

Insights and Innovations in Community Mental Health

The Erich Lindemann Memorial Lectures

**organized and edited by
The Erich Lindemann Memorial Lecture Committee**

hosted by William James College



Table of Contents

Foreward.....	3
The Eclipse—and Reemergence—of Community	4
Introduction by David G. Satin, MD.....	5
Cheng Imm Tan, MDiv.....	8
Introduction by David G. Satin, MD.....	8
Cheng Imm Tan, MDiv	8
Matthew P. Dumont, MD.....	15
Introduction by David G. Satin, MD.....	15
Matthew P. Dumont, MD.....	15
Maurice R. Stein, PhD.....	21
Introduction by David G. Satin, MD.....	21
Maurice R. Stein, PhD.....	21
Rahsi Fein, PhD	27
Introduction by David G. Satin, MD.....	27
Rashi Fein, PhD	27
Discussion	34

Foreward

The Erich Lindemann Memorial Lecture is a forum in which to address issues of community mental health, public health, and social policy. It is also a place to give a hearing to those working in these fields, and to encourage students and workers to pursue this perspective, even in times that do not emphasize the social and humane perspective. It's important that social and community psychiatry continue to be presented and encouraged to an audience increasingly unfamiliar with its origins and with Dr. Lindemann as a person. The lecturers and discussants have presented a wide range of clinical, policy, and historical topics that continue to have much to teach.

Here we make available lectures that were presented since 1988. They are still live issues that have not been solved or become less important. This teaches us the historical lesson that societal needs and problems are an existential part of the ongoing life of people, communities, and society. We adapt ways of coping with them that are more effective and more appropriate to changed circumstances—values, technology, and populations. The insights and suggested approaches are still appropriate and inspiring.

Another value of the Lectures is the process of addressing problems that they exemplify: A group agrees on the importance of an issue, seeks out those with experience, enthusiasm, and creativity, and brings them together to share their approaches and open themselves to cross-fertilization. This results in new ideas, approaches, and collaborations. It might be argued that this approach, characteristic of social psychiatry and community mental health, is more important for societal benefit than are specific new techniques.

We hope that readers will become interested, excited, and broadly educated. For a listing of all the Erich Lindemann Memorial Lectures, please visit www.williamjames.edu/lindemann.

The Erich Lindemann Memorial Lecture Committee presents

THE SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL
ERICH LINDEMANN MEMORIAL LECTURE

The Eclipse—and Reemergence—of Community

Case Conference Participants

Maurice R. Stein, PhD: Jacob S. Potofsky Professor of Sociology, Brandeis University

Cheng Imm Tan, MDiv: Associate Minister at Large, Unitarian-Universalist Urban Ministry; Director, Asian Women's Project; Chair, Asian Task Force Against Domestic Violence

Matthew P. Dumont, MD: Medical Director, Transition Services, Westboro State Hospital; author of *Treating the Poor*

Rashi Fein, PhD: Professor of the Economics of Medicine, Department of Social Medicine, Harvard Medical School

Moderator

David G. Satin, MD, FAPA: Assistant Clinical Professor of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School; Assistant in Psychiatry, McLean Hospital

Friday, April 22, 1994, 2:30 – 5:30 pm

*Massachusetts School of Professional Psychology
221 Rivermoor Street, Boston, MA 02132*

Introduction by David G. Satin, MD

We might start by considering what community means. Some definitions emphasize caring:

Louisa Howe quotes C.C. North that community members "are bound together by the necessity or convenience of fulfilling certain essential needs in a cooperative way." Howe's own view is that community relationships exist and are valued for their own sake, as ends themselves, rather than as useful for specific objectives.

Ferdinand Tönnies expressed this value as "Whenever, by institutionalized means, men are bound to each other through their wishes and answer affirmatively to each other, there a community is existent."

Robert Frost was even more pity in his poem "The Death of the Hired Man": "Home is the place where, when you have to go there, They have to take you in...I should have called it Something you somehow haven't to deserve."

