve to bring a semblance of order and purposefulness into what has been a challenging process.

This work, as is the case with the research project, is also based primarily on experiences in the Scottish communities. However, it seeks to go further in that it draws on, and makes reference to, experiences in Great Britain and beyond. While the frame of reference is therefore relatively localised and specific the hope is that it may be of more general relevance. I am certainly not in a position to speak on behalf of any other communities than those in Scotland, but nonetheless I am confident that the topics of this work have a more universal application.

This work will not be limited to a consideration of the changes that are currently being experienced in the Camphill communities. I will also be looking at the whole question of community as an archetypal social phenomenon. I will therefore be considering the Camphill communities in the wider and more general context of the historical development of the intentional community movement as a potent force for personal development, social renewal and human progress.

In what follows I will be focusing primarily on the Camphill communities as intentional communities. I will hardly be touching on their development as centres of curative education and social therapy. As these are the fundamental tasks of Camphill, it might seem perverse that I will be virtually ignoring them. However, I have made a conscious decision to focus on one aspect of the communities in the knowledge that other people have been turning their attention to other aspects.

There is an understandable tendency on the part of people living in the Camphill communities to consider themselves as unique and in some way special. They could be forgiven if they consider themselves to be fortunate to be part of the development of a community impulse that has a long and treasured history and well-respected and proven traditions.
Perhaps they are also proud to be able to contribute to the benefit of vulnerable individuals and to society as a whole; to provide answers to a society that seems to struggle to maintain and recreate a sense of social cohesion.
The members of the Camphill communities are aware that they living out the inspired ideas of Rudolf Steiner and Karl Konig. They are probably less aware that they are also part of the wider sociological phenomena of intentional communities; a movement with a history far longer and far wider than the unique history of the Camphill Movement.
This work is intended to look at the communities as part of this wider context; to look at them in their historical, sociological, philosophical and cultural context. This is done, not to lessen the sense of uniqueness of the communities, but in order to come to a greater appreciation of the community-building impulse of the Camphill communities.

While looking at community-building in general and community experiences from many different perspectives - academic, theoretical and practical – this nonetheless remains a story of Camphill communities. Therefore, at the same time as I will be looking for a wider perspective, I will also constantly be referring back to the specific and unique situation in Camphill communities. In this way it will hopefully be possible to see what can be learnt from the insights and experiences of others in order to add to the knowledge and insights of the collective Camphill experience.

This work is not a general look at the development of the Camphill Movement since its beginning and up to the present day, nor is it an overall view of all the different Camphill communities in the world-wide Camphill Movement. What I have been looking at, and will be dealing with, are conceptual frameworks and processes, and trying to see how they relate to the common experiences of how the Camphill communities have changed and are changing. This is an open-ended process, which pulls together many different strands of thought, insights and musings in an attempt to see a 'bigger picture'.

I should explain in advance the inconsistency of style in what follows. Some parts will be a narrative; a personal account based on my own reflections and musings and things that I have heard expressed in a variety of meetings and conversations over the years. I have tried to avoid expressing my own opinions and sought instead to represent the articulated thoughts and feelings of other people. I accept that there will be a bias in recording such thoughts, as it can be said that people hear what they want to hear and filter out the rest.

Somebody else, observing from a different perspective and with a different set of beliefs, would have written all of the following very differently because they would have made different observations.

In her 'Leadership and the New Sciences' Margaret Wheatley uses the example of the work of Karl Weick to say that we participate in the creation of our own organisational realities. '*The environment that the organisation worries about is put there by the organisation'.* We 'enact' the environment that we live in by what we choose to notice and worry about.

Having been so involved with Camphill communities myself, it will be impossible to remain objective and disinterested. Each person will judge for himself or herself how much they identify with these more reflective and anecdotal aspects.

The other part of this eclectic style will be more objective and based on a variety of published and unpublished sources. My intention is to look at the change and development in Camphill communities in the light of more general research, models and theories of intentional communities, in order to derive the benefit of new insights from other perspectives.

THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

I will now set out the unifying ideas that form the basis of what is to follow.

The individual, social groupings, societies and the human race all show an evolutionary tendency or potential to progress towards a raised level of consciousness, of 'wisdom' and moral integrity. They absorb information from their environment, adapt in response to changes in their environment and become more complex as they evolve onto higher levels of organisation and 'intelligence'.

At the same time both communities and other organisms and organisations develop in accordance with inherent 'laws' and patterns that can be observed and mapped. The pattern of development is that communities evolve through identifiable phases and levels.

The inherent pattern of development of individuals, social groupings, organisations, communities and societies is to progress through phases from what could be called the 'group' phase, to a phase of individualisation, followed by a phase that could be called 'universal awareness'.

The times of transition between one phase of development and the next can be marked by crises, anxiety and doubt. This is because the vitality of the previous and present phases show signs of having reached a culmination at the same time as the new ideas, forms and structures of the next phase begin to become manifest but as yet in unclear and provisional ways.

Experience shows that the social forms of communities evolve from being small, simple and cohesive to becoming large, complex and differentiated. This is a process of change that seems to be inevitable and a characteristic of this process seems to be that the communities evolve from being an inspiring Utopian endeavour to becoming a well-run organisation.

Throughout this work I will be describing the development of communities as if it were an objective reality; as if communities have a life of their own. We need to be clear from the outset if this concept is accurate, realistic or useful.

What do we mean when we say, for example, that 'communities develop in accordance with recognisable patterns of development?'

This implies that the communities follow their own laws of development rather than being the sum of the collective activities of its members. It might help to imagine that the word 'community' reflects the overall consciousness of all the members together, but also extends to include the whole 'story' of that community.

Yet at the same time, communities are made up of people, and therefore reflect the actions and development of these people, both collectively and individually. Communities also relate to a wider context and are affected by developments in the wider society.

Most communities have a form of leadership– either one inspiring leader or a group of more experienced members. These leaders appear to be the ones who are guiding the community along its developmental path. But even this is not so straightforward. The truth could be one of three different scenarios or a combination of all three. In the first instance it could be said that the leaders determine the path from their own wisdom.

It could also be said that in fact they are simply doing what the members make clear in one way or another that they want them to do; that they follow and serve the will of the members. Thirdly, it could be the case that they are following an inherent path of development built into the 'wisdom' of all communities that they are not even aware of.

For all of these reasons, it will never be possible to state unequivocally that 'communities' follow an independent life of their own. However, despite this, there does seem to be grounds to say that communities develop according to inherent principles of development, while recognising that this development is directly affected by both internal and external dynamics. In this way, while communities in general might all follow a similar pattern of development, no two communities will ever develop in exactly the same way.

It seems that change is a local phenomenon and takes place in small, incremental steps. These changes accumulate over time into recognisable and common trends. They are self-referring in that, while each community finds its own way of dealing with and assimilating change, nonetheless, all such changes are made within a general agreed framework of what a Camphill community is.

These changes are signs that the accustomed traditions, forms and structures, are no longer able to provide answers to the new situation the communities find themselves in. They are signs that the communities are in transition to a new phase of development.

Communities rarely follow a developmental path in an orderly manner. For all sorts of reasons – some of which we will be considering – they go through healthy and progressive times - times of an intense community experience - and then through unhappy times or even crises when they seem to regress to earlier stages of development. Although an overall path of development may be discerned by an objective observer who studies the community over many years, the life of an intentional community will never appear to be orderly, tidy or even rational to those who actually live in them, and especially not over a short timescale. The challenges of the present and the possibilities of the future are best understood by a wider and broader appreciation of the principles of community development.

AN OVERVIEW

The aim of Chapter 1 is to consider what is happening in the Camphill communities today in order to establish a basis for all that will follow. This I have done through recording some findings from a series of group conversations, from the research project that I carried out into the changing experience of community and from numerous written reports. From these findings I have attempted to identify a series of trends currently manifesting themselves in the development of the communities. I then examine some of the reasons that people have given to explain these trends.

In Chapter 2 I take a brief look at the variety of responses to changes that have been taking place in Camphill communities. I then consider some models of change and assess their relevance to what has been happening in the communities.

In Chapter 3, I move on from the specific developmental circumstances of Camphill communities and begin to explore wider patterns of change and development. I present a variety of models that have been used to portray the developmental trajectories of societies and civilisations. I go on to consider some theories of sociocultural evolution that map out the developmental stages of the human story. I then look at Rudolf Steiner's three stages in the historical development of human consciousness and his three social principles and see how they can be applied to the development of intentional communities. The purpose behind this is to identify archetypal patterns of development that hold good for the developmental path of the individual, social groups, organisations, communities and societies.

In Chapter 4 I present a variety of models of developmental paths of intentional communities. Some of these are from are drawn from general experiences and some are based on the insights of Anthroposophy. I end with a look at how leadership styles reflect the developmental phase of communities.

In Chapter 5 I set out my own model of the developmental phases in the life of Camphill communities. This is based partly on the models of the previous chapter and partly on my own experiences and reflections.

Finally, in Chapter 6, I extend my model into the future and set out possible further developments of the Camphill communities.

AN EXPLANATION OF TERMINOLOGY

As my presumption is that this work will be read either by people who are living and/or working in Camphill communities or by people who are familiar with them, I have not gone to the trouble of explaining all the terms that would be unfamiliar to others. However, there are two instances of my use of terminology that merit an explanation.

Residents. There is no satisfactory collective term for those people with learning disabilities or other developmental disturbances who have funded places in Camphill communities. To compensate for this, and in keeping with the terminology of my research study, I will be using the unsatisfactory and inaccurate term 'residents'.

Community members. This is another question of collective terms. In Camphill circles, the term 'community members' has usually been reserved for those people who have joined the Inner Camphill Community, which is the community of those people world-wide who have made a commitment to the more esoteric and spiritual aspects of Camphill. However, in this work I will be using it in its more general sense to describe any or all of those people who live and work in communities, including Camphill communities.

Community-building. This is the term used to describe the dynamic process of creating and nurturing the experience of community between people. I am told that the term 'community - building' is a direct translation of the German word 'Gemeinschaftsbildung'. It seems that although English term 'community-building' has unintentional overtones of a physical process, the German term 'gemeinschaftsbildung' describes the etheric development and formative forces of a social organism. It describes the processes of creating, shaping and forming rather than simply building. However, because the term 'community-building' is so widely used, I will be using it throughout this work in the hope that it will be understood in its wider sense.

CHAPTER 1
RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN CAMPHILL COMMUNITIES

It is apparent that all the communities in Scotland are in a process of change, and it is this process of change and where it is leading that is the focus of this work. In order to establish a basis from which to study how this change manifests itself, it is first necessary to arrive at a clear picture of the situation in the communities and how people have been experiencing this change.

What follows is the attempt to paint a picture of the developmental journey as it has been up to now of the Camphill communities in Scotland. Later on in this work, we will try and see if it is possible to envisage how this journey might continue into the future.

IDENTIFYING TRENDS

First, a personal story that will serve to illustrate the theme. My wife and I joined the Camphill community of Mourne Grange in Northern Ireland in 1979. At that time, there were approximately 60 people living in 5 house-communities on 60 acres (24 hectares) of land.

When we left, 12 years later, there were approximately 120 people living in 11 house communities on 100 acres (40 hectares). The existing workshops had been expanded and other new buildings had been built, including new workshops, a hall, a shop, and buildings for land work.

Since we left, 4 more new houses have been built and the number of employed staff has gone from 4 to more than 30.

In 1991 our family, now with 3 children and another on the way, moved to Beannachar community in Scotland. Our possessions, that in 1979 had fitted into 2 rucksacks and 2 trunks, now filled a 2 ton van. When we arrived we joined a community of approximately 55 people - living in 2 houses - and 3 employees. There were 6 workshops. 15 years later, when we left, there are 64 people living in the community, 10 employees and 8 workshops. In that time, a new house and a new workshop unit has been built and work will soon be completed on another new house and a new multi-purpose building.

In 2007 we joined Milltown community, which was just one house, one workshop building, some outbuildings, and a very small parcel of land. An extra five and a half acres (2 hectares) of land has been bought and work has now started on building a new house with perhaps a small multi-purpose building to follow later. Milltown, the last of the Camphill communities in Scotland to embark on a programme of building and/or buying houses, is going to join the other communities in a consistent trend of development and expansion.

Although this is a small and personal picture it is not insignificant in that many other people living in Camphill communities elsewhere could tell similar stories.

And the story is that communities grow as they develop. They grow not only in size but also in complexity and diversity. I do not know of any community that decided to become smaller, to 'downsize'. Many may have wished to become less complex and more cohesive, but there is no evidence that this wish has ever been granted.

The only exception to this trend is one that I came across in my community-building research project. This was Garvald Home Farm; a community that has consciously decided to resist the pressure for hierarchical management structures, work shifts, training and qualifications, televisions and technology. It has remained small and retained its simplicity and cohesion.

Schumacher's assertion that 'small is beautiful', sounds like a forlorn cry in the face of inexorable progress that is tending to go in the opposite direction.

It could also be said that the closure of Templehill community, in the Scottish region, represented another exception to this trend. However, Templehill was closed as a result of a series of crises rather than a strategic decision. It was never the intention that Templehill would close. In fact, shortly before it closed, the community had recently opened their second new house and had formulated an ambitious Development Plan.

The development of other successful intentional communities reveals a similar pattern of growth. Robin Alfred describes the development of the Findhorn Community in the book that he co-edited called 'Beyond You and Me – Inspirations and Wisdom for Building Community'. He writes, '*Starting from nothing except one old caravan, and much faith and positive thinking, the community now has some £4 million of assets, 120 staff, and is supported and surrounded by a wider community of some 400-500. It is visited by over 10,000 guests each year, a significant proportion of who take part in residential workshops'.*

Kathy Galloway, the leader of the Iona Community has a similar story to tell. This is from a talk that she gave at the New Lanark Conference in 2004; '*The Iona Community started off as a movement, a religious community. But somehow it got to a point where it discovered that it was also an organisation with a turnover of nearly 2 million pounds a year, fifty staff and hundreds of volunteers'.*

As part of the research that I undertook into the changing experience of community in the Scottish Camphill communities, I was invited to participate in an inclusive conference in Newton Dee in 2006. This was one in a series of conferences, which were part of the process of visualising the need to re-create the centre of their Village life, especially focused on the place of the existing Phoenix Hall. The theme of the conference that I attended on 2nd October, was the social life.
I conducted a blackboard exercise which asked people to list the kind of changes that had been at work over the years, both specifically in Newton Dee and generally in all Camphill communities.
I carried out a similar process in Loch Arthur community, also in October 2006, and also as part of my community-building research.
The list below incorporates the findings of both of these exercises. I have grouped the findings into separate headings.

Living arrangements
- The house communities are smaller but there are more of them.
- There are mostly single rooms within the houses for residents, whereas previously most of them had been shared rooms. There are more separate living arrangements; for independent living, for coworkers to be separate from residents, flats, rooms outside the house community, flats and houses outside the community altogether.

Lifestyle
- People have more individual programmes, especially the residents. These include therapies, befrienders, counselling, College, work placements outwith the community. This is especially so in the Village communities that have an ageing population. There is more of a willingness to create different lifestyles for different people – for the ageing, for new people and for employees.
- These changes are reflected both in the work and social life.

- There is more money available than had been the case previously. As a result there is less need to prioritise and compromise and to be aware of the needs of others. Most people take holidays abroad.
- There are more people who are 'day attenders' as opposed to being residential. These include both those being cared for and employees.
- Previously there had not been such a lot of technology. There had not been televisions, Fax machines and computers. Now there are televisions in houses, DVD players in bedrooms and computers everywhere.
- People expressed that they felt life was more pressurised.

Cultural Life
- Previously everybody had been expected to go to all the cultural events in the community. Now there is more freedom and choice to attend or not, or to do other things altogether.
- People are less willing to participate in the cultural life of their community. Instead they expect to be entertained by visiting performing artists or they rather go to town to the cinema or to the theatre.

Organisational Roles
- It is no longer the case that everybody is 'hands-on' with the core tasks of running houses and workshops.
- Roles are less rigidly determined by gender. Previously the women were in house, and the men were in charge of a workshop and busy attending lots of important meetings - although it is still mostly men who attend the meetings and are involved in management.
- More people spend more time in offices than previously
- Long-term community members are recreating their roles; some are moving out of the community; some are standing back or retiring; some are taking up external training or pursuing other interests.
- There is a lot more specialisation. Some areas of work require such a level of expertise that not everybody is able or willing to take responsibility.
- People are taking responsibility for one particular area of work, e.g. a house or a workshop or training or administration, but not responsibility for the whole community.

Work
- Previously work had mostly been done by hand. Now there is more equipment, machinery and technology.
- There is less emphasis on land work as being central to the community.

Regulation
- There is less internal regulation; less rules about what you can do and cannot not do, e.g. the use of radios and TVs, alcohol, dress code for formal occasions. Life now is less fundamentalist and more liberal, flexible, adaptable.
- There is more external regulation from external bodies; the Care Commission, the Scottish Social Services Council, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education, contract compliance, Health and Safety, Environmental Health, Fire regulations and so on.
- There has been an enormous increase in paper-work and office-work.

Leadership and management styles
- Previously there had been self-appointed and forceful leader figures, now there are mandated groups and people are appointed to responsibilities.
- Management structures are more inclusive.
- There are more employed people, especially in key roles such as house co-ordinators, managers and administrators.

Buildings
- The houses are smaller with the emphasis on more private and personal spaces.
- Some communities own or rent flats and houses outwith their estate.
- There are more offices to accommodate more staff in order to deal with the increase in administration.
- There are more carparks because there are more employees and more visitors.

Resources
- There is more of everything; more people, more money, more equipment and machines, more gadgets and devices, more buildings and infrastructure.

Demographics
- The residential population of the Village communities is ageing
- The population of the residential coworkers in all communities is ageing.
- There are more employees

Other, less tangible changes
- There is less sense of service and more sense of rights and expectations.
- People say that they feel tired and less inspired.
- The communities are less self-absorbed and introspective and are turning outwards to engage in the wider community.

A further trend, that is directly related to those mentioned above, is that in many of the Camphill communities in Scotland – and indeed in some of the communities in England also – there has been a drop in the number of residents over the last few years. At the same time as there has been an increase in the number of people coming into the communities on a day basis – both fee-paying and employed – there has also been a decrease in the number of people actually living in the communities.

Another factor is that the forms and structures of Camphill communities have been going through processes of change. This phenomenon has been researched by Michael and Jane Luxford who, between 2001-2003, carried out the most extensive research ever conducted across the world-wide Camphill Movement. Their intention was to assess the extent to which the Movement in general, and individual communities in particular, have coped with change since the beginning of Camphill over sixty years ago. This they did by taking stock of the present efficacy of some of the forms of Camphill, especially the Three Pillars of Camphill - the College Meeting, the Bible Evening and the Fundamental Social Law - and the three dimensions of the social life which are commonly referred to as the Threefold Social Order.

The Luxfords published the results of this social audit in 2003 as a 'Five Steps Research Paper' with the title 'A Sense for Community'. They found that both the forms of the Bible Evening and the College Meeting are in overall decline. There is hardly any regular group study as people are more likely to pursue personal study and interests. In the cultural life they identified a process of social fragmentation with people staying away from cultural events. The overall impression is that there is a lessening of culture and creative activity in the communities.

The reasons they found for this are all reasons that I have identified previously. They found that life has become more complex. External regulation and increased administration are taking energy away from other things. People who could act as inspired examples to others are instead engaged with management and administration. With a more diverse population, especially employees who work weekday shifts, it is harder to get people together for common social and cultural activities.

It seems that as the communities have developed over time, there has been a decline in the vitality of, and commitment to, the traditional forms of the past. The forms that once inspired people and brought them together in a daily celebration of community now appear either to have become routine or to be neglected.

There has also been an observable trend away from the informal and flexible community structures of earlier days towards an organisational system that is now more formal, more clearly defined and more structured.

The reasons for this change have partly been the result of the natural move towards a more organised way of working and partly due to pressure from regulatory authorities that Camphill should adopt a hierarchical management structure. Along with this went the need to develop clear lines of responsibility, clearly demarcated professional roles and the adoption of professional standards. It could also be said that the communities are, to a certain extent, the victims of their own success. Growth in the size of the individual communities and in the number of people living and working in them has made it almost inevitable that small-scale, idealistic communities have become large organisations. Similarly, growth in the overall size of the Camphill movement in Scotland has made an organisational structure necessary if the communities are to work out of a shared ethos and ideology. It is a simple fact that the increase in size and complexity of the communities has led to an increase in administration and organisation.

A further internal structural change, that was highlighted in my research study, is the fact that the people who live in the communities are, for the most part, limiting the spheres of their activity. In the past people might have been willing to combine the role of Houseparent with that of running a workshop, working in the office and taking an active part in the management group.

Fewer people are combining such major responsibilities now, which results in more clearly defined roles and creates the need to have more people in the workforce.

This is a symptom of what I would call 'role differentiation'. Previously communities were led by individuals in clearly acknowledged leadership roles. These leading personalities in each community owed their position to a variety of factors; charisma, age, wisdom, experience, leadership skills and qualities, time spent in the community and time spent in Camphill in general. In most cases these individuals were members of the internal Camphill structures, by which I mean the Anthroposophical Society and the Inner Camphill Community. They were the people who were held the Sunday Services, who gave the talks, produced the festival plays, held the Bible Evenings, and were generally active in all the spiritual, cultural and social realms of community life. The same people were also the leaders in organisational matters. They were the people who had a leading voice in all matters to do with management and administration.

They were the people who spoke to the authorities, planned and looked after buildings projects and signed the cheques. These leaders created a kind of network of trust and understanding between themselves over the entire Camphill movement.

Over the recent years, and for perhaps a variety of reasons, both personal and professional, there has been a separation in the leadership of the spiritual and cultural life of the community and its organisational structure. In some cases the previous situation is still in place in that the organisational leaders are also active in the spiritual and cultural life of Camphill. In other cases people's position in the management and administration structures is not in any way dependent upon, or related to, their membership and activity in the spiritual and cultural aspects of the community.

From all that we have seen, it can be concluded that the trends becoming manifest in the communities are as follows:

- From young to old - following the natural laws of growth.
- From collective to individual
- From communal to personal
- From small to large
- From simple to complex
- From informal to organised
- From cohesiveness to diversity
- From conformity to choice and independence

What is interesting is that people seemed to agree that the effects of these trends had largely been felt over a period of the last 10 or 15 years. It seems that, while there has always been a certain amount of constant change over the time of Camphill's existence, nonetheless, the changes of the last years had been the most significant and the most rapid.

The general tendency for societal change to accelerate over time was highlighted by Bernard Lievegoed in his book 'The Developing Organisation'. He said that the nature of social change in the 20th century (the time in which he was writing) was threefold. The first two aspects we have already come across; an increase in scale of all social entities and a trend of growing complexity. However, he said that the third element is the acceleration of all developments; '*An explosive situation has been reached in many fields; scientific literature, the cost of health services, transport, education, the increase in world population; all these have reached 'critical' points'*. Many people might agree that the trend of acceleration that Lievegoed described in 1969 has only increased in the 21st century.

This is a new trend to add to these consideration; that change accelerates over time.

There is no suggestion that these trends represent extreme polarities; that all communities were previously completely cohesive and have now become completely diverse; that all communities have moved from being only collective to being only individualistic. Nothing is as simple as this, especially in communities that are relatively autonomous and self-directing, and display such remarkable differences.

These trends manifest themselves in different ways depending on whether the community is a school or a village; whether it is a long-established place with a relatively stable history or one that has been through a substantial amount of internal change, especially involving a radical turnover of people or whether the community is mostly comprised of residential coworkers or mostly staffed by salaried workers who live outwith the community.

The response to, and effects of, the challenge of change also manifests differently if the culture of the community is one that is open to change and new influences or one that seeks to resist them. The above list of changes and trends does not portray a common and consistent series of changes across the board from one extreme to the other. Rather, it highlights the fact that some people feel that there has been a marked and significant shift in emphasis in the life of the communities; a shift that has more marked in some communities and less marked in others.

An important point to make at this early stage is that, in assessing the effect of change on the communities, the forces of change in themselves are not the only consideration. What is equally important is the response of the communities to those forces of change. A great deal of change has been absorbed by the communities over a long period of time and no doubt this will continue to be the case. The focus here is on the amount, the pace and the type of change, the impact of change on the communities and the response of the communities to this change. Thus the crucial issue is what impact the changes of the last 15 years have had in terms of the experience of social and cultural cohesion and shared values and goals.

A sign of a healthy and cohesive community is the amount of change that it can absorb and integrate without a detrimental effect. In this way the challenge of change is a challenge of the resilience and coherence of the community; its ability to adapt and develop; its ability to make sense of what is happening and find new ways forward. In considering the recent history of the Camphill communities in Scotland it is noticeable that it has not been external change that has posed a critical threat to the immediate viability of any community.

No community has been closed by the statutory authorities, nor because of the impact of regulations, the lack of referrals or the lack of a workforce. The one community that did close, did so because of a variety of factors, the most critical of which were internal. Two other communities have had to go through a major re-structuring, again on the hand of internal break-down. The tipping point in all three cases was as much due to the inability to deal with internal issues than to the ability to integrate the impact of external change.

Therefore, it must be borne in mind in all that follows that nothing is as simple as it seems. We need to be wary of the tendency to think that any problems in the communities or challenges to the communities come from outwith the boundaries of those communities, or that any change is inherently dangerous and inimical to the culture of the communities.

There is no doubt that Camphill communities are having to face as much change as any other community, religious movement, care provider or organisation. But what is significant is the specific response of the communities in general and individually, to the changes that have marked the last decade or so.

I will be looking at this question of change and the response to change later and in more detail. But before I do that, I will set out some thoughts about how these trends operate across the boundaries of the communities.

COMMUNITY TRAFFIC

A concept that encapsulates many of the trends that have been identified is that of 'traffic'. This can be understood in the literal sense of an increase in people and vehicles coming in and going out of the community. It can also be understood in a metaphorical sense of an increase in the flow of information, ideas and impressions across the symbolic boundaries of culture and coherence of the community.

In the first sense, there seems to have been an increase in the flow of physical traffic. There has been an increase in the number of people who come in to the communities for the working week, namely day attenders employees and coworkers who are supported by the communities but live outside. This has been the reason for the explosion in the growth of carparks in the communities over recent years. In 2007 it was observed that there were more cars parked in Murtle estate during the working day than there are pupils in that estate.

There has also been an increase the number of people coming in and out of the communities in order to regulate the communities in one way or another, be it in relation to care, finances or organisational management. On the hand of this there are people who come in to do work on behalf of the regulators; whether recording, monitoring, carrying out required modifications or similar activities.

In addition, there are also the builders who are putting up all the new buildings and the contractors who maintain the increasing amount of infrastructure.

Added to this is the flow of traffic out of the community. This includes residents attending College courses, coworkers attending the BACE course and other training courses, and people generally involving themselves in the wider community for a variety of reasons.

A further instance of the two-way flow of traffic is the trading aspect of Camphill communities in Scotland. The bakery, store and shop in Newton Dee, the shop in Loch Arthur and the Herb Workshop in Beannachar, (which also has a mail order service), experience the complexity of cross-boundary activity. To some extent this is also a cross-cultural activity, in that the customer culture of expectations of immediate service and fixed and regular opening hours does not always accord with the Camphill culture of quieter weekends and closures for celebrating festivals. The pressure of production and trade are not always compatible with running a workplace for people with disabilities. While the benefits of these shops and services to the communities are significant in terms of public relations, providing a service to the local community and extra revenue, nonetheless the tensions between the benefits and difficulties still remain.

Apart from physical traffic of people and vehicles, there is also traffic on a symbolic level. By this I mean new ideas, attitudes, cultural practices, care principles and practice, technology; all those things that are new elements crossing the boundaries into the traditional Camphill culture.

And again, this is a two-way flow in that Camphill ideas, culture and practice also make their way from within the communities to the society 'outside'. The means for the dissemination include Camphill ideology formulating the essentials of a degree course in the BACE; the work of Camphill Scotland in representing Camphill to a whole host of agencies, and Public Relations work. In addition there are the aspects of Camphill culture that people take with them when they leave the communities, either on a daily basis or permanently. There are probably many other instances of this two-way flow of 'information' across the boundaries.

There is a general question that applies to all the situations above; that is, to what extent are the communities able to control the amount and the complexity of the traffic across its boundaries?

In order to try and assert some control over the speed of the vehicular traffic entering the communities it is possible to install 'speed bumps' on the drives of the estates. However, this only serves to 'calm' the traffic rather than to reduce it. It is less easy to see how it is possible to calm the amount of 'informational', regulatory and cultural traffic entering the communities. In this sense, and to further stretch the analogy, Camphill Scotland can be regarded as the regional body entrusted with policing the speed and type of regulatory traffic entering the Camphill communities.

The result of all this 'traffic', which has significantly increased over the last decade, has been that the boundaries of Camphill have become more permeable. As a consequence, Camphill has become more visible and also more susceptible to external influence. The question then is what is the effect of this? In this sense it is not just the resilience of the boundaries that is tested but also the internal coherence of the communities.

COMMUNITY BOUNDARIES

In his book 'The Symbolic Construction of Community', Anthony Cohen has much to say about boundaries. It should be pointed out that Cohen uses the term community to denote a group of people who share a common identity, heritage and norms. His case studies, for example, include the Naskapi Indians of Labrador, the Saami Lapps of Norway and the people of the Shetland island of Whalsay. It is clear that he is not using the term community in the sense of an intentional community. Nonetheless, his insights are helpful in throwing light on question of boundaries and identity in intentional communities.

He asserts that change within a community - brought about by exposure to external influences - serves to strengthen both the symbolic expressions of the culture of a community and its boundaries. It serves to strengthen the sense of identity, and to mark the community out as something separate.

Further, he says that the same is true the other way round; namely that change from outside the community strengthens the internal culture, revitalising the significance of rituals and the symbolic expressions of the culture. In other words he seems to argue that influences deriving from an external source, whether pressing against the boundaries or going so far as to undermine the structural coherence of a community, serves to heighten – not lessen - the sense of community. External pressure gives rise to resistance, which in turn strengthens the sense of a separate identity.

In saying this he goes against the orthodox view that asserts that external pressure from the host society to conform eventually leads to the community adapting to the norms of the wider society, and in turn to a decrease or loss of a sense of a separate identity on the part of that community.

Cohen has obviously based his theories on a great deal of research into ethnographical fieldwork. But that does not mean that the theories automatically apply to the situation in Camphill Communities.

Following Cohen's reasoning, we would expect that, at a time when the Camphill communities feel under external pressure to conform to the ideology and practices of the conventional care sector and to mainstream organisational management systems, there would be a strengthening in the spiritual and cultural practices that define the ethos of the communities. In fact the opposite seems to be the case. People who responded to my research questionnaire reported that there is less support for, participation in, and commitment to, the spiritual, cultural and social realms of community life.

Further, it seems that a culture faced with external challenges can develop stronger identity at the boundaries, but at the same time, become less cohesive and coherent internally. In other words, as Camphill is subject to increased traffic and a heightened 'visibility', the identity is strengthened just where it meets the external environment. In order to explain Camphill to those who need, or want, to understand it better, the sense of a separate, unique and meaningful ideology and culture of practice is amplified.

At the same time that this process is underway, the community members themselves might be experiencing a loss of just this sense of purpose, confidence and coherence that is expressed at the interface with the public.

This can give rise to a disconcerting experience of a community member reading Camphill publicity material and wondering if what is written is really the case. Does the presentation, designed for a public audience, match the reality on the ground? Can the people operating at the boundaries accurately reflect the complexity and diversity of changing opinion of those at work within the communities?

Pressure from external sources can operate in such a way that things become simpler and more clearly defined at the boundary and yet more complex internally.

These concepts - traffic, boundaries, culture, change and development – and the perplexing questions they raise in the context of Camphill communities are just some of the many issues that I will be considering later.

REASONS FOR THE TRENDS

When the same people in Newton Dee and Loch Arthur who had suggested the list of trends we have been looking at were asked what they thought the reasons might be for these trends, they suggested three causes. These can be set out as follows:

1. The development of Camphill communities is no different from developments in the larger societal and global context. What happens in the external society will obviously happen within the communities.

2. People change over time. Changes in the attitudes and values of the members of the communities lead to changes in the culture and structural forms of the communities.

3. The impact of increasing regulation and requirements on the part of external regulatory authorities.

All three of these reasons reflect the idea that no community is unaffected by changes in its members and in the wider society. What is interesting is nobody suggested as an explanation the idea that there are innate and natural laws of development at work in the communities; that there are general ordering principles at work in how communities change and develop over time.

Before turning to this latter idea later in this work, I will firstly consider in greater detail the three reasons that were given for changes in the communities.

1. Changes in society

The first reason given to explain the changes taking place in the Camphill communities is that changes in the communities are simply the reflection of changes occurring in the wider society. In an attempt to examine this assumption, I will present some findings from two books that identify and record trends in modern society in Great Britain. It will then be possible to see to what extent they reflect the trends that have been identified in the communities.

These books compile figures and statistics from a series of social indicators and extrapolate trends from them. In looking at these findings, I will only be presenting trends that are relevant to our focus. The point of this exercise is to read these indicators and at the same time to imaginatively translate them into the context of the changes that have already highlighted in Camphill communities.

The first of these books is 'Twentieth Century British Social Trends' edited by Halsey and Webb. They list a series of trends that have emerged over the course of the last century.

In relation to modern British society the authors identify an improvement in material conditions and affluence, a fourfold improvement in economic growth, a growth in the number of managers and professionals (manual workers are now only a third of the overall workforce), an increasingly complex division of labour, a reduction in the hours of work and an increase in paid holidays, and a greater emphasis on leisure, private transport and consumer durables. They say that Britain is going through '*a vast social transformation from a static, industrious and poor country to a mobile, leisure seeking and opulent one'*.

They note that '*the family as an institution is in trouble*' as a result of a weakened social fabric and what they term 'collapsed community.' They note also '*the increasing presence of old people and the disappearance of children*' and the fact that Britain in the 21st century is going to be multi-ethnic. Further, they identify a rise in democracy and bureaucracy and the spectacular rise in communications from radios, televisions, and telephones to the world-wide web.

They assert that the language of public discussion changed after Thatcherism; '*words like 'competition', 'private enterprise', 'individual choice' became more frequently heard and displaced ideas about socialism, co-operation, nationalised industries and comprehensive school which had dominated public discussion in the 1940s and 1950s'.* '*The collapse of European communism and the Marxist states, the fall of the Berlin wall and the rise of the European Union re-transformed the life of Britain. Manufacturing, trade unions and the traditional family waned while lawyers, supermarkets, the internet and education waxed'.*

They conclude by making the point that different people will interpret these trends differently according to their outlook. They say that the 'pessimistic traditionalist' will see only decline and the collapse of a stable and ordered society, whereas the 'optimistic liberal' will regard the liberation of women, rising educational attainments, tolerance, increased leisure, better housing and more social mobility as signs of invigorating progress.

The second reference book is called 'Living in Scotland – Social and Economic Change since 1980' and is by Paterson, Bechofer and McCrone. It is similar to the work above but it concentrates on the last two or three decades of change in Scotland.

The authors begin by saying that there has been a revolution in how people in Europe and North America imagine society. They no longer see society as a collective, but rather as a web of individual opportunity and choice. They say that the situation is somewhat different in Scotland, where the assertion of the value of community and the dignity of the nation's ancient collective principles are still a potent force. They find that the decay of the old economic base of manufacturing, the erosion of class differences and the individualistic ethos introduced by Thatcherism has weakened the previously strong tradition of community and collectivism. Although, to use their words '*Scotland remains attached to some kind of egalitarian collectivism*' they nonetheless find that it is on the wane.

They find, among other things, that there is an ageing population, more social mobility and that more people are now working in the finance and business services than in manufacturing industries.

There has been an increase in financial security, especially in terms of insurance, pensions and savings. There is a rising level of ownership of consumer goods, notably washing machines, dishwashers and computers and an increase in leisure opportunities. All told, people have become tolerably comfortable and have a decent life. Scotland, they conclude, '*is a more affluent, comfortable and pleasant place to live in than it was just two or three decades ago'.* Yet despite the positive appearance they also found signs that society is seriously divided and stratified and that that the old communities (of work and the neighbourhood) that provided support have all but disappeared.

What is of interest here is that both of these studies identify similar trends in modern society. They also both assert that the ideology of Thatcherism represented a turning point in the development of British and Scottish society and politics. Paterson, Bechofer and McCrone go further in saying that things have changed very rapidly thereafter.

They say that normally they teach that societies generally change much more slowly than is generally supposed, but that that was '*plain wrong*' for Scotland in the last decades. The implication is again that recently societal change has been very rapid and that there has been more of it than is usually the case.