In contrast is the instrumental or exploitative view of community: such as Roland Warren's observation that specialized interest groups and organizations fulfilling specific technical functions are essential—and increasingly dominant—aspect of "community", and Robert A. Nisbet's objection that "The most fundamental problem [behind the loss of family or other group coherence] has to do with the *organized* associations of men...in an economy and political order whose principal ends have come to be structured in such a way that the primary social relationships are increasingly functionless, almost irrelevant, with respect to these ends." In this respect Emil Durkheim wrote of *anomie* (and suicide) as the end result of loss of social relationship. What is happening to community in our society?

Maurice Stein, our first speaker, noted in 1960, in his book *The Eclipse of Community*: "Substantive values and traditional patterns are continually being discarded or elevated to fictional status whenever they threaten the pursuit of commodities or careers. Communities become increasingly dispensable, finally extending even into the nuclear family, and we are forced to watch children dispensing with their parents at an ever earlier age in suburbia. The process becomes increasingly dependent upon centralized authorities and agencies in all areas of life. On the other hand, personal loyalties decrease their range with the successive weakening of national ties, regional ties, community ties, neighborhood ties, family ties and finally, ties to a coherent image of one's self. These polar processes of heightened functional dependence and diminished loyalties appear in most sociological diagnoses of our time. However, we have only recently become aware of the full extent of human vulnerability and manipulability. We live in a period when the 'existentialist' experience, the feeling of total "shipwreck", is no longer the exclusive prerogative of extraordinarily sensitive

poets and philosophers. Instead, it has become the last shared experience, touching everyone in the whole society although only a few are able to express it effectively."

A reviewer of Matthew Dumont's most recent book *Treating the Poor: A Personal Sojourn Through the Rise and Fall of Community Mental Health*, came away with the appreciation that privatization—or, perhaps more precisely, corporatization—destroys community. Local improvement is sacrificed to remote control, and inequality is a fundamental, if unspoken, premise of our society. Unremarked upon, as well, are the ways in which these developments are diminishing not just the community dimension of our mental health care but also our communities themselves.

After the massacre of Sioux by the Seventh United States Cavalry in 1890 at Wounded Knee, South Dakota, the Sioux chief, Black Elk, spoke eloquently: "A people's dream died there. It was a beautiful dream...The nation's hoop is broken and scattered. There is no center any longer, and the sacred tree is dead."

What is the source of hope for the "reemergence of community"? Maurice Stein also wrote that "The struggle for maturity in Crestwood Heights, for secure roots in Park Forest, and creativity in Exurbia, no matter how badly distorted, could become entering wedges for social change. These struggles reflect the desire for deeper human encounters and experiences than those encouraged by the preoccupations with status, and they could become the occasion for identity transformations in which this preoccupation will assume a lesser place."

James Kelly, the 10th Erich Lindemann Memorial lecturer, advocates the collaborative approach between mental health consultants and community residents to the design of social settings as corrective to the contemporary plight of "fragmentation, isolation, and alienation."

Perhaps the resurgence of fundamentalist religion, the search for ethnic roots, the defiant interest in naturopathic medicine, and the popularity of self-realization training and treatment are efforts to recreate community and a sense of meaning in life.

It will be interesting to hear how current proposals for health care reform weigh in the balance between the eclipse and reemergence of community.

Marice R. Stein will address this issue from the sociological point of view. He is Jacob S. Potofsky Professor of Sociology at Brandeis University. In 1960 his book *The Eclipse of Community: An Interpretation of American Studies* was published, and he continues to study and write about community in American society.

Cheng Imm Tan will address this issue from the point of view of the community activist, creating communities where they are needed.

Matthew P. Dumont will address this issue from the point of view of the mental health clinician who is sensitive to the politico-economic environment in which mental health and illness take place.

Rashi Fein will address this issue from the economic point of view.

Cheng Imm Tan, MDiv

Associate Minister at Large, Unitarian-Universalist Urban Ministry; Director, Asian Women's Project; Chair, Asian Task Force Against Domestic Violence

Introduction by David G. Satin, MD

Reverend Tan has her master of divinity degree from the Harvard Divinity School, and is the director of the Unitarian Universalist Urban Ministry's Asian Women's Project, also the chair of the Asian Task Force Against Domestic Violence, and the co-chair of the International Coalition of Refugee Women. Among other things that she has done is co-director of a program within the Ecumenical Social Action Committee. She was given the Asian Unity Award for outstanding community service and leadership, and among other things that she has written is an article, *Loving Everyone Effectively*, published in present time, and her interests include promoting dialogues between people of different religions, classes, sexes, cultures and nationality. Cheng Imm Tan is working in the inner city to develop unity among people who need this for their survival.

Reverend Tan.

Cheng Imm Tan, MDiv

I'm going to try to not talk too much, but I cannot promise. When I talked to David Satin, this is the task he asked me to do, so I just want to tell you what was the task that was put before me. He asked me to address how the sense of community has changed and how it affects mental health services, and as somebody from community services to focus on how I conceive of community, how I contact the community, how I get them involved, so that is what I will be talking about.

My experience in working with communities comes really mostly from working with the Asian community. As a U.U. minister I also work with trying to form a larger sense of community if you will between urban and the suburban, but just for this afternoon, my focus will be on the Asian communities, and what I would like to do is give you a sense of what the Asian communities look like.

The Asian community, as you know, is the fastest-growing minority group in this country, and I just want to talk a little bit about the history of the Asian community in Boston. As many of you know, there's Chinatown. Chinatown has been there for a long time, and historically it was a small place where mostly Chinese immigrants came to. Chinatown is really the focal point for the Chinese immigrant community, usually first-generation, very self-contained. In the past people used to live there for many generations, live there, grew up there, and not even have to go out of Chinatown. It's very self-contained, self-sufficient, and you don't even have to learn English.

Now times have changed quite a lot, and things have changed quite a lot. Usually what happens is there will be first generation people who will come into Chinatown and then they will move out from there as they get a footing in the community or in the environment and in this country, they begin to move out to the suburbs. The nature of Chinatown itself has changed quite a lot. It used to be mostly Chinese from China, and mostly first generation, then Taiwanese, Hong Kong, a lot of immigration from Hong Kong because of 1997, and in the past decade the Vietnamese have also been coming into Chinatown, and it's mostly Japanese Chinese.

How many of you have been into Chinatown lately? You've seen the changes, I mean just look at the restaurants, that's one clear sign. Chinatown still is one of the major focus, and still is an immigration center. Other communities: there is an increasingly big community as you know of Vietnamese in Dorchester, in Brighton-Allston. Brighton-Allston is Vietnamese, some Cambodian, Chinese. Chelsea, Revere, Lynn and Lowell as well, mostly Vietnamese and Cambodian. Malden-Melrose area also now more of the Asian community up there that you can sort of identify that the communities are there. And there are the much more dispersed Japanese, Korean, Filipino communities that you can't say that they're here or there, they're sort of dispersed everywhere. So one of the characteristics that I want to point out is that Asian communities have become increasingly diverse. It used to be very Chinese, or mainly Chinese, at least in this area. But even if we've been in the Chinese community, there are many, many different groups--from Taiwan, Hong Kong--and even within the group of Chinese Chinese there are groups who speak different dialects and different languages because they come from different parts in China, so you can be sitting at a table with four Chinese people who still cannot speak to each other. So making communication is always a challenge.

For the Chinese community, one of the things that we do have that enables us to communicate is the script. There is a similar script--we can speak different dialects but the written script is similar so you can read anything in script. But that's of course not true for other Asian ethnic groups, you know like Vietnamese, Cambodian, the script is totally different, or South Asian is totally different. So it's an increasingly diverse community.

The differences is not only language, it's also in terms of its history. There's been historical differences in its history, and when I'm talking about historical differences I'm talking about historical conflicts and differences that happened in Asia, and people bring those conflicts and that history when they come here, and so people remember those political conflicts and those political differences when they come here. And these differences have been one of the elements that have separated us as a community. So these diversities makes a sense of community within the Asian community a little bit of a challenge, even though I think that in the US environment, people think of Asians as very

homogeneous, but usually people can't tell us apart, and they think of us as homogeneous in that sense, but what I do want to stress here is that there is a lot of diversity.

But we also share quite a bit in common, that is true. What do we share in common? There is a focus, we're talking about community here, within the Asian community there is much more a focus on the family and on community. It's a perception, it's an identity that supercedes the identity of the separate individual. I think most Asian ethnic share that, that there's a focus on the family and on the community. We also share and exchange a lot in terms of culture and religion. There's a long history of people travelling in different places, bringing religion and culture and intermarrying and things like that, so there's been a lot of exchange in terms of culture, religion and food. We also share an identity as a largely immigrant and refugee community. Over 60% of the Asian community is an immigrant community whose first language is not English.