What can be learnt from looking at these studies? What societal changes have been highlighted that are similar to the changes experienced in the Camphill communities? The list of answers is impressive and includes the following:

- An ageing population that is not being replenished by new coworkers who intend to stay indefinitely in the communities. This demographic trend is highlighted in my research paper.
- A rise in the number of people working in positions of management, finances and administration in comparison to those working 'at the coal face'; in other words the hands-on task of care.
- More diversity in the 'workforce'. A move away from a collective spirit towards individualisation.
- The greater availability of consumer goods, information technology, holidays and pensions. A feeling that life is more comfortable and secure.

People must obviously draw their own conclusions from all of the above. However, I believe that it is valid to agree with the assumptions of some people in Camphill who say that Camphill communities have been going through the same amount of change and the same kind of changes as society in general over the last decades.

2. Changes in people

The second reason that was suggested for the perceived trends in Camphill communities was that people in general have changed and therefore the communities have changed. The communities have changed because the people living in them have changed and also because the people joining the communities, the new coworkers, the employees and the residents bring with them different ideas, expectations and aspirations than was the case previously.

What kinds of changes have there been?

Some people in the communities welcome the opportunity to have more space and time to themselves. Some choose neither to attend common events nor to support the common cultural and spiritual life of the community. Others feel less confident in, or have little connection to, the belief system that underpins the communities. Others again feel tired and worn out and no longer inspired and enthusiastic as they were when they first joined Camphill. Some people who in the past may have chosen to live in the communities now choose to be employed and live outside of the community. Some people very obviously have welcomed the move to become more professional, whereas others have equally obviously resisted this move.

While some people view these trends as detrimental to the overall health of the Camphill impulse and the life in the communities, others see them as signs that Camphill is moving with the times; simultaneously developing and improving care practice and making it easier to live in a community setting.

It may also be that the perception of these changes is a phenomenon particular to only one generation of community members. The demographic make-up of the communities today is that most of the people in long-term positions of responsibility are of roughly the same age. I would suggest that these are the people who, more than any other group, are most concerned with the affects of change on the future of the communities.

The idea that the experience of change in the communities is predominantly the concern of this relatively homogenous group is reinforced by the research findings of William Steffen. In 2004 Steffen produced a report and discussion document as part of his ongoing work for the Coworker Development Project of the Association of Camphill Communities in Britain and Ireland. The document was the result of his visits to 25 Camphill communities to research into issues of recruitment, retention and coworker lifestyles and expectations.

In this document Steffen highlights clearly the difference between the generations in Camphill. An appreciation of these differences can help us to better understand how different groups of people are reacting to the challenges currently facing Camphill communities.

He terms those people who came to Camphill between 1972-1985 as 'the current carrying generation' and describes how they differed from the pioneering generation in that '*they were working out of a blend of socialism, environmental concern and Anthroposophy'.* He suggests that these motivations perhaps diverted their energies away from innovation in curative education and social therapy and the dedication to inner work that had been so central to the previous generation.

Steffen then describes how this generation had reluctantly to cope with successive waves of statutory regulation and the increase in specialisation and administration. Now, many of these people are choosing a new direction for their lives – either within or outside Camphill – and many of those who are left '*find themselves under ever more intense pressure and responsibility. Some feel that they have to stay to ensure the community's continuity; some because they could not face the uncertainty, emotionally and materially.'* Steffen says that old age provision is an increasing concern and that many of these coworkers express feeling stuck and tired. '*The tiredness is often in relation to living with residents, and taking on of a never-ending stream of new, short-term coworkers. Tiredness is also often in relation to unresolved and seemingly insoluble human difficulties between senior coworkers which seem to paralyse at a deep level the ability of the community to move on creatively'.*

However, Steffen also says that '*this rather sober assessment should not detract from the fact that many coworkers of the generation continue to provide strong leadership, creativity, occasionally inspiration, openness to newcomers and in human relationships, and enthusiasm for the work and life that they are involved in'.*

Steffen calls the next generation 'The Gap Generation' in the sense that there is a gap in continuity and succession, marked by the relative lack of resident long-term coworkers in their late 20s, 30s and early 40s. '*The next generation',* he says, '*is not joining and not staying'.* And in view of what he calls their '*constitutionally different'* outlook and expectations, it is unlikely that this is going to change.

He asserts that this generation grew up under the influence of the 'Thatcher' years, in which self-interest and market principles replaced idealism, social(ist) principles and altruism. Volunteering is seen as a good career move to improve the individual's CV rather than as a way of expressing social ideals and working for social improvement. Here again, as previously, we find the idea that the 'Thatcher years' marked a kind of turning point in the socio-political history of Britain.

It is worth noting here that most coworkers in Camphill communities are not British. Therefore, in accepting what Steffen says here, the assumption has to be that Europe in general has experienced the same kind of social changes as are described here in relation to Britain.

On the basis of conversations in the communities, Steffen describes how this generation express their feelings about Camphill. They find in Camphill the same ethos of regulation, administration and professionalisation that they thought they had left behind.

They are disappointed with what they find in terms of the reality of how Anthroposophy and Camphill ideals are manifest in the communities in that the outlook has a tendency to be parochial, and there is very little time and space for a family life.

There is another group of coworkers, those who come for a year and less. These people are not necessarily expected to stay and take long-term responsibility for the communities and very few do so.
On the contrary, most, while enjoying the challenge of the experience and admiring the hard work and dedication of those who run the communities, express clearly that they would not consider returning in order to stay. Steffen has this to say about this group of coworkers; '*They do their allocated tasks in house, workshop and classroom willingly and well, but beyond that their own interests (video, internet, pub, parties and other socialising) are top of their agenda. Most show no interest in aspects of Camphill as a movement, in Anthroposophy, the religious services, talks, etc.*'

Steffen also identifies a more mature group of volunteers whose main focus appears to be the furtherance of their vocational or professional experience, and again are not seen as having much interest in the wider and deeper aspects of Camphill.

In terms of the Scottish context one would need to add the experiences of the students of the Bachelor of Arts course in Curative Education and Social Therapy (BACE) and explore how the communities perceive their contribution towards the future of the communities. It appears that many BACE students are taking on a high level of responsibility in the communities while participating in the course and that some have taken up employment in the communities after their graduation. It remains to be seen if enough graduates are going to stay in the communities in order to be the next generation of long-term coworkers.

Some of Steffen's findings (summarised in the report of a Coworker and Community Development retreat held in February 2005) that relate to the theme of 'changes in people' are listed below. While his research was conducted among the Camphill communities in England and Wales, this list would also apply to the Scottish communities.

- The number of unsalaried carrying coworkers is critically low and shrinking in all but a few communities. Their levels of responsibility and stress are rising. Most of them are in their 50s and 60s.
- Few communities have significant numbers of younger carrying coworkers committed to stay beyond a few years. There seems to be a generation shift in attitudes regards life-sharing, social ideals and unsalaried work in those currently in their 20s and 30s.
- These younger potential carrying coworkers who join the centres are faced with very different community landscapes in terms of social and spiritual creativity, vibrancy and pioneering spirit and regulatory constraints from those joining 20 or 30 years ago.

The fact that many of the people in Camphill communities who are in positions of overall responsibility are at roughly the same age and have been in the communities for roughly the same amount of time also serves to reinforce and amplify some trends.
It seems that many of these people are less stirred by the esoteric knowledge of Anthroposophy than when they first encountered it. Certainly there are less study groups, public lectures and conferences now than there were some years ago.

Some people have found new inspiration from other philosophical or spiritual sources; some from training courses and professional development, while others have perhaps become absorbed in the concerns of personal and community daily life.

In their book 'The Human Life' George and Gisela O'Neil describe the life situation of people in their thirties. This description, however, also describes the situation that some people of a later age experience as a phase in their personal life journey in the communities.

'As the thirties approach, the fever and fervor, the vigor and the fiery enthusiasm – all diminish. Dreams die down, relation to things spiritual grows pale……The wants and needs of life take on an increasing importance. Outer necessities begin to weigh on us. Time must be structured. Devotion to play rehearsals, ritualistic festivals, or those endless talk sessions called 'meetings', the singings, get-togethers, and conferences – their need all wanes. The limits of strength and time, non-existent before, make their appearance. We keep track of our hours. Commitments take on importance…… The process of 'sobering up' is gradual. The low point is reached……when health and vitality become a problem and illness and suffering take their toll. When exhaustion and inner numbness can set in. It is then we find our enthusiasm which shaped our little world of enterprise and responsibility is simply no longer there! A soul dampness has smothered the fires of youth. What joyfully carried us is gone. Idealism gives way to life-necessities'.

From all of this it does indeed appear that people have changed; both the people in the communities and the people joining the communities. These personal changes are obviously making themselves felt in the development of the communities.

3. External regulations

The third reason that has been put forward to explain these trends is the impact of external regulations. The widely-held assumption is that the requirements imposed by statutory regulatory authorities has been inimical to the development of the ethos and lifestyle of the communities

As a first step in exploring this assumption, I have gathered up various points of view about the impact of regulations that have been expressed in the communities.

People have said that the regulations have been introduced into the social care sector as a direct result of poor practice, neglect and abuse in mainstream provision.

The purpose of the regulations is therefore to make social care practitioners and providers accountable to the state for their actions and to limit the risks of any form of harm to people in care. In this more negative light the regulations are seen by the more sceptical as a way for people to 'cover their backs' and as a 'damage limitation exercise'. Therefore, it has been argued, these regulations are inappropriate for Camphill communities. It is argued that it is not possible to legislate for trust and mutuality, which are seen as the genuine basis for care in Camphill communities. Further, it is said that these regulations will actually serve to undermine such trust and mutuality and also the unique experience, knowledge and insight built up over many years in the Camphill communities.

It has also been argued that the regulations tend to over-institutionalise communities that seek to promote an atmosphere of homely and family-based support. Highly visible No-Smoking signs, Fire Exit signs and the like, locked bedroom doors and exit and entrance doors, dishwashers and televisions, fixed menus, and many other requirements have all been resisted – to varying degrees of success - as factors that work against this atmosphere.

The requirements for assessing, recording and reviewing the life of the residents has been seen as breaking down the relationships of mutuality between residents and coworkers and replacing them with more distant relationships of client and service provider.

Regulations and the paperwork that they bring with them, have been seen as creating an unnecessary extra burden on people who are then less able to spend time with the residents and building up a healthy community. Mainstream training for state qualifications has also been seen as introducing an alien and unhelpful culture into the communities and diverting energy and resources away from the promotion of the Camphill ethos and values.

Some people have also expressed the feeling that regulations serve to put undue pressure on the communities and create a constant state of wariness and anxiety about the next set of rules to be introduced; rules that always seem to leave the communities feeling wrong-footed and appearing defensive.

Needless to say, there are many views to the contrary. Some people assert that the regulations have introduced a new focus and energy into the work with vulnerable people that were sorely needed. I will be looking at these differing views a little later.

The question is to what extent is it true that the impact of the regulatory regime on the Camphill communities has been inimical to the communal ethos of the communities? This is a subject that brings to light very marked differences of outlook. These differences seem to depend on both the role of the community and the role of the individual. At the risk of being controversial, I present several hypotheses.

It seems to me that, in general, the communities in Scotland working with children and curative education have generally been more open to the challenge of regulations and inspections than those working with adults and social therapy.

Further, that those people directly interfacing with the regulatory authorities have been more open to regulations than those people not directly engaged at this boundary.

It also appears that, generally speaking, older people who have been the longest in the communities have more concerns over these issues than younger and newer people.

Finally, it seems that people who have joined the communities from a background of previous experience in social care work tend to be more in accordance with the purpose and necessity of regulations than those who have only previously worked in Camphill communities or those who come from other backgrounds not associated with social care.

The difference in how people view the work of the regulatory authorities also reflects what may be a fundamental difference in the reasons why people join a Camphill community and what they think is the mission and the core values of the communities.

If we turn again to those people who joined Camphill in the 1970s and 1980s, it might be true to say that their motivation was partly out of a life commitment to what was seen to be an alternative movement. At that time it was easier to see that Camphill was a movement that actively promoted a culture that was separate from the mainstream. The emphasis was on living in community, overcoming egoism, engaging in valuable work to help disadvantaged people, creating a warm and supportive home life, working on the land and producing traditional handmade crafts. Hard work, mutually supportive relationships, the communal celebration of life in community and an interest in, and commitment to, Anthroposophy offered a fascinating, inspiring and purposeful alternative to what was seen as a world of competition, conflict, consumerism, materialism and self-centredness. This wave of people were generally well educated, broad-minded and predominantly middle-class. They joined Camphill as a lifestyle choice and not as a job or a career opportunity. In fact, in joining, they willingly and consciously put all thought of a career, of financial security, even of a private life, to one side.

However, over the years, and especially since the 1990s, the communities were challenged by the requirements of an increasingly regulated care regime, and by the concomitant increase in administration. These individuals who had been motivated to join Camphill by counter-cultural idealism now had to integrate just those elements of state control that they had sought so hard to avoid. In response to this dilemma, individuals have had to work out their own levels of acceptance, compromise and resistance.

The motivations of people who have joined Camphill since, are obviously different, and therefore their reactions to the regulatory changes are also different. As Steffen remarked, the 'landscape' of the communities has changed.

They are currently far less obviously practising an alternative lifestyle. The Camphill approach to the issue of the dignity and worth of people with disabilities has been integrated into mainstream values many years ago. The response of society and the state to these people has moved away from residential care in communities and towards integration into the local community. Other communities and organisations now offer a far more radical approach to questions of spirituality, the environment and living in community than Camphill does.

And it seems that some people who join Camphill now, especially as an employed member of staff, see Camphill as being primarily a care provision and therefore expect the emphasis to be on professional social care.

There seems to be a difference in attitude among community members about whether the central focus of the work of the communities should be community-building or social care; whether community is a task or a setting.

On the one hand there is the view that the communities, while primarily centred on the needs of those in care, are also centres for spiritual, cultural and social renewal and for the development of all the community members. Proponents of this view hold that it is through creating a healthy and balanced community life that includes spiritual, cultural and social aspects and seeks to promote the well-being and fulfilment of every individual member, that the needs of the residents are best met.

The funding that the communities receive should be used to develop the entire life of the communities so that they can create a fulfilling and purposeful social setting, in which the residents can partake in and benefit from, to the same extent as other community members.

This view could be said to be that Camphill communities attempt to build community *with* the vulnerable people in their care.

On the other hand is the view that communities have only one main task, and that is to provide the best possible care for the pupils and adults who are in their care. This core task should come before all others.

This view would assert that an over-emphasis on issues, concerns, activities and needs that do not relate directly to the needs of those receiving care only serve to distract from the primary task of providing the best possible care and support for the residents. The work of the community is only made possible by the money that is received through caring for vulnerable people. As the communities receive state funding, they are accountable to the state for how the money is used and are bound to accept all the regulations that go with it. The focus should remain firmly on the residents, without whom the communities would not be able to continue.

This is the view that the communities are *for* the children and adults with learning disabilities.

The difference is one of emphasis. It is clear that the two tasks of community-building and social care go hand-in-hand; the one enhances the other. The two together create the identity of a Camphill community.

While the views above portray stark extremes, and while some individuals or communities may tend to agree with one point of view more than another, in reality, there is a wide spectrum of views held by individuals and communities across the Scottish region; views that continue to evolve and become more sophisticated over the years.

The characteristic feature of Camphill communities, of curative education and social therapy, has always been, and continues to be, the fact that they are holistic environments and holistic pedagogic and therapeutic disciplines. This means that the communities encompass all aspects of the life of the residents, including the creation of a community setting. Neither a community setting without the residents nor care provision that is not in a community could be a Camphill community.

In order to better assess the relative impact of regulations on Camphill communities I spoke to a cross-section of those people who are actively involved in integrating the regulatory regime into the communities. It became clear that all of these people consider that the communities have no choice but to change if they are to remain viable. All of them also agreed that the changes that have been brought into the communities on hand of regulatory expectations and requirements have, without doubt, been to the benefit of the residents in that they have introduced a more healthy balance between the needs of the community as a whole and the needs of the individual resident.

Most of them also asserted that the degree of the change – towards fostering the individual needs of each resident - would not have occurred when it did without such external intervention. In the light of this, legislative intervention is seen as the prime mover in shaping innovations in the social care practice of the Camphill communities.

There is another aspect to this question. It is clear by now that the communities have been through a process of rapid and far-reaching change. It is also clear that, as part of this, and at the same time, the impact of the regulations began to be felt in the communities. But it cannot be inferred from this that regulations have been the cause of all the major changes in Camphill communities.

The Inspectors, Contract Compliance Officers, regulators and enforcers have not demanded that members of the communities become more individualistic in their outlook and attitudes. They have not insisted that community members change their voluntary status or required that the communities employ people for key posts within the communities. While the regulators have required a radical overhaul of the management structures and social care practice in the communities, they have not required that the communities cease to celebrate Bible Evenings or Sunday Services or that they cancel Anthroposophical study groups. And at the same time as the debate about Care in the Community as against 'care in a community' is still ongoing, placing authorities continue to send children and adults with a variety of disabilities and disturbances to Camphill communities in the knowledge that no other kind of provision is able to meet their needs.

It does not seem to be realistic to suggest that the regulatory authorities alone have wrought such a great degree of change in the communities in Scotland over the last 15 years. Other factors, as we have seen, have also been at work.

TRENDS: SOME CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

It seems that the trends of change in the communities are due to the interplay of three inseparable forces working simultaneously. If one accepts that the trends that I have identified in the communities have been caused by three factors; change in society, change in the community members and the changes brought about in by state regulation, it become impossible to say that one factor alone instigated the change.

All that can be said is that change, a constant presence in all communities at all times, has accelerated and intensified since the 1990s due to the simultaneous interplay of three related factors. Change in, for example, the attitude of the community members and their relation to the wider society was reinforced and amplified by changes in society. Further processes of change were instigated by the fact that the all care provisions increasingly came under the scrutiny of the state in a way that had not been seen before. Changes in regulations led to more pronounced change in the already changing attitude of the community members and so on.

Change in one area disturbs the other areas. This then becomes a chain reaction or 'feedback loop' in which the disturbance is amplified as it is felt in each area and creates a higher degree of change as it circulates throughout the system. One could then say that the trends at work in the communities are the result, not of one cause or another, but of the simultaneous convergence of three complex and inter-related forces of social change acting in a self-referring feedback loop. Self-referring in that all the change that has been integrated in Camphill communities, while necessarily expanding the concepts of both Camphill and community, nonetheless are integrated with reference to the ethos and identity of Camphill communities.

Although it is a live issue in the Scottish region in 2008 as to how far a community can depart from the traditional model without losing its Camphill name, nonetheless no community has yet ceased to consider itself as anything but a Camphill community, despite the level of change that it has taken on board. It could be said that the response of the communities so far has been one of resilience, and adaptability and a marked degree of boundary flexibility.

I have set out the reasons that community members have put forward as explanations for the trends in the changes in the communities. However, there is another explanation that was not suggested. This is the idea that there are innate laws or patterns of development that pertain to individuals, to society, to organisations and to communities. In all of these cases development tends to go through three phases; from the group, to the individual and finally to a new form of community.

An essential element of these theories of development is that the transition between developmental phases can be times of crisis, uncertainty and doubt. As the individual, the society, the organisation or the community approaches the end of one stage, pressure builds up for change and change becomes more rapid.

In the light of this, the trends and changes that I have been outlining, and the speed and scale of change, are symptoms of the fact that the communities are in a transitional stage between development phases. The concepts of developmental phases and transitions will be major themes throughout all that follows.

CHAPTER 2: CHANGE - RESISTANCE AND INTEGRATION

Having looked at the many changes affecting the Camphill communities over the recent years, and having attempted to identify inherent trends at work in those changes, it is now possible to move on to consider the different types of change and the differing responses to change.

TYPES OF CHANGE

From all that has been considered so far in relation to the forces of change at work in the Camphill communities, it has become clear that there are different types of change.

Some changes just seem to happen without anybody even being aware of how or why the change began to be felt. These are gradual changes that accumulate over time until people can then realise that indeed, things are now different from how they were previously. There are some examples of these types of change among the list of trends identified at the beginning of this work. For example, without anybody deciding it, there are less cultural activities and those that do take place are less well attended than previously. Community members have become more individualistic and have more choice about what they do and how they do it. In adult communities, the population has become older. These changes occur naturally and seem to have a life of their own.

Similarly, other changes have been assimilated from outside the communities as the boundaries became more diffuse. The world has changed; society has changed, people have changed and the communities have changed as a consequence. There is more technology and mechanisation in the communities than previously; more televisions and computers, more office work, more bureaucracy and, some would say, more pressure and more stress. These changes are also not ones that the communities have chosen or decided upon; they have come in from 'outside' and are the signs of the times that we live in.

In contrast, there are those changes that have been imposed on the communities. The most obvious example of these is the changes that have had to be implemented on the hand of the requirements of external regulatory authorities.

Finally, other changes have been decided and implemented by the communities. Obviously these are related to, and perhaps even in response to, the other changes that have been at work. Nonetheless, the communities make conscious decisions to implement changes. Examples of this type of change would be decisions to build a new house, a hall or school buildings. Other examples are the decisions to pay coworkers pensions, to employ house co-ordinators, to design a Camphill degree course, to form Camphill Scotland.

Just as there are different types of change, so there are different types of responses to these changes. Further, it can be seen that these responses also change over time

RESPONSES TO CHANGE

Many commentators on organisational development suggest that there is an instinctive resistance to change, and indeed, an observer might be forgiven for thinking that the default mode of the Camphill communities is to resist change from external sources.

It is certainly the case that changes whose source lies beyond the boundaries of the community are usually seen as being detrimental to the life and culture of the communities and are met with either ambivalence of with resistance. However, in many cases, once the change has been implemented, the response is modified.

The changes brought about by the increase in technology, professionalisation and employment in particular were generally resisted when they first made themselves felt. Only later were they reluctantly accepted, and now they are viewed as being integral to both the development and the ongoing viability and sustainability of the communities.

When fax machines and computers were developed, it was said in some quarters that they should not be allowed to be introduced into Camphill Communities. It was argued that electronic technology is intrinsically harmful, both in terms of the electronic influences that they emitted and the fact that they were seen to be inimical to the spiritual development of the human being. Now electronic devices are a normal part of everyday life in the communities.

Not so long ago the sentiment was expressed that employing staff in core positions was going to be the end of Camphill. Now most communities in Scotland would not be able to continue without the input of their employees.

Regulations were first viewed as inimical to the culture of the communities and resisted accordingly. Now they are seen – admittedly not by all – as a necessary stimulus for an increasing consciousness and professionalisation of the core task of the communities and welcomed as safeguarding and promoting the needs and development of the individual resident living in a community context.

In contrast, however, there are other changes that are also viewed with ambivalence. While initially welcomed, it is also recognised that these changes contain within them the possibility that their results and impact might not be beneficial after all.

'Choice' and 'rights' are words that usually have positive connotations. However, in a community context, the exercise of too much personal choice and too many demands for personal rights - on hand of both residents and coworkers - can be viewed negatively as factors that undermine community cohesiveness. In order for a community to remain a community, choices have to be made with the acceptance of the limitations of a communal setting and rights have to be tempered by responsibilities.

Another example of the ambivalence of value judgements of words is 'money'. In nearly all situations and cultures, access to more money is regarded only as a positive development.

However, there is a sentiment that has been expressed over the years that there is a price to pay (as it were) for having more money than previously. That price is seen to be that the communities have become too 'comfortable' and 'bourgeois'. The implication is that Camphill is meant to be a movement of dedication, service, and sharing and that the cutting edge has been blunted by a certain sense of affluence. There is no longer a need to engage with the other community member about their needs if there are sufficient resources to fulfil all needs. People can decide on their lifestyle and their relation to the community without financial constraints. My research project cites some community members who suggest that the increase in personal choice and the finances to make these choices possible has led to a decrease in the experience of community.

In this sense, the increase in choices and the access to more money - both usually regarded as positive changes - can be seen as having negative results. Here we meet the concept of a 'Trojan Horse'. This is the idea that something new might carry within it an unseen and unrecognised danger. A new development might promise improvement, and even be introduced into a community with the assurance that things will somehow get better as a result. Later it will be seen that it carried within it an element that served to undermine something of value and significance to the community ethos.

The ambivalence in the attitudes towards change comes from the recognition that change is inevitable but that it can have both positive and negative consequences.

Change is not value-free. It is seen by some as positive and by others as negative; the difference being whether it is perceived as an opportunity or a threat. It might be said that a healthy and confident community responds to change in a different way than a community that is insecure or under extreme pressure.

The healthy community recognises that change is an integral part of development and is open, responsive and pro-active in adapting to and integrating change. The community that is struggling to cope with excessive demands is more likely to seek to either avoid or resist change.

Csikszentmihalyi, in his book 'Flow – the psychology of happiness', takes this further and goes some way to explain why people react to change in different ways. He says that our response to change depends on our sense of ourselves in terms of identity, coherence and confidence. Identity in the sense of being in a community of meaning and purpose with a shared ethos, shared intentions, a tradition and a belief system. Coherence means our ability to understand, to make sense of and to manage change. Confidence is based on a past ability to integrate change.

He says that the optimal experience is when there is a conscious effort to master challenges and when change improves practice. Once this has been accomplished, positive feedback reinforces our ability and willingness to integrate further change.

This is termed an autotelic experience, enjoyed by those people who actively engage with challenge and change; who transform the opportunities in their environment rather than resigning themselves to live within constraints which they feel cannot be altered. In this sense, people create their own environment by their attitude, interest and will to develop and to make life more complex. This leads to a perfection of skills and a heightened sense of awareness and engagement; of freedom and creativity.

However, the idea that acceptance of change can be a positive and transformative experience should not lead to the belief that resistance to change is therefore something necessarily negative.

In the Ways to Quality Course Udo Herrmannstorfer highlights the positive element in resistance. He accepts that some resistance arises from fear of change to the status quo, which has been built up and achieved through sacrifice and determination. But he also asserts that some resistance is healthy and beneficial. While the delay caused by resistance might seem frustrating and unnecessary to the innovators, it actually serves to bring an element of consciousness and reflection into the picture. In this way it serves as a balance to proposals that might have been developed in an unhealthy atmosphere of urgency and illusion and not thoroughly thought out and worked through. Through healthy resistance, idealism is tempered with reality. But he goes on to say that once the initiative for change has been strengthened and invigorated by the process of reflection and consciousness, then the forces of resistance should give way. In other words, the process of resistance should not be allowed to lead to a negative 'blocking'.

Herrmannstorfer developed this idea of 'healthy resistance' to throw light upon the process of an individual bringing forward an initiative within the context of his or her community. Yet the concept is equally valid when considering proposals or requirements for change from beyond the community's boundaries.

In this context Camphill Scotland operates at the boundary of Camphill, and its task is to seek to modify and resist change that is seen as either counter-productive or posing a threat to the ethos and culture of the communities. The other aspect of the dual role of Camphill Scotland is to prepare and support the communities in integrating unavoidable or beneficial change. The term for this is 'controlled acculturation'. This implies the gradual assimilation of external change into the community. In this sense Camphill Scotland has a crucial role in building up the confidence of the communities in the manner highlighted by Csikszentmihalyi.

It can be seen that the differing responses to change - either resistance or acceptance - depends on the nature of the community in question and also on the nature and source of the change.
In most situations, change from an external source will be perceived as a threat to the distinctive ethos of the Camphill communities.
The reaction is then is to resist and to be defensive in order to protect the culture of the communities. Any external change is only integrated into the community after it has been made 'safe' or when the community feels safe. By this I mean only after the proposed change has been modified so as to reduce its impact, or only after the community has developed a sufficient degree of confidence that it can integrate the change without any serious threat. This process is an active and ongoing one. Despite the fact that it might seem that the Camphill communities have tended to resist external pressure to change, in reality they have actually assimilated a great deal of change, most noticeably over the last decade or two.

THEORIES OF CHANGE

A brief consideration of various theories of change can help in the process of understanding the significance of change and the differing responses to change.

The first theory of change for consideration is that of Hegel's theory of dialectical change. This is based on the idea that conflict between two belief systems produces tension. If this tension between incompatible forces increases over time, there will be a collision. This collision leads to a sudden leap forward, which creates a new set of forces on a higher level of development. Thus, conflict between opposing ideas produces a new order and new concepts that provide the basis for social change.

I am not suggesting that the dynamic between the culture of Camphill communities and the regulatory care culture, or that of Camphill communities and society as a whole, is of the nature of dialectic struggle along the lines of the above. However, the idea that accumulating tension between ideologies will eventually lead to dramatic change onto a new and higher level has some merit. That is as long as it is not thought that the new level represents a capitulation of one ideology in the face of another. Rather it is a process of a thesis - a force or an idea - meeting the resistance of another idea - an antithesis; a counterforce. The result is that the two, the thesis and the antithesis, are eventually integrated onto a higher level - in a synthesis or a resolution. The result should then be a wiser and more highly developed social organism, which has reconciled two common truths.

Another way of understanding the phenomenon of change is in terms of 'cyclical progress', as described by Ken Wilber. This is the idea that a system – such as an intentional community – develops within certain parameters that belong to that level of its development. However, over time the system begins to run up against the limitations of that level and breaks through to a new and higher level of existence. As the system hits against its inherent limitations the pressure of change builds up at the transition point between the present level of development and the next level. In this sense the various changes that are making their effects felt in the communities can be seen as a sign that the communities are poised to shift to a new level of development.

In his book 'The Hidden Connections' Fritof Capra develops this idea further. First he asserts that all living systems exhibit the same patterns of organisation and development. Systems in nature are repeated in the social domain. Therefore the findings of science will apply to the study of society. There is a kind of 'evolutionary economy' whereby evolution uses the same basic patterns no matter on which level. This is a reflection of many other philosophies and theories that find higher patterns of order working through all levels of the created world.

However, Capra says that human social life is distinct from other natural systems in that it has an added level of 'meaning' - such as communication, symbolic language and culture - and that therefore additional interpretative methods such as anthropology, social theory and philosophy are needed to interpret this 'meaning'.

He resists all the current organisational theories based on the mechanistic systems model and instead says that human organisations are living systems that naturally and continually change and re-create themselves. Hence I include intentional communities in here. Although Capra uses the term 'organisation' he makes it clear that these theories relate to all social groupings. Thus, for my purposes, 'organisation' becomes interchangeable with 'community'.

His model is that small changes in the external environment begin to accumulate through the informal human network of the organisation until they reach a state of instability; a kind of tipping point. The existing order can no longer integrate all this new 'information' and enters a state of uncertainty, confusion and doubt. The organisation is forced by change to abandon its structures, behaviour or beliefs. As a result it either breaks down or breaks through.

The breakthrough leads to the organisation emerging onto a new level, organised around the new meaning. This process is termed 'emergence'. As this process of breakthrough and emergence occurs, the organism learns and becomes 'wiser'.

Another model of change is found in the work of Margaret Wheatley, in her book 'Leadership and the New Science'. Wheatley says that her readings in biology, evolution, chaos theory and quantum physics gave her a whole new way of looking at organisational management.

Like Capra, she says that the time has come to change the way in which we understand organisations. Rather than seeing their workings through the frame of the materialistic and mechanistic Newtonian model, we should now see organisations in terms of patterns and webs of connections that are found in the natural world; patterns that are revealed by the new sciences. The New Science, she says, show '*inherent orderliness of the universe, of creative processes and dynamic, continuous change that still maintains order......a world where change and constant creation are ways of sustaining order and capacity*'.

She says that '*our concept of organisations is moving away from the mechanistic creations that flourished in the age of bureaucracy. We now speak in earnest of more fluid, organic structures, of boundaryless and seamless organisations*'.

Wheatley has no time for the dialectical oppositions of Hegel and Marx and talk of polarities and irresistible forces. Rather she sees change taking place locally and incrementally. Every small, local part is connected to the whole. Therefore when there is a series of incremental changes occurring in one locality the effect becomes 'global'; not through the idea of critical mass or tipping point, but through the web of inter-related connections. Where Capra asserts that the organisation facing cumulative change either breaks down or breaks through, Wheatley says that it simply re-organises itself.

Wheatley here points to the paradox that a total system achieves stability through supporting change within itself. In her model there is no central command system that tries to stamp out fluctuations. She argues that in organisations that attempt to do this, the pressure to change accumulates, threatening the stability of that organisation. In contrast, her model is of a fluid organisation that absorbs incremental change as an ongoing process, and thus avoids becoming destabilised.

She describes the interesting concept of 'self reference'. This means that an organism, or in our case, an organisation or community, changes in such a way that it remains consistent with itself. In allowing for change, it will use a path into the future that it believes is congruent with what it has been in the past. To use Wheatley's words, '*when an organisation knows who it is, what its strengths are and what it is trying to accomplish, it can respond intelligently to change from its environment. Whatever it decides to do is determined by this clear sense of self, not just because a new trend or market has appeared…The presence of a clear identity makes the organisation less vulnerable to its environment. It develops greater freedom to decide how it will respond*'. This model, taken from the findings of the new sciences, shows how a whole organism (either natural or social) with a strong sense of identity, allows for a high level of autonomy and change in its individual parts without it threatening the stability of the whole organism. All actions of the small and local 'areas' are connected to the whole and are made with reference to the identity of the whole. '*In organisations, if people are free to make their own decisions, guided by a clear organisational identity for them to reference, the whole system develops greater coherence and strength. The organisation is less controlling, but more orderly*'.

I have quoted Wheatley at length, simply because I consider her model and the concept of 'self reference', to be very useful ways of looking at change in Camphill communities and in Camphill as a whole.

CONCLUSION

Although there are major differences in these models, there are also similarities. Hegel, Wilber and Capra all show how change causes disturbance to a system, and thereby threatens its stability. Whether through a collision, or through an ongoing process that gathers momentum, the system becomes unstable to the point where the need for a resolution increases, and the amount of change can no longer be contained in the existing culture and forms. This is a time of transition until the system either reorganises itself or emerges onto a new and higher level of development.

During the time of transition nothing is certain any more except that things can no longer continue indefinitely as they have been in the past. It is not a comfortable time to live through. However, the ability to live through such a transition time is heightened by an understanding of models of change that explain the innate laws of development in nature and society. These models make it clear that transition is followed by emergence.

However, it is a question if the process of change in the Camphill communities is really so momentous and creates a sense of such instability as some of these theories might suggest. In my experience, the Camphill communities value stability and conformity. Generally speaking, people seem to be wary of change, unless it very obviously comes from within the boundaries of the culture, or unless it accords very closely with the values of the culture. As a result change is integrated rather slowly and over a long period of time and thus does not build up sufficient pressure to de-stabilise the communities. One could say that proposals for change are processed at length in Camphill communities. They are discussed interminably at meetings, conferences, workshops, Councils and committees. And this process continues until the change is made safe enough to be accepted, or the communities are made to feel safe in accepting it.

In this sense it is not so much an accumulation of pressure that is going to lead to 'breakdown' or 'breakthrough', but rather a slow assimilation of and adaptation to change, much as Wheatley has suggested. Thus the endless amount of time and discussion spent on considering proposals for change can be seen to act as a kind of 'pressure valve', preventing the change from critically destabilising the communities and, instead, creating a climate of confidence in which they can be assimilated.

What is clear is that incremental and local changes are integrated into the communities. Over time they accumulate into large-scale trends that will eventually lead the community to enter a new stage of development, different in many respects from what was there before. In the process the community emerges onto a new and more advanced level of development.

CHAPTER 3: MODELS AND THEORIES OF DEVELOPMENT

In this chapter I will be looking again at developmental trends, but now from a wider and longer perspective. I will be looking for more universal and general archetypal patterns that might throw light onto the smaller scale trends that have been be highlighted so far in this work. I will also be exploring the concept of 'progress'

I have not yet attached any value judgements to the processes of change that have been identified. There has not been any implication that things have got better or have got worse. It is a significant step to move from this objectivity to begin to ponder the relative value of change. One can begin by asking if the Camphill communities have somehow *improved* themselves; have they got better over time? On a larger scale this is the same as saying '*is development intrinsically good*'? Or to phrase it differently, '*is all change progress*?' There are also questions as to what the terms 'improvement', 'better' and 'progress' mean.
It is not realistic to expect to arrive at any conclusions about this. The answer is going to vary from person to person. One can only hope to gain insights from different perspectives and then try to come to personal conclusions.

But what is important here is that people find meaning in the present through their understanding of the past and their beliefs about the future. There are many different ways of perceiving and finding meaning in change and development, and this is done through seeing events and processes in a longer context. The understanding that we then come to informs our actions, defines our attitudes and responses and determines how we live out our life.
An individual's belief in the overall direction of change and development determines how that person engages with, and responds to, change.