And as the Asian community too, there are different needs and struggles that differ according to education and available resources according to community. For example, the Cambodian and Vietnamese community, their struggles are quite different from, say, someone from Hong Kong, or from the more affluent Asians countries that have not seen the same kind of war, the kind of trauma that Vietnamese and Cambodians have. The struggle is a little bit different.

The other thing that we also share in common is sort of what I referred to earlier, sort of being lumped together as a group, and share the same, experience the same discrimination and violence that is often overlooked, and I say overlooked because racism in this country is defined mostly in Black-White terms, and so even though there's discrimination and violence that goes on, those events are usually overlooked and are really invisible because they're not named as such. The other thing that we share in common is really a sense of invisibility within the US environment. There's a obscurity in terms of history and our contributions, there is really, you don't learn much when you go to school about Asian history and Asian immigration and Asian contributions to this country, and stuff like that. There is no Asian hero or heroine in the US that I know of, is there? That really stands out?

[Audience Comment]

Thank you. That's a good example of what I'm talking about. There's so much contribution in terms of culture...You get my point, you know, in terms of really contributing something. I'm sure there is, it's just never lifted up and named. It's just like how with the Black community, you know, they talk about Black History Month and lifting up Black heroes and stuff like that, the same kind of movement has never been in the Asian community.

The other thing we share in common of course is the myth of the model minority, is that all Asians come here and they succeed, and if you look at the poverty statistics, that's absolutely not true. The other thing that we share in common is that, I think that many of you are aware that the climate is increasingly hostile to refugees and immigrants of any refugees and immigrants, but because the Asian community is largely a refugee and immigrant community, we also receive much of the hostility, which means that even though you've been born here, you've grown up here, you're several generations, you're still seen as an outsider, as a guest.

Not so long ago, I don't know if you read in the Boston Globe a few months ago, there was a woman who was stopped by a driver, I think she cut him off, I don't know what exactly happened, or she didn't go when the light turned green, you know how Boston drivers, and they go 'toot, toot, toot,' and he said something like, 'Go back to China,' and she wasn't even Chinese, I think she was Japanese, and was second or third generation US. I think this shows us the attitude that still prevails.

The other thing that Asians share in common also is that most Asians have come from countries that have been colonized by Western countries, and so have in some ways have internalized, what shall I say, a sense if you will of Western superiority. Now that goes both ways. I guess what I'm trying to say is that for some Asian they feel that their culture has been in some way attacked if you will, or eroded, you know what I mean? Because if the cultural norm is something else, and there's always pressure to conform to the Western cultural norm, so you feel like there's always a struggle to maintain what you are and what you have, and there's been two trends that I see happening: one is to hold on to everything that is within your culture and say that 'everything that we know and do is right', even some of the irrational stuff, particularly around violence against women and treatment of women's issues, or the other trend is to say, 'let's completely assimilate and forget about who we are,' which doesn't work either because you are not viewed as being able to completely assimilate.

Some of the effects, I think of the, what shall I say, the coming together if you will of Asian culture and Western culture, some of the things that I think for example the Asian cultures have adopted is a different way of life, different medical technology, and what I see happening even in Asian countries is the commoditization of women. For example if you look at China, with China opening up, not that the oppression of women did not exist--oppression of women and the use and abuse of women happens in all patriarchal cultures--but in China, because it is beginning to open up as a capitalist society more and more, the trend is now that women are being commercialized and commodified in a way, not to the extent that it used to be, I mean it's really grown a tremendous lot. The other thing that Asians I think share in common is close ties with the Asian homeland, because most are immigrants.

So how does this affect, in terms of mental health of the Asian community? Well I think as I mentioned, the whole construct within the Asian community is much more family-focused, community-focused rather than individual-focused, and I think that mental health here tends to be an individual focus concept of mental health, it's you, yourself, getting well. So mental health in many cases within the Asian communities is seen as something that only mad people do, I mean you have to be really crazy in order to go for counseling, you must be really off your rocker if you need to get outside mental health because mental health is really not seen as something that's done on a normal basis in the Asian community.

It's mental health, fiscal health, family health and community health, it's sort of rolled into one. It's like when you're sick here, you go get medicine. In the Asian community, it's the foods you eat on a daily basis that helps to prevent you from getting sick. It's not like a separate kind of thing, or when you have a baby, there are certain rituals and certain foods that you take that the doctor doesn't prescribe, it's just part of the culture, so I think mental health is something that's not really seen as separate. However, I will have to say that obviously there are mental and emotional distresses, and I think that's quite obvious as a result of the struggles, as a result of the dislocations coming from one culture to another culture, and as a result of just daily living, the pressures of daily life.

I think that in the community as a whole over the years there's been a lot of debate about identity: What does 'Asian' really mean? Who defines community? Who defines what the Asian community is? In many ways it's been imposed from the outside. Asians in many ways don't define themselves as Asian communities. You ask somebody who is Asian, 'Who are you? What are you?' they'll probably say, 'Well, I'm the son of so-and-so, I'm the daughter of so-and-so,' or 'I'm a specific ethnic group,' rather than just Asian identity kind of thing. And also because it's a minority community within a larger culture that's very different there has been a lot of struggle in terms of identity, and this shows up particularly with groups that have tried to assimilate, you know, like first generation kids who grew up in the suburbs, and then think of themselves as US citizens, and then in their college years really begin to rethink again about their identity. Identity—there's been a lot of struggles with that.

It also has given rise to a lot of intergeneration gap issues, particularly with immigrant parents and their children, whether they're immigrant children or first generation children, and immigrant parents often have to rely on their children to serve as interpreters, and that creates a disbalance in terms of the child-parent relationship, and just all types of around the child being more assimilated and the parent wanting to preserve some traditions and stuff like that.

The other challenge for the Asian community in terms of mental health is trying to recover from war trauma, and also acculturation issues, and from what I've seen in terms of treating war trauma, at least in the Boston area, first and foremost there are few places that have bilingual counselors, and secondly, the kind of treatment I've seen is mostly medical, which means taking medicine, ingesting something which cures the symptoms rather than cures the causes of it. And again also I think the treatment seems to be very individual-based rather than looking at the community as a whole and how the individual relates to the community.

So what does it mean to be mentally healthy within the Asian community? I think what that means is to have a really healthy sense of who we are, to be able to articulate our needs, and to organize effectively as a community to get our needs fulfilled, and to not only do that independently but to understand that there is a connectedness and interdependence among everyone, not only among all the different diverse Asian communities, but among people as people. I mean as people, as human beings inhabiting the same, similar Earth, we really cannot live without one another and without making sure that we somehow assist each other to live a good life, to live a life that is just, that have the necessary needs fulfilled.

There is a Buddhist scripture that I would like to quote you. It goes something like this: 'We are all alike in not wanting pain and wanting happiness. What is so special about me that I should strive for my happiness alone?', Which I think is a very nice way of showing the interconnectedness that unfortunately has been covered over by all kinds of divisions.

As someone developing community services, how do I reach the community? First, I think obviously you have to understand the dynamics of the community, and come up with culturally-appropriate strategies. For example, the issue that I work on is domestic violence. Now domestic violence, as you can imagine, is not an issue that most people will want to talk about. I mean, it's not like I can go into a community and say, 'Hey, let's talk about domestic violence. Did you know that domestic violence is a crime? Do you know you're not supposed to do that?' I mean, they'd sweep me out of there really quickly. So what I need to do is come up with culturally-appropriate strategies, and I, who am I, I'm Malaysian Chinese, I'm not a member of any of these main communities, so to speak, and so how I reach people is to really reach them as people, and to do it in culturally-appropriate ways, so for example, when I talk about domestic violence, I never talk about it as a gender issue even though it is, I talk about it as a family issue. It's like looking at the glass whether it's half full or half empty--either way you come to the same conclusions, the same issues, and if I present it as a family issue and say, 'You know, family is so important to us, and domestic violence destroys our families. So if we can address domestic violence, our families will be preserved, and what that means is mutual

respect. What that means is treating each other well. What that means is nonviolence', and we are a small enough community that if I present it that way I can include people to work with me, rather than create divisions between the genders, for example.