How do people view the overall development of history, of civilisation, of community development?
Most people would say that in, regard to the overall development of the human race and civilisation, that things have improved - even though we have not defined what those 'things' are. There seems to be some consensus that overall, the development of the human race follows a course of progress; that things get better over time; that evolution progresses onwards and upwards.
This is termed the teleological view of history – the belief in a purpose; that human beings and society as a whole becomes more just, prosperous, knowledgeable and harmonious over time.
Yet when it comes to make a judgement on whether things have improved or not within our own lifetime, we get a different picture. It seems from experience that older people are more likely to say that things were better in the past and that younger people are more likely to say that the best is yet to come. People in Camphill are no exception to this. Older members of the communities have expressed that there is a fundamental difference between those people who lived in Camphill during its earlier days - between those who have had a personal experience of Dr.Konig and those who have not. There is an implication that this personal life-changing encounter with Dr.Konig, or with others of the founder members, defines what it means to have lived in the 'glory days' of Camphill. In those days people worked harder, studied harder and lived closer together. They benefited from living in the company of inspired and gifted leaders. There was less money, more challenges. Life was harder but more glorious.
To these people it seems that nowadays we have too much money and material comforts and people seem less interested in upholding the traditional ethos and spiritual values of Camphill.

Things may look differently from the perspective of a younger person, living in a later stage of community development. This person has very different expectations of what community life should be like and of the balance between the community and the individual. He or she might have quite different views about the rigours and sacrifices of the early days; of the authoritarian power structures, the limited opportunities for personal space, time and choice.

This is borne out by the results of my research findings. People who have been longest in Camphill communities report that their experience of community is declining whereas people who have come to the communities more recently say that it is improving.

We have to recognise that the concept of progress is a personal, ideological and cultural construct. In other words you see and belief what you want to see and belief, according to your belief system and worldview. You see things as conforming to, and confirming your previously held beliefs and modify your beliefs to integrate new observations. And these beliefs are, to the extent that they are consciously formulated, based on assimilating the ideas and theories of other people and integrating these with what one can learn from reflecting on one's personal experiences of life. The positive outcome of such integration is a sense of coherence; the feeling that life makes sense.

Although we might differ on how we understand life, we need to believe that it somehow has a meaning and purpose, and in turn that the changes we experience also have meaning and significance. We attribute value to change - be it positive or negative – according to our worldview and out of our need to find a meaningful pattern in the events and changes in our environment.

DEVELOPMENTAL TRAJECTORIES

Below I have outlined a series of simple models of developmental paths, or trajectories.

Linear vs. Spiral

Some of these models illustrate a downward, declining, path and some an upward, progressive, path. This is quite straightforward. However, I have introduced a new element, and that is the *pattern* of the upward or downward trajectory. I have differentiated between a trajectory that is direct and linear and one that is cyclical; that repeats itself in upward or downward spirals. This will hopefully become clearer as the models are explained.

Model 1: linear constant

In this model, nothing changes except time itself. Things neither get better nor worse; they just are the way they are and remain that way. Imagine a graph whose left-hand vertical scale marks out the grades of increasing 'progress' from the bottom to the top. The lower horizontal scale measures out the passage of time from left to right. On this graph, this model is represented by a straight line, starting from an arbitrary point on the left scale and going to the right.

Here we have the notion that what we call historical development is nothing more than a series of change that have no intrinsic value in relation to 'better' or 'worse'.

This is the thinking of the Postmodern school of thought, as exemplified by the school of 'Neoevolutionism' which says that the idea of progress – the idea that things improve over time - is no more than a cultural construct. In other words progress is a series of complex ideas and words that have no objective reality. The concept of progress depends entirely on who is using it and each observer attributes their own value. The objective terms 'order' and 'progress' have no validity. There is order, there is also chaos, but nobody can say that there is a purpose. Therefore the concept of change as progress is invalid. According to this school of thought we cannot talk about either development or progress, only change over time.

Some anthropologists of the early 20th century also reject the notion of stages of progressive evolution. They assert that contemporary 'primitive' societies are just as evolved as so-called civilised societies; they are just as peaceful and equitable and healthier and more in harmony with their environment than modern societies. On this basis they also reject the notion of progressive evolution.

Model 2: Cyclical constant

This model differs from the previous one in that things change over time in recognisable stages of increasing complexity. What is new in this more dynamic model is the concept of *cyclical change*. Things do not stay the same. As time passes new skills and knowledge are acquired; new inventions and discoveries and more advanced technology propel humanity forward.

An example of this in terms of agriculture is the mechanical progression from the hoe, to the plough, to the tractor. A similar progression is the one from organic manure and compost and crop rotation to the use of chemical fertilisers, herbicides and pesticides and crop monoculture. Although these might represent progress in terms of the technology and science, it is not necessarily progress in terms of environmental protection and sustainable land use. The positive aspect of technology is marked by the negative use that is made of it. Other examples include the development of the internet and the worldwide web, which represent enormous technical developments in terms of communication and global information, and have the potential to create a world wide community of information. Yet the most common use of both is apparently for pornography and crime.

The basic tenet of this model is that there are recognisable 'leaps' in progress in terms of technology, information and knowledge but this is countered by the use made of them. Overall things neither improve not get worse. Societies do indeed evolve and change. But some things remain constant – greed, the misuse of power, war, poverty, inequality, oppression and so on. There have always been diseases; but as soon we develop the medicines to cure one, another one emerges. We no longer suffer from bubonic plague and leprosy but instead we now have AIDS, MRSA and cancer. No matter how much we develop we stay the same. Humanity develops in cycles of ever-increasing complexity, knowledge and expertise, but this cannot be called progress.

On our graph, this model is similar to the one above; it is a line going from left to right, starting from an arbitrary point on the left scale. The difference is that the line is no longer straight, but is made up of a series of loops, or spirals.

Model 3: Linear Dissipation

This could be called 'The Big Bang' model, based on the idea that after the Big Bang, energy dissipated, slowed down and cooled off, materialised, and eventually became solid matter. Matter continues to decay, losing energy as it does so. This is a descending trajectory in which velocity decreases and energy dissipates. This is a model of entrophy; a mechanistic concept that asserts that all closed systems eventually come to a standstill. Applied to conditions of group life, the theory of entrophy says that groups tend to fall apart unless they are actively held together constantly through one mechanism or another.

This model is the same as the images of 'The Invisible Hand of God' and 'the Clockmaker' of the Renaissance times. God created the world and then stood back. A divine horologist created a wonderfully intricate and complex clock; he wound it up and then left the workshop.

Once the clock is wound up it ticks away from then on, losing energy as time takes it away from its original impetus.

Here we also have the imagery of 'The Fall' of humankind. Adam and Eve had been living a life of peace and harmony in the Garden of Eden; free of care and trouble. Then Evil entered the Garden in the guise of the snake. Eve succumbed to the temptation of Satan and subsequently both Adam and Eve were banished from Eden and were cast down to Earth.

Here they are separated from God, ashamed of their nakedness and have to work for their living.

This is a common theme in much of the literature about communities. Many authors assert that in earlier times, people lived in peace and harmony both with nature and each other. They lived in extended families and tribes, characterised by a strong sense of belonging and by mutual support. It is as if early people lived in a kind of earthly Paradise. These authors go on to say that we now live in 'Fallen' times. Modern society is characterised by competition and conflict between individuals, groups and countries; by social isolation and ecological destruction. The argument is that, faced with the modern breakdown of societal solidarity, we must re-learn the values of community from the example of early societies.

This outlook, that regrets a lost past, is not a recent phenomenon. There was an earlier worldview of civilisation in a state of decline; a decline from Ancient Greece, to Ancient Rome to Middle Ages, and it was the worldview that was prevalent throughout Europe prior to the 18th century. It can be traced back to the 8th century BC when the poet Hesiod portrayed human history as having unfolded through four ages. First there was the Golden Age, when men lived happily with nature and with each other. Then came the Silver Age, when men rebelled against the gods, who in turn destroyed many of them. Then came the Bronze Age when men turned on each other to kill and wage war. In this time some exceptional men showed such nobility in battle that it was also termed the Heroic Age.

But then came the worst time of all, the Iron Age, in which there was no redeeming heroism, only a fall into the worst side of human nature; greed, lust, meanness and selfishness. Hesiod portrayed these ages as a successive fall from God and wholeness to separateness and the realm of man's lower nature.

If this model is applied to spiritual, cultural and social initiatives, it can be imagined that originally there was a formative idea – which came from a higher realm of inspiration. As time goes on and the expression of this impulse becomes more 'grounded' in its physical manifestation, it begins to lose energy and vitality and its ability to move people. It could be said that the further that ideas and inspiration travel from their creative source, the more they dissipate.

The extreme form of this model could be said to be dystopia – the opposite of utopia. It is an imaginary world where everything is as bad as it can be. Dystopia is a living hell of overpopulation, environmental degradation and destruction, nuclear disaster, and the war of all against all.

On a graph, this model would be represented by a straight diagonal line going from the top left side to the lower right side.

Model 4: Cyclical Dissipation

Felipe Fernandez-Armesto, in his book 'Millenium', refers to Oswald Spengler who wrote the book 'Decline of the West' during the course of the First World War. In place of the linear, progressive history charted by most other historians, Fernandez-Armesto asserts that Spengler proposed a model of '*tangled, downward spirals of senescence and decay for civilisations, which he conceived as analogous to living organisms'.*

This model posits that, although humanity seems to be developing positively – and there are many examples of advances in technology, science, medicines and so on, actually things are getting worse. It is not a simple case of a downward slope, but of a series of downward spirals.

Many aspects of the history of the West – for example the Industrial Revolution, the creation of overseas empires - appeared at the time to be signs of the onward march of civilisation. From our vantage point today it is easy to see the more negative and destructive aspects of these.

Cars, planes, central heating, and a whole host of other improvements each seemed to have heralded in new and better times. Now we know that pollution increasingly degrades our environment and CO_2 gases have reached terminally destructive levels in the atmosphere. There is talk now that we have reached, or even passed, a 'tipping point' in relation to global warming and that the process of environmental destruction is now irreversible.

The paradox of this model is that that things have never been better and never been worse. It could even be said that we have become better at making things worse. All our advances have hidden costs and now we are paying the price.

Another angle on this is a concept akin to the 'law of diminishing returns' applied in a cultural context. Tonnies, whose work became the foundation of 'neoevolutionism', which was briefly touched upon in the 'linear constant' model', states that social progress is actually regressive, in that the 'cost' of progressing to newer, more evolved societies results in the decreasing satisfaction of the individuals making up that society.

On a graph, the trajectory of this model would be represented by a series of loops beginning at the top left and travelling towards the lower right.

Model 5: Linear Progress
This is the orthodox and conventional model of evolution and history. Progress is always upwards, usually constant and uniform. This is the inexorable march of progress ever onwards to a better future. It could be called the Darwinian model in that things start out small, simple and lacking in consciousness and intelligence and evolve into increasingly higher and better forms. During the course of development, social groupings, of whatever scale, accumulate knowledge, skills and experience. Things that prove not to be useful are discarded, and things that convey advantage are integrated. Through a process of adaptation and cumulative 'wisdom' the community, group or society advances.

This way of thinking leads us to believe that the most recent manifestation is therefore the best. This model was especially popular and prevalent during the time of the Industrial Revolution, and later during the time of the great technological and scientific breakthroughs and inventions. It is the utopian belief that humanity was approaching the pinnacle of its development; was overcoming its reliance on the natural world and entering a 'brave new world' of a technical fix for all problems.

On a graph, this would be represented by a straight line beginning in the lower left-hand corner and rising evenly to the top right.

Model 6: Cyclical Progress
This is the idea that progress tends to move upwards and in cycles. It is best described by Ken Wilber, in his book 'A Brief History of Everything'. He says that '*every stage of evolution eventually runs into its own inherent limitations, and these may act as triggers for the self-transcending drive'.* In other words, an idea or situation, perhaps even a social grouping, works for so long and then there comes a point where it cannot usefully go any further. This results in chaos, which in turn either leads to dissolution or to an emergence onto a new and higher level. However, Wilber says that '*this new and higher order escapes the limitations of its predecessor, but then introduces its own limitations and problems that cannot be solved on its own level'.* Thus things move on in cycles of new beginnings that in turn have to give way to another start on a higher level.

But overall and over time, the impetus is upwards, to a more highly developed state of consciousness. In terms of social and group processes, the trajectory is upwards to a heightened awareness of how everything is interconnected; to an awareness of global issues and environmental responsibility.

This model gives hope to those who believe that we will be able to find a way out of our current problems. History shows us that we will continue to find answers to the mess we keep getting into. But these new answers will have to evolve from a higher level of insight and knowledge. As Einstein said, the problems that we face now cannot be solved by the same level of consciousness that created them.

We should not forget that each new solution carries new problems built into it.

On a graph, this model would be represented by a series of loops or spirals moving from the lower left to the upper right.

I have shown six models of developmental trajectories using the concepts of linear or cyclical progress or dissipation. I will now turn to two other models whose nature is both similar and yet also different from the previous ones. The novel element here is that these models allow for the processes of both progress and decline; and even for cycles of progress and decline over time.

Model 7: Descent and Ascent
This model also begins with the Fall from the Garden of Eden, which was a feature of the imagery of model 3. In the account written in Genesis there is no indication that Adam and Eve will ever be allowed to return to Paradise. This, then, appears to be the path of the Fall, of descent only. But in the Oberufer Paradise Play the Angel, as she expels them, utters words of promise; '*I will you both slowly recall'.* Here is an intimation that there will be a Path of Ascent, back to Paradise, back to Heaven.

It is, of course, the central message of New Testament Christianity that God sent his only Son, who redeemed humanity, and thereby allows the individual back to God, presumably at the point when we die.

The Spiritual Science of Rudolph Steiner makes it clear that this path of ascent is not only individual and does not only occur at death, but is the path of development for the whole of humanity and began at the point when Christ died on Golgotha. The human race fell from the world of the Spirit and gradually descended into a material and earthly existence. At the moment when humanity was most in danger of losing knowledge of the world of Spirit, Christ also descended into an earthly incarnation and died on the cross. From this point onwards, each individual and humanity as a whole, has the possibility to begin the path of ascent back to the world of Spirit.

This trajectory is more difficult to imagine represented on our graph. One would have to imagine a downward curve from the top left to the centre of the lower scale. This then becomes an upward curve from the centre of the lower scale to the top right corner.

Model 8: Cyclical Ascent and Descent
The model above can be expanded to include the idea of descent and ascent over recurring cycles of time. For example, a person incarnates, leads a life on earth and then dies and returns to the heights from whence he came. But a new concept is introduced, namely that the person is reborn again and again over successive reincarnations.

Model 9: Plant Metamorphosis
Finally, we can look at the imagery of plant metamorphosis, which revolves around the principle of progressive development through successive stages, which then lead to death and new life. Not only is this imagery similar to the principles inherent in both models 6 and 8, but it is also the model of development that seems to appear most in the story of Camphill.

In 1960 Dr. Konig wrote the following (as the opening words to 'The Three Pillars of Camphill' in the booklet 'The Camphill Movement'). '*Twenty-one years ago the seed of Camphill was sown. It grew and sprouted in several directions and gradually unfolded into the Camphill Movement. This Movement, being a living entity, can hardly be defined in a few words......it remains fluid, alive and progressive.'*

He used similar imagery in 1961, in the autobiographical essay, 'The Candle on the Hill: '*The experience of the first Advent Sunday thirty three years past* (which he had witnessed in the Sonnenhof childrens home in 1927) *was a seed; out of it a tree began to grow, the stem of which is rooted in Camphill, but its branches spread far and wide.'*

Again, there is a whole sequence of plant imagery in his essay of 1965 entitled 'The Three Essentials of Camphill'. Here is a small extract: '*The seed of Camphill had already grown into a small plant. Branches developed and attempted to sprout through their own strength. And one day a few buds began to appear on one or other twig of this tiny bush. They unfolded into flowers and radiated their beauty and scent into our hearts.'*

Anke Weihs developed the imagery further still in a booklet she wrote in 1978 called 'The History of the Camphill Community as from 1954'. She wrote the following: '*A tree can be a paradigm for the conception of a community – seeded in the Spirit, to grow and branch and blossom in a finite world through the stages of development inborn in living organisms: from the monomorphic through the ramose to the multifold, ultimately to be drawn up by the Spirit for a new seeding in the future.*'

This imagery is founded on the assumption that the Camphill Movement is a living impulse and a Camphill community is a living organism. They develop organically, following patterns of growth found in the world of the plants. It is interesting in that Anke's description mirrors the 'Fall and Rise' model of development. Implicit here is the idea that the impulse for community is born from the world of the Spirit and returns there once it completes its earthly manifestation, much like the life of the individual human being in this model.

Ken Wilber uses the same imagery of plant growth - of death leading to new life - to describe his idea that the Spirit seeks to unfold on earth over the course of human history. He says that at this time in our development, the *modern* worldview is struggling to give way to the *post modern*. '*Spirit has run up against its own limitations at this stage in its unfolding. This extraordinary modern flower blossomed in its glorious spring, and now can do nothing but watch its own dead leaves fall dead on the ground of a rising tomorrow. And what indeed will bloom in that new field?*'

Bernard Lievegoed also adopts the imagery of plant metamorphosis. He says that the development of an institution whose main task lies in the spiritual life is different than for groups that have a social or economic task. Institutions of the spiritual life follow a pattern of development from the initiative stage, which he calls the *'sprouting phase',* through the '*growth phase'* and culminate in the *'blossom phase.'*
One would expect a further stage of seed, but Lievegoed does not say this. Instead he say that the seed process occurs in the changed individual, rather than in the group. He says that the third phase is really a 'change of mentality' among the members of the group. '*This change is based on the dormant seeds of the Spirit Self being awakened in people'.*

Implicit in all of this is the concept that every living organism carries within itself the potential for renewed life after its own death, just as the plant, before it dies, sets the seed that in turn will become a new plant. The individual plant dies, but the archetypal and 'eternal' plant lives on through the resurrection of the seed in spring.
In this sense the 'eternal self' of the individual takes up a new life when born on earth and does not die when the physical body of the individual dies on earth. This is the Rosicrucian principle of 'to die and to become'; to die in one life, in one manifestation, in order to be reborn in another. The same could be said to apply to social organisms and communities.
In this sense, the impulse of Camphill did not 'begin' in 1940, nor will it end if the Camphill communities cease to exist. It is part of what is called a 'spiritual stream', a spiritual impulse brought down to earth with a specific intention and task. The physical manifestation of that impulse may come to an end, but the impulse begins again on earth with a new form.

This is what Rudolf Steiner spoke about in the series of lectures called 'From Symptom to Reality in Modern History'. He said that '*it is vitally important in the epoch of the Consciousness Soul that man should have a clear understanding of the forces of birth and death in their true sense; that is a knowledge of repeated lives on earth, in order to acquire an understanding for birth and death in the unfolding of history'*.

He says that '*the fundamental characteristic of the epoch of the Consciousness Soul is that, on the physical plane, we can only create if we are aware that everything we create is destined to perish*'.

In relation to the theme of the development of intentional communities in general and Camphill communities in particular, the model that I find most useful from those set out above, is that of 'Cyclical Progress'.

I have come across two theories of development that are closely related to this model. They are the theory of 'Spiral Dynamics' and 'The Law of Complexity/ Consciousness'.

Spiral Dynamics

This is a developmental theory first propounded by Professor Clare Graves and then developed and expanded by Don Beck and Chris Cowan,

In their book 'Spiral Dynamics' they set out a summary of Graves' thinking. It is interesting to apply what is said here to the development of communities.

1. *Human nature is not static, nor is it finite. Human nature changes as the conditions of existence change, thus forging new systems. Yet, the older systems stay with us.*
2. *When a new system or level is activated, we change our psychology and rules for living to adapt to these new conditions.*
3. *We live in a potentially open system of values with an infinite number of modes of living available to us. There is no final state to which we must all aspire.*
4. *An individual, a company, or an entire society can respond positively only to those managerial principles, motivational appeals, educational formulas, and legal or ethical codes that are appropriate to the current level of human existence.*

A Spiral cortex best depicts this emergence of human systems as they evolve through levels of increasing complexity. Each upward turn of the spiral marks the awakening of a more elaborate version on top of what already exists. The human Spiral, then, consists of a coiled string of value systems, world views, and mindsets, each the product of its times and conditions.

We can add to this the idea of Wilber that each level or system has its own limitations built into it. When the society, company or community eventually runs up against these limitations, there will be a time of crisis until the social organism - community in our case - emerges onto a new and higher level.

Eventually, the community will run up against the limitations of this new level and the process repeats itself. This, according to Wilber, is the driving force of progress.

It can be seen, especially in the light of earlier parts of this work, that Camphill communities do indeed run out of answers and run against difficulties. In these situations new answers have to be found, which bring more problems with them.

It may be best to illustrate this with some examples.

In the earlier phases of development of Camphill communities, people were willing to sacrifice something of their autonomy in order to serve the community. This was a crucial element in creating communities that were both cohesive and sustainable.

More recently, community members have asserted their individuality, their rights and their needs. The challenges inherent in a community lifestyle have become more apparent and now new answers are needed in different times and situations.

So far this 'answer' has been to allow community members more personal time, more personal space, more possibility to find an individual relationship to the community as a whole. This is obviously what was needed and has allowed some people to stay in the communities who might have otherwise left. But again, true to the model, this 'answer' of tolerance and acceptance, of granting individual autonomy, brings its own challenges and questions in regard to the stability and cohesiveness of the communities.

Another example is that, again, in the earlier days of community development, and even later, the communities tended to be somewhat isolationist and introverted. Attention was focused primarily on the creation of a social form that was different from the mainstream and this led to a certain amount of conscious disengagement from the wider society.

However, as we have seen, the fact that the core task of Camphill communities is the care of vulnerable members of the wider community, the state began to demand that the communities open their doors to external scrutiny and regulation. The response to this led to a greater amount of direct engagement both with the regulatory authorities and with other charities and organisations concerned with social care.

From this there has been a discernible process of turning beyond the traditional boundaries of the communities to engage in a variety of issues that continues to gather pace.

Thus we can see that what was right for one phase of development eventually ceases to hold true. That 'answer' it could be said, no longer works. Often the community continues to try and insist that the traditional way of doing things is the only right way, but over time it becomes apparent that it no longer works. There follows a period of transition as new ways and new 'answers' are adopted. Eventually it becomes clear that the community has entered a new phase of development and that now there are new ways of doing things, different from the past. However, this does not last, as, sooner or later, it becomes clear that the new ways also have limitations and drawbacks which will need to be addressed.

It becomes futile to expect that any one solution will actually solve community dilemmas once and for all. The search for answers to community living is not only elusive, it is also a continual process. It is a never-ending quest, as anyone engaged in the questions of community building and community development will acknowledge.

The consolation for some people is that each new solution actually leads the communities to a higher stage of development, more in tune with the times, than the previous.

It is not only a question of having to find the appropriate social forms and organisational structures for new phases of community development. The spiritual and cultural life of the communities also has its own developmental path. It remains a burning question how the development of the spiritual impulse of Camphill informs the daily practical life, the social relationships and the care provision aspects of the communities. It is a constant challenge to bring these unique and particular developmental paths into harmony.

The law of complexity/consciousness
Teilhard de Chardin formulated a principle of evolution that is of fundamental importance to all of this. In his book 'The Phenomenon of Man' that was published in 1955, he set out his Law of Complexity/Consciousness. His theme was the evolution of the spirit through successive stages of increasing complexity and increasing consciousness. The universe strives towards higher consciousness, and it does so by arranging itself into ever more complex systems and structures. First he looked at how this law applies to matter. He asserted that even in the geosphere - the realm of inanimate matter – there is a very limited degree of consciousness.
Matter becomes structured in increasingly complex forms in the biosphere – the kingdom of the plants and animals – and has a higher level of consciousness. Finally, consciousness reaches its peak in the noosphere, the realm of the human being who has the highest level of consciousness which is manifest in the ability to reflect and to think.

Teilhard de Chardin then took the principle further and applied it to the social forms of the human being. He traced the evolutionary process of the human race spreading out over the face of the earth. This preliminary phase was one of expansion and divergence as the human race separated out as it expanded to colonise the earth. However, once the earth was covered, a second process began of compression and convergence as people were forced together into increasingly complex societal forms. As the societal forms became more compressed, they became more complex, and, as part of the same process, the level of consciousness increased.
Teilhard de Chardin's law of complexity/consciousness is another insight into developmental principles that helps to explain the processes at work in evolution, in social groupings, in intentional communities and in Camphill communities. As a Jesuit priest, Chardin's aim in formulating his law was to reassure people that they did not need to despair in the face of the increased complexity of modern society. They could trust that the evolution of consciousness would always tend upwards, and would carry them with it. In the same way, members of communities who feel bewildered by the tendency in their communities to increasing complexity can take re-assurance from Chardin's law that complexity will be accompanied by increased consciousness.

My conclusion is that the model of Cyclical Progress, the theory of Spiral Dynamics and the law of Complexity/Consciousness all offer unique and helpful insights into the developmental paths of Camphill communities.

Final states
There is an interesting question thrown up by a consideration of these models that needs attention. And this question is - where is all of this development going? Is there an end to development?
Teilhard de Chardin imagined a critical threshold, which he termed the Omega Point. This is point at which humanity will have reached its highest level of social complexity and of consciousness. At this point consciousness will break through both time and space and emerge onto a new higher plane of existence altogether.
Some theories of development show that the earthly manifestation of a spiritual impulse may come to an end without it being the end of the development of that impulse.
There are other scenarios of development that allow for, or even predict, either a cessation or a culmination of all development.

Some views of history are founded on the a-priori visualisation of a 'final state', a culmination of the current order-building endeavours. The final state envisaged depends on the view of society. The Utopian thinkers imagined that once utopia was created on earth, no further improvements could be made.

Having achieved the desired and desirable state, no more could be done to make it any better. What follows could be called a 'steady state'. As in the fairy stories, 'they all lived happily ever after.'

It has been said that Marxism is a utopian ideology, based as it is on a vision of a future ideal society. Marx held that it is the conflict of contradictions inherent in the economic system that produces the force for change in society. As has been seen previously, this struggle between incompatible forces is known as dilalectical materialism. The Marxist vision is of a future time in which the means of production are communally owned, the class struggle has come to an end and oppression and exploitation have disappeared. Communist society will no longer contain the contradictions that generate the force for change. The 'final state' has been achieved and no more development is needed.

The same idea of a final state is shared by Francis Fukuyama, from the other end of the political spectrum. He sets out his version of the final state in his book 'The End of History and the Last Man', written in 1992. He says that the ending of the Cold War marked the end of history. Not just a particular period of post-war history, but the end of history as such. He reaches this conclusion on the hand of the fact that, as he sees it, western liberal democracy is now the dominant social system. In his words, it is the final form of human government.

An alternative view is what has been termed 'liquid modernity'. This is the idea that history continues and no time or state can ever be said to be final or complete. There is no ultimate destination. Presumably this theory would say that the end only comes with the passing of the last human being.

There are also many religious and spiritual beliefs that hold that the ultimate destination of humans is not on this earth at all. While on earth the human being will always be incomplete and imperfect, struggling towards 'goodness'. Development only comes to an end in the next world.

We can ask if there will there be a time when Camphill reaches a 'final state'? One could imagine several scenarios.

It could happen that one particular community has evolved to such a perfect level that no improvement is possible. This is a utopian vision wherein no further development is necessary.

An alternative scenario is that society as a whole has evolved to such a level that a Camphill community is no longer distinguishable from any other form of society. The ultimate goal is achieved in that there is no longer any need to be a separate and alternative place, a beacon for others, an alternative culture.

However, there are other, less positive possibilities. It could be that Camphill communities no longer manage to provide relevant answers to the questions posed by our times; that they run out of enthusiasm and inspiration and are no longer separate or 'visible' because they are no different from the society around them. This possibility of dissipation cannot be lightly discounted. This final state would also be the end of the physical expression of the Camphill Movement.

The significance of developmental paths

What can be learnt from these different models and theories that could be of use in understanding the present situation in the Camphill communities and how the communities can best face the challenges of the future?

We have seen that there are different ways of making sense of change according to an overall view of development in general. An insight into these different models enables us to appreciate why it is that different people react to change in different ways.

Those people whose outlook is determined by the model of dissipation will probably feel less positive about the changes that are taking place and would therefore be less likely to engage in them.

On the other hand, those people whose worldview is determined by a progressive model would be more likely to engage with processes of change, even if they do not fully welcome all of the consequences arising from this change.

The overall idea of this work is that the changes currently taking place in the communities are part of an overall developmental trend that leads the communities from earlier and simpler phases of community development to a time of increasing complexity and diversity. However, the present phase in the history of Camphill communities is only part of developmental trajectory that will continue on into the future. New phases of development are yet to unfold.

I believe that insights into the patterns of developmental paths and trajectories enables community members to arrive at an overall understanding of the past, present and future development of their communities. Through such insights, it is possible to explore the appropriate forms and structures of the next phase of development of their community.

SOCIOCULTURAL EVOLUTION: THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL FORMS

The 14th century Islamic scholar, Ibn Khaldun said that societies are living organisms that experience cyclic birth, growth, maturity, decline and ultimately death due to universal causes. There are historical precedents for the idea that there is a universal ordering principle that determines the development of individuals, social groupings, organisations, communities, societies and civilisations.

But it is possible to go further and say that these developmental cycles follow an archetypal pattern, and that there are recognisable phases in that pattern.

This archetypal ordering principle is that all social organisms begin in a stage in which the ordering structure is that of the group. This is a stage characterised by a high level of cohesiveness and conformity.

As the group develops over time it gives way to a phase in which the individual asserts his or her autonomy. The needs and rights of the individual assume a greater importance than the dictates of the group.

Finally there is the potential – and it is no more than a potential – for development to a phase of what we can call 'universal community'.

This is the principle that I will now explore in greater detail through a simplistic look at the historical developmental phases of the human race. This is done so as to look for trends of development on a universal, macro scale and then apply them to the specific micro level of intentional communities.

There are many books that map out the stages of development of the human race. Different authors map out this development in different ways; demarcating different stages in this development and using a variety of names for these stages. Below is my own schemata based on the work of some of these authors.

1. **Foraging/ hunting/ gathering.**
   This is the earliest known form of human society, prevalent from between 1 million – 400,000 years ago
   The social formation of this time was small tribes of 40 or so people based on kinship lineage. The group shared all resources equally and there was no personal wealth. In addition to foraging, there was nomadic herding of animals. The worldview was magical and mystical.

2. **Horticulture/Agriculture** began between 10,000 and 2,000BC and remained the dominant mode until the Industrial Revolution. Neolithic farming began in the Near East and the impact of this was as revolutionary during its time as the Industrial Revolution would be later. Indeed, one could say that this was the time of 'The Farming Revolution'. Technology evolved from the manpower of the hoe to the animal power of the plough and from using stone, wood, leather and wool to the use of metals.
   The social formation transcended the family and tribe and was characterised by the emergence of villages, towns, cities and empires. There was an accumulation of wealth, social ranking and inequality.
   This was the time of kings and emperors who built up armies, massive city complexes and empires. The surplus produced by agriculture led to trade and a merchant class. It also freed some people from subsistence activities and thus enabled the development of philosophy, culture, art, writing and mathematics at this time.

Despite these massive advances and innovations, this was predominantly a rural, agrarian, and pre-industrial era, dominated by a religious worldview.

3. **Industrial**
Although this era is titled 'industrial', the many innovative changes that occurred at this time were by no means only to do with technology. There were enormous and revolutionary advances as technology advanced from manpower and animal power to machine power in the late 18th century. And the move to industrialisation and new technologies was accompanied by the emergence of other social and political phenomena. These included capitalism, which entailed the creation of a new class of those who sell their labour, and a new class of entrepreneurs who set up businesses; urbanisation, which resulted in demographic concentration and centralisation; and the new political order of liberal democracy in which for the first time citizens, rather than monarchs, enjoyed political power.
A whole new rational and scientific worldview had emerged at the time of the Enlightenment in the 18th century. This brought with it new ideas about how society should be ordered.
In this time society changed from being feudal and agrarian to becoming democratic and urban-industrial. One of the outstanding changes of this time is said to be the breakdown of the traditional cohesion of family and social units and the rise of social mobility and individualisation.
Industrialisation brought with it division of labour, factories and urban squalor and social deprivation. Cities expanded and multiplied, empire-building accelerated and nation-states were formed. Wars, a constant feature of historical development in all societies, grew into so-called world wars.

4. **Post-Industrial or Modern.** It is said that people in the West now live in a new and modern society. Heavy industry and a manufacturing economy have largely been replaced by a service economy and the 'information society'. The most important new characteristics of the modern, post-war economy and society are now information technology, the media, leisure activities, consumerism and lifestyle choices.

5. **Post-Modern**
As the modern gives way to the post-modern, yet another worldview emerges. This worldview is based not just on perception and observation but also on interpretation. All truths are relative, determined by culture; they are social and cultural constructions. The process of individualisation has advanced to the point that it is said that people are now more different from each other than similar and therefore the concepts of society and sociology are outdated.
In this time there has been a process of globalisation, both of the of economy and of information. There has been a rise in international institutions, at the same time as there has been a growing loss of faith in large rational bureaucracies, global capitalism, centralised political power and the nation state to meet individual and social needs and to solve the problems facing the citizens of the 21st century.
The energy crisis, global warming, terrorism, world poverty and global diseases all serve to show that societies are both mutually dependent and globally vulnerable. There is a new awareness growing that a new mindset and worldview is going to be needed if the human race is to survive the global challenges of the future.

What can be learnt from this brief and simplistic overview of the story of the human race? Again, there are common themes emerging. Taking a global perspective, it seems that the historical development of societies show a trend from cohesion and simplicity, to individualisation and complexity. What is new here are the indications of a third phase of development – a phase of a new appreciation of the universality of humanity, of global interdependence and environmental responsibility.

It is clear that such a broad look at world history cannot hope to portray an accurate picture. The stages that I set out above are very obviously sweeping generalisations and do not hold up to a considered scrutiny. It could be said that these stages only apply to certain societies and at certain times. It might be more accurate to propose that this portrayal of societal development can only usefully be applied to the development of industrialised countries of the west.
 Helen Bee, in her book 'Lifespan Development', asserts that it is only the European and Euro-American cultures that have gone through a stage of developing an individualistic culture.
She quotes a study by Patricia Greenfield in 1994 that showed that roughly 70% of world population operate within a collective belief system that is characterised by group solidarity, sharing, reciprocal duties and obligations and group decision-making. In this dominant social model, strong and cohesive social groupings nurture the individual throughout the course of their life.

There are other reservations about accepting the above model of stages wholeheartedly.
Current studies of socio-cultural evolution show that the concept of unilineal evolution – the concept that all societies start out primitive and become civilised - has been superseded by the concept of multilineal evolution, which show that societies change in unique ways according to specific circumstances.
It is also clear that a study of the development of world civilisations shows that not all societies go from strength to strength, improving in the process. Some civilisations fail. Their growth is curtailed by stagnation, cultural decadence, over-affluence, war, disease, natural catastrophe, over-exploitation of resources or a variety of other reasons. It is clear that the concept of an overall march of progress and civilisation applied to all societies worldwide is deceptively simplistic.

I recognise that the models and theories that I am describing apply only to a relatively few instances of societal development. The focus of this work is very specific in that I am turning my attention to the origins, growth and development of intentional communities in modern western societies. Bearing this in mind, I am going to continue to develop the theory that these societies tend to move from an initial phase of simplicity and social cohesion to a phase of complexity, differentiation and individualisation.

A crucial turning point in this process was the Industrial Revolution. There are many social theorists who subscribe to evolutionary models of the social response to industrialisation, urbanisation, social and geographical mobility and greater social heterogeneity and diversity. They describe this societal response in terms of the progression from a state of simplicity to one of complexity.
In the vanguard of these are Maine, Weber, Durkheim and Tonnies. These four theorists by no means agree among themselves as to a common model, yet, despite the differences, a picture emerges from their work of two very different types of society; rural and pre-industrial and urban post-industrial.

The traditional rural and pre-industrial societies were held together by the fact that everybody was more or less the same. These societies were marked by a high level of social cohesion and conformity. Social norms were strong and rigorously enforced and social behaviour was well regulated. These societies were highly structured and ordered in terms of rank and status. Pre-determined and rigid hierarchies ensured social and class stability.

In contrast, modern, post-industrial societies are highly complex. They are characterised by relationships that are relatively more free of kinship, rank and class. The individual might have a series of different social relationships in different social circumstances for different purposes as a result of being socially more mobile. For example he or she might have different social contacts and networks for work, leisure and family. Altogether there is less cohesion and more individualisation.

All four of these theorists – and many after them – associate a high quality of supportive social relationships and the sense of community with the former, anachronistic mode of rural and pre-industrial society. They say that this quality of social relationships and sense of community is lacking, or at least is diminished, in modern post-industrial societies.

Thus, these writers emphasis the same social phenomena that has been the theme of all that I have set out throughout this work. In their writings, it is clear that the watershed of the Industrial Revolution marked a rapid change from a society characterised by social stability, order, cohesiveness and conformity to one characterised by mobility, individualisation and diversity.

It is interesting to consider the social forms of Camphill communities in the light of the historical distinction between pre-industrial and post-industrial societies.

It might seem that the communities have sought to recreate, or re-establish social forms and a way of life based on the pattern of rural, pre-industrial cohesiveness.

In contrast to the development of the wider contemporary society, the emphasis in the early years of the Camphill communities and most other intentional communities was not on urbanisation, mechanisation, technology, individualism, and social mobility. Rather these communities have traditionally been founded on farming and gardening, craftwork, and community-building. They have consciously developed something of a counter-culture, embracing very different values and practices than modern society and actively seeking to avoid some aspects of modernisation. The choice of the name 'Village' to describe some Camphill communities indicates the intention to create a social setting founded on rural and pre-industrial forms. And in the village communities – as in most Camphill communities – community-building has been founded on social solidarity, stability and cohesiveness, the creation of mutually supportive social relationships, a shared life of home, work and cultural activities, simple self-sufficiency and the communal celebration of seasonal festivals.

To all intents and purposes, the social settings of Camphill communities might seem to represent a striving to return to a rural haven, a pastoral idyll and a pre-industrial Arcadia.

But these are not villages in the traditional sense; the community members had not been born into these villages. What was new about these communities was that the community members had left the place where they were born. They had chosen a path different from the one that they had been expected to follow by convention and tradition. They had made a conscious decision to live in an intentional community, which both transcends the traditional kinship ties and also represents a pioneering social form for the future.

Despite this conscious rejection of social convention, and despite the conscious adoption of a community lifestyle, the social forms of the communities – especially in the past – were still based on the conventional hierarchies of authority and experience and the social form of the extended family.

House communities were run by 'house-mothers' and 'house-fathers'; workshops were run by 'workshop masters'. Social roles were largely based on gender, as was, and is, the case in mainstream society and great value was placed on social order and stability.

However, this is changing. Many of the changes in the communities that were identified at the beginning of this work represent a trend away from what could be called the traditional model of society in the past towards a more contemporary social form characterised by all those things that have become associated with the post-industrial and modern societies.

In this way, the communities are currently following a path of development which resembles that of any other social form in contemporary western society. Although most of the communities are still rural and still place great value of traditional forms and social cohesiveness, they have become increasingly influenced and changed by the norms and values of modern mainstream society.

RUDOLF STEINER: PRINCIPLES OF THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF CONSCIOUSNESS

I have set out various models and theories of development. Some of these suggest that the human race has evolved by accumulating knowledge, experience, skills and technology. In the process the social forms and worldviews has also moved on to higher levels.

One of the pressing questions of our time is to what extent has the moral development of humanity accompanied developments in other realms? We have weapons that can destroy the whole world many times over. We know that our lifestyle and actions are destroying the stability of our global eco-system. We have the resources to feed the entire population of the world if we chose to do so. We can manipulate genes in plants, animals and genetically engineer human life. But the question remains if our moral and ethical development, our sense of responsibility towards others and to our future, have kept pace with the speed of our scientific and technological advances.

Rudolf Steiner, in a lecture that has been entitled 'Preparing for the Sixth Epoch', spoke about the ascending consciousness of the whole of humanity as it develops over recognisably differentiated periods of time. There can be no doubt that Steiner saw the development of humanity over time as being a progression towards a higher state of consciousness, towards a fuller expression of what it means to be a human being - and a spiritual being -living on earth.

What he says here is very relevant to the theme of this work, as it posits a *trend* towards a higher consciousness that unfolds through *phases* of development.

Steiner said that when people first lived on earth they lived as part of a group; part of their family, their tribe and later as part of their country and nation. In this stage of development people were not aware of themselves as being an individual. They could only think of themselves as part of the group that they belonged to. And at that time these groups were led and guided by an enlightened leader or ruler; a patriarch, king or high priest. Using Steiner's terminology, we can call this the time of *'group consciousness' or 'collective consciousness.'*

The next stage of development, and the stage that we live in now, is the stage where we become aware of ourselves as an *individual*. We have achieved a state of personal autonomy and to some extent transcended the need to conform to family, class and social expectations. This is called the time of *'ego consciousness' or 'individual consciousness'*.

But Steiner says that there is another stage still to come. In this future stage - and there are the first signs of this already - the individual becomes increasingly aware of the needs of other individuals. We feel connected to other people but not like it was in the old stage of group consciousness. This will be a time when we rise beyond our egoism, of thinking only about ourselves, and realise that the wellbeing of the whole of society rests entirely on the wellbeing of each individual. We will realise that we are all interdependent on each other - that nobody can be well or happy as long as one individual somewhere else in the world is suffering.

This new stage in our development will transcend the ethnocentric and egocentric world views of earlier stages. It will overcome factionalism, sectarianism, competition and exploitation and usher in an age of co-operation, altruism and harmony.

This will be the time of true community; of *'community consciousness', 'the consciousness of universal humanity'*.

The path outlined by Steiner - from group to individualisation to universality - is a potential path of development, not an actual path. The future is not something mapped out in advance, but something that we have to ensure by our own moral development. Contemporary intentional communities are a preparation for this next stage in the development of the human race.

Steiner's model was formulated to describe the evolution of human consciousness and societal forms. It was not intended to describe the evolution of an intentional community. Nonetheless, because archetypal patterns of development have universal applications, his ideas do indeed relate directly to the stages in which communities and other social grouping develop. It is possible to gain further insight into the evolutionary paths of communities by changing our perspective from the macro scale to the micro. But, in order to do so, we need to modify Steiner's terminology.

When Steiner used the term 'community' it is clear that he is referring to social relationships between highly developed individuals and not to intentional communities. Throughout his lectures and books, Steiner uses the term 'community' in a broad way to describe a sense of the universal experience of brotherhood between people. He also uses it more specially at times to apply to individuals who have a heightened sense of moral development and a sense of responsibility for the development of the whole of humanity. It is a sense of shared destiny and a striving to a higher state of consciousness between people who are karmically committed in their hearts and souls to serving the modern spiritual impulse of Anthroposophy.

In the sixth lecture of 'Awakening to Community' he says '*It is particularly noteworthy that the community-building ideal should be making its appearance in our day. It is the product of a deep, elemental feeling found in many human souls today, the product of a sense of definite relationship between person and person that includes an impulse to joint activity*'.

Steiner's use of the word 'community' clearly does not extend to living together. His use of the word 'community' describes an experience whereas in Camphill it is used to describe both an experience and also a location where community 'happens'.

How would it be to apply Steiner's three phase of consciousness to the developmental path of intentional communities?

There is some truth in the fact that an intentional community, in its early stages, has a strong sense of 'group consciousness'. There is a high level of cohesion and conformity. The individual is not only willing, but also happy, to serve the needs of the community - even before his or her own needs. There is a high level of commitment to the guiding ideology and community principles and there are very clearly defined boundaries between the community and the wider society. Although the experience of community is never so intense as in these early years, there is also the danger that the individuality of each person is to some degree overwhelmed by such an intense community-building process. It would also be true to say that most communities in their pioneer phase are led by an inspired and charismatic leader, as was the case in the early civilisations of Steiner's 'group consciousness'.

Thus it is valid to say that the first phase of community formation is characterised by 'group consciousness'.

It is equally valid to say that, as they develop, most intentional communities move away from this group consciousness into a phase marked by increasing individualisation. The individual members of the community begin to assert their autonomy and the commitment to the ideology and community norms and standards is more relaxed.

The idea that the individual must serve the community is increasingly replaced by the idea that the community should fulfil the needs of the individual.

If Steiner's sequence of development is extended and applied to communities, we can expect that the third phase would characterised by a less intense and immediate experience of togetherness and more of a looser association of highly developed individuals who work together out of a shared concern for the welfare of universal humanity.

The difficulty of terminology here is that using the term 'group' to describe a community in its early stages seems just as ill-fitting as restricting the term 'community' to an intentional community in the third phase of development.

For these reasons, I propose that in order to understand the development of intentional communities through the perspective of Steiner's map of social development, we would best use the terms of 'traditional community', 'individualised community' and 'new community' to describe the sequence of developmental phases.

It is important to note that it is obvious that Steiner's map is sequential in one direction only - in that civilisations are seen to progress historically through the developmental stages one after the other. However, the plan is not so rigid when it is applied to communities.

Communities do not only progress from one stage to another in an orderly fashion. A community can switch from a 'traditional' mode to an 'individualised' mode and back again for a variety of reasons. It can also display elements of both simultaneously, as well as showing signs of embryonic forms of a 'new community'.

What can be learnt from all of this? What we can see is that a study of the development of organisations, societies and the course of the history of civilisation reveals a tripartite pattern. Human organisations seem to follow a threefold path of development that leads from a phase of unconsciousness communalism, through individualism characterised by consciousness of the self, to a potential third phase in which the connections between individuals tend to lead to a higher, more altruistic way of being. This is a new and universal sense of community.

The first stage can be seen as a preparation and the second as a test in that the third stage can only be realised when the higher potential of the individual becomes an active force for progress. The test is whether or not the individual can take responsibility for his or her own development; if the individual can transcend egoism and bring to life the higher Self. The final phases of development can be seen not as a fixed principle that follows naturally from the second, but a potential only. After the second phases comes either breakdown or breakthrough. In the light of this, intentional communities can be seen as a training ground for the higher development of the individual, of society and of humanity, so that each may reach their full potential.

THE THREE SOCIAL PRINCIPLES OF RUDOLF STEINER

There are further insights of Rudolf Steiner that are pertinent to theme of this work. In addition to mapping out three phases of social and cultural development, Steiner also formulated three social principles. Steiner proposed that society should be seen as having three complementary but separate realms of activity; the spiritual/cultural sphere, the sphere of rights and the economic sphere. Each level of Steiner's Threefold Social Order has a guiding principle that sets out the ideals and aspirations of that realm.

I will first consider these principles in the way that Steiner intended them to apply, namely as three inter-related levels all operating in the same society at the same time. Later I will show how they can also apply to the developmental stages of an intentional community.

Michael Luxford has written an excellent commentary of these three principles in Appendix IV of his book 'A Sense for Community'. He explains the context in which they were written and applies them to the issues of contemporary society. In contrast, all I will be doing here is to focus on crucial quotations from Steiner that defines each principle.

The first of these principles, the Social Principle, is better known as The Fundamental Social Law and is very familiar to people living in Camphill communities. The second and third are less well acknowledged.

The Social Principle

'In a community of human beings working together, the well-being of the community will be the greater, the less the individual claims for himself the proceeds of the work he has himself done; i.e. the more of these proceeds he makes over to his fellow workers, and the more his own requirements are satisfied, not out of his own work, but out of work done by others.'

The Sociological Principle

'The greatest ideal of the state will not be to control anything. It will be a community which wants nothing for itself, but everything for the individual.'
'He who can read the development of mankind rightly can only support a social order which has as its aim the unrestricted all-round development of individuals, and which abhors the domination of any one person by another.'

The Spiritual Principle

'No spiritual movement in our time can flourish if its aims are specialised in any way. It is what you might call an occult law that every genuinely sound and fruitful spiritual movement must exist for the good of humanity in a general way……It is purely and simply a spiritual law: if a spiritual movement is to help humanity to progress it must be generally human in intention and character.'

The Social Principle relates to the realm of economics and the distribution of resources and is characterised by the attribute of 'brotherliness' and interest in the other person.

The Sociological Principle relates to the realm of human rights, characterised by the attribute of equality. Each individual has the right to seek to fulfil their own potential and the social obligation to promote the fulfilment of the potential of the other person.

The Spiritual Principle relates to the realm of culture, characterised by the attribute of freedom. The individual must ensure that the social initiative of which he is a member serves the needs of the universally human.

These three principles can be seen to operate simultaneously in a threefold stratified society. Yet I suggest that they can also be seen to operate progressively over time.

The important point to make here is that Steiner emphasised that fact that social principles and social forms change and develop to reflect the changing consciousness of humanity and societies. In the lecture series 'From Symptom to Reality in Modern History' he said that '*it is impossible to create forms of social life that last forever. He who works for social ends must have the courage constantly to build afresh, not to stagnate, because the works of man are impermanent and are doomed to perish, because new forms must replace the old'.*

Dieter Brull, in his book 'The Mysteries of Social Encounters' cites a lecture by Steiner in which he said that even the Threefold Social Order, while appropriate for the current times, will have to replaced in the future by new forms: '*Now the demands of our time have made the threefold social order necessary. And again, there will come a time when the threefold social order must be overcome. But this is not our present time, it is the time three to four centuries from now. And at that time one will have to think of how to replace it'.*

The implication is that the social principles of Steiner do not have to be seen as static. Usually they are viewed as vertical stratification. By this I mean that different levels apply to different aspects of society at the same time. What I am suggesting now is that they can be seen to operate horizontally; that is they can apply to the same society at different times, as that society evolves.

Previously, I set out what I called Steiner's 'three principles of the historical development of consciousness'. In the light of the above, I suggest that these correspond to the principles of the Threefold Social Order.

The Social Principle can be said to apply to the stage of 'group consciousness', The Sociological Principle to the stage of 'individual consciousness' and The Spiritual Principle to the stage of 'the consciousness of universal humanity'.

Because these developmental principles are archetypal, they apply equally to intentional communities as they do to societies. Therefore, it can be said that communities also follow the same path of development that has been outlined above.

Communities start in a phase of social cohesion and solidarity – of group consciousness. During this early phase, the individual community member serves the needs of the other members and the needs of the community as a whole, without any expectation of personal reward or payment. In turn, the needs of the individual are met by the work of others. This is the time of the Social Principle.

As the community develops, the individual community member begins to assert his or her autonomy. In the time of individual consciousness, the community promotes the development of each individual member, and encourages and enables each member to reach their full potential. This is the time of the Sociological Principle.

Following this, there is the potential for communities and their members to advance to a phase in which they no longer serve the group or the individual, but rather serve the development of universal humanity. This will be the time of the Spiritual Principle.

CONCLUSION

The work of Rudolf Steiner - and most especially his writings and lectures on the theme of developmental principles - provide valuable insights into the successive developmental stages of both societies and intentional communities and also the ordering principles that operate in these stages. These archetypal patterns of development explain some of the phenomena that are coming to light in Camphill communities as they evolve from the stage of group consciousness to the stage of individual consciousness. Using the work of Steiner as a basis, it becomes possible to reach insights into the future development of these communities. This I will be doing at a later stage of this work.

In the next chapter, I will be complementing these insights of Steiner with a wide range of other authors and researchers who have focused on the developmental paths of intentional communities.

CHAPTER 4: THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTENTIONAL COMMUNITIES

In this chapter I will be looking at a series of models of the genesis of the social forms of communities and organisations.

But first we need to become clearer about what we mean by community development and how an understanding of this development can provide insights into both the present and the future challenges facing the Camphill communities.

Camphill communities, in common with all similar organisations and social initiatives, change and develop over the course of time. Social groupings exist in relation to other groupings and in relation to society as a whole. On the larger scale societies exist in relation to other societies and to their environment. It is obvious that communities, organisations and societies all adapt to changes in their external environment. It is equally apparent that they also change and develop in response to changes in their internal dynamics. The question of the internal development of communities merits more close attention.

One school of thought might say that a community is simply a group of people. People are famously fickle, erratic, spontaneous and sometimes irrational in their behaviour. People also have ideas and make plans, which they try and put into practice. These plans then have to be amended and altered in the light of other circumstances and events. The people in the community have to continually adapt their aims and strategies in the face of external challenges. People are human and make mistakes; they take wrong decisions based on incorrect, misleading or misunderstood information or mistaken assumptions. This school of thought would therefore argue that the development of all social groupings - including communities - is nothing more than the result of the actions of its members and lacks an overall unifying 'plan' or design.

An alternative school of thought would say that a community, like its individual members, is a living organism, and again, like its members, follows 'laws' or principles of physical, social and spiritual growth. These laws may be hidden and unconscious and manifest themselves in ways that are not necessarily noticed or understood by the community members. This school of thought would say that there is an internal ordering principle underpinning the evolution of communities.

Clearly these two outlooks are not exclusive to each other. And just as clearly, change is not necessarily the result only of chance nor only of inherent 'laws' built into all social groupings. Members of a community can bring about change consciously and intentionally through their actions and attitudes, in response to changes in their environment and in a manner that has been informed by their understanding of social and spiritual principles.

People in Camphill communities would go further than both of these views and say that a community has its own particular destiny and is guarded and guided by benign spiritual intervention. Rudolf Steiner refers to this in the lecture cycle 'Awakening to Community'. He describes how a group of people who have a mutual experience of waking up to the soul and spirit life of each other, and who study and work out of Anthroposophy together, attract into their company spiritual beings to guide and accompany their work.

He takes up this theme again, in the lecture 'Brotherhood and the Struggle for Existence (1905), he says, '*People who work together in a brotherhood are magicians because they draw higher beings into their circle…This will be the secret of the progress of mankind in the future; to work through community.*'

It could be asked if there is any value in speaking of laws of development - in identifying trends and phases. I believe that the value in trying to understand such principles of development is that members of a community, through an understanding of the stage of development that their community is in, are able to develop the social forms appropriate to that stage of development. Not just the social forms but also the appropriate ways of relating to each other, the appropriate ways of making decisions and even the most harmonious design of buildings and the use of the landscape. On the hand of the latter, Dr.Konig challenged the Camphill Movement to develop new social forms and made an explicit reference to the relationship between social forms and architecture. In an editorial in the Cresset journal in 1965 he wrote: **'***Are we willing to create an entirely revised social order? An order in which all men can live as brothers and are at the same time equal and free? This is the task for the immediate future. If we succeed, modern architecture is bound to change because building and masonry were always the true expression of the prevailing social life of the respective age.*'

It is obviously the case that the social forms and structures- including physical structures such as buildings - reflect the prevailing mood of the times that the community is living in. They are, as Konig said, the true expression of that age.

Yet it is possible to see this from a different angle and imagine that communities, out of an understanding of the principles of community development, could develop forms and structures that would bring about the birth of a new culture, new social relationships, new economic relationships, new organisational structures, new use of land and buildings, all of which would serve to usher in a new and progressive phase of community development.

THE CONCEPT OF DEVELOPMENT IN PHASES APPLIED TO THE HISTORY OF CAMPHILL

The basis of this work is that all living organisms and social organisations establish relations among themselves and to their environment. These relations change and develop over time and, in doing so, they follow recognisable patterns of metamorphosis from a lower phase to a higher, more complex and conscious phase. Further, and this is the crucial part for the considerations of this work, this developmental path follows certain archetypal and identifiable phases.

There is no question that change and development are constant elements of life. The questions that we are addressing here are whether or not one wishes to see these changes as trends and patterns, what phases we divide them into and what names we give to these phases in the overall patterns.

The idea of phases of development is firmly embedded in both Anthroposophy and in the way that the history of the Camphill Movement is understood.

Rudolf Steiner described separate epochs in the development of the human race and in human consciousness. I have previously referred to some examples of this. Steiner also pointed out that each epoch has different qualities and different tasks and that one epoch is complete in itself. Each epoch gives way to the next, and each epoch carries a new potential for further development.

There have been several prominent authors who have based their work on the insights of Steiner and have mapped out the path of both individual and social development in terms of phases. I will be turning to these shortly.

A closer look at the development of Camphill communities in general seems to show that, not only can we observe recognisable trends in their development, but also that we can discern recognisable phases as these trends unfold.

In order to illustrate what I mean I will describe the unfolding development of Camphill, in very simple terms. While I recognise that not everybody may agree with this portrayal, I do believe that it serves the purpose of illustrating the theme.

Dr. Konig began the first Camphill community out of his personal vision. Other people joined him, inspired by his visions, but there was no doubt that he was always the charismatic leader. He decided how everything was to be done and was recognised in his time and thereafter, as the father-figure of the Camphill Movement. This is despite the fact that Dr.Konig and the other men were all interned on the Isle of Man during the war years and it was the women who began the first community at Camphill estate in his absence.

As new communities were founded elsewhere across Europe and the world, this pioneer phase, with its pattern of inspired, charismatic and forceful leaders, repeated itself in each new community. Thus the series of phases that I outline here occurred, not just in the Movement as a whole as its development unfolded, but also in each place.

When Dr.Konig died in 1966 a different phase began, different in many ways from the first. Most importantly, the other founder members, and those who had come subsequently, decided to carry on out of loyalty to Konig and his inspiration and because they themselves had found their life's work in Camphill. It should not be presumed that Camphill would have continued as a matter of course. Not all communities survive the death of their founder.

This was a time in which there were several leaders working together; all of whom had been co-founders and all inspired to keep the vision alive. This was a time of co-operative and collaborative leadership by a group of inspired and inspiring individuals. After the initial stage, Dr.Konig had already been at pains to delegate responsibility for different areas of the work and even for different communities during his time. Through the fact he had not continued to concentrate all organisational power in his own hands, he ensured the survival of the Movement after his death. The time after his death was a time both of further growth of new communities and also of consolidation and organisation within the existing communities.

Then came a third stage - the phase that the communities are in today. This is the time of what could be called 'community-maintenance'. This is no longer a time of inspired leadership - in fact people now are rather wary of people who set themselves up to be leaders. It is a time of coping with change; of compromise and adaptation to a different external and internal environment. The inspiration of the early days is no longer so strong and many people feel over-burdened. The personal needs of the members have come to the fore along with the need to focus on professional development. There are ongoing concerns in many communities on many different levels.

It is the time to begin to turn towards the future sustainability of the communities. It is the time to consider if the existing forms and structures still serve their purpose and, if not, what can take their place. It is also the time when the communities begin to consider their place in terms of the wider society and wider concerns.

There have been other, more detailed, descriptions of the unfolding history of the Camphill Movement

Anke Weihs, gave an address at the British New Year Assembly of Camphill Communities in 1982. She began by quoting some insights that Dr.Konig had had regarding the biography of Camphill. These are mapped out as follows:
1935-1940: At this time the first Camphill community had not yet been started. Konig said that this was the phase of Pantheism; of the gathering together of the several formative influences. These were Anthroposophy, the Bohemian-Moravian Brotherhood and his experiences as a physician in Pilgramshain in Germany.
1939-1954/55: This was the time when the young people who were to found Camphill met up again in Scotland. It was the time when the co-founders, who had been predominantly Jewish, began to learn to become Christian. The inauguration of the Bible Evening was a fundamental part of this phase.
From 1945 onwards, to the end of the century, was the time to live and practice Christianity. Konig said that this was the time to fulfil the mission of service to the Image of Man (to use the term as it was then used), where it was suffering and stricken and to create a new culture freed from its origin in Middle Europe. He described this as the creation of '*a healing culture within a community context'.*

In her address, Anke Weihs then mapped out her own insights into the patterns of development inherent in the biography of Camphill in the first three decades of its existence
1939–1949: She described this time as the time of pioneering, of absolutism and intolerance; an attitude of defence towards everything beyond the boundaries.
1949–1959 was a time of consolidation, settling and also expansion.

1959-1969: she said this was the phase in which Camphill integrated into the world in the context of the various countries into which Camphill had spread. The characteristic of this time was a greater sense of tolerance and a turning inwards. Dr.Konig had died in 1966.

Elsewhere, Anke Weihs spoke of how Dr.Konig had become increasingly concerned by his feeling that the communities were becoming more bourgeois. She said that there was an '*inclination to settle down, a move to the reduced sphere of responsibility, a smaller unit, of greater efficiency, higher fees. In place of absolutism and enthusiasm of the first decade, reason and convenience began to play their part…The elements of 'establishment' became discernible'.* She went on to comment on an increase in tolerance, permissiveness and self-centredness.

These latter observations are highly interesting as these trends described by Dr.Konig were similar to the trends that were described by the respondents to my research questionnaire, 45 years later. They also echo what we have seen before about how communities move from an initial phase of enthusiasm to one of 'normalisation'.

Anke Weihs saw the beginning of the next thirty-year period as being a time of a new sense of absolutism, but this time the absolutism of the individual taking personal responsibility for the community. This is a theme that I will be coming back to.

In the book 'Holistic Special Education', Angelika Monteux presents her own map of the development of Camphill.

She separates the history of Camphill into six differentiated periods. She begins with a first stage called 'Beginnings in Vienna'. This was the time in which the circle of friends formed that was later to disband due to the need to escape from Austria just before the war. They would then come together again in Scotland to found the first Camphill community.

This pre-community phase extends into Monteux's second stage, 'The Pioneering Phase'. This runs from 1927, when Karl Konig graduated from medical school until 1940, the year of the establishment of Camphill in Aberdeen.

The third phase is called 'Community ideals and the ethos of curative education in the Schools: 1940–45'. This was the time of the establishment of several structures and community forms; The College Meeting, The Bible Evening and The Fundamental Social Law.

Next, Monteux identifies a fourth phase 'A phase of consolidation and expansion 1944-64'. New communities began in Scotland and elsewhere; the Camphill training seminar started up in 1949. The first school, St.John's School began in 1948. Dr.Konig began to delegate leadership to the people who would take over and continue after his death. The Camphill Hall was built in 1962.

The fifth phase 'Further developments and new challenges: 1964–90' was the time of the formation of more communities and more training course.

Finally, 'A time of crisis and renewed pioneering: 1990–2006'.

In a similar way to Weihs, Monteux sees the future as a new stage of pioneering, but in a different sense. She cites the requirements from regulatory authorities and the policy of inclusion as being new challenges to Camphill communities. This is a time of fear, uncertainty, insecurity and tensions. However, a re-appraisal and re-evaluation of these challenges has led to new sense of confidence, which in turn has led to the beginnings of a dialogue with professional and government bodies. The Camphill Seminar has been accredited and is now the Bachelor of Arts in Curative Education. Monteux concludes that there is now a new and positive spirit in the Camphill Schools in Aberdeen.

I showed earlier that social organisms- including communities – reach a point in their development that leads either to breakdown or to breakthrough. The models of both Weihs and Monteux clearly show the Camphill communities passing through a succession of developmental phases that eventually lead to an emergence onto a new level. They both see the communities passing through a new phase of pioneering, of rejuvenation, as they face the challenges of the future. These processes of 'breakthrough' and 'emergence' are not isolated incidents in the life journey of a community. Each time of transition, between each phase of development, leads to breakthrough or breakdown.

If we look again at the models of Camphill's history that I outlined above, it can be seen that each model uses a different method of identifying the separate phases of development. Dr.Konig and Monteux divide the history of Camphill into phases according to their dominant characteristics – or motif– without any regard for equal periods of time. In contrast, Anke Weihs uses a simple system of 10-year periods.

Yet regardless of the specific method that is used, there is evidence of the need to trace the evolutionary path of the Camphill Movement by dividing it up into successive stages, each marked by a novel and characteristic element. The purpose behind this is to make manifest the hidden fact that the Camphill Movement has changed and developed over its history. It has not remained static, but is following a path of development from one stage to another.

The conclusion to be drawn from this is that the Camphill Movement is following a dynamic course of development that continues to lead it forward into new and unknown phases of potentiality.

It is understood that these phases of development have only been identified once they have become manifest or they have been completed. It is not the case that community leaders or community members have said that now that a certain stage has been completed, that now it is time to move into the next stage. The Camphill Movement as a whole, and each community in particular, has developed through a combination of responding to internal and external changes and through the intuition of members that new forms must be developed for changed circumstances. The patterns and phases of development are only discerned in retrospect.

Nonetheless, a comparative study of the history of many intentional communities makes it possible to discern archetypal patterns in their development. From this, it becomes possible to know in advance something of the nature of each phase.

I must add some words of caution to this claim, which must be borne in mind in all that follows. First, models that are used to describe the evolutionary path of the development of the Camphill Movement will not necessarily apply to the development of each particular community. It should be clear from all that has gone before, that the archetypal principles of social development apply on any level. However, this is a principle and the practice will vary from one community to another.

It is also not the case that all communities progress through developmental phases in an orderly and predictable fashion. There are many reasons why the developmental path of a community may be disrupted. Communities are living organism made up of people and like individuals, may also go through an 'identity crisis', or a crisis of confidence, might get stuck in an outdated mode, might regress or even become unhealthy and/or die. Some communities may move from one stage of development to another in an ordered and natural way. Others may experience crises of one sort or another and may have to revert to an earlier phase and start again from where they find themselves.

Having said this, it is also true that no community can ever really be said to revert to its earliest pioneering phase. Once this earliest phase is over, its over and it will not come back again. In some Camphill communities in Scotland, internal crisis and social disintegration has led to many people leaving at the same time and the necessity of making a new start with a new group of people. But this new start takes place in the context of the fact that the community is already in a phase of organisation.

Time has passed, the community has become established, the same residents are still in place, relations with regulatory bodies are in place, the community has already developed certain ways of doing things; there is a definite and recognisable culture and identity already in place.

It is also the case that a community can be in more than one phase at a time. Within the community, different groups of people might be in different phases. The most obvious differences are between the traditionalists and conservatives who generally resist change and the liberal, modernist reformers who promote change.

Other differences are between those who have been living in the community for some years and newcomers who are in a different life stage, have different life experiences or who have a different worldview. There are also differences in the make-up and temperament of different people, their different worldviews and their different ways of working. There are some people who feel happier working in a well-managed, rational, efficient and organised way and those who have an antipathy to 'rules', and follow their feelings and instincts and try to promote spontaneity and initiative.

In the light of all of this, theoretical and even observed patterns of development are not always going to evolve harmoniously and progressively in every community.

Yet, while it is important to recognise this and allow for discrepancies, disruptions, aberrations and exceptions, it is nonetheless valid and worthwhile to look at the general and archetypal patterns in community development so as to better to understand the specific circumstances in each community.

MODELS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTENTIONAL COMMUNITIES

People who work in Camphill communities may be proud of the uniqueness of the communities; of the unique and particular genius of Dr. Konig in creating community forms and practices that people may regard as being quintessentially 'Camphill'.

However, a comparative study of intentional communities reveals how many of the things that appear to be unique to one community or group of communities, are actually common to most intentional communities. This does not lessen or detract from the particular nature of Camphill communities. Rather it reveals how much the communities are embedded, whether they know it or not, in a culture of building alternative intentional communities; a culture and a history that has always run parallel to the development of mainstream society. Therefore a study of the theories of development of a range of intentional communities will serve to show something of the general genesis of communities which can then be applied to the specific situation on the Camphill communities.

Each of the models of community development that I describe below is different from the others. And through reading each one, it is possible to gain insight into yet another aspect of the development of the Camphill communities. I will also show that, despite their differences, they tell a similar story, which can be pieced together once each has been considered in turn.

I will begin by looking at a model that shows how communities first separate themselves out from society and are then eventually assimilated back into society.

The anthropologist Victor Turner, following the lead of Arnold Van Gennep, identified three stages in the 'rite of passage' ritual whereby young men in tribal societies are initiated into adulthood. These three stages are separation, limen (the state between one status and another) and reaggregation.

A later anthropologist, Jonathan Andelson, saw that these three stages also apply to the life cycle of intentional communities, as seen by an external observer. First, the community members separate themselves off from the wider society. They then go through a stage of liminality or marginality, before being reintegrated back into mainstream society when the community fails.

Andelsen sees failure and reaggregation as inevitable, and the stage of liminality is therefore always transitory and limited.

He points out that, seen from the point of view of the community member, the stage of separation is actually the time of coming together, and the stage of reaggregation is the stage of unravelling of the bonds that held the members together. Obviously, the community members would not consider failure to be inevitable; their goal would be to reach a 'steady state' of separation.

The middle stage, however, is similar from both points of view. It is a time characterised by minimal structure, maximum cohesion and an undifferentiated experience of equality and community.

The question now is if Andelsen's model is able to shed more light on to the developmental path of Camphill communities.

It could be said that the first stage of separation began when the individuals who were later to form the first Camphill community came together to meet and study with Dr. Konig in Vienna. Dr.Konig had a special interest in, and concern for, children with learning disabilities and developmental disorders. He and his friends were Jews who studied the work of Rudolf Steiner in a time when the Nazis had come to power in neighbouring Germany.

It is clear that they were coming together out of a shared response to what was happening in society at that time and out of a wish to create an alternative reality. This was the time when these people recognised that they shared a common vision that was not shared by the society that they lived in.

Their physical separation from the wider society of which they had been a part took place when they were forced to leave Austria when it was annexed by the Nazis in 1938. At this point Dr Konig and his friends entered the liminal state; a state of being homeless and marginalised. His description of the time (in the essay 'The Candle on the Hill') bears eloquent testimony to this; '*We were together again – in a foreign country at the brink of a terrible war – a tiny company of shipwrecked people in a nutshell of a boat'*.

There followed many years of this second liminal stage. In the early years in Scotland, Dr.Konig and the founders of the Camphill Movement lived as refugees attempting to create an intentional community looking after disabled children. They lived a marginal life. They were from a different culture and spoke a foreign language. They were not integrated into their locality, they shared a marginal philosophy and they looked after children who had been marginalised by society.

Dr.Konig described this experience in the essay cited above: '*The barriers of nationality and language were very deep; we were regarded as foreigners'*.

Anke Weihs reinforced this image of this liminal status in a talk she gave in 1969 in which she described the pioneering group as '*like a tiny army'* under the strong and determined leadership of Dr.Konig. She says that the community began to develop '*in an attitude of defence against the world. During the war we were 'enemy aliens' in a foreign country. We were vehemently aggressed (sic) and distrusted by our fellow anthroposophists. We were so absolute in our community-living that many others were offended as well'*.

The states of separation and marginalisation were further reinforced by the fact that the men were sent to internment camps on the Isle of Man and in Canada in 1940.

The third stage of Andelson's model is that of reaggregation, in which the community dissolves and reintegrates into mainstream society. The Camphill Movement has managed to avoid this fate for over 68 years and there are no signs that this is going to change soon. Therefore we have to conclude that the third stage of the model does not apply to the Camphill communities - at least not yet.

However, what does seen clear is that, rather than disintegrating and reaggregating into the wider society, the Camphill communities have gone through a process of what could be called 'normalisation'. To a certain extent, the communities do indeed remain somewhat separate and marginal. The ideology of intentional communities has not been adopted by mainstream society and intentional communities are not widely accepted by the state as the most appropriate setting for the education and care of people with learning disabilities. In addition, Anthroposophy remains a marginal belief system.

But, on the other hand, there is an increasing engagement with both society and the state, especially on the level of special education and care provision. The communities have neither failed nor have they been assimilated back into mainstream society. Neither do they exist in a state of liminality and impermanence. Instead they are in what could be called a 'steady state' of 'normalisation'. They are well-established and well-resourced. They are adapting to, and accommodating a great amount of change and finding new ways to ensure their survival and sustainability. Although the boundaries have become flexible and less obvious, and the process of convergence between the communities and the wider society is increasing, they nonetheless remain separate to some extent from mainstream society and mainstream care provision.

The conclusion must be that although Andlesen's model no doubt applies to many intentional communities, it does not accurately describe the developmental path of the Camphill communities, which continue to defy Andelsen's inevitability of failure.

The second model for our consideration is from a study by Anthony Wallace into what has been called the revitalisation movement of the 1960s in America; the movement that led to an unprecedented period of community formation in American history. This model is described in the book 'Intentional Community' by Brown.

Wallace concludes from the results of his study that there are six major tasks that revitalisation movements must perform if they are to be successful.

1. Mazeway reformulation. This means the reformulation and restructuring of existing elements of mainstream society. The example that Wallace used is the interest in Eastern mysticism that characterised the 1960s commune movement.
2. Communication: the emergence of a prophet or leader to communicate a message of personal and societal transformation and salvation.
3. Organisation: The founder takes a less central role as management structures are put into place along with the delegation of roles and responsibilities.
4. Adaptation: adapting to the host society and integrating resistance and changes. The constant reworking of doctrine in response to experience so that the community fits in better with the expectations and needs of its members.
5. Cultural Transformation: People begin to feel better about themselves, there is healthy cultural revitalisation and organised programme of concerted group action.
6. Routinisation: Increasing importance of political and social structures and informal rules. This is the time when it could be said that things have settled down.

Wallace said that the result of all of this is a 'steady state'; the community is established and perhaps also established some new branches elsewhere. Some of the markers that differentiated the community from the wider society have been abandoned, and the boundaries have become less distinct. Mainstream society has also changed and the need for an alternative philosophy, ideology and culture has diminished.

It can be asked to what extent does this model fit the development of the Camphill communities? Wallace does not imply that these tasks of revitalisation unfold over time. However, if it is imagined that this is the case, then certainly there are aspects that fit in with the story of the development of Camphill. I will look at them one by one.

1. Mazeway reformulation. Although this is an unfamiliar term, it indicates that existing elements in society are given a new meaning or significance. It is not so much the creation of a new society but the reformulation of the way in which the individuals and groups find meaning in the existing society. To put it another way, it is the creation of a new belief system that enables people to find their way around the maze of life, whose constituent parts are already in place.
   In the context of the beginnings of Camphill, this corresponds to the time in which Dr. Konig and his friends began to formulate the ideas that would stand behind the formation of the first community. The fact that some children are born handicapped (to use the terminology of that time) was a recognised phenomenon in society.

Dr. Konig assigned a new significance and status to these children; he reformulated the significance and meaning of the child with a handicap. Dr. Konig and his friends studied Anthroposophy and Anthroposophy was the philosophical foundation upon which Camphill was built. Anthroposophy in itself was a reformulation; the bringing together of ideas and insights from both the Eastern and the Western traditions, from both ancient and modern belief systems, from the realms of natural science and the realms of heightened spiritual vision. Steiner's Spiritual Science functioned, and continues to function, as 'mazeway reformulation'.

2. Communication. This corresponds to the fact that Dr.Konig became the charismatic leader; the man who communicated the inspired message that led to the formation of all the Camphill communities. As the message was communicated among wider circles, more people joined.

3. Organisation. There came a time when Dr.Konig began to delegate the work of running the communities and establishing new communities to other people. He remained the inspiring leader-figure and spent time travelling round to visit the communities, but others took the responsibility of managing the development of the organisational aspects of the communities. Following the death of Dr.Konig and over the subsequent years the role of the inspired leader figure that he and other co-founders personified began to recede at the same time that the organisational aspects of community life came to dominate.

4. Adaptation. Again, over time the communities have had to modify their principles and practices to integrate changed circumstances in both the internal and external environment. Idealism has had to reach a compromise with the realism and pragmatism of community maintenance and survival.

5. Cultural transformation. Of all the identified phases, this one fits in less well with the concept of developmental stages of community evolution, in that it is an aspect of community life that is at work from the first day onwards. Rather than being one in an ongoing series of phases that unfold over time, cultural transformation on both a general and personal level is a continuous process. While its affects might be more apparent in one phase or another; while it may wax and wane over time, it is not a unique characteristic of any one particular phase of development.

6. Routinisation. The implication here is not so much that life in the communities has become routine, but rather that, as was seen previously, structures and rules are more apparent at a later stage of a community's development than are novelty and change.

As Wallace's 'steady state' is achieved the communities are regarded as centres of excellence in providing care, rather than being regarded as centres of counterculture. There is an established interface with the state and there is established financing of the service that the community provides. The communities, as we have seen, are well-established, well-resourced and well-managed. The distance between the community and the society for which it acted as a critique has narrowed.

We can see that Wallace's model of revitalisation tasks, when viewed as a series of progressive phase, are a close approximation of the developmental pattern of the Camphill communities.

The next model for consideration is that of Tonnies, who was one of several major figures whose work defined what was later to be called 'sociology'. Tonnies had written a book called 'Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft' in which he set out the two conceptual opposites of community and society. He used the word gemeinschaft to mean 'community', in its wider sense as meaning all forms of relationships that bind people to each other over time. In this sense community is a social unit.

Against the backdrop of social changes in the modern age, Tonnies saw that the concept of 'society' is something very different from, and even opposed to, the concept of 'community'. Gesellschaft, in his usage, represents the large-scale, impersonal, individualised and contractual ties that hold society together. Tonnies asserts that all societies, past and present, and throughout the world, have been characterised by the shift from rural social cohesion to urban individuality and social disintegration.

In her book 'Commitment and Community', Rosabeth Moss Kanter gives the terms coined by Tonnies a different emphasis. Rather than using them to describe universal historical tendencies in society, she uses them to trace the development of intentional communities from a phase of 'community' to one of 'organisation'.

Kanter identifies what she terms '*two incompatible pulls in social life'*. She says that on the one hand there is a pull to community – to being human - and on the other a pull to becoming an organisation – to being efficient.

In her words, '*The Gemeinschaft aspects of a utopian community consist of those mutually expressive, supportive, value-orientated, emotionally-laden, personally-directed, loving social relations often called 'community'. They include mutual recognition of the values, temperament, character, and human needs of group members. Their highest priority is maintenance of values and close relation, and they are based on commitment, the personal involvement of participating members.*

In contrast, the Gesellschaft elements in a utopian community consist of those relations that are functional for dealing with environments, whether physical, social, or supernatural; for 'getting the job done'; for acquiring things the group needs from its environment; for maximising feedback and exchange with other systems in the form of information, resources or acceptance'.

Kanter said that most of the communities in her study of American intentional communities moved from gemeinschaft to gesellschaft; from 'community' to 'organisation'. Over time they moved from an emphasis on community-building to becoming an organisation that produced, traded and provided services. This process led to an undermining of the community boundaries, the rise of a specialised and professional workforce, some of them hired and with no commitment to the community and its ideology, an assimilation into the wider society (isomorphism), and to dual leadership; the situation in which there is one leader for the community aspects and a different one for the organisational aspects.

Further, she asserted that the prosperity that comes with economic success also leads to a decline in community as the members move towards behaviour patterns of individual consumption and what she called 'privatism', and the community becomes more bureaucratic. She cites Richard Ely who, as far back as 1885, wrote that whereas poverty can knit members into a compact whole '*prosperity can be fatal'.* Kanter concluded her work by saying that all communities have to operate in a changing environment and as they do so they become less ideological and more pragmatic; they become less of a community and more of an organisation. Yet through this process they ensure their survival.

The findings of my own research into Camphill communities indicate that similar processes to those described by Kanter are at work in the Camphill communities. Earlier in this work I referred to the rise of a specialised and professional workforce, the prevalence of dual leadership and the ongoing process of assimilation into the wider society.

Some respondents to my research questionnaire, writing 122 years after Ely, echoed his sentiments that too much money is not necessarily a good thing in terms of community-building. When asked to explain how the experience of community had changed over the years, many respondents pointed to the tendency of Camphill communities to become more of an organisation and a care provider and less of a community. Some said that there is less commitment and less vision than previously and some that the focus had moved from the social life to the work life. This is the move that Kanter described as the move from the supportive relations of gemeinschaft to the drive to get a job done that characterises gesellschaft .

These phenomena and processes that my research highlighted are signs that Kanter's assertion - that intentional communities move from community to organisation - applies also to Camphill communities.

The inevitability of this move has been identified by other writers, some of whom suggest that as social groupings of whatever sort become larger - as they invariably do over time - they become more organised and more structured.

Research shows that there seems to be an optimal size for community and that when that size is exceeded the sense of personal contact and loyalty to each other decreases and the need to introduce organisational structures and systems of governance increases.

In his book 'The Tipping Point', Malcolm Gladwell draws on research into the social behaviour of primates, primitive hunter-gatherer societies, the military, religious organisations and business companies to show that there is what he calls 'a magic number of 150' that determines the quality of social interactions and sense of community.

All the cross-discipline research Gladwell cites points to the fact that social cohesion is more easily attained and maintained in groups of less than 150. Beyond this number, the group dynamics tip into organisational structures.

This conclusion is reinforced by E.F.Scumacher in his book 'Good Work'. He writes that social organisations and workplaces '*made up of, say, one hundred people, can still be fully democratic without falling into disorder. But structures employing many hundreds, or even thousands of people cannot possibly preserve order without authoritarianism, no matter how great the wish for democracy might be'.* If you have a big social structure, he asserts, you need authoritarian management systems and lots of rules and regulations.

Kanter says that if a community gets much larger than a few hundred members, its organisation must change. After studying many Utopian groups, she concluded that as they get larger, they increase in complexity, in the distance between members and in their potential for inequality. She suggests that if Utopian communities are to transpose to urban settings and include large numbers of the urban population, that this would best be done as a federation of associated communes rather than one big commune. She writes that '*it is clear, in any event, that communes cannot be built on the scale of urban communities, or even of component parts of such communities, such as neighbourhoods, merely by retaining the communitarian social institutions of two hundred and simply increasing the number of people. Larger size necessitates differences in social organisation that may violate utopian ideals.'*

All of this reaffirms the maxim that intentional communities tend to become more organised and structured the longer that they survive. The authors above suggest that the dynamics of groups of people 'tip' into organisational structure when numbers in the group reach between 100 and 150 people.

While this is true, experience shows that this process does not only depend upon an increase in numbers. Even small communities of less than 100 people become more structured and organised over time. It is clear that it is a combination of both an increase in numbers and longevity that causes the transition from a loose organisational structure to one that is more rigid.

The move from community to organisation is also described by Victor Turner, who I mentioned earlier. In 'The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure' he described the two opposed and interdependent modes of social relations. Social life, according to Turner, is a dialectical process that alternates between 'structure' and anti-structure'. Turner said that a community may at times display communitas', which is spontaneous, affective, egalitarian, undifferentiated and unstructured. Elsewhere he describes it as an intense, intimate and liberating kind of bonding that is experienced only in 'liminal' states. Structure is, in contrast, static, hierarchical and instrumental. Turner portrays community development as a process that passes through either communitas or structure at different times. While the community alternates between one or the other it also passes through three stages; spontaneous, pragmatic and institutionalised. Like Kanter, Turner sees this as a dissipative process that the community has to go through over time as it has to deal with the reality of survival. As the community develops, it has to come to terms with what Turner calls the 'routinisation of charisma' and the normalisation of communal life as it turns it attention to the production and distribution of resources and the need for social control.

It is clear that both Kanter and Turner regard 'community' and 'organisation' and 'communitas' and 'structure', as being irreconcilable and opposed. They use these terms to map a decline in the experience of community as organisational structures take over.

There are limitations to all of the models that I have outlined up to this point. The final stage of Andelsen's model is the failure of the community initiative as it is reintegrated into mainstream society. The models of Wallace, Kanter and Turner all trace community development as beginning in a state of 'community' and ending in a state of organisation, routinisation and institutionalisation.

All of these models are models of the dissipation of the experience of community and the decline of the community into organisational modes in order to ensure economic survival. The results of my research project show that many people in Camphill communities see their communities following this trend.

However, there are other models that show that this move from community to organisation is actually a natural progression through a succession of developmental stages; stages that progress beyond those imagined by the writers that we have considered so far.

The next model was developed by Carolyn R. Shaffer and Kristin Anundsen and appears in their book 'Creating Community Anywhere – Finding Support and Connection in a Fragmented World'. Their ideas fit in very neatly with some theories of change and development that I set out earlier, in that they say that the natural development of communities is a cyclical and not a linear process. They observe that a community's developmental phases tend to repeat themselves as a series of sub-cycles within a larger cycle.

Echoing the concepts of Spiral Dynamics, they say that each set of phases that they map out below represents one turn of a spiral and that communities tend to move to a higher turn of the spiral each time they complete one set of phases. As I have shown before, community development is cyclical and each cycle leads to a higher level of consciousness and 'wisdom'.

Shaffer and Anundsen map out 5 phases of community development as follows:
1. Excitement: a time of great possibilities, hopes, dreams and fantasies. It is a time of idealism, creating a shared vision and purpose.
2. Autonomy: in the second stage disillusionment and disappointment sets in with the fall from idealism to reality. The members begin to assert their individuality and first signs of conflict appear. They call this time 'jockeying for power', as power struggles become apparent. However, this process of asserting the needs of the individual over the needs of the group does not have to lead to community disintegration. If a balance can be found that leaves most people content, the communities' chances of moving to the next phase and surviving over the long term are in fact increased.
3. Stability: the time of people settling into roles and the community adopting structures. While a more stable time than the previous ones, the danger is of getting stuck and becoming unresponsive to change and new ideas. In this stage there is the danger of institutionalisation and excessive bureaucracy.
4. Synergy: A move from function to consciousness; a time of fulfilment, in which what is good for the individual is also good for the community. A yearning to be whole and to connect to the whole. A sense of common responsibility and mutual awareness; previous leaders can step back. At this stage the danger is that the community becomes too introverted. The community feels that it has reached a final stage of development.
5. Transformation. There are many different possibilities at this phase. The community can either expand its awareness beyond its boundaries, segment into a number of smaller communities or disband entirely.

This model describes the process that other writers have already set out. As an intentional community develops, the members begin to assert their individual needs and aspirations and the community begins to settle down into organisational structures. What is new here, however, is that Shaffer and Anundsen identify further stages of community development, which they term 'synergy' and 'transformation'. In this stages the needs of the community and of the individual members are reconciled and the community has the potential to engage with the concerns of its wider environment. However, they make the point that a community can also disintegrate and fail, and, indeed, most intentional communities have done just that.

But what is of great interest here is that this is model that goes beyond the stages mapped out by the previous models and indicates the potential for communities to evolve into future settings for individual personal transformation and for social renewal.

Finally, I will consider a model that was developed to trace the developmental path of religious communities.

This model was developed by two sociologists, Raymond Fitz and Lawrence Cada to map the life cycle of religious orders. An explanation and interpretation of this model is the basis of the book 'Living the Way - Quaker spirituality and community' by Ursula Jane O'Shea, who used the model to trace the development of the Quakers.

It could be said that this model is not necessarily appropriate for this study, in that Camphill communities are not religious orders. However, whilst Camphill communities are not part of a religious order, nonetheless spiritual and religious forms, rituals, services, celebrations, verses, prayers and practices have played a central role in all Camphill communities. Further, we should not hesitate to gain insight from any source that touches upon the principles of development of any social organism.

Fitz and Cada proposed that the life cycle of a religious community followed five phases of growth and decline: foundation, expansion, stabilisation and breakdown, succeeded by a period of transition during which the community could die out, survive at a minimum level or enter a new phase of growth. O'Shea says that most religious communities and orders simply die out at the final stage of transition, while some, like the remaining Shaker and Amish communities in America, survive at what she terms a 'minimal' level.

O'Shea's assertions might need qualification and definition in regard to the survival at a minimal level of the Hutterites, Bruderhof and Amish. It is apparent that the Anabaptist religious communities in America and Canada, despite noticeable historical divisiveness and contemporary challenges, nonetheless display a remarkable quality of stability and endurance in comparison with most other intentional community movements.

Fitz and Cada identified three hallmarks of the small percentage of religious communities that manage to renew themselves. They said that these transforming qualities that lead to renewal are based on an inward religious experience rather than on the attempt of the community to 'organise itself out of trouble' by introducing organisational change. The hallmarks that they identified were a profound renewal of the spiritual life, a reappropriation of the founding charism - a divinely bestowed power of inspiration - and responsiveness to the signs of the times.

What can be learnt from this model? It is clear the Camphill Movement has followed the first three of the phases identified by Fitz and Cada - foundation, expansion and stabilisation. However, as I have shown previously, it is very premature to project the phases of breakdown onto the Camphill Movement as a whole. A few communities in Scotland have indeed passed through a process of breakdown for reasons of internal implosion. While this proved terminal for one, the others have indeed gone through a process of renewal. This renewal, however, has perhaps been less of an inward religious experience as described by Fitz and Cada, and more of a combination of a commitment to the Camphill ethos and a drive to ensure continuity through re-organisation and pragmatism.

It could be said that the Camphill communities are in the stage that Fitz and Cada term 'transition'. The communities of today could indeed, either die out, survive at a minimal level or enter a phase of renewal.

Shaffer and Anundsen and Fitz and Cada indicate a crucial aspect of the development of Camphill communities. They show that communities have the potential to go beyond what is seen as the inevitable decline from pioneering inspiration to organisational maintenance; from being intense, marginal and separate to becoming routine, stable and integrated. They suggest that communities have the potential to transform themselves beyond this stage. However, they also stress that this remains a potential step, and that communities may fail to achieve this.

It is this potential of transformation that can follow what seems to be a decline into an organisational phase, that I want to turn to now. I will do this on the hand of a consideration of further models of community development.

ANTHROPOSOPHICAL MODELS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF ORGANISATIONS AND COMMUNITIES

I have considered some theories of the development of intentional communities that are derived from the insights of sociology and anthropology. I will now turn to some further models, this time models that are based on the insights of Anthroposophy.

I will first briefly sketch the ideas and models of a series of authors - Lievegoed, Schaeffer, Glasl and Brink - who draw their inspiration from the insights of Rudolf Steiner.

I will also be looking at a recent book by Jan Martin Bang called 'Growing Eco-Communities'. This is his second book on eco-communities and is based on his experiences and research into many intentional community movements world-wide, including his experiences of living in Camphill in Norway.

Obviously, the brief summary of the work of these authors that I will be giving here is by necessity going to be incomplete and selective and will not do full justice to their work. A full appreciation of their work is only possible through reading their books in full.

In all of these models it is possible to see how vision, leadership, social relations, organisational style and the perspective of the community differs from one phase of development to another.

Following this, in chapter 5, I will set out my own model of the development of Camphill communities. This will be based on the work of the authors that we are about to consider, but it will also be grounded on my experiences of living in Camphill communities, my research on community-building and the preceding parts of this work. I will describe each developmental stage in detail and draw on the work of these authors as I do so.

It is important to bear in mind that the models that I will now be looking at have been designed to describe a variety of social and organisational undertakings, not specifically intentional communities.

Lievegoed sets out different developmental patterns for what he terms 'institutions of the spiritual life', for social groups and communities and for economic organisations.

Glasl makes it clear that his theories refer to commercial organisations and companies.

Brink, on the other hand, sets out different models for personal, social and organisational development. She also differentiates between the developmental roads of a commercial organisation and an 'ideal-based organisation'.

Schaefer's model covers all manner of social and organisational activities and initiatives. Bang is the only one of these who writes specifically about intentional communities.

It is therefore a question of whether or not it is appropriate to apply principles of organisational development to Camphill communities.

I believe that this is a valid exercise, for two reasons. Firstly, as I have shown, there are archetypal patterns of development that apply to all situations in which human beings live, work and interact with others. It is clear that these patterns vary according to the type and level of interaction and engagement, yet nonetheless certain archetypal principles can be discerned in all such common social activities.

Secondly, Camphill communities do not simply limit their activities to one discreet sphere of activity. They operate on many different levels simultaneously, and because of this, most models of social development will apply on one level or another.

A Camphill community can be accurately described as all of the following; an institution of the spiritual life, an ideal-based organisation, an intentional community, and as an economic and even a commercial organisation.

Lievegoed asserted that an institute of the spiritual life realm is based on the creativity of free individuals who sacrifice their own wishes and destiny to the higher aim that they serve. It is based on spiritual and cultural ideals and everything else is of secondary importance. There is no doubt that these are characteristics of Camphill communities.

However, there is equally no doubt that, on another level, a Camphill community is an organisation. It interfaces with a variety of social and state systems. It has a management structure, a business plan, financial plans, policies and procedures. It acts as a business company, pays rent, invests money, provides pensions, provides a service in exchange for funding, recruits and trains staff and is inspected by, and accountable to, care agencies, financial accountants, charity regulators and other external bodies. It is not possible to visualise a Camphill community functioning effectively without these organisational aspects in place.

In fact the trend from 'community' to 'organisation' is as manifest in Camphill communities as in all other communities. Over the years the organisational aspects of Camphill communities have increasingly come to the fore.

Another term in use that transcends the apparent division into either a spiritually-oriented or commercial endeavour is that of a 'social economy organisation'. This is used to describe an ethical business or a public benefit organisation that has a social rather than a business purpose or aim.

This term could well be applied to Camphill communities in that their primary aim is to do some social good but also have to operate as a financially successful business.

Bearing all of this in mind, I believe that it is best to keep research into the development of Camphill communities as wide as possible in the knowledge that all of these models are applicable to Camphill communities on one level or another.

Lievegoed's Models
I will start with Bernard Lievegoed, since his writings on many aspects of individual, social and organisational development have inspired and set out the terms for the authors that follow. In his book 'Developing Communities', Lievegoed asserts that an institute, an association or a business is a living organism which is continually changing; it grows and develops as it attains new levels of maturity.

Lievegoed clearly distinguishes between the developmental paths of institutions, social groups and communities, and economic organisations. He differentiates the three as follows:

Among institutions that work out of the spiritual life, he includes Waldorf Schools and centres of adult education and curative education. Although not mentioned by name, it can be clearly understood that Camphill communities belong here.

What he terms social groups and communities applies to local Anthroposophical groups and the Anthroposophical Society. The term 'community', in Lievegoed's usage, does not extend to an intentional community.

The term 'economic organisation' is self-explanatory. It includes production processes and bio-dynamic farms and other initiatives of working life.

Lievegoed is clear that very definite laws apply to each separate realm of activity.

It appears that Lievegoed would count Camphill communities as institutions of the spiritual life, therefore we will turn first to what he says about these.

He uses imagery of plant metamorphosis to describe the three stages of their developmental path:

1. **The Initiative Phase**. This corresponds to the sprouting phase of the plant. The initiative is the creative ideal of a group of like-minded individuals. In this germinal phase, leadership changes according to the abilities of the individuals and the various tasks and areas of work. The objective of the institution is to bring an ideal of the initiators into reality. All other practical considerations are arranged to serve this ideal.
2. **The Growth Phase**. In this stage the preliminary group now sub-divides into smaller groups with their own tasks and responsibilities. It remains a 'flat' system with no hierarchies; an association of mandate groups.
3. **The Blossoming Phase.** Now all the subsidiary groups work together, after some minor adjustments. '*Everyone is focused on and permeated by the idea of developing creativity in the service of a Mystery task'.* The mystery task is to serve the advancement of human evolution. Lievegoed says that in this phase, the institutions should become 'practice grounds' in which future forms of working together can be tried out. There is no final state. There are only continual efforts to achieve the potential of this third phase.

Lievegoed says that at the third phase there is equilibrium between the different levels of the institution; the spiritual aims, the social relationships between the members and the economic and technical services.

However, in the Camphill communities of today, the organisational aspects appear to have more weight than the spiritual and cultural. A lot of effort is currently going into the consolidation and promotion of the unique quality of Anthroposophical work. Nonetheless it can be fairly said that the equilibrium described by Lievegoed, while perhaps a feature of life in Camphill communities some years ago, remains elusive to most communities today. Just as Lievegoed said, the qualities of the third phase are achieved then lost again and again.

Lievegoed only briefly touches on the form of communities of the social life, saying that they are characterised by democratic social relationships. He makes no reference to the dynamics of their development.

He gives a more detailed account of the developmental path of economic organisations, and also outlines this at length in the book 'The Developing Organisation'. He maps out three developmental stages.

1. **Pioneer phase.** In the pioneering phase of economic organisations a single leader inspires the workers and makes the purpose of work clear to everybody. The objective of the organisation is to provide an economic service to society.
2. **Differentiation phase.** As the economic organisation grows, it becomes more differentiated, specialised, efficient, departmentalised and bureaucratic. The phase of growth is termed the 'bureaucratic' or 'differentiation' phase. The organisational forms in this phase are the centralisation of power, hierarchical command structures and the division of labour.
3. **Integration phase.** The third phase is that of integration. This is the time of a change of mentality; what has been called 'organisational transformation'. Tasks and functions are re-evaluated from a wider perspective as the organisation turns its attention to the question of how it relates to the wider society and the global environment. In this phase organisational leadership requires wisdom and maturity to be able to see the wider context in which the organisation functions and its longer-term aims.

Of special interest here is the fact that Lievegoed emphasises that, in both institutes of the spiritual/cultural life and in economic organisations, the second phase is one of transition. It is the stage in which re-organisation is necessary due to the fact that the numbers of people have increased. The real goal of development lies in the third phase; the phase of transformation.

Schaefer's model

In the book 'Vision in Action' that he co-edited with Voors, Schaefer writes that organisations are living systems with phases of crisis, adaptation, growth and development. Each phase of development has its own particular crisis, which offers impetus for the next stage of development.

In outlining the phases of development Schaefer does not make the differentiation between spiritual, social or economic activities that Lievegoed does. He uses the general term 'initiatives' and includes schools, banks, shops, restaurants, government agencies and companies. He also includes cultural and service initiatives.

His map of the developmental path of these initiatives is the same as the one that Lievegoed set out for the development of organisations.

1. **Pioneer Phase.** For an initiative to succeed over time there needs to be an individual or a group responding to a real need, a number of capable people willing to work hard and a sound organisational and financial basis. First there is a gestation period; an individual with an idea. Then follows the birth. This is a vibrant and exciting time, full of surprises and growth. Routine is limited and direction is clear. It is a creative time. In the past the pioneer was an individual, now it is more likely to be a group.

   After a while there comes a crisis, as everything becomes bigger, more complex and more impersonal. Leadership becomes unclear and motivation decreases. This crisis then leads to emergence onto a new level.

2. **Differentiation.** There is now a move away from the personal, intuitive, improvising mode to a more objective, clear and functional way of meeting objectives. This is the time of hierarchies, procedural handbooks and rigid reporting relationships. There is a tendency to want to muddle through and to resist the pressure to change. The challenge is how to bring about functional differentiation without losing human creativity and commitment. The crisis is when differentiation is carried through by mechanistic structures, systems and procedures without considering their impact on human capacities or motivation.

3. **The Integration Phase**. In this phase there is the need to formulate a new set of goals so that people find meaning in their work and their lives. It is the time to integrate the wider body of stakeholders. It is also important to balance the technical, economic and social elements. Delegation is the key to developing semi-autonomous groups or teams that can learn to take responsibility for their own areas of responsibility. This process engenders excellence and commitment, as the individual uses their capacities to the full for the benefit of the whole. The vertical structures of the differentiation phase are replaced by 'horizontal consciousness'. In this phase, there begins the process of reviewing and monitoring the health of the whole organisation.

Glasl's Model

In his book 'The Enterprise of the Future' Glasl makes it clear that his model of development refers to organisations and that he is writing as a management consultant. The whole thrust of the book is directed to organisational management in commercial companies and the terminology and references reflect this throughout.

The new element in Glasl's work is that he mapped development beyond the three phases that Lievegoed had set out for organisations and included a fourth phase.

1. **Pioneer.** Glasl uses the metaphor of a brotherhood or family and compares relationships in a family to those in the pioneer phase.
2. **Differentiation.** At a certain point there is a crisis as external and internal demands change. There follows a move from informal to formal organisational relationships and structures.
3. *Integrated Phase*. In this phase new paradigms, new concepts and new guiding principles are needed. The organisation is now seen as a living organism rather than an efficient and well-run machine. This change is reflected in the terminology of management theory, which has moved from the mechanistic models of 1960s and 70s to models of biological sciences. Three areas of the organisation that have previously been separate now have to be integrated: the technical (physical resources), the social system (organisational structure, individual functions, management) and the culture (identity, policy and strategy).
4. **Association.** In this new phase, Glasl describes the organisation as an element in a biotope which he defines as '*a whole, inter-dependent network of relationships between different organisations and stakeholders'*. The organisation has adopted an attitude of responsibility for those things that lie beyond its immediate boundaries. It has become an enterprise of the future.

Brink's Model

The models of Lievegoed and Schaefer have three stages while that of Glasl has four. Brink has formulated a model of seven stages, which she applies to the development of the life of the individual, to social development and organisational development.

Her overall thesis is best summed up in the words '*all development, be it in an individual, between people, in collaborative situations, in organisations or wherever, takes place according to fixed laws which point the way – a way in which something becomes visible and can be experienced. What is that something? It is the spirit which lives in everybody and everything, is recognised in all spiritual movements and can be summarised as 'the primeval source of all being'. Human development takes place so that this source can be active and reach expression in and between people, in organisations and in the greater whole of society and the world. Thence it elevates human life to higher realms of consciousness and existence'.*

These words point to the fact that the developmental stages of community development are reflected by, and are a reflection of, the developmental path of the individual. It is also possible to see a reflection of these patterns in the changing relationship between the individual and the community as each community member follows their personal journey through community.

However, these aspects deserve a separate study of their own for which there is no room in this work. Instead, I will only turn to Brink's models for the development of organisations.

She distinguishes between commercial organisations and what she terms 'ideal-based' organisations, as did Lievegoed.

I will first consider the developmental path of commercial organisations:

1. **Theocratic.** The priest-king or Pharaoh is an intermediary for the gods and the executor of their will on earth. They have the status of a demi-god and represent the pinnacle of earthy hierarchy. At this time there was no individual self-consciousness.
2. **The autocratic organisation.** The hierarchical leadership style is still prevalent in modern business organisations. This is an authoritarian and paternalistic style, personified by 'The Boss'.
3. **The bureaucratic organisation**. Following the Second World War, the emphasis moved to organisation and efficiency. Organisations disintegrated into separate parts; separate decentralised departments and management teams. This is also called the 'phase of professionalisation', in which the need to continually keep up with developments led to the development of professional skills and expertise. Systems and procedures became the new structures. The increasing ego-awareness of employees led to workers' councils, trade unions and more democratic worker involvement. This was the time of the development of the concept of 'human resources management'. Management leadership now is about finding out what the employee needs and wants so as to create a more effective workforce. Leadership style moved away from the boss to the more interactive style of the guide and coach.
4. **The Transforming Organisation.** This phase is characterised by the process of turning inward to the real task and mission of the organisation and its relation to the wider society. The organisation is reformed in the light of these 'deeper' values. The focus shifts from results to people. It is the time of writing mission statements, of aspiring to social responsibility and to contribute to the development of the whole world.
5. **The organisation based on moral values and principles**. Brink says that this phase is only just beginning to unfold and its true potential still lies in the future. The five key characteristics of this phase are:
   - Strong aims, mission and vision based on moral principles.
   - Mission and vision create enthusiasm and involvement among employees, each of whom has their own separate contribution.
   - Each person is encouraged to develop their own potential, to take initiative and responsibility.
   - Decentralised power, flat hierarchy and little bureaucracy. Structures, roles and policies are designed to promote mission and value as top priority.
   - Importance is given not just to reason and rational analysis, but also to feeling, inspiration and spiritual insight.

Brink says that this is a recent development of last 25 years and no organisation is yet in this phase.

6. **The organisation as a new community.** This is also a potential form for the future. It includes the involvement of other people and their development. There is a new feeling of solidarity and love. Each person is inwardly aware of the whole and the fact that the whole can only develop if each individual in it develops.
7. **The organisation as a contributor to world development**. This is the culmination of the process of the continued spiritual development of individuals. In phase 5 the emphasis was on the personal development of the individual and in phase 6 on relationships with coworkers. In phase 7 the organisation and its members relate to the development of society, humanity, nature, earth, the world and the cosmos. The organisation has become a truly sustainable enterprise.

Brink's Ideal-Based organisation.

As I have pointed out, Brink differentiates between the 'developmental roads' for a commercial organisation and an 'ideal-based organisation'. She says that both types of organisations follow the same developmental path, but in different ways. She says that the primary aim of an ideal-based organisation is the realisation of an ideal, not the making of a profit. She says that they are often founded by one or more people with an ideal, a strong conviction or a truth as their starting point. They have a clear mission aimed at changing the world or society.

She says that examples of ideal-based organisations are Amnesty International, Friends of the Earth, The World Wildlife Fund, Medicins sans Frontieres, as well as political parties and ideological institutions such as churches and other institutions with a spiritual aim.

She presents a summary of the differences between the developmental phases of the two types of organisations:

Phase 2: the autocratic or pioneering phase. In the second phase, leadership is more personalised in an ideal-based organisation than in a commercial one. There is usually one leading individuality who represents and articulates the ideals and takes the lead. This is something of phase 1 still at work. The other people are very dedicated to the 'cause' and in service to the ideal, again, more than would be the case in a commercial setting. There is a stronger sense of community between the workers and a stronger sense of identity and of a separate culture. There is little room at this stage for the personal element.

Phase 3: the professional or bureaucratic phase. In the ideal-based organisation there is a lot of resistance to moving into this next phase. There is an instinctive resistance to structures, work-processes and management. People might either lack the necessary skills or be unwilling to develop them. There is a fear that the free way of working of the pioneering days will no longer be possible; that spontaneity and creativity will be curbed and that the ideal will be compromised. Because of this there is a succession of long, chaotic and inconclusive meetings. There is little in the way of personal and professional development.

Phase 4: the transformation phase. If there has not been any renewal in phase 3, then things become stuck in phase 4. The culture becomes increasingly rigid and coercive and the leading figures become conservative, repressive and even manipulative. The atmosphere becomes insecure and mutual trust disappears as power games and conflicts prevail. People either rebel or leave. The end is in sight.

The only possibility to continue is through transformation, usually with outside help. This follows the same course as for a commercial organisation. It requires the re-connecting to the original mission and vision. The focus must shift to people, as the organisation goes back to do the work of phase 3. The danger is that a new leader or manager is appointed who tries to bring about change without consulting with people, finding out where they are and helping them to develop.

In an ideal-based organisation the ideal tends to be more important than the individual through stages 1, 2 and 3. This is balanced in phase 4. In phase 5 the ideals are re-formulated by the individuals involved. Now both the ideal-based organisation and the commercial organisation follow the same road towards phases 6 and 7.

Jan Martin Bang: Youth, Maturity and Old Age.

Bang looked at a variety of developmental models for both organisations and communities but then decided that, rather than trying to fit what he found into a theoretical model, he would simplify things into a pattern that he observed as he travelled around communities. Therefore, he traces community development as passing through the stages of Youth, Maturity and Old Age. He uses images of nature - how trees and rivers change as they develop - to describe community development and observes how the theory and insights of permaculture can be applied to social organisation. Here again, it is possible to bear witness to the correlation between the principles of organisational development in nature and in human society.

Bang says that in the stage of Youth everybody does everything and jobs are rotated to avoid anyone becoming possessive or territorial and to prove that everybody is equal. In the subsequent stage of maturity this is seen as inefficient and people begin to specialise.

In this first youthful stage, people are fully engaged and work enthusiastically; they do not count the hours or the cost to themselves or their families. Everybody serves the needs of the community and pulls together. These are the glory days that create memories of a golden age that then become part of the story of the community.

Like other commentators, Bang says that small communities in the youthful stage work in much the same way that families work; they have shared meal times, shared common spaces, informal and spontaneous conversations and an informal decision-making process.

He describes the subsequent stage of maturity as the 'steady state' that lasts longest. There is now a division of labour as people specialise and efficiency and professionalisation become more important. There is a differentiation between people in terms of power, status, and access to resources.

There is an increasing tension between the individual and the community; between the private and personal and the collective and communal. Increasingly the community begins to serve the development of the individual.

As the community grows in numbers and size, there arises a definite identity and culture. Interaction with the outside world increases and becomes more complex and intense. Paradoxically, despite the feeling and appearance of stability, the dominant theme of this time is change.

By the time the community enters the third stage of Old Age, individualisation has taken hold. As people grow older they are less fired by collective idealism and tend to want their own money and personal financial security.

This is the time when the community goes through a reappraisal of its vision and values.

In the afterword, Bang poses, but does not seek to answer, an intriguing question. He suggests that there is a spiritual aspect to any community that guides and informs its development and asks if this spiritual component is also subject to the laws of development. Does it grow, decay and die? What happens to it after the death of the community that it was attached to? This is left as an unanswered question.

This concludes the appraisal of a wide variety of models of community development. Before I move on to apply them to the development of Camphill communities, I am going to make a detour to look at the complex questions of leadership and decision-making and how they evolve as communities and organisations pass through successive developmental phases.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF LEADERSHIP

There is a tendency in Camphill communities to either avoid or deny the fact that there are leaders. In general the members of the communities are wary of ascribing leadership to individuals. Even when some individuals are nominated as managers, these managers themselves are quick to point out to the regulatory authorities that they are acting on behalf of the whole community; that they are the named manager in a 'group management' structure.

In an article in the New View magazine entitled 'Reflections on Leadership', Kevin Avison says that '*It is no true community that simply states, "we have no leaders here, all decision-making is collective", because collective decision-making is only morally sound when each individual carries individual responsibility and some leadership tasks inevitably involve differentiation'.*

He says that whereas previously leadership was based on power, status and rewards, modern, progressive leadership must be a fundamentally moral activity and implies a path of conscious development. He goes on to say that '*Modern leadership relies on negotiation and clarity of purpose; it is specific to need and situation and is increasingly a quality distributed within an organisation rather than one anchored in a powerful individual. While the use of leadership can be a moral touchstone, apparent rejection of any leadership at all can be a moral malaise'.*

Avison is saying that a community can only claim to have no leaders if all the members of the community are leaders; that everybody has developed to sufficiently high level that all take leadership initiative and responsibility. This should act as a cautionary tale to those communities that still deny that they have leaders. At the same time it points to a future development of 'communities of all leaders'.

A community, by definition, has problems with leadership. Leadership seems ideologically to be incompatible with community. Therefore the whole question of leadership in Camphill communities – what it is, if and when leadership is necessary, what forms it should take, how leaders are appointed and so on – deserves a separate study. What I will be doing here is not to examine all aspects of leadership in the community context, but rather to look at how the appropriate leadership forms develop in line with the development of communities.

I will now consider the forms of leadership that appear in the different developmental phases outlined above.

In the early phase of community development - the theocratic, autocratic or pioneering phase - leadership is autocratic, authoritarian and one could even say patriarchical. At this early stage of community formation, whether the leadership is vested in an individual or in a group, the leadership style is personal and direct. Glasl points out the danger in this overly-personal style. He says that there is a tendency that a personality cult develops along with a personal dependence on the founder or founding group of people.

The danger then is that this person or group holds onto power too long and cannot guide the organisation into the next phase of its development. The community members in general do not learn the skills of leadership necessary to ensure continuity once the original leaders are no longer in place. It is a fact that many intentional communities do not outlive the death of the founder.

Those communities that do survive move on to the next stage of community development. In this second stage of differentiation and bureaucracy, the leader acts as a manager, and often there is a leader/manager for each of the many areas of community life. Leadership is no longer intuitive but a matter of skills and expertise. It has more to do with organisational effectiveness than personal vision. This is the time when the leaders have to consciously organise everything. This involves both specialisation and professionalisation. Decision-making is lengthy, laborious and complicated. It is the time of the diagrams of how the groups are inter-related and who is responsible for what.

In the next phase of integration and transformation, the leaders must look to learn from the mistakes of the past and to the future vision of the organisation.

Schaefer says that this is the time to develop a culture of excellence; each person using their innate faculties for the benefit of the whole. There develops the recognition of the potential and creativity of each person and the need to promote their professional development.

One of the central challenges of community leadership is a commitment to renewal; to review and learn from the successes and failures, and to monitor the health of the whole community. The health of the community also includes the manner in which it fits into the whole picture of its associated networks, into society and its relation to the global ecology of the earth.

Robert Greenleaf coined the term 'servant leadership' to describe the ideal form of leadership in this third phase. In a community context it is a conscious wish to enhance the development and autonomy of each community member. The leader lets go of control and relinquishes power and status. Instead he cultivates self-knowledge and self-leadership.

Brink makes the important point that, as the community moves through the phases of its development, the leadership, either an individual or a group, is usually one step ahead; leading the way forward out of the knowledge of what is needed for the next phase of development.

A similar path of leadership development – but in the context of organisations rather than intentional communities- has been outlined by Gerard Fairtlough in his book 'Three Ways of Getting Things Done'. He set out three different ways in which people work in organisations depending on the structural organisation of their work environment and on their personal preference.

Although Fairtlough presents these three ways as alternatives in the present, I belive that they can also bee seen as progressive stages over time on the path leading to a higher form of consciousness that defines a mature organisation or community.

The first of Fairtlough's stages is hierarchy; the familiar pyramid of power for the autocratic phase of organisational development. If the organisation or community matures, hierarchy as a means of getting things done evolves into heterarchy, which is characterised by strong interactions between participants of equal status in order to decide on co-ordinated action.

Finally, the stage of responsible autonomy is reached where the participants are relatively autonomous and self-sufficient and there is no need for external rules; the participants are sufficiently mature and morally developed to know what to do and how to do it.

Jeffrey Nielsen, in 'The Myth of Leadership: Creating Leaderless Organisations', echoes Avison in asserting that, in a mature organisation, there is no longer any need for a leadership founded on 'rank thinking'. He says that if and when all participants have developed the appropriate skills and moral development, then they can achieve the state of an equal, peer-based and leaderless organisation. In such a developed organisation, any guidance that is needed would be provided by peer councils and rotational leadership. In this stage, leadership is a form of collective intelligence.

Scott Peck also describes this is his book 'The Different Drum'. He says that '*communities have sometimes been referred to as leaderless groups. It is more accurate to say that a community is a group of all leaders'.*

He writes of 'the flow of leadership' – the process in which one member steps forward with one part of a solution and the community, recognising the wisdom of this, accepts it. By a kind of magic – as he puts it – this frees up others to come forward with the other necessary parts of the solution.

However, he stresses that, although this flow of leadership in community is routine, it can only become so if traditional hierarchical patterns and control are first set aside.

The idea of communities that are based on the equality of peers who have achieved a measure of personal self-direction and self-development - communities of all leaders or communities of no leaders - certainly sound like what most members of Camphill communities believe, at the best, has been achieved, and if not, is their aspiration. There is no doubt that in certain situations, and in certain communities, this is indeed achieved among equals. Yet Camphill communities are not comprised only of equal peers. There are many levels of commitment and involvement and there are hierarchies of age, experience and skill.

In any community, there are those who are indeed peers; those members of approximately the same age who hold positions of responsibility within the communities. There are also people who stay for a long time in the communities and yet choose not to become responsible for the overall governance of the community. There are those who do not intend to stay for more than the four years or so of the BACE course. There are also new and younger community members, another peer group, but this time of people who have little say in how the communities are run. Most of these join the communities for a year's voluntary service. There are also employees, some who are members of the first group and others whose job description precludes overall involvement and responsibility.

Therefore, while there are instances of genuine peer collaboration among leaders – which are indeed examples of Fairtlough's heterarchy - there are also situations of straightforward hierarchy where it comes to managing and leading a workforce of people who are less skilled, less experienced and who perhaps do not wish to accept full responsibility for all areas of community life. The hierarchical situations are often tempered by efforts to involve and consult and 'empower' those people who work under the guidance of the leaders, but few are left in any doubt about who actually makes the final decisions. It is difficult to imagine how it could be otherwise in a community that has so many levels of experience, skills and responsibility, and so many requirements to demonstrate management competencies and appropriate governance structures.

Nonetheless, within the communities, there is a growing recognition that authoritarian governance structures and overtones of benevolent paternalism are increasingly inappropriate. Times have changed and attitudes have matured. One example among many is the fact that some communities have consciously decided to leave behind terms such as 'Housemother' or 'Houseparent', in favour of 'House Co-ordinators'.

In the same vein, the leadership embodied in the personality of Dr. Konig passed, after his death, to his nominated successor, Thomas Weihs, whose title was 'Superintendent'. However, Thomas Weihs, perhaps out of the recognition that leadership by one person was no longer appropriate, chose five Principals for the administration and management of the Camphill Schools. Nowadays the term in use is the Co-ordinators.

Co-ordination belongs to a form of leadership of relatively autonomous and self-directing groups. In this situation, leadership is more about facilitating effective collaboration and providing a forum for collective decision-making than for the authoritarian leadership style of the past. It is the time of encouraging people to take initiative and groups to become self-directing.

There has also been a move away from the recognition that some individuals seem better suited to leadership roles than others to the insight that different people can take the lead on different issues and at different times. Lievegoed asserted that this role mobility is a characteristic of a mature community and termed it a 'free, wandering leadership'. Avison refers to it as 'distributed leadership', in which leadership is differentiated among various people rather than being anchored in a powerful individual.

Community members are also increasingly aware of the inherent dangers of allowing leadership to become concentrated in any one individual or group of strong individuals. There is a realisation that people in positions of authority are changed in some way by the influence and power that goes with a position of leadership.

A community member might be chosen or delegated to represent his fellow community members, but ends up becoming a little removed from the concerns of those he was originally representing and eventually the distinctions between 'representative', 'leader' and 'manager' become blurred. I make no apology for continually using the male gender while referring to leadership, as it is also very noticeable indeed that most community representatives who attend the innumerable Camphill business meetings are men.

Community members are also aware that positions of leadership and authority tend to attract a certain amount of power and influence. This can include greater access to community resources, a higher degree of autonomy, and less need to be accountable to others.

Unintentionally - through the effectiveness, willingness and skills of some and the disinclination to become involved in responsibility and leadership of others - the organisational structure of the communities remains more hierarchical, and has more to do with power and authority than anybody might have wished. This recognition leads to a drive to move to a 'flatter' hierarchy.

This has been witnessed in the move towards investing confidence in people so that they may grow into leadership roles. Also in the move on the part of the leaders to get back in touch with the 'grassroots' through inclusive stakeholder meetings and to encourage community members to express their aspirations and visions for their community. These initiatives represent a move away from the inherently alienating form of organisational management that characterises an earlier stage of community development to the inclusive and visionary community leadership that will define the future development of communities.

Another aspect of leadership in present-day Camphill communities could be termed 'differentiated leadership'. It is best described by an elder Camphill coworker who I interviewed as part of my research. This person observed that previously the leaders in Camphill communities were inspirational figures who took the lead in all realms of community life; they held the Sunday Services, carried the festivals, they gave talks and offered personal support and guidance. They were active in the esoteric work of the community and in the work of the Anthroposophical Society. They also gave the lead in the management of the community. Increasingly nowadays, these roles have become separated; it is not necessarily expected that the people who take the lead in management would be active in the cultural and spiritual realms of community life.

This observation was made with a sense of regret, yet it is a manifestation of the transition from the pioneer phase to a phase of organisational differentiation that we have seen above. It is also an example of the different qualities of leadership and management. Management is about running a complex organisation, using specialist knowledge and specialist skills. It is about information, co-ordination, and organisation.

Leadership, on the other hand, is about inspiring confidence in people. It is about vision and the future. It is based on the ability, as Brink pointed out, of being able to see the next developmental phase of the community, of leading the way, and inspiring people to create the appropriate social and organisational forms for the future.

It is probably true to say that all of the different forms and styles of leadership that I have outlined above - with the possible exception of the autocratic boss - are present to one degree or another in the Camphill communities, depending on the formal structures, the developmental phase and the personalities and preferred styles of those living and working in the communities.

It is also probably also true to say that, despite these differences, the elusive aspiration of members of the communities is towards the form of a 'community of all leaders' or a 'community of no leaders'. However, Avison's words remain both a warning and a challenge. This form is only achieved when every member of the community - or, recognising the pragmatic considerations regarding the make-up of these communities, when every member of the peer group of those accepting long-term responsibility - achieves a high condition of moral development and a personal mastery of the skills required to build a mature community.

CHAPTER 5: DEVELOPMENTAL PHASES OF CAMPHILL COMMUNITIES

Now that I have set out a variety of models of the development of intentional communities, and also considered some aspects of the different forms of leadership that accompany this development, it is time to turn specifically to the development of Camphill communities.

Previously, in describing the various developmental models, I gave many examples from the story of the development of the Camphill communities. Now, at the risk of a certain amount of repetition, I will drawing together much of what I have set out so far into one comprehensive model.

In this chapter I will be looking at the communities in terms of how they have evolved from the first days to the present day. In the next chapter I will set out some thoughts about some possible and potential future developmental forms of the Camphill communities.

THE PIONEER PHASE

An enlightened individual has a vision. He - it is usually a man - inspires others and begins to form a community around the vision. In this early stage the community is based on the personality of the leader and leadership is charismatic and authoritarian. People join the community in this phase because they have been moved by an encounter with the leader and inspired by his vision.

The accounts and anecdotes of those people who joined Camphill in the early days make it clear that Karl Konig was indeed a highly charismatic personality. Many people have described that their encounter with him changed their lives and stressed the deep significance of a personal meeting with him. They said that they felt as if Dr. Konig knew them better than they knew themselves.

They have also described their great sense of personal loyalty to him and their absolute trust in the direction and guidance that he gave to their lives and in his spiritual, social and organisational leadership.

In her description of these early days, Monteux says that Dr.Konig and his wife, Tilla, were revered as mother and father figures. It is a common trait in pioneering communities that the founder leader is regarded as a father figure and even addressed as 'Father'. This not only indicates the fact that other members of the community are glad to seek leadership from the founder, but also that they have renounced their previous family allegiances. Similarly, and again in common with other intentional communities - especially religious ones - the early Camphill founder members referred to each other as 'brothers and sisters'. Many lectures given in these earlier days begin with the words, 'Dear Brothers and Sisters'.

Despite the egalitarian and inclusive ideals of community, it is clear that Dr. Konig was the leader and that a structural hierarchy of power and influence was in place. In common with other intentional communities in the pioneer phase of development, the leader was also 'protected' from the ordinary members by a trusted inner circle of his friends and fellow founder members. Access to Dr.Konig had often to be arranged through the members of this inner circle.

In this pioneering phase the ethics of the leader are internalised by all the other community members. They submit to the leader and the leadership style willingly, glad to be allowed to partake in something so inspiring, unique and creative. The individual is in service to the community and places their trust and energy at the disposal of the leader. The mission and goals are clearly expressed by the leader - and later by those who the leader appoints as his successors - and these people become the moral authorities for the communities.

Those who are not willing to submit to this leadership, or grow disillusioned with it, are faced with no choice but to leave. In the case of Camphill, this was what happened to Hans Schauder. He felt that he could not go along with the leadership of Dr. Konig and left Camphill to begin the Garvald communities.

Ironically, he says that he did not wish to lead the new Garvald communities in the way in which Dr. Konig had led the Camphill communities, yet also recognised that his relative lack of leadership allowed problems to develop that might have been avoided if he had been more autocratic.

In his autobiography, 'My Vienna', Hans Schauder writes the following, '*I could not and did not want to put my stamp on Garvald in the way that Konig had done in Camphill. When Garvald was founded, our ideal was that of a free community where people would undertake their responsibilities to the best of their abilities and where a free commitment by the individual member of staff creates harmonious co-operation between them all. Many such idealistic communities have been started and they mostly suffer the same fate as Garvald did at the time. Individual members of the community still had so much room for manoeuvre that this led in the end to chaotic conditions which I would not have been able to control even if I had been more robust………no community can exist without order. This applies particularly to communities which care for children with disabilities. I was, however, unable to wield the rod of iron*'.

Shauder's words of reflection are in recognition of the need for certain leadership characteristics in the Pioneer stage of development. Schauder wished to miss out the first, autocratic, phase of community development and attempted to create a community based on qualities that only emerge in later stages of development.

Jean Vanier, the founder of the L'Arche communities, in his book 'Community and Growth' calls this pioneering phase the Heroic time. Everybody is full of youthful idealism and energy; everybody is 'hands-on', working hard with very little resources and no material reward. The reward is the fulfilment of being totally engaged in a unique venture. Nothing is impossible. As new challenges and unexpected situations demand answers, the leader or leading group is continuously finding new answers out of intuition and creativity. It is a time of initiative and improvisation. The community is flexible and responsive. Decisions can be made quickly and people are happy to spend hours in animated conversation sharing their inspiration and thoughts for the future. It is a creative and exciting time.

This is the time of fundamentalism and absolute certainty. There is a sense also of being chosen to fulfil a unique mission for the benefit of the development of humanity. It is a time of separation from the world, of being different, perhaps even a sense of being 'chosen' or called to a special task of momentous importance.

Thomas Weihs, one of the founders of Camphill, wrote in 1979 that '*1939-1949 was the phase of absoluteness and intolerance. We saw our task in standing against the whole world……from which we had set ourselves off……we lived, convinced of our task, certain of our mission and spiritual intention…It was strenuous but triumphant. It was easier than any later time*'.

Despite the firm hold of Dr.Konig on all community affairs, nonetheless he began the process of differentiating the separate areas of responsibilities of running the Camphill Schools and of the awareness of the expanding Movement. He began to delegate responsibility to people and in this way, he also helped to ensure the survival of Camphill as a Movement after his death.

The bonds of allegiance that had previously been vertical - from the leader to the members - now became horizontal - from one member to another, or perhaps more accurately, horizontally between the members of the trusted inner circle of leaders, and later between those leaders of the new communities as the Movement expanded.

The Pioneering phase did not end with the death of Dr.Konig. Those people to whom he entrusted responsibility for the Movement continued to fulfil the role of community leaders and exercised a form of leadership not so dissimilar to that exercised by Dr.Konig. They also enjoyed the loyalty, commitment and deference of their fellow community members. This was the case in each new community that formed during these years. Each in their turn went through the phases of development that had marked the development of the first Camphill community.

There is a shadow side to this first phase of development, as indeed there are for all subsequent phases. There is a lack of independence among the community members as they submit to the authority of the leader and the immediate demands of communal life. The community is also in danger of becoming overly self-centred and inward-looking; feeling that it has all the answers and is therefore in some way 'better', more enlightened than mainstream society. The community boundaries are rigid and exclusive. In this phase, communities can be very 'liminal', marginal and vulnerable. There is a danger that the community is only held together by the vision and presence of their leader and, indeed, as we have seen before, most communities do not survive beyond the death of their founder.

This is the time and the phase in community development when the feeling of community is most intense. The community is small, simple and cohesive. Everybody is the same, there is a feeling of a family. It could be said that there is a feeling of 'group consciousness'.

One might say that despite the authoritarian leadership style, despite the sacrifices and renunciation, the lack of money and other resources, the hard physical work, the lack of personal space and free time – that despite all of this, the sense of community will never be so strong again.

Yet it is probably more accurate to say that it is *because* of all of these things that the sense of community is so strong at this early stage.

From now on things only become more complicated.

After some years of the pioneer phase, problems begin to emerge that indicate that a change is needed. This phase begins to show its limitations and the need to move on to a new phase becomes more pressing.

As the community increases in size and complexity, new decision-making and organisational processes become necessary. The previously autocratic leadership style and the often spontaneous and chaotic decision-making system are challenged by newcomers who have not shared the experiences of the early days and who have less deference and loyalty to the leaders.

While the pioneer phase provided the only answers needed in the early stages of the community's development, the community now begins to run up against the limitations of that first phase. New forms and structures, new leadership styles begin to develop to provide answers to new questions posed by the fact that the community has now grown in size and complexity.

However, there is no clear line of demarcation between the first and second phase, nor between any of those that follow. Instead, the communities change - either incrementally or rapidly depending on circumstances - until a new and different form of development becomes apparent. It is often only in retrospect that it is possible to say that the community has indeed moved onto to a new and different phase in its development. The communities slowly change until a new and different form of development becomes apparent.

THE ORGANISATIONAL PHASE

Different terms have been used by different authors to describe the second phase of community development. It has variously been termed the 'professional' or 'bureaucratic' phase and the phase of 'differentiation'. I have chosen to call this time the phase of 'organisation' and this aptly describes what might be felt to be the dominant mood and activity of this next stage.

Obviously, the communities did not only start to manifest signs of organisation once they had left the phase of pioneering behind them. Many elements of organisational development, specialisation and differentiation were already making themselves felt in the phase of pioneering. Lievegoed said that the main principles of the second phase of commercial organisations were mechanisation, standardisation, specialisation and co-ordination. All of these principles have been identified in the earlier consideration of trends at work in Camphill communities.

This is the time when both organisations and communities begin to separate out the different functions, hence the use of the term 'differentiation' to describe it. Another word used is bureaucratic. The word 'bureau' comes from the French and is the word that was used for a desk with many drawers and compartments. Later it came to mean a department of government. Thus bureaucracy is a style of government or organisation that is based on managing affairs by separating them out into specialised departments.

In Camphill communities this second phase is marked by the formation of separate groups for finances, building and maintenance, land work, house concerns, admissions, workshop issues, education, training, staff recruitment, the cultural life and so on. It is the phase when mandated groups are formed to deal with specific issues. Group leaders are appointed to head up the various groups and there are co-ordinating meetings to pull the work of all these groups together. And then there are complicated diagrams of how all the different groups relate to each other; the flow of communication, the line of decision-making.

It is the time of management. All the different functions, all the responsibilities, the work of all the people, need to be co-ordinated and managed in order to ensure that the community is run in an efficient manner.

Whereas the pioneer phase was intuitive, informal and personal, the phase of organisation is rational, formal and impersonal. Now there is a shift from identification with the original impulse towards an emphasis on functions and procedures. The emphasis is less on why people came together in the first place and more on how they now function as a group. It is about how to maintain what has been inherited; how to run the organisation that has emerged from the inspiration of an earlier time. It is a time of community and organisational maintenance.

Jean Vanier describes this as the time when the community and its members fall from heroism to the concerns of daily life; from idealism and inspiration to pragmatism and reality.

In her book 'The Shadow Side of Community and the Growth of the Self', Wolff-Salin interprets the second stage as being the time when the community moves from being 'on the edge' to becoming stable and structured. She says that liminality becomes institutionalised as the focus of the community shifts from life to work. She says that in the process mystery becomes routine.

Yet she also recognises that the differentiation is too extreme to fully reflect reality. Even in a structured and organised community, there must be moments of what she and others have termed 'communitas', a heightened experience of togetherness that characterises liminal communities. By this she means moments of honest sharing, humility, aspects of the sacred and the symbolic. While she says that communitas without structure is unreal, she also says that structure without communitas is soulless.

Looking at Wolff-Salin's work in terms of the patterns of developmental stages it could be said that the passion and enthusiasm of the pioneer phase cannot last for ever and will eventually cool off into something more sustainable and better able to ensure long-term viability.

And yet on the other hand a community that becomes so organised, structured and bureaucratic that there is no longer any breathing space for just that passion and enthusiasm has lost just those unique elements that mark it out as a true community rather than a collegial business, co-operative venture or communal organisation.

It is for this reason, among others, that in many Camphill communities this transition to a new phase of development has often been accompanied by a certain degree of angst, confusion and even division along ideological lines. It is a time of moving, however reluctantly, from the idealism of the amateur to the competence of the professional. The time when people begin to realise that Camphill communities are not just about an idealistic and alternative lifestyle, but are also professional care providers. The feeling of angst among some members of Camphill communities is heightened by the feeling that the emphasis on organisational development has in some way had a detrimental affect on the spiritual and cultural life of the communities. There is little doubt that it is just the spiritual and cultural aspects of community that can so often provide the sense of 'communitas' - of the sacred and symbolic - that Wolff-Salin says gives balance to communities as they become more organised and structured.

In this second phase of community development good intentions and good will are no longer enough and there is now a policy and procedure for everything. Jean Vanier says that *'communities start in mystery and end in bureaucracy.'*

Kathy Galloway, leader of the Iona Community, gave an address at the New Lanark Conference 'Building Inclusive Communities' in 2004 that describes this developmental process. I have quoted from this earlier on, but I repeat it here as it so aptly describes the experience of so many intentional communities, including the Camphill communities.

'The Iona Community started off as a movement, a religious community. But somehow it got to a point where it discovered that it was also an organisation with a turnover of nearly 2 million pounds a year, fifty staff and hundreds of volunteers. In order to be true to itself as a movement, it has had to sit down and work out what it means to operate justly and with integrity as an employer, as a limited company, as a business. Inclusiveness is then worked out in lengthy deliberations about holiday pay and grievance procedures, in decisions about what kind of coffee to buy and how best to recycle the rubbish. Sometimes it feels as if we have written policies about **everything!**

All of this is a huge amount of work………but it is absolutely a fundamental of good practice……I think it's not enough to depend on the personal good will, or patronage, of a few influential individuals, or even on the good intentions of a community. Nice people don't guarantee good practice, only appropriate structures do that. One of my predecessors as Leader of the Iona Community used to say 'good administration is a form of love' and I agree with him'.

Many people in Camphill communities have had, or continue to have, difficulties with this transition from the first to the second phase of community genesis. Community members have asserted that 'I am proud to be an amateur and I do not want to be a professional'.

As we have seen previously, many of those people now in leading positions in the communities originally joined to avoid becoming a 'professional' and now find themselves managing an increasingly complex and successful organisation. Offices increase in size and the time spent in offices increases. People have said that 'this is not why I came to Camphill'.

There is a certain amount of ambivalence at this time, both among different people and between different communities. Some people are determined to resist moving into this stage of organisation, fearing that with the adoption of management systems there will be a loss of creativity, spontaneity, freedom and individual expression. They fear also the loss of the traditional culture of the communities; the active cultural life and the communal events. When faced with the requirement to obtain an accredited qualification, some of these people have said that they would rather leave Camphill than take part in a professional training course.

To some extent, of course, these fears have indeed been realised, as my research work has shown. There seems to be clear evidence that the stage of organisation is accompanied by the lessening of a sense of community. I use the term 'accompanied by' as it is far too complex an issue to say that the phase of organisation *leads to* a lessening of the sense of community.

Yet experience, evidence and the stories of others indicate that the experience of 'communitas' is at risk in this phase.

However, other people view this phase as a welcome departure from a climate in the communities of an arbitrary, over-personal and often disorganised and inconsistent way of working. The view of these people is that it is time to move onto a different way of running the community and they embrace the clarity, objectivity, order and the transparency of a more organised management system. It is also said that, as Camphill communities receive all or most of their funding in return for providing care, then they are accountable for the way in which the money is spent, the community is managed and the level of the care that is provided. All of these aspects need to be embraced consciously and responsibly and new attitudes and skills need to be cultivated in order to do so.

This touches on an area of controversy that I have referred to in many different ways previously; namely the balance and tension between the parallel and inextricably linked impulses of creating and maintaining an intentional community and providing care to vulnerable people.

The impact of regulations concerning care provision has been identified previously by some people as a good part of the reason that the communities have been moving away from being a community and becoming more of a professional care organisation.

But it is not so straightforward that one can assert that care regulations are to blame for the fact that Camphill communities have moved in this direction. I would rather say that the communities were already tending to move in this direction as a natural development from the pioneer phase to the phase of organisation. Both Weihs and Monteux, in describing the history of Camphill, have said that the Movement had entered a stage of what they have termed 'consolidation' within ten years of its inception. The requirement to register Camphill communities as schools and care provisions and the accompanying increase in state involvement is a process that began only in the 1980s, some thirty years after the inception of Camphill. Therefore it is difficult to assert that regulations alone have caused the communities into an organisational mode.

Regulations were not the only catalyst for change. Many forces of changes were operating at the same time. It is more accurate to say that the impact of the new and increasingly stringent regulatory regime became the focus of change; it provided a focus and amplification for a variety of forces of change already at work in the communities.

One consequence of the requirement to integrate these regulations into community life has been a shift in the balance between Camphill as a spiritual/cultural/social/community-building impulse and Camphill as a care provider. In the development of Camphill these two have always been inseparable, yet the balance tends to change over time and from community to community.

In this second phase of development, and in response to the intervention of the state in the form of a new care ideology and the subsequent new regulatory regimes, there is no doubt that a major shift in this balance took place.

This shift of emphasis is characteristic of communities that are moving from their first to the second phase of their development. Whereas many communities have moved on from the time of pioneering, all Camphill communities are in this second phase of development, and to a certain extent will remain so. Even if they succeed in developing beyond this phase, they will never leave it entirely behind. The phase of organisation, professionalisation, bureaucracy, individualisation and differentiation is the 'modus operandi' of any Camphill community that has been in existence for more than 15-20 years. While some smaller places may still retain some of the characterises of an earlier stage, all communities of a certain age and size will inevitable adopt an organisational style of management and experience differentiation among its membership.

As all the Camphill communities in Scotland are over 20 years old - and some are over 60 years old - it is clear that they are all either in this organisational phase or are moving beyond it.

But, even when communities begin to develop further onto new and higher levels, they will still operate on a daily basis at this organisational level. It is not yet possible for a community to provide care for people with learning disabilities, be accountable to the state, manage a differentiated workforce and remain financially viable without a firm grounding in organisational management.

This stage is not without its difficulties, as has been seen. One aspect of the shadow side of the second phase shows itself in the fact that some people become disillusioned or even feel that they have to leave as they cannot come to terms with the transition to this new phase of development.

The danger that organisational principles overwhelms the human side of community life is articulated in the notes from the Camphill Movement Group meeting in October 1997. The report from Scotland said that, in order to relate to the world, there was, (at that time), the need to quantify, qualify and 'professionalise' all aspects of community life; '*it is easy to get bogged down in the practical, to turn to machinery, cars and computers to solve the practical and to forget the human side of life.* In a similar vein; '*people are so involved in the official side of life that the actual community life suffers'.*

This echoes the sentiments of Jean Vanier that it becomes easier at this stage of community development to make and obey rules than to love other people.

Within the context of the Scottish communities there have been examples of community division and even disintegration caused by differing views as to how the community should develop during this second phase.

There were examples in Scotland of communities that tried to stay in the pioneer phase indefinitely. It was the mode that people felt most comfortable in and the one that they equated with community at its best. People who felt that way actively and consciously resisted anything that smacked of external pressure to become more professional, since they saw it as inimical to community. At this point some community members disengaged from taking an active role in the leadership, decision-making and management of their communities.

However, resisting the need for change meant that some communities struggled to cope with an increasing number of difficulties. These included organisational aspects; the office work had increased over the years but neither time, space or resources had been allocated to keep up with this. The result was that necessary work did not get done on time and that a few individuals who felt responsible for this realm became overloaded while others did not recognise the importance and relevance of their work.

In some situations people tried to muddle along as best as they could without having acquired the necessary skills to deal with a changed environment. Issues to do with external requirements and governance were avoided or dealt with inappropriately.

Eventually cracks began to appear, both in the running of the community and also between people. Motivation and commitment was probably at a low point for some community members.

In some places this manifested itself as division into camps, with the traditionalists on one side and reformers or modernisers on the other. However, while this was a major problem at one time, most people and most communities have now come to terms with the need to integrate change and to move forward into a new phase of community development.

Some writers have suggested that the members of the second generation of intentional communities suffer from a feeling of guilt that they have not been able to uphold the ideals and vision of the founders nor been able to live up to their expectations. They are told that the early heroes worked harder, were more inspired and motivated and made greater sacrifices than the present generation. Things were harder and more glorious in the past and are much easier now. There is a sense of implied criticism and an implicit assumption that the early days were better.

There is then an understandable sense of disillusionment among the second generation that they have the responsibility of the present and the future rather than the glory of the past.

In conclusion, it can be seen that the transition from the pioneering phase of community development to the subsequent phase of organisation is marked by a certain amount of disillusionment, disengagement, resistance and even division. Yet on the other hand it is also marked by a certain sense of clarity, order and renewed purpose.

No matter how community members experience this transition, it is nonetheless inevitable that at some point in the development of their community, the emphasis is going to shift away from the early pioneering style and towards a more settled and organisational way of living and working in community.

THE THIRD PHASE: CHANGE AND TRANSFORMATION

There was something inevitable about the move from the pioneer stage to the stage of organisation. It had to do with the death or withdrawal of the founder individual or founder group and the increase in size, complexity and differentiation of the community along with the need to respond to changes in the external environment.

There is something less predetermined about the nature of the transition to the next phase of development. It is partly an unconscious process as the community moves from one phase to another following the principles of community development. It is also something to do with some people becoming aware that things can no longer continue as before; that new attitudes and outlooks, structures and forms are needed to do justice to what is now needed. The leaders begin to tune into these developmental principles and like all good leaders, imagine how things could be better in the future, on a higher level of community existence. In this way it become a conscious, proactive and willed development. It is the time to integrate all the change that has taken place in so many areas of community life, to reassess how the community is doing and to revisit, and perhaps reformulate, the communal vision, values and goals.

The manner in which this is done varies greatly from community to community and is much more of an individual and specific process than was the transition from the first to the second phases.

It will depend on a variety of specific elements. This will include the history of that community, its culture, its core task, its location and external environment. It will also depend on the character of the people who live and work there, the quality of their relationships, their individual and communal working styles and their past experiences and future aspirations.

I experienced some difficulty in finding the appropriate term for this third phase in the development of Camphill communities. I settled for 'change and transformation', as it seems to me that there are two processes at work together at this time - processes that are similar but also different.

Change can be either positive or negative. It means that something has become different. Transformation, however, is usually seen as being positive and is far more radical. It could be said that a series of changes accumulates to the point that something is transformed; no longer recognisable in its new form from how it was previously. In the context of community development, it could be said that an ongoing process of incremental changes has tipped the communities into a new phase. They have metamorphosed into a new kind of community with fundamentally different attitudes, outlooks, forms and structures.

It seems to me that this third phase of development combines Glasl's phases of 'Integration' and 'Association' and Brink's phase of 'Transformation'.

Integration is certainly a major theme of this time as the communities attempt to incorporate a great variety of changes on many different levels. There is also a move towards 'association'.

There are many signs that the communities are turning outwards in order to link up with other similar initiatives. But it could not yet be said that the communities have moved beyond their own concerns to establish associative relationships as the new way of working. The associative mode of community development is a concern and aspiration of a relatively small number of people.

This third phase also corresponds to Brink's stage of 'Transformation'. Just as Brink describes, people in the communities are formulating new statements of their vision and mission; the communities are finding ways to allow community members to develop their potential both personally and professionally, and there is a new awareness of social, ethical and environmental responsibility.

Brink made the point that, in regard to an ideal-based organisation, this transition can be a difficult time as the organisation may have to go back and learn lessons that it had failed to learn in previous phases; lessons about both organisational management and putting people first. She adds that this process often requires the help of an external consultant. This has indeed been a recent scenario in some of the Camphill communities.

Bang terms the second phase of community development the time of 'Maturity'. His list of the hallmarks of this phase - specialisation, efficiency, professionalism and differentiation - leave us in no doubt that he is describing the phase that I have termed as 'organisation'. However, his description of the third phase - which he terms 'Old Age' - catches some of the aspects of the experiences of communities at this time, but not others. It emphasises the feeling of tiredness, the concerns over money and security and the lessening of inspiration. Bang's term 'Old Age' implies that people in the communities are tired and approaching the end of their working lives, which for some people, is of course, true. Concerns over care of the elderly - both residents and coworkers - is currently a major issue in the Scottish Communities

Tiredness was also an issue that was addressed in Steffen's 'Co-workers and their Communities in Camphill England and Wales'.

His report says that many coworkers, after 20 or 30 years of service in the communities, '*entertain the question of giving their life a new direction – either within or outside Camphill – 'before it is too late'. Some have left to train or study; some to provide services to Camphill from 'outside' such as holiday facilities and retreat centres; others to be employed by Camphill centres as therapists, workshop masters etc. Most of those who remain find themselves under more intense pressure and responsibility. Some feel they have to stay to ensure the continuity; some because they could not face the uncertainty, emotionally and materially. A few move on to another community where a different situation may provide new ways to express their openness and creativity in community life. Old age provision is now a real concern for all. In my conversations and work I met many co-workers of this generation who expressed how tired they feel, particularly in adult communities. Stuck in their own and the community's 'ruts'.*
The tiredness is often in relation to living with residents, and taking on of a never-ending stream of new, short-term co-workers. Tiredness is also often in relation to unresolved and seemingly insoluble human difficulties between senior co-workers which seem to paralyse at a deep level the ability of the community to move on creatively'.

However, despite the very evident signs of tiredness, and despite the age of some of the communities and the people living in them, it would be going too far to imply that they are entering a process of decline and dissipation. Indeed, there are signs that other processes are also at work. As the term 'transformation' implies, this can be a time of renewal.

As I have said before, the borders between these three phases are not as clear-cut and well-defined as this model would make out. The communities have evolved from the pioneer phase into the phase of organisation and professionalisation. Now, in this third phase, many aspects of the previous phase continue to dominate the management practices, the social forms and the daily experience of life. Yet what is different is that new elements make their presence felt. Some of these new elements become well established, others appear as embryonic, tentative and exploratory initiatives and will only reach their full potential in a future phase of development.

There are two aspects to the changes that are occurring at this time. On the one hand, the communities have had to change in reaction to changes in their external environment. Examples of this would be the need to conform to the requirements from external regulatory bodies and the need to employ people to central roles within the communities. These changes are reactive.

On the other hand the communities have made clear and conscious decisions on a number of issues that show a high level of self-determination. Examples of these would be the transformation of the Camphill Seminar into an accredited degree course; the decision to introduce the Ways to Quality course into the communities and the formation of Camphill Scotland.

A further example is the way that the communities have become more inclusive; encouraging residents, coworkers and employees to be more involved in, and have more say in, the life and management of their community.

It can be said that even the proactive, transformative, decisions have in reality been made in reaction to change. This is true, yet the communities nonetheless saw in these challenges the opportunity to improve their practice and to transform themselves.

A good example of this process of transformation in the face of change is described in 'Holistic Special Education'. In the chapter entitled 'History and Philosophy' Angelika Monteux describes a feeling of insecurity and crisis of confidence that eventually led to what she calls a new phase of pioneering:

'*The impact of regulations and the adoption of the inclusion policy caused great insecurity and many began to question not only the ongoing need for curative education, but also the relevance of the traditional Camphill ideals, values and practices. Were they still adequate and meaningful in the modern age? Looking back now it is clear that this crisis of confidence opened the way to a phase of renewed pioneering. The perceived attacks on fundamental Camphill values and principles led to a process of re-appraisal and re-evaluation of Camphill traditions. This gave new insights into the essential character of curative education and the confidence to start a dialogue and positive exchange with professional and government bodies. It was important to open doors to the wider professional environment and to make the wealth of knowledge and experience gained in the School available to others, whilst at the same time gaining new insights through that exchange'.*

The 5 elements of the third phase
The third phase of community development is the most complex and challenging so far, especially as it plays out on many different levels. It is also the phase of development that all, or most, of the Camphill communities in Scotland currently find themselves in.

Recognising that several different processes are at work during this phase of development, I will now attempt to separate them out in order to see better what is happening. It is possible to discern five related, yet also distinctive, strands of development in the communities in this current phase. I will consider them each in turn. They are as follows:

- Integrating change
- Integrating people's needs and developing their potential
- Developing new and inclusive structures
- Increasing awareness of wider concerns
- Reformulating vision and goals

Integrating Change

The communities have experienced a great amount of change during the course of the last 10-15 years, on many different levels. The list includes regulatory requirements, the move towards meeting the personal needs of both residents and coworkers, the decline in the traditional spiritual and cultural aspects of the communities, the increase in the ratio of employed workers compared to residential community members, the increase in complexity, diversity, differentiation, individualisation and specialisation on all levels of community life. A great amount of community time, energy and resources has gone into meeting the challenges of the last years.

New skills and new attitudes have had to be learnt, developed and integrated. Many people have undergone additional training and become internal trainers themselves.

My research has shown that for some people it seems as if there will never be an end to new requirements and expectations, and trying to keep up with them is seen as having distracted people from the true values and ethos of the communities.

Others have seen this as a difficult but rewarding experience that has led to the communities improving their practice and to individuals developing their potential, to the benefit of both the community in general and of all the people living and working in the communities.

What is very clear is that the communities have had to adapt to a great many changes, in both the internal and external environment. This was one of the hallmarks of the second phase of development of the communities. Now in the third phase it becomes a process of integrating all of these changes and their implications and consequences.

Integrating people's needs and developing their potential

Another hallmark is the move beyond organisational and management skills towards what is termed 'people skills'.

The third phase of community development is about the individual - recognising and supporting the needs and promoting the creative potential of the individual. It is also about moving beyond the realm of organisation and material concerns to the realm of ideals and aspirations, to the existential question of the real tasks of community-building.

In a previous section I set out what has been called 'A Sociological Law' formulated by Rudolf Steiner in the last years of the 19th century. He wrote that '*In the early stages of cultural evolution, human kind tends towards the formation of social units. Initially the interests of the individuals are sacrificed to the interests of those associations. The further course of development leads to the emancipation of the individual from the interests of the associations and to the unrestricted development of the needs and capacities of the individual. The greatest ideal of the state will be not to control everything. It will be a community which wants nothing for itself and everything for the individual'.*

An insight into the application of this law in Camphill communities is highlighted in the report by Deborah Admiral of an international gathering – the Karl Konig Centenary gathering - that was held in the Camphill community of Soltane, in America in 2002. The report reads; '*I think the phenomena we can see in society and all our places indicate that the Sociological Law is demanding payback for being under-appreciated. If we are not pro-active and outspoken in making our communities focus on serving the development of all the individuals within them (as opposed to the mood that all individuals are only there to serve the community) individuals will assert this demand anyway, leading to social dissolution'.*

We have seen that modern society shows all the signs of increasing individualisation and we have acknowledged that communities are not exempt from the effects of this. We have also seen that communities pass through a stage of cohesion and conformity, in which the individual is willing to serve the community, to a stage of individualisation and differentiation in which the individual begins to ask what the community can do to serve his or her needs.

In this latter stage community members are more likely to seek a higher degree of personal autonomy. They would like to have more space and time for themselves, to have their own separate accommodation within the community, to live outside the community and come in to work, to have clearly defined boundaries of responsibilities and participation, to pursue their own interests or to begin a course of training or employment outside of the community.

It may be said, with some justification, that the communities are finally putting people first not as an idealistic and altruistic aspiration born out of benevolent good will and a grasp of the inevitable laws of community development, but simply as a response to this trend of people putting themselves first.

This line of thinking would say that as people began to carve out for themselves some extra degree of personal and private space and time, the community had no choice but to go along with this. In this sense meeting the needs of individuals is a reaction to the rise in individualisation

But the new impulse of this third phase to focus on the development of the community members must be more than just a case of reacting to and accommodating their individual wishes, choices and needs. It must be a proactive aspiration to create an environment in which the individual is encouraged to become aware of their need to develop and to fulfil their innate potential on both personal and professional levels. The community can only develop to a higher level of wisdom and maturity if and when the individual community member also does so.

There are two processes at work simultaneously. On the one hand, the communities are witnessing an increase in what we can term *individualism* or *individualisation*. Community members are asserting their personal independence and their personal needs, wishes and aspirations.

On the other hand, at this stage of their development, the communities should be fostering the promotion of the *individuality*. This means that they should be doing all that they can to allow each individual to achieve their highest potential. This crucial distinction is captured in a quotation by Malidoma Some in the book 'Beyond You and Me'; '*Individuality, not individualism, is the cornerstone of community. Individuality is synonymous with uniqueness. This means that a person and his or her unique gifts are irreplaceable. The community loves to see all of its members flourish and function at optimum potential. In fact, a community can flourish and survive only when each member flourishes, living in the full potential of his or her purpose'.*

This points to the subtle distinction between individuals in community (individualism) and a community of individuals (individuality).

The third phase is the time of adjusting the balance between the individual and the community. In the earlier times, it was held to be a matter of course that the individual should surrender to the will of the community and put their destiny at the disposal of the community.

Nowadays, most people, even some of those who have spent many years living out these injunctions to the best of their abilities, and certainly most new people and employees, would be very wary of such sentiments. These words, and the ideals behind these words, belong to a different stage of the history of the community.

In any community setting the balance between the individual and the community is going to be a controversial and ongoing issue that, in most cases, will never be resolved to the satisfaction of all the community members. In reply to my research questionnaire, many people cited boundary issues between the individual and the community as one of the most negative aspects of community life.

The process of integrating the needs and fostering the development of the individual should not be seen as something that is inimical to community-building. It is a process through which the individual and the community become congruent; come into a harmonious balance. What is good for the individual is also good for the community and vice-versa.

We have seen previously that many of the coworkers who have been in positions of responsibility in the communities for some years are of roughly the same age, namely their late 40s and 50s. Therefore, we might think that they are also in roughly the same phase of personal development.

A characteristic of this time in a person's life is that they begin to go through a process of re-evaluating their life so far and to ponder on how it might have been different and perhaps could still be different. There might be the unconscious urge to develop an aspect of their life that had not been able to come to expression previously. As a result of this, some people, especially women who have spent many years looking after house communities and their own families, take up a new path in their life.

The experience in the Scottish region is that these new paths are focused around creative and healing impulses such as counselling, nursing, art and art therapy. Another focus has been on tutoring and mentoring; promoting the growth and development of younger people. Activities such as these are both ways in which older and more experienced community members are able to find a new role in life and also ways in which they can serve the development of others.

Here we can see very clearly that what promotes the development of the individual also benefits the community - or, at the very least, the members of the community.

The integration of the personal wishes and needs of the individual takes place on several complex levels. It is not just that people's needs have changed, but also that their articulation of them has changed. Whereas in the pioneering phase of community, people were willing to forego and renounce their personal needs so as to serve the community, the same people nowadays are less willing to do so.

There is currently a climate of rising expectations that is very different in nature from the previous emphasis on sacrifice, service, conformity and collectivism. In terms of the residents, they themselves, their parents and social workers and care mangers all expect higher standards of care and more personalised care planning and 'service delivery'. Residential coworkers, for their part, have higher expectations than previously concerning their standard of living, their personal time and private space.

In addition to this, those new people joining the communities now, whether on a residential or employed basis, do not join at the pioneering phase and therefore they are unlikely to subscribe to the ideology of that time. They join a modern community in which people expect to be able to articulate their needs and have them respected and accommodated, albeit with certain reasonable constraints. The third phase of community development is all about creating a new, healthy and sustainable balance in the inevitable tension between the individual and the community.

There are both negative and positive aspects of this move towards recognising the needs of the individual as against the needs of the community. My research clearly shows evidence of both aspects. On the one hand, some people - especially newer and younger people - say that their experience of community is on the increase.

They say that the communities have at last entered the modern age and are acknowledging that times have changed. While these people might bemoan the relative lack of communal events, they nonetheless appreciate the increase in attention that is now being paid to their needs and wishes. They express their appreciation of a new climate in the communities. They say that the communities are becoming more open to new arrangements and new ideas, and that people have more freedom than previously. In addition, there is more room for initiative, diversity and personal freedom.

Yet, there are some major reservations on the part of older coworkers about where all of this is leading. During the course of my research I heard many concerns as to how much community will be left when everybody has finished asserting their individual rights. These older people say that the experience of community is in decline.

Having gone through the phase of organisation and come to terms with a great deal of partly unwelcome change it would be understandable if many people in the community - especially the older ones and those with a more conservative outlook - have become worried or dissatisfied with the way in which the community is developing. It is no longer the community that they thought that they had joined and it may seem that many of the original Camphill ideals have been allowed to slip. In some cases, older community members decide not to enter the phase of organisation or only to do so reluctantly.

Thus, in this third phase of community development, if the community is to retain its cohesion and sense of common purpose, it is necessary to go back for those people who, for one reason or another, are not on board; to attempt to redeem the sense of disenchantment or disenfranchisement felt by some coworkers. This must be a genuine process of listening to grievances and trying to work together to understand how people feel. Recognising the level and speed of change, it is not surprising that individuals will have individual reactions to it. But the community as a whole would need to get everybody back on board if the next phase of development is to go forward. This is a fundamentally crucial process if the community is not to be hampered by members who have disengaged or 'opted-out', because this next phase is all about the involvement, inclusion and the fulfilment of each individual.

A further aspect of this phase of integrating people is the very complex and controversial aspect of the integration of employed workers into the communities. In many communities, employees have been recruited into roles and tasks that had been previously been held by residential coworkers. Others have been recruited to posts that had not existed previously in the communities.

As my research highlighted, currently 40% of the workforce of the Scottish Camphill communities is employed. The demographic trends highlighted in my research also showed that this percentage is going to increase in the future. The integration of this employed workforce has not been a smooth process, and there still remain difficulties on both sides.

Some residential respondents to the research questionnaire blamed the changes in their experience of community on the negative effect of employing too many people into central positions.

For their part, some employed respondents spoke of the pressure to conform to the conception of community that they did not feel comfortable with.

They also said that they are not comfortable with the perception that employees are in some way 'second-class' members of the community. Some expressed that their expectations of community did not match what they experienced on a daily level; that residential coworkers were not always able to live up to the ideals that they espouse.

The concerns around the question of how to integrate employees into the life of the communities is also a part of the process of creating community forms and structures that are truly inclusive.

Developing new and inclusive structures
Part of the process of recognising the importance of the individual in community life is to involve more people in decision-making and planning for the future. This move to involve the grassroots and stakeholders is born out of the recognition that people have the need and the right to have a say in matters concerning their life. It is also the recognition that such involvement will instil in community members the feeling that they are valued, which in turn will enhance their sense of 'ownership'. It represents a move away from previous organisational and management structures that may have disenfranchised many people towards more inclusive, transparent and egalitarian community processes. This process also serves to ensure the future viability of communities in that it encourages, empowers and enables new people to take up positions of responsibility and leadership.

Community members have been proud to say that there are no 'bosses' in Camphill and that decisions are made communally and by consensus. Despite this, some new people joining the communities have been surprised and dismayed to find that there are firmly entrenched hierarchies in place.

The reality is that the communities have not always been inclusive in the past. There have been hierarchies of age, experience, responsibility and commitment. The prevalence of such hierarchies is due to several different reasons.

It is partly due to the nature of the task and the responsibilities of looking after vulnerable people and the management and governance issues that go with that. It is partly due to the need to provide consistency, purpose and order on both a community and organisational level. It is also partly due to innate human nature, in that some people tend to move towards positions of authority and leadership, and others do not. It is also partly due to the wish on the part of some people to attempt to maintain and uphold the ethos and culture of Camphill. For all of these reasons, it was felt that only certain people were qualified to take part in decision-making processes.

To a large extent, this remains the same today. Yet there are also significant changes. There has been a move over the last years to include coworkers, residents, employees and board members in a whole range of community processes.

A good example of this trend is the series of conferences held at New Lanark over the last years under the collective title of 'Building Inclusive Communities'. There is also an ongoing series of one-day conferences for residents and those who attend on a day basis. Most communities now have meetings that are designed to provide a platform for the views of residents to be expressed and for them to become more involved generally in the life of their community.

Another example is the formation some years ago of Camphill Dialogue; an international meeting designed primarily for the external members of management councils.

A further example is the number of employees who now are part of the management structures and others who are House Co-ordinators in the communities.

These examples, and there are no doubt others, point to the fact that there has been a very noticeable trend over the recent years towards the creation of more inclusive structures.

Increasing awareness of wider concerns

Communities in the pioneer phase tend to be somewhat introverted. People who join pioneering communities have to some extent rejected the conventions and values of mainstream society and their main focus is on creating a utopia that is set apart from the world. The primary concerns of pioneering communities revolve around internal processes and they are wary of becoming too involved in the affairs of the outside world.

Later, in the organisational phase, the communities are busy dealing with internal processes and structural organisation. Their engagement with the world is often characterised by an element of defensiveness.

However, as communities develop over time they become more inclusive internally and more responsive externally. The third phase of community development is marked by a degree of positive engagement with the wider society. As communities develop, they become more aware of their responsibilities towards their local social, economic and ecological environment and to the more general global concerns of their time.

There are two levels to this new impulse of association. On the one hand there is the associative working between Camphill and Anthroposophical initiatives. There are some long-standing examples of this such as the Association of Camphill Communities and the Scottish Association for Curative Education and Social Therapy. A more recent example is the formation of the Council for Anthroposophical Health and Social Care and the Anthroposophical Curative Education and Social Therapy Association. These are associations that serve to foster interest, activity, co-operation and collaboration between initiatives, individuals and groups that all share a common ideological grounding.

On the other hand there is an increasing collaboration and partnership with other initiatives. One example is the partnership between the Camphill Schools and Aberdeen University that brought about the Bachelor of Arts course in Curative Education and Social Therapy. There has also been a rise in the level of public relations work, in partnership with professional external organisations. Camphill Scotland was formed specifically to engage with policy-making processes, regulatory authorities and also with other voluntary organisations providing social care.

However, Clemens Pietzner, in a report of the meeting of the Camphill Movement Group in June 2006, pointed to another aspect of this engagement. He suggested that '*There is some kind of structural inconsistency, which largely prevents Camphill from being an effective partner with others. Something needs to change in how we perceive that issue'.*

One is left to wonder what this 'structural inconsistency' might be. It is certainly true that Camphill is not as engaged with other initiatives as might be expected and that relatively few community members are active in this process. Perhaps it is to do with Camphill's strong sense of separate identity and a feeling of not wanting to compromise this identity. Perhaps it is due to an excessive degree of introversion, or a lack of confidence, time or skills. It does appear, as Pietzner suggests, that something will have yet to change if Camphill communities are to become fully effective partners with bodies and initiatives not directly related to Anthroposophy.

Just as there are signs of an increasing will to engage in partnership relations, there are also numerous signs that some community members are developing a heightened awareness of, and sense of responsibility towards, issues and concerns of the wider society. This interest is most obvious in relation to 'green' and ecological issues such as Bio-dynamic horticulture and agriculture, nutrition, complementary medicines and healthcare, ecological building and energy use.

However, it is interesting to explore on what level the sense of responsibility is made manifest and which issues are taken up as concerns.

The aims of the Camphill Movement are 'to work for the Good' and 'to uphold the dignity of the Human Being where it is under threat'.

The focus of these aims has always been on building life-sharing communities for and with people with learning disabilities. There was never the intention that Camphill would campaign for these aims. There has always been an unspoken and unacknowledged understanding that if members of Camphill communities were to engage in civil, political and societal campaigning, they would do so as an private citizen and not as a representative of Camphill. Dr.Konig's views on this are made clear in an article by Melville Segal in the Camphill Correspondence of March/April 2006. Segal says that *'Dr.Konig…advocated the establishment of 'islands of culture' in which the warm heart forces of the intellectually disabled person would play a vital role. For Dr.Konig, who was a refugee from the ravages of Nazi aggression, such sheltered communities should be a far more lasting contribution to the future than "gesticulating before the steamroller" of negative social forces that were bound to arise after the Second World War'.*

However, in the 21st century, some people have said that the communities are out of touch with the real world. It has been said that in the early years the Camphill communities were leading the way on a variety of social issues, but that now they have been left behind.

This has changed over the years and the level of engagement in representation to policy-makers and the signing of petitions are increasing every year. There was a recent instance of Scottish Camphill communities launching a successful campaign against the proposal to build a new dual carriageway that would have run through two of the Aberdeen communities. But this is perhaps an exception to the rule that Camphill usually keeps a low public profile of social issues, even on issues to do with disabilities, intentional communities and social renewal.

The report from the Karl Konig Centenary celebration that was hosted by the American Camphill communities in 2002 highlighted the need felt by some people that Camphill lend its voice to those campaigning on important issues.

'There may well be a need for the transforming Camphill movement to draw fire to itself by being internationally outspoken on important world issues, e.g. abortion, hunger, product testing on animals, modern farming practices, GM development, energy misuse, pollution, education, health care, nutrition and so on. Such a transformation might encourage and require a greater sense of world citizenship in Community members and thereby dissolve the remaining barriers which prevent true integration of Camphill into the world'.

To a great extent both associative working and active and direct engagement in world issues remain as emergent phenomenon whose potential for community transformation is yet to be fully developed.

Reformulating Vision and Goals

We have seen that as communities become more mature they become more aware of the needs and aspirations of their members as individuals and of issues beyond their immediate boundaries. Further, they also become more self-aware and more reflective.

After all that they have experienced in the way of change, and having gone through an extended process of adaptation and integration, the Camphill communities and their members are currently evaluating where they stand now in relation to the original tasks, missions and values of Camphill.

Over the recent years there have been numerous meetings and conferences and other initiatives that have focused on these questions.

There were two conferences in Newton Dee, in 2000 and 2001 on 'The Future Development of Camphill in Scotland'. There was a Vision Meeting of the Aberdeen communities in 2005. The Association of Camphill Communities have formulated a Mission Statement for all the communities in UK and Ireland, and in 2002 produced revised Articles of Association that incorporated updated aims, objectives and principles of membership. On hand of the Ways to Quality programme, several communities have been busy drawing up Guiding Vision Statements. In 1999 and again in 2001 The Movement Group - the representative body of all the Camphill communities world-wide - asked the communities to address the question of 'what are the essentials of Camphill?' On the hand of this, the Movement Group then produced a paper in 2001 that was entitled 'Acknowledged and Accepted Essentials of Camphill'. They also produced an accompanying list of 'Observations and Reflections', which highlighted many of the themes that we have been looking at in regard to this third developmental stage of the communities:

'To make full, positive and creative use of the direct meeting and recognition of the other person is ever more a central element in the community-building of today. This has always played a vital part, but nowadays is the one aspect above all by which community life becomes meaningful, especially for young people'.

'Camphill is going beyond its borders and growing into the world, trying to meet the needs of the world'.

'Readiness to change and be flexible is an essential in our time: questioning,, mobility, and transformation, finding new ways of meeting and working together'.

'A new essential is partnership – there is a need to share ideas and ideals with other: parents, professionals and other organisations'.

Again, in 2005, in preparation for their meeting in June 2005, the Movement Group asked all the communities world-wide to address the following questions: *'What is your vision for your community over the next 5 years? What are your main challenges, hopes, aims?*

The final question has great relevance to our present considerations: '*What phase of development is your community going through?'* Unfortunately, respondents failed to engage with this last question and it remains unanswered.

The report following the meeting makes interesting reading in relation to the question of vision forming. I set out some extracts below:

'A clear vision is a very powerful thing and it is amazing what can happen in a place when this has been reached. Nowadays the main questions are – who will carry this vision, and how can we include all the people involved?'

'Visions for the future cannot come in the form of answers or solutions to practical problems. We need to find the right way of coming together to create space for a new perception and to ask the right questions. Where do we stand? What are our ideals? What is our mission, our vision?'

'Is vision *the wrong concept? Should we rather focus on something more inward, more in keeping with listening than in seeing, something more akin to ...devotion? It needs to be built up anew from the listening space created between people'.*

'We should perhaps not try to form our vision too strongly in advance – the main thing is to create the right conditions. The next step is not one of thinking and planning (necessary as they are) but of intuition'.

'A helpful principle is not to give fixed answers, but to live with questions, in a space of freedom'.

We can see from this report that no new vision has necessarily been arrived at. Yet we can witness a process of communities and individual members trying to arrive at insights as to how best to ask the right questions and to hear the answers.

Unfortunately, this 'living with questions' that was referred in the report, can be a frustrating process of endless and unresolved meetings about goals and strategy with little emerging in the way of clarity. This is perhaps yet another indication that the Camphill communities are in a stage of transition from one phase of development to another. They have not yet finally achieved all the potential development of the third phase, the phase that I have termed 'Change and Transformation'. Yet at the same time many community members are saying that it is time to move the communities forward into the future. It is clear that the old certainties are no longer in place. It is also clear that there is a will to create new forms and values. Despite this, a new vision for the future is not yet discernible.

As care providers the Camphill communities look set to continue their work for many years to come. As intentional communities, they no longer seem to have the answers to the questions and challenges of the present time. It seems that the communities are going through a period of transition. They have come up against certain limitations of their past and present forms and need to break through to a new level of development.

This process will involve yet more change. This change will work itself out on all levels simultaneously. It will affect the individual, the social and inter-personal relationships and the spiritual and cultural life of the communities. It will be felt in terms of the organisational forms and structures and may even bring about modifications in the identity and the boundaries of the communities.

To a certain extent, this change will simply happen by itself, whether or not the communities choose it. Yet some elements will be the result of conscious decisions made by community members; informed by an understanding of archetypal patterns of community development and born out of a clear vision of what is needed for the future.

CHAPTER 6: SOME INSIGHTS INTO THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENTAL FORMS OF CAMPHILL COMMUNTIES

At the beginning of this work, I set out the changes that have been occurring in the Camphill communities in Scotland over the last 10-15 years. I have tried to show that we can gain an understanding of these changes by looking at the broader patterns of how communities in general change and develop over time.

In this last section, I will be trying to imagine how the communities will change over the next 10-15 years. This will be based on extending the processes that have been considered previously and on the models of those writers whose work include future scenarios. By its very nature, what follows will a combination of foresight, hypothesis and conjecture. Nonetheless, it will be based on the continuation and fulfilment of the developmental principles and processes that informed all of this work.

There can be no doubt that the communities will continue to change in the future, just as they have done in the past. They will change simply because it is the nature of communities to change, and to some extent this will be a passive process of change taking place of its own accord. Yet change can also be directed. Through an understanding of the archetypal patterns of community development, people living and working in the Camphill communities can become active participants in the process of guiding the communities into a healthy and sustainable future. This will be a question of creating the appropriate social relationships and organisational forms and structures. It will be a question of having a vision for the future and building community around that vision.

Some aspects of this change and development will inevitably be a continuation of the past and the present. By this I mean that all the processes that have been identified in previous phases of community development will continue to work themselves out to some extent or another. Certainly, none of the various elements of the third phase have yet been developed to their full potential.

The communities are in a period of transition, and this process is set to continue for a good number of years. During this period new elements that contain promise for the future will begin to manifest at the same time that the communities are working to bring to fulfilment the potential of the present phase.

There will therefore be a continuation of phenomena that are characteristic of transitional phases. There is - and will continue to be - a certain amount of uncertainty and anxiety on both a personal and community level. This revolves around all the many changes that are presently taking place, not all of which are seen as being positive. It also revolves around the question of what the future is going to bring and what the communities are going to be like in the next years. There is an experience that the past no longer provides the answers for the present situations, but that the new answers for the future are not yet apparent.

But there are also plenty of new ideas and initiatives for the future that are presently being developed and put into practice. Some of these have proved to be successful, and some less so. This process of innovation and experimentation will continue as people search for new answers. There is a feeling that the future forms and structures do not need to be so firmly tied to the past as has been the case up to now. There is a certain degree of freedom to experiment - both out of necessity and out of the enthusiasm that comes with new ideas - and the willingness to allow and encourage the development of new ideas and new practices.

It needs to be said that although I am assuming that the Camphill communities will continue on into the future, this assumption may not prove to be valid.

Intentional communities tend to start out as very intense, 'on the edge' and enjoy high levels of togetherness and shared idealism. If they manage to continue beyond this point - and many do not - they tend to become less radical, less fundamentalist, less idealistic and more organised, more complex, more differentiated and more stable,. Therefore it is possible that some Camphill communities will remain indefinitely in this 'steady state', without any further major development. Some of them may continue as schools or care providers without any longer having any recognisable community identity or ethos. They may end up being assimilated back into the mainstream education or care sector.

Some may have to close for a whole range of reasons. This could be due to a lack of referrals and funding if the community is not deemed to be 'strategically relevant' to the authorities. It could be due to a process of internal crisis leading to implosion and collapse.

Others again may slowly wind down and close over a longer period for a variety of reasons.

There is also another future scenario to consider, and that is that Camphill- rather than the communities - continues, but in a new form.

Anke Weihs gave a talk in 1986, which was entitled 'The First Advent Sunday and the 30th November'. In this talk she shared her vision of how Camphill would develop into the future. '*It seems to me that there must be a metamorphosis of what we call 'community' into something else in the future……… What would a possible metamorphosis and future of Camphill be? I believe it is the change from Community to Brotherhood, and I believe that the seeds of Brotherhood were laid into Camphill from the very beginning. A community is defined, has contours, ways of life, a transcendent idea. Brotherhood has no defined contours; it goes from person to person. I think along these lines when I think of the future'*.

The implication is that the Camphill of the future will have no physical and tangible structure and presence. It will be a shared feeling of having something in common with other people; of sharing common beliefs and strivings. It is an experience rather than a location. This is based on the idea that a community impulse is more than its physical manifestation. It existed before a physical community was created and will continue after the demise of its tangible counterpart.

However, the hope has to be that some or most of the communities will continue to develop and will eventually emerge onto a new and higher level of community existence. Not only will they have found the answers for their future vitality and sustainability, but they will also be in a position to address the challenges of the future faced by society and humanity at large.

While recognising that success is not something that can be taken for granted, I will nonetheless continue on the assumption that some or all of the Camphill communities will continue to develop into the future.

And I will continue by firstly setting out insights from the writers I have cited previously - all of whom have turned their attention to the future development of Camphill communities, intentional communities and organisations.

As will be seen, there is a remarkable consensus among these writers as to how the organisations and communities of the future are going to develop.

William Steffen, writing in the concluding section of 'Coworkers and their Communities in Camphill England and Wales' offered a personal reflection entitled 'Community scenarios in the coming decade'.

He points out that he witnessed signs of rejuvenation in the communities that are small and urban. '*This is perhaps because the community has a size that enables and supports a high degree of differentiation of activities, creating a rich context, and people that support diversity and innovation. Other, smaller communities may be linked into an urban context in a flexible way, enabling a variety of forms of closer and looser involvement, training partnerships and scope for personal development of all involved*'.

He concludes that '*no doubt one of the defining elements that will ensure a future for a community will always be the qualities of human interest, potential for relationship building and openness to diversity in a carrying co-worker group*'.

Michael and Jane Luxford point to something of a similar nature in the conclusion of their book 'A Sense for Community'.

'*The most crucial aspect for Camphill today and into the future is, we conclude: to bridge over into the wider social context, by developing links and associations with other people and initiatives without losing 'own identity'......The necessity therefore, is not to give up on the spiritual characteristics of the Camphill Impulse or Movement. Instead it is to ever and again realise what these are, and to grasp that they are not exclusive but 'of the world'. What Camphill has achieved, as a* **sense of community** *has been a generally human impulse and necessity*'.

Rudolf Steiner, in his formulation of 'The Spiritual Principle', emphasised that any spiritual movement must exist for the good of humanity in general. It cannot exist just to serve its own specialised interests. The recognition here is that any social initiative, such as the Camphill Movement, that considers itself to be a spiritual impulse, and that wishes to do good, must overcome the inevitable tendency to become absorbed only in its own interests and concerns. Such introversion may have been appropriate in an earlier phase of its development, but as the community becomes more mature and more wise, it must seek to be effective in the world at large.

Margaret Wheatley uses the insights of 'The New Sciences' to throw new light upon the changes in the way that organisations operate. She says that there has been a recent move away from materialistic and mechanistic understanding of organisations to viewing them as patterns and webs of connections. From this, she says that the organisations of the future will be fluid, organic, boundary-less and seamless. The organisation will be less controlling but more orderly. Traditional forms of control and leadership will be replaced by personal initiative and by an individual sense of responsibility. She says that if people are free to make their own decisions guided by a clear organisational identity for them to reference, the whole system develops greater coherence and strength and can respond intelligently to changes in its environment.

Margarete van den Brink describes how, in the final and highest stages of their development, organisations and communities are based on moral values and principles, and that they will become contributors to world development.

In these new organisations the individual takes initiative and responsibility. Power is decentralised and structures are designed to promote the mission and values of the organisation as a top priority. Each individual is aware of the whole organisation and the organisation is aware of its responsibilities to the environment and to the wider society.

Udo Hermannstorfer takes up the same theme in a lecture entitled 'Social and Spiritual Renewal in Independent Organisations: Challenges of the 21st Century'. He sees the apparent loss of community as the time for its revival in a new form.

'*The point of being furthest away from the community as a developing individual can be at the same time the point of return. The individual may form connections, associations with other individuals. And this provides the possibility for building community. Just at the point where it seems that we have lost the old community, there arises the opportunity for building new communities. Out of the old community can be born the new. The old order was hierarchical. Now we can experience that in our new thinking we have no longer to organise ourselves hierarchically but can turn on the level of the 'I' to the self-determined ego, to each other. The turning to each other can bring about a new, open formative space.*'

He says that these new communities will be built around a common goal, and will depend upon the voluntary action of the individual. It will be based on common recognition and trust; on insight and shared consciousness. In these communities each individual is able to unfold their abilities and become effective; individual and social development goes hand in hand. These modern communities are open, inclusive and their influence reaches beyond their boundaries.

From all that I have set out previously concerning the third phase of the development of Camphill communities, and from the insights cited above, it becomes clear that the communities of the future will be characterised by different qualities than those of the past. They will be less defined in terms of their identity and boundaries and will have developed links to other, similar initiatives Further, they will have developed an awareness of their responsibility to the wider society, to the environment and to global concerns. The emphasis on a shared physical location will be less important than the quality of relations between individuals and their interest in each other. The emphasis on the individual serving the needs of the community will less important than the community serving the development of each individual to their full potential. The communities will be formed around individuals who have developed a high sense of autonomy and responsibility, who are able to take initiative and who enjoy a sense of mutual trust and shared consciousness. These new communities will be characterised less by communal solidarity and tradition and more by differentiation, collaboration, innovation and flexibility.

Throughout this work, the focus has been on Camphill communities as intentional communities and, to a lesser extent as organisations. I will be retaining the same focus in projecting models of community development on into the future. In what follows I will not been taking into consideration the aspect of the communities that is to do with social care and education. I will leave to others the task of discerning the future direction of curative education and social therapy in Camphill. Instead, I will be considering the aspects of personal development and interpersonal relationships, the social and cultural life, how communities are run and how they organise themselves, and how communities relate to their wider environment.

While, for the sake of this exercise, we will be considering these several aspects in isolation, in reality they all overlap and even at times become indistinguishable. For example, it is not possible to talk about the new qualities that will be needed for the communities of the future on the level of the individual without considering how this is affected by new qualities in the realm of interpersonal relationships and organisational management. The way in which the communities are run and managed affect how the individual behaves. The changing needs, wishes and tendencies of the individual determine the quality of the social and cultural life of the communities, and so on. While recognising this overlap, it is nonetheless possible to separate out these different elements and look at them one by one and see how they might look in the future.

PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT AND ETHICAL INDIVIDUALISM

The future development of the communities is going to depend upon the activity of self-directing, responsible and morally developed individuals. The social, spiritual and organisational forms of communities have always been the outer expression of the inner moral life of their members. Conversely, community has always been a place that actively promotes the self-development of the individual. Camphill communities challenge the individual member to work on their personal development - either actively through group work and individual mentoring - or simply through the fact that the close and continuos encounter with residents and fellow co-workers demand a process of personal transformation and the development of new moral qualities.

It is also not only that the individual members must transform themselves in order to be able to live in community, but also that the person who strives to serve the community has the responsibility to develop new moral qualities in order to do so.

Previously, I pointed to the fact that in their third phase of development, the communities encourage and enable their members to develop to their full potential. As a result, these enlightened and empowered individuals bring about transformation process in their communities.

Rudolf Steiner described how one aspect of this moral development will be based on the courage on the part of the individual to follow their own individual path of searching rather than following the given norms and expectations of their peers and of society.

He lays out the concept of ethical individualism in his book 'The Philosophy of Freedom'. '*I acknowledge no external principle for my action, because I have found in myself the ground of my action, namely my love for this action……I do not work out mentally whether my action is good or bad……I carry it out because I <u>love </u>it. My action will be 'good' if my intuition, steeped in love, finds its right place within the intuitively experiencable world continuum; it will be 'bad' if this is not the case*'.

He distinguishes between those 'unfree spirits' whose actions are determined by past experiences, societal expectations and rules and those 'free spirits' who make original decisions out of intuition, true freedom and what he calls 'moral imagination'. In the light of this, he sees the decisions of the ethical individual, acting out of inner, ideal intuition, as the most perfect form of human action. True morality is the result of the human being developing his moral will to the point when it becomes part of his essential nature.

In this sense, the community no longer provides the moral directives for the actions of the individual. Whereas in previous phases of community life, the individual was subordinate to the will and 'rules' of the community, the individual in the modern community responds only to his own inner morality. Steiner developed this theme further: '*A greater freedom can indeed be wished for, a freedom that is real, namely, to decide for oneself the motive of one's will. External powers may prevent me from doing what I want; in that case they merely enslave my spirit, driving my own motives out of my head to be replaced with theirs, that they intentionally aim at making me unfree. This is why the church is not only against actions, but more particularly against the motives for actions, <u>the impure thoughts</u>. A church makes its followers unfree when it declares all motives to be impure which it has not enunciated. A church or other community infringes on freedom when its priests or teachers regard themselves as keepers of conscience, and the faithful <u>must </u>come to them (to the confessional) to receive the motives for what they do*'.

When Steiner refers to 'other community' above, he was obviously not referring to an intentional community, Nonetheless, in some instances these words do indeed refer to such communities and to Camphill communities.

There have been times and circumstances in which the community - or more particularly, a group within the community - have taken upon itself to direct the motives and therefore the actions of other individuals within the community. This has always been accepted as right and proper. The individual expects and even wishes to serve the community and to derive a source of moral direction from the community. This applies particularly to situations in the earlier stages of Camphill's development in which people willingly submitted to the personal intervention in their lives by community leaders. The directions given from people considered to be wiser, and steeped in the wisdom of the community, were welcomed as a source of personal and moral guidance.

But this is no longer the case. In the current phase of community development, people are wary and suspicious of others who presume to direct and intervene in the affairs of other individuals - be it out of the wish to be helpful or out of a sense of superior moral authority. Community members nowadays are more likely to seek the advice of their peers in a relationship of mutual trust and support. They might also seek counselling, or ask for professional guidance and support. Very few would turn to a wiser and more experienced older community member in order to find moral guidance and direction in their life.

While it might be true that younger and newer community members continue to seek for guidance from those seen to be older and wiser than themselves, the general principle of allowing and welcoming direction from others belongs to an earlier phase of community development.

The communities of the future will be made up of free and morally advanced individuals who choose to be together and relate to their fellow community members as equals and brothers. These individuals act out of sense of moral responsibility and do not hesitate to take initiative when prompted to do so by their intuition of what is right for the community. They act freely out of their individual conscience yet remain accountable to their fellow community members for their actions. Their motivation and actions reflect the identity and ethos of their community. They wish to serve the community and the wider world and choose to put these goals above their own personal interests.

The present authority and power of certain individuals and groups who seek to control and guide the community - albeit out of a sense of enlightened benevolence and community service - will become a thing of the past, just as the personal authority of a charismatic leader has become a thing of the past.

Some people might argue that promoting the idea that each individual should follow the dictates of their personal conscience would only serve to undermine a community. The fear that actions arising from individual conscience will work against a community is based on the earlier concept that communities should order and control the actions of its members. Once an individual has attained an inner authority founded on the desire to promote the good of the community and of humanity in general, external rules and authority will no longer be necessary.

Needless to say, this might sound like the impossible aspiration of a Utopian dream when compared with the social reality of today, both in society and in Camphill communities. Nonetheless, there are already signs in the communities that this is beginning to happen, and indications that people wish to act in this way.

Camphill communities were founded on the insight, vision and moral authority of leaders. They are now run by management teams and co-ordinators. Each system has both advantages and limitations. In the future there will be no centralised authority and leadership structures. The communities will be made up of self-directing, morally developed individuals who have chosen to live and work together out of the recognition that community is the social form of the future.

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

The level of the moral development of the individual will obviously determine the quality of interpersonal relationships and of the social life in any community. All three are inextricably linked and any improvement in the first will be immediately and directly experienced in the others.

My research into the changing experiences of community in the Camphill communities in Scotland touched upon many issues to do with interpersonal relations. It became obvious that the quality of these relations is a major concern to community members.

Among several paradoxes highlighted by the research findings was that interpersonal relationships are both the best and the worst aspect of living in community. When asked what are the most positive aspects of living in community, respondents stressed the importance of the mutuality of relationships; the mutual support, care and interest. They emphasised the special depth of faithfulness between community members, and the feeling of a sharing of destinies. Good relationships were cited as being the second most positive aspect of community life.

When asked the most negative aspect of living in community, respondents cited difficulties and misunderstandings between people, unhealthy and disappointing relationships and interpersonal conflict. Some of these difficulties and conflict was unresolved and long-standing and obviously continue to mar the experience of community for the people concerned.

When respondents were asked to make suggestions as to how to improve the experience of community, the one aspect that was emphasised most was the need to improve the quality of interpersonal relationships.

It is clear from this, if it was not already apparent, that a feeling of true community remains elusive. It remains an aspiration rather than an achievement.

It is hard to see how this is going to change into the future unless determined efforts are made in a very conscious way to address the long-standing shortcomings in forming and maintaining healthy relationships between community members.

Living in community is an enormous challenge and people need support in their daily community life on an ongoing basis. This support is even more crucial at times of difficulties on an inter-personal level. Much could be done to improve the present situation, both on the level of cultivating more interest in, and support for, the other person and also in teaching community-building skills. This should be an integral part of living in community. Instead, it is often the case that energy is put into all of this only in response to problems between people. If more was done to promote the art and skills of living together in community on a pro-active basis, it is possible that some of the difficulties might be prevented or ameliorated. It is clear that,w in order to improve the quality of relationships and to promote healthy social settings for the future, the communities would need to devote more time and attention to systems of personal support for individual community members generally and for dealing effectively with conflict on a community level.

It must be a question for Camphill communities why it is that there has not been any concerted and sustained effort to develop and teach the skills of living and working harmoniously with other people in community.

Previously in the Camphill communities, but less so now, there were many courses of study in all aspects of Anthroposophy, including self-development. These courses still continue under the auspices of the Anthroposophical Society.

People new to living and working in Camphill communities receive an induction that includes aspects of the history, ethos and principles of Camphill.

There are several Camphill Seminars, most especially the Home-makers Seminar, the Adult Communities Seminar and the Anthroposophical Healthcare course.

The BACE integrates the principles and practices of Anthroposophical curative education and social therapy, the principles of mainstream social care teaching and experiential learning through living and working in a Camphill community.

The Ways to Quality course teaches a system of organisational management based firmly on Anthroposophical insights.

Currently, there are many professional training courses running in Camphill communities in Scotland and many people are taking part in external courses. There is a growing interest in non-violent communication and biographical counselling.

In addition, a number of excellent books about Camphill have been published, especially over the last few years.

But for all this wealth of information and training, there is not a course specifically about how to live in community. It seems that there has always been the expectation that community living is an experiential education; that community is something that is lived and not taught. It was expected that through living in community, following the examples of others, by reading the work of Rudolf Steiner and Karl Konig and attending conferences, and seminars, people would pick up and develop the necessary skills of community life and in turn pass them onto others.

Yet the question remains if it was ever justified to approach the acquisition and development of community-living skills in this way, especially after the passing of the original community leaders who taught community virtues by their inspiring examples. It is even more of a question if it is justified or wise to continue to do so today.

We have seen that the workforce of today's Camphill communities is diverse in terms of background, experience, commitment and involvement. People join communities, and take up employment in communities, for a variety of reasons and not all of them to do with community living.

It is no longer realistic to expect that all newcomers to the communities are familiar with the ethos and norms of community life and skilled in community living. It is also no longer realistic to expect that all newcomers wish to engage fully in all aspects of a community lifestyle and to accept the personal consequences of so doing.

For all of these reasons, the challenge of creating and sustaining community – both as a location and as an experience – is perhaps greater than it has ever been in the past. A great amount of time, energy and resources has been put into developing the organisational and professional aspects of Camphill communities over recent years. In order to face the challenges of the future, and in order to continue to create settings for the experience of community to become manifest, it would seem that the communities would do well to learn and teach community-building skills in a more rigorous and concerted manner than has been the case previously.

THE SOCIAL, SPIRITUAL AND CULTURAL LIFE OF THE COMMUNITIES

In order to gain insights into the way in which the cultural life of the communities is changing, and into how it might evolve in to the future, it is necessary to first see how it has developed in the past.

The origins of the Camphill Movement, or at least the background of its founders, lie in the high culture of Central Europe, and more specifically, Vienna. The pioneers and first generation members of Camphill carried this culture with them to Scotland and it became a characteristic and vitally important part of the unique flavour and ethos of the communities. These people also saw it as one of their tasks to preserve this culture in the face of the barbarism of the Nazis; to transplant the light of Middle Europe to a safer place and to preserve it at the time of darkness which was then beginning to cover Europe.

Dr.Konig had been at pains to say that he did not wish to create an island of Middle Europe in Scotland. Nonetheless, it might seem that the members of Konig's circle, who then went on to found the first Camphill communities, felt it to be their responsibility to preserve and promote the culture of Central Europe. Here the word 'culture' can be understood in both senses; something of the ethos and destiny of Central Europe and also its expression in cultural events and activities. The life of the early Camphill communities was enriched by study groups, talks, lectures, plays, recitals, concerts, choirs and festive seasonal celebrations.

As is the case in intentional communities in general, as much emphasis was placed on culture, and communal enlightenment and enjoyment as it was on work and the daily concerns of survival. However, the cultural life of the Camphill communities was perhaps less light-hearted than some other intentional communities, which have tended to emphasise fun, creativity, self-expression, spontaneity, egalitarianism and informality in their communal celebrations. The Camphill communities – in common with the Anabaptists and the Moravian Church – have always had a more sober, formal, hierarchical and religious emphasis to their spiritual and cultural life.

It could be said that initially the emphasis in Camphill communities was on culture, knowledge, education and religion. Also that the spiritual and cultural life was led by the enlightened community leaders who had a vast store of knowledge and insights and were always developing and extending their knowledge through their own reading and study.

It seems that the cultural life of the Camphill communities has undergone a process of change in relation to its style.

By this I mean that the nature of the cultural life has become less formal and instructive and more to do with entertainment and enjoyment. The style has become more inclusive and participatory. Generally speaking, there are less cultural events and they are less well attended.

In his book 'The Spiritual Tasks of the Homemaker', Manfred Schmidt-Brabant throws some light on the change in the nature of the cultural life. He refers to an insight of Rudolf Steiner when he says that '*in the second half of earth evolution, humour will take the place that was held by piety until now. Piety and humour allow the person to raise himself above himself*'.

Brabant then goes on to describe how the character of culture has changed over the years. He writes that '*Culture always had (and still has) two sides. On the one hand certain cultural duties in the religious realm had to be fulfilled; they included church songs and sacred buildings, the striving for knowledge and religious-social behaviour. A new polarity was added at the end of the Middle Ages and the beginning of the present: culture became more and more – out of a middle-class attitude – entertainment, pleasure. Once a duty ordered from above, culture now served the egoistic satisfaction of wishes. The transition to the middle-class way of living- in a negative sense – reduced our cultural life to fun and amusement'.*

He suggests that there is a tendency to move away from duty and form and towards entertainment. This tendency can be seen both in the support for events such as parties, folk-dancing and ceilidhs, and in the number of people who would as soon stay at home to watch a DVD or to go to the cinema as attend a talk in their community hall.

The style of cultural events is also changing. Whereas previously there would have been an appreciative but passive audience attending a talk, nowadays there tends to be a more inclusive, active and participatory style to such events.

Some community members have mourned the passing of large traditional gatherings such as the New Year's Assembly and the Easter Conference. These were characterised by the traditional form of keynote lectures from eminent speakers.

More recently, the emphasis has been on more inclusive and creative forms of culture. The inclusive New Lanark Conferences and the one-day conferences for residents are two good examples of this emergent phenomenon. Generally speaking, in conferences and seminars, the time that was previously reserved for erudite keynote speakers is now being replaced with time for small and more intimate conversation groups that emphasis inclusiveness and participation..

The 2006 Community Gathering in Botton Camphill Village was billed as an inclusive gathering and not a conference. It was a novel celebration of social artistry and community-building and has much potential for the future form of the cultural events in Camphill.

The trend in the Camphill communities to move away from more formal aspects of the cultural life is reflected in the realm of spiritual activity. There are now less Anthroposophical study groups and Camphill Community groups and meetings than previously. The Bible Evenings, that has always been regarded as an essential and defining aspect of any Camphill community is celebrated less frequently and in some communities has disappeared altogether.

There have been creative efforts to instil new commitment to, and to breathe new life into, these forms and activities, and in some communities that Bible evenings have become more participatory Saturday evening conversations.

There are many reasons for all of these changes. To a certain extent they reflect changes in the wider society. They are also connected to the rise of individualism, more choice, looser community boundaries, and less social control.

In previous times, both the boundaries of the community and the level of social control were higher than they are now. Because the boundaries are now more permeable, there is more access to events outside the communities and to media and entertainment technology. Community members have become more free in choosing how to spend their time at the same time that there is more on offer in terms of televisions, computers and other electronic media players.

The membership of the communities, as has been seen, is more diverse and assertive in regard to their rights and choices. Community members no longer respond in the same way as previously to the expectations of others and to notions of duty and conformity. Overall there is less 'policing' of what is acceptable and what is not, and what community members are expected to do and not do.

My research findings also indicated that people are feeling tired - both physically overworked and also less inspired by the traditional rituals of the community culture. In response some community members have voted with their feet not to attend community events, while in contrast others are actively engaged in exploring and devising new and innovative cultural forms and content with the aim of revitalising the cultural life of their communities.

As has been pointed out in previous parts of this work, the processes at work in these aspects of community life have been accompanied by changes in external regulations, in the rise in organisational management and in the drive for training and qualifications. Yet the changing nature of the spiritual and cultural life is primarily an internal dynamic. They have changed because community members have changed, not as a result of any direct external pressure to do so.

It is because of this that simply expecting, or hoping for, a re-commitment to the traditional forms and activities is not likely to be successful. Both people and communities change and develop and the challenge is always to understand the implications and consequences of this. However, while it is one thing to understand the processes at work, it is another thing again to develop the appropriate forms and activities that are both an expression of, and an encouragement to, the spiritual and cultural life of the communities.

What is becoming clear, however, is that the social and cultural life of the future will be participatory and inclusive. Creativity in these realms will resist becoming settled into 'traditions' and instead will be more spontaneous and will rely upon the inspiration and enthusiasm of individual initiative.

HOW THE COMMUNITIES ARE RUN: THE LEVEL OF ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Previously I have mapped out the changes in the way in which the Camphill communities are organised and managed. In the early pioneer days, the communities were led by forceful personalities who tended to exert leadership in all aspects of community life. More recently, this evolved into group management, in which the work of the various delegated responsibility groups is brought together by a few co-ordinators. While this remains the dominant mode of organisational leadership, there has also been the emergence of the short-lived and single issue 'focus group', which brings together the most appropriate people to work together to reach insight and inform the decision-making processes.

These changes in the organisation of Camphill communities reflect the conventional theories of organisational development. These theories trace the move away from a centralised chain of command and fixed authority structures towards a web of influence, in which many people are involved and in which information and ideas circulate freely. The traditional structures, dominated by a few people on behalf of the others, will be replaced by systems that are more fluid, flexible, responsive and dynamic.

People, information and ideas will move across boundaries that will have become more diffuse and porous. Boundaries will be less about defence and protection and more about the exchange of information that will lead to growth and development.

Margaret Wheatley makes the point - which is of particular relevance to communities - that the power of an organisation is its power of relationships between its members. She says that the quality of these relationships will become more important than organisational structure. New organisations will be characterised by the way in which people relate to each other, listen and speak to each other, how they work with diverse members and the level of collaboration and truth spoken one to another. These qualities have always been integral to Camphill communities and in the past have distinguished them from commercial organisations. The fact that organisations are now waking up to this way of working together simply proves again that communities are the social forms of the future.

It is clear from all of this that organisational creativity, innovation and flexibility will hold more potential for the future development of Camphill communities than will the traditional structures that are presently in place. There are signs that these new principles are being taken up on various levels and we have seen that the organisational structures of Camphill communities are beginning to become more inclusive, more responsive and less hierarchical.

This new way of working will only be effective if many more community members become active and involved in the running of their communities. The challenge for the future will be to encourage and enable yet more people to become involved in these creative and dynamic group processes and to invest people with enough trust and responsibility that they feel empowered to participate effectively.

Currently there are many concerns about succession – who will run the communities when the people presently doing so step down or retire. It is becoming clearer that many of the people who will be creating house-communities, teaching in the classrooms, leading workshops and attending meetings in the communities of the future will be employed co-workers.

It is also becoming clearer that the Councils of Management are going to have an increasingly influential role in how the communities are managed and how they operate on a daily basis.

The challenge is how to bring all of this together in a manner that enables the communities to evolve the appropriate organisational systems that will lead them into the future.

EXTERNAL ENGAGEMENT: SOCIAL RENEWAL AND GLOBAL AWARENESS

Intentional communities have a dual role. They are both places of retreat and places with a mission. In the earlier stages of community development the element of retreat and separation from the world is the main focus. Later, in order to ensure their long-term viability, communities need to engage with society on a practical basis in economic terms. Most end up providing a service of some sort to society that brings in a steady source of income. As communities become more mature, a different emphasis comes to the fore. Communities begin to become aware of their societal, environmental, and even political responsibilities and increasingly engage themselves in external affairs. They enter into associations with similar organisations and become active in external networks of relationships.

In order to be able to reach beyond the traditional boundaries of an intentional community, the community members need to be motivated by mission rather than by retreat. To extend their consciousness in this way, both the communities and their members are going to need a great deal of confidence and a strong sense of their identity. They will also have to share a common awareness of the need for collaboration and engagement beyond the boundaries.

Camphill communities are no exception to all of this. One of the missions of Camphill has always been 'to do the good' - not just on a personal and community level, but also for the betterment of society and for the progress of humanity as a whole. The practical aspects of this mission have been primarily focused on special education, social care, bio-dynamic agriculture and horticulture, and handcrafts. There are shops and trading operations that both make products available to the general public and open the doors of the communities to the public in many ways. Public Relations is growing in importance. Camphill Scotland is in active dialogue with policy-makers and other authorities. There are several innovative Camphill initiatives concerned with ecological and environmental awareness, ecological building and renewable energy. Internationally, new Camphill ventures tend to be founded upon a direct engagement with local and national needs rather than a desire to be removed from society.

What do the Camphill communities find as they increasingly turn their attention to the world beyond their boundaries? The world is a very different place than it was some 60 years ago when Camphill was first founded, and a lot has happened during the time that the focus of the communities was primarily on internal concerns.

One major development has been the growth in 'globalisation' and the transcendence of national boundaries. There has been an exponential growth in international business corporations, global communications and media, of international terrorism and crime and of global warming. Accompanying this has been a parallel growth in international and global governance institutions that attempt to regulate the more detrimental aspects of all of this.

There has also been a rise in the global consciousness of people throughout the world, as demonstrated by the tremendous support for appeals for international aid for famine and disaster relief and for the movements against war, poverty, slavery, and in support of debt relief, fair trade, environmental protection and other world-wide concerns.

There has been a general awakening on the part of politicians and ordinary citizens to the fact that what happens in one part of the global village affects all the other parts. Rudolf Steiner had said that in the next epoch of human development there would be a rise in the awareness of the universality of humanity and that nobody would be able to rest easy as long as somebody else in the world is suffering. There are many signs - among all the negative aspects of globalisation - that this is beginning to happen.

The time of increased individualisation carries within it the potential for either the lower or the higher aspects of the human ego to predominate. Individualisation can lead either to selfishness and social isolation or to ethical and moral development and a new form of community. The same applies to the rise of a universal awareness – it can lead to international competition, exploitation and wars of domination or to a new universal brotherhood. The new consciousness transcends the limitations of both the ethnocentric worldview that focuses on the interests of my group, race or nation, and the egocentric worldview that focuses only on individual self-interest.

A very different and relatively new development on the world stage has been the rise of what is called 'civil society'. This is a less self-interested response to the worst affects of unrestrained globalisation and is a sure sign of the birth of a new universal consciousness of a higher order. Historically, there have always been voices raised in protest against injustices in the world but what is so significant about the civil society movement of today is that it represents sustained and direct action on the ground that attempts to effect changes, redress injustices and restore control to the ordinary citizen.

Nicanor Perlas of the Anthroposophical Group in the Philippines and the Asia-Pacific Initiative Group has been very active in introducing Steiner's ideas of the Threefold Social Order into the Philippines. In the proceedings of a conference held in the Philippines in October 1998 he set out the significance of the civil society movement. He defined civil society as 'private action for the public good' and said that '*civil society action often takes the form of questioning certain premises, certain programs and policies. It is not operative in the political sphere in the sense of political formations and political parties although it engages in political advocacy of certain cultural ideas'.*

He then went on to say that on the one hand we see the worldviews and values of elite globalisation and on the other we see a reaction to this in the different forms of fundamentalism, including ethnic wars. In the middle is civil society. He said that '*there is a new cultural force that did not exist historically and I think it is important to recognise the existence of this force. This force is now being called global civil society. It is a third force. Personally I see this force as the most important social innovation of the 20th century in much the same way that the nation state was the innovation of the 17th century and the market was the innovation of the 18th and 19th centuries'.*

Perlas indicated that the emergence of civil society is indeed a sign that humanity is evolving towards a higher level of consciousness. He said that the various forms of global activism represent an unprecedented and radical shift in values in many parts of the world; '*One could almost say that, here before us we can catch a glimpse of the slow but epochal movements of that grand process that we call the evolution of human consciousness in action'.*

Steiner had said that this process leads to what he called 'ethical individualism'. In a similar way, Perlas uses the term 'cultural creatives'. He lists the aims, goals values and concerns of these 'cultural creatives' as being ecological sustainability, the re-building of communities, the rebirth of the cultural sphere, limits to growth, holistic health, sustainable consumption and voluntary simplicity.

In an article in the magazine 'Communities' Malcolm Hollick uses the same term and estimates that 25% of the population of the USA and Europe are 'cultural creatives'. His article is written from the point of view of a citizen of 2050, hence his use of the past tense rather than the future tense that we would expect.

He says this about the cultural creatives: '*These people were concerned for the future of the planet, and rejected consumerist values in favour of personal and spiritual growth, relationships and community. Among the cultural creatives were many who had developed their valuable personal qualities through management trainings, personal growth workshops, inner reflection, spiritual practices and healing therapies.*
Their skills included team-building, group facilitation, conflict management and decision-making processes'. Significantly, he concludes by saying that '*some had lived in intentional communities where they honed their skills in the practical challenges of daily life*'.

The themes of social conscience, social responsibility and social activism on a local scale is picked up by Claude Whitmyer, in the book that he edited called 'In the Company of Others'. He describes this new force in relation to the intentional communities of tomorrow.
He cites examples of community-supported agriculture, local trading vouchers and labour credit schemes. In the cities there are collaborative housing and food co-ops and community trusts in which people share communal land, tools and other resources. He says that all of these are the seeds of social renewal. They are all part of the rise of an international civil society in which citizens take responsibility for global issues as an alternative to the dominance of mainstream commercial and political vested interests.
He says that local and regional networks of small communities will supplement and replace the current dependence on national structures and 'big' government and suggested that these networks can be perceived as the beginning of a new planetary culture.

The question for the future is what part can Camphill communities play in these forward-looking developments? In many ways the communities could be called civil society organisations with their emphasis on 'doing the good' and their promotion of the values of holistic special education, social care, bio-dynamics and ecological awareness. The communities have also touched many people who have come into contact with them and they have demonstrated the benefits of a communal lifestyle based on alternative values. Yet in many other ways it could be said that the communities have chosen not to engage in the task of social renewal on a national or global scale.

The 2008 Camphill Dialogue raised some concerns about the development of a more global outlook. The report of the meetings that was written by Jon Freeman asks some pertinent questions as to how Camphill could ever transcend both its western and its Christian foundations. These questions are highlighted in the following extracts:
'*There is clearly a challenge for Camphill if it is ever to become a truly global impulse. How might it articulate the universal human nature of the Christ spirit in the world in a way that distinguishes it from the Christian religion and avoids confusing or conflicting with other cultures and religious contexts? How does it avoid any tendency towards separatism or group egoism?*'
'*A question also arises because the middle-European society and values from which Camphill founders emerged and the prevalent historical context of both fascism and Stalinism, shaped the social vision in ways which were particular to that group and that time. Potentially this extends the question of multicultural context into the aspects of the social vision. What would be a contemporary articulation for a vision of (a) new social order which (is) also equally meaningful and inspirational beyond the western world?*'

These can only remain as questions for the future.

A possible future task

While it may the case that the Camphill communities have not actively participated in global issues and concerns, they have nonetheless played a vital role in their local contexts. They provide opportunities for people to experience community living and to acquire the skills necessary for community-building. All the people who pass through the communities learn about personal transformation, responsibility, appreciation of the other person and, in addition, a wide range of practical skills. They also learn how difficult it is to live closely with other people and how often misunderstandings, antipathies, and conflict mar the experience of community.

A possible future task of Camphill communities is to formalise all of this experiential learning and to develop it into a training programme or community-building course. This would be a course that would teach people the skills of how to become a 'cultural creative'; a citizen of the future. It would be about applying the art and practice of community-building to a wider social setting. This would be a complement to the many other similar initiatives, which together play a part in bringing about a universal shift in the beliefs, values and behaviour of people on a global scale.

This would not be something new for Camphill, as there are currently many Anthroposophical and Camphill training courses and workshops that focus on one or another aspect of this.

Nor would it be a task that would be unique to Camphill, as there are currently many intentional communities and ecovillages occupied with this task. In his chapter of the book 'Beyond You and Me', Daniel Greenberg makes the case for collaboration between the ecovillages movement and the academic world that would result in the formation of 'learning communities'. He argues that ecovillages are physical and social 'laboratories' experimenting with new technologies, social structures and worldviews. They develop and teach practical knowledge and wisdom that can be applied to real-life settings. In the same book Leila Dregger says that intentional communities are places to learn the lesson of peace in order to take these lessons to conflict zones around the world. And Wolfram Nolte says that '*what is so special about ecovillages and communities is that not only are theoretical concepts of ecological social and human lifestyles being tested and developed in real life. They become the most important fields of research, schools of life which society badly needs if it wants to survive'.*

What would be the contents of such a course that would be taught in Camphill communities? The curriculum would be based around a range of subjects relating to personal, community and organisational growth and development. It would include the following and more:

Personal growth
Spiritual development and spiritual practices
Understanding life journeys
Healing therapies
Mutual support systems
Forming and sustaining healthy relationships
Forming and sustaining healthy communities
The role of intentional communities
The ecovillage movement
Team building
Group facilitation
Conflict management and resolution
Non-violent communication
Consensus decision-making

Ethical Individualism
Responsible leadership
Healthy living and lifestyles
Ecological responsibility
Global awareness
Civil society and cultural creativity
Social economy organisations and social enterprises
Social renewal

The development of such a training programme would serve many purposes. It would serve to deepen and widen the knowledge and experience of community-building within the Camphill communities and in the process would lead to a renewed inspiration and commitment to community-building processes. It would involve collaboration with many other people and initiatives that have a shared focus on personal transformation and social renewal. It would also provide a means for the communities to engage in the process of exploring new ways of answering some of the pressing questions that have come to the surface in post-modern society and in the new global environment.

CONCLUSION

In all that has gone before, I have attempted to explore the developmental metamorphosis of intentional communities in general and of Camphill communities in particular. Hopefully, these insights have thrown some light onto what has been happening in the Camphill communities over the last years and provided a 'bigger picture' that goes some way to making sense of all the forces of change that have been at work.

On the basis of these insights, I made some attempts at imagining what the communities of the future might look and feel like. Nobody can know for sure exactly how the communities are going to develop. What is certain is that each community is going to have to find its own way forward in facing the challenges ahead. No individual or group will be giving a definitive statement as to the way forward.

Some of these challenges are the age-old challenges faced by any intentional community - how to live closely with other people, how to create and maintain a common vision and arrive at commonly-accepted values in a time of increasing individualism and among a diverse membership; how to maintain a sense of community and life-sharing when people want more time and space for themselves; how to maintain a sense of community as the community becomes more of an organisation; how to develop organisational structures that promote individual responsibility and initiative yet also preserve cohesion and sustainability and how to uphold community values in a society that is increasingly materialistic and individualistic in outlook.

Other challenges are perhaps more particular to Camphill – how to maintain a sense of mutuality in relationships in an increasingly regulated and professional care setting; of justifying community as an appropriate care setting in the face of opposition from those who direct social care policy and allocate resources; of caring for residents and coworkers as they retire and need support in their old age and of upholding spiritual beliefs in an increasingly sceptical and secular society.

The process of finding answers to these challenges is going to require a great amount of energy, imagination, inspiration and hard work. It is going to need a re-appraisal of how to live and work in community in the 21st century.

It will require a new sense of commitment to some aspects of Camphill, finding new forms for other aspects and also of introducing new and innovative community practices. It will require enthusiasm for learning new skills and of being open to new ideas. It will also require a willingness to move beyond the traditional boundaries of Camphill.

This process of adapting to, and integrating change, and developing new answers for new situations has been an ongoing process over the entire history of the Camphill movement and has ensured the continuity and viability of the communities. In this ongoing process the communities and their members will continue to change and develop, just as they have being doing throughout the course of their respective journeys so far. Change and development will be constant elements in the life of the communities as they continue to unfold their potential for personal transformation and social renewal.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Andelsen, Jonathan, G. *Coming Together and Breaking Apart: Sociogenesis and Schismogenesis in Intentional Communities.* In Brown, Susan, Love. Ed. 2002: *Intentional Community. An Anthropological Perspective.* State University of New York Press.

Bang, Jan Martin. 2005: *Eco-Villages. A practical Guide to Sustainable Communities.* Floris Books.

Bang, Jan Martin. 2007: *Growing Eco-Communities. Practical ways to Create Sustainability.* Floris Books.

Beck, Don Edward and Cowan, Christopher, C. 1996: *Spiral Dynamics. Mastering Values, Leadership and Change.* Blackwell Publishing.

Bee, Helen. 1998: *Lifespan Development.* Longman.

Bock, Friedwart. Ed. 2004: *The Builders of Camphill. Lives and Destinies of the Founders.* Floris Books.

Bouvard, Marguerite. 1975: *The Intentional Community Movement. Building a New Moral World.* National University Publications. Kennikat Press.

Brown, Susan Love. Ed. 2002: *Intentional Community. An Anthropological Perspective.* State University of New York Press.

Brull, Dieter. 2002: *The Mysteries of Social Encounters.* AWSNA Publications.

Capra, Fritjof. 2003: *The Hidden Connections.* Flamingo.

Chardin, Pierre Teilhard, de. 2002. *The Phenomenon of Man.* Perennial (Harper Collins).

Cohen, Anthony, P. 2004: *The Symbolic Construction of Community.* Routledge. Taylor and Francis Group.

Cook, Michael. 2004: *A Brief History of the Human Race.* Granta Books.

Csikszentmihaly. 1992: *Flow: The Psychology of Happiness.* Rider. Random House. London.

Dregger, Leila. *Communities. New Opportunities for International Solidarity.* In Joubert, Kosha, Anja and Alfred, Robin (eds). 2007: *Beyond You and Me. Inspiration and Wisdom for Building Community.* Permanent Publications.

Fernandez-Armesto, Felipe. 1995. *Millenium. A History of our Last Thousand Years.* BCA. Bantam Press.

Glasl, Friedrich. 1997: *The Enterprise of the Future. How Companies Develop. Moral Intuition in Leadership and Organisational Development.* Hawthorn Press. UK

Greenberg, Daniel. *Ecovillages – Academia.* In Joubert, Kosha, Anja and Alfred, Robin (eds). 2007: *Beyond You and Me. Inspiration and Wisdom for Building Community.* Permanent Publications.

Hasley, A.H. and Webb, J. Eds. 2000: *Twentieth Century British Social Trends.* Macmillan Press. London.

Jackson, Robin. Ed. 2006: *Holistic Special Education. Camphill Principles and Practice.* Floris Books.

Joubert, Kosha, Anja and Alfred, Robin (eds). 2007: *Beyond You and Me. Inspiration and Wisdom for Building Community.* Permanent Publications.

Kanter, Rosabeth, Moss. 1972: *Commitment and Community. Communes and Utopias in Sociological Perspective.* Harvard University Press.

Kirkpatrick, Frank, G. 2001: *The Ethics of Community.* Blackwell Publishers UK

Konig, Karl. 1993: *The Camphill Movement.* Camphill Books.

Large, Martin. 1981: *Social Ecology. Exploring Post Industrial Society.* Self-published.

Lievegoed, B.C.J. 1973: *The Developing Organization.* Tavistock Publications Limited.

Lievegoed, B.C.J. 1991: *Developing Communities*. Hawthorn Press.

Luxford, Michaeal and Luxford, Jane. 2003: *A Sense for Community. The Camphill Movement. A Five Steps Research Paper.* Directions for Change. Social Research.

McKanan, Dan. 2007: *Touching the World. Christian Communities Transforming Society.* Liturgical Press. Minnesota.

Metcalf, Bill. 2004: *The Findhorn Book of Community Living.* Findhorn Press.

Muller-Wiedemann, Hans. 1996: *Karl Konig. A Central European Biography of the Twentieth Century.* Camphill Books.

Nolte, Wolfram. *From Local Communities to the World Community.* In Joubert, Kosha, Anja and Alfred, Robin (eds). 2007: *Beyond You and Me. Inspiration and Wisdom for Building Community.* Permanent Publications.

O'Neil, George and O'Neil, Gisela. 1990: *The Human Life.* Mercury Press. Spring Valley. New York.

O'Shea, Ursula, Jane. 2003: *Living the Way. Quaker Spirituality and Community. The 28[th]James Blackhouse Lecture.* Quaker Books. London.

Peck,Scott. M. 1990: *The Different Drum.* Arrow Books.

Paterson, Bechofer and McCrone. 2004: *Living in Scotland: Social and Economic Change since 1980.* Edinburgh University press.

Roth, Peter. 2007: *Worlds in the Mirror.* Camphill Books.

Schaefer, Christopher, and Voors, Tijno. 1986: *Vision in Action. The Art of Taking and Shaping Initiatives.* Hawthorn press. Anthroposophic Press.

Schaffer, Carolyn, R. and Anundsen, Kristin. Eds. 1993. *Creating Community Anywhere. Finding Support and Connection in a Fragmented World. G.P. Putnam's Sons. New York.*

Schauder, Hans. 2002: *Vienna - My Home.* Privately published by Agathe Dawson, Edinburgh.

Schmidt-Brabant, Manfred. 1996. *The Spiritual Tasks of the Homemaker.* Temple Lodge Publishing.

Steiner, Rudolf. 1974: *Awakening to Community.* Anthroposophic Press, Inc.

Steiner, Rudolf. 1957: *Preparing for the Sixth Epoch.* Anthroposophic Press Inc.

Steiner, Rudolf. 1988. *The Philosophy of Freedom.* Rudolf Steiner Press. London.

Surkamp, Johannes. Ed. 2007: *The Lives of Camphill. An Anthology of the Pioneers.* Floris Books.

Van Den Brink, Margarete. 2004: *Transforming People and Organisations. The Seven Steps of Spiritual Development. Temple Lodge Publishing.*

Vanier, Jean. 1989: *Community and Growth.* Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd.

Wheatley, M.J. 1999: *Leadership and the New Sciences – Discovering Order in a Chaotic World.* Berret-Koehler Publishers USA.

Wilber, Ken. 2001: *A Brief History of Everything.* Gateway.

Whitmyer, Claude. Ed. 1993: *In the Company of Others. Making Community in the Modern World.* The Putnam Publishing Group. New York.

Wolff-Salin, Mary. 1992: *The Shadow Side of Community and the Growth of the Self.* The Crossroad Publishing Company. New York.

Journal Articles and Published Papers

Admiral, Deborah. *Karl Konig Centenary in Soltane, Pennsylvania, October 2002.* Camphill Correspondence.

Avison, Ken. *Reflections on Leadership.* New View magazine. (Date unknown).

Hermannstorfer, Udo. *Social and Spiritual Renewal in Independent Organisations: Challenges of the 21st Century.* Notes from a lecture in 2004 edited by Johannes Surkamp. Camphill Correspondence November/December 2005.

Hollick, Malcolm. *How community values conquered climate change – a future history.* Communities – Life in Co-operative Culture. Spring 2008. Issue 138

Konig, Karl. *The Candle on the Hill.* The Cresset. Volume V11 Summer 1961.

Konig, Karl. *The Five lamps of Modern Architecture.* The Cresset. Easter 1965.

Konig, Karl. *The Three Essentials of Camphill.* The Cresset. 1965.

Perlas, Nicanor. *Shaping the Future: Globalisation, Anthroposophy and the Threefold Social Order. Tagaytay City, Philippines. October 1998. Conference Proceedings: Part 1.*

Segal, Melville. Article about Orion Community. Camphill Correspondence March/April 2006.

Weihs, Anke. *An Address at the British New Year Assembly.* Camphill Correspondence March 1982.

Weihs, Anke. *A History of the Camphill Community as from 1954.* Camphill Press. Undated.

Unpublished Material

Freeman, Jon. *Evolving Camphill. Treasuring the Ideals, Visioning the Future.* A report of the meeting of Camphill Dialogue 2008.

Galloway, Kathy. *Building Inclusive Communities.* An address to the New Lanark Inclusive Conference 2004.

Plant, Andy. 2007: *Experiences of Community. A Study of the Changing Experiences of Community in the Camphill Communities in Scotland.*

Reports of the Camphill Movement group meetings 1991-2007

Ways to Quality. The Inner and Outer Preconditions of Quality Work. A practical handbook for independent educational and social therapeutic institutions. *Unedited second translation 2003.*

Weihs, Anke. *An Address to the Community.* 30th November 1969.

Weihs, Anke. *The First Advent Sunday and the 30th November.* A talk in the Camphill Hall. 1986.

Working Paper on The Essentials of Camphill. Amended June 2001.

Web-based Material

Association of Camphill Communities website.
www.camphill.org.uk/filestore/CDP/index.html

- Steffen, William. *Co-workers and their Communities in Camphill England and Wales. A report and discussion document. February 2004.*

- Steffen, William. *Camphill Co-worker and Community Development Retreat for Rural Land and Workshop Based Communities. February 2005. Summary report.*

- Steffen, William. *Co-worker and Community Development Retreat for Camphill Schools and College Communities. May 2005. Summary report.*

- Steffen, William. *Co-worker and Community Development Retreat for Urban Camphill Communities. September 2005. Summary report.*

Fairtlough, Gerard. Cultural Theory and Triarchy Theory. Triarchy Press. Accessed: 6/7/07
www.triarchypress.co.uk/pages/articles

Nielsen, Jeffrey. *The Leaderless Organisation.* Triarchy Press. Accessed: 6/7/07
www.triarchypress.co.uk/pages/articles/theleaderlessorganisation

Oved, Yacov. *Communities in the 20th Century. A lecture delivered at the 6th International Communal Studies Association Conference.* Accessed: 13/1/07
www.communa.orgil/commu2000.htm

Wikipedia. www.wikipaedia.org

- *Anabaptist.* Accessed 21/3/07
- *Fukuyama: The End of History and the Last Man.* Accessed 16/7/06
- *Sociocultural Evolution.* Accessed 6/7/06
- *Teilhard de Chardin.* Accessed 20/4/08