Other ways I go about it of course is to have linguistically-appropriate staff so that you can communicate. To find ways of reaching the communities I can reach them through the general media, the usual t.v., the usual radio. I have to find community media. We also do a lot of home visits, really, I mean just going to somebody's house. I met you at the supermarket so we start chatting and so I'll say, 'Can I come to your house? I just want to talk to you a little bit. Do you have some neighbors? We'll get together and have a cup of tea and talk about how our life is like,' and that's how you begin. You talk about how life is like, what your kids are like, what their lives are like, and then you say, 'Well, this is what I do as well,' and it slowly comes out that way. These are just, I won't say too much, my time is probably up, I can answer more questions if you would like about what are some of the culturally-appropriate ways that I use to reach the community. Thank you.

Matthew P. Dumont, MD

Medical Director, Transition Services, Westboro State Hospital; Author of 'Treating the Poor'

Introduction by David G. Satin, MD

Matthew Dumont will address this issue of community from the point of view of a mental health clinician, but one who is sensitive to the political-economic environment in which mental health and illness takes place. Dr. Dumont got his medical degree from the University of Chicago School of Medicine, and completed the fellowship in Community Psychiatry at the Laboratory of Community Psychiatry at the Harvard Medical School. He was eventually the Chief of the Center for Studies of Metropolitan Mental Health Problems at the National Institute of Mental Health, an assistant commissioner and director of the Division of Drug Rehabilitation in the Department of Mental Health of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and director of the Chelsea, Massachusetts Community Counseling Center.

He has now stayed in public service, and is the director of the Transitional Services at the Westboro State Hospital, in the Department of Mental Health, and a lecturer on psychiatry at the Harvard Medical School. His publications through the years have reflected a remarkable constancy in his values and his interests. In 1967 he wrote an article, *Tavern Culture: The Sustenance of Homeless Men*, in the *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*; in 1971, *Government as Dada* in the journal *Transaction*; in 1974, *Self-Help Treatment Programs* in the *American Journal of Psychiatry*; and in 1977, *Is Mental Health Possible Under Our Economic System?* in *Psychiatric Opinion*. His two books have been in 1968, *The Absurd Healer: Perspectives of a Community Psychiatrist*, published by Science House; and in 1992, *Treating the Poor: A Personal Sojourn Through the Rise and Fall of Community Mental Health*, published by Dymphna Press. Matthew Dumont on clinical aspects of community.

Matthew P. Dumont, MD

We were in training together at the Massachusetts General Hospital as psychiatric residents a few years ago, and were students of Erich Lindemann, which is why we're here. And I wish he were here to help us think about this.

I'm not going to talk about the clinical aspect of community because I have too many complicated feelings about the fact that my 16 years of working as a community psychiatrist came to an abrupt end. I was sucker punched by some forces, including our good governor, who decided that community mental health was a luxury that the state

could not afford, and I was laid off by him, which was not a devastating event. I'm still alright, I'm working, I managed to survive, but it was a disorienting one because I had thought that this little clinic in Chelsea where I had been for 16 years would be left alone because it was such a cheap place, I mean, 20-odd professionals, much cheaper than an emergency ward visit to the MGH, which replaced much of our work. I had to get beyond, I had to change the scale of my reaction to being sucker punched by our governor, beyond his being a mean-spirited, narrow-minded son of a bitch. He is a mean-spirited, narrow-minded son of a bitch, but that's not the issue because Mario Cuomo is now doing the same thing in New York State, and he is a great liberal, and a very decent human being. And it's happening all across the country, and in fact in some ways the same phenomenon at a slightly different scale is happening all over the world, and it's that scale that I'm going to ask you to share with me, a slightly broader stroke image, because I think the fact that my little clinic in Chelsea was closed was simply one tiny speck of a much broader picture landscape.

I'll tell you how I got the insight into how broad this is. In Haiti, which I visited to in 1991, with part of a health in human studies study group. It involved in this visit in part spending a day in a general hospital in Port-au-Prince and another day in the national penitentiary of Haiti, institutions which many of us would find it difficult to distinguish, by the way, one from the other. In the general hospital there were people sitting around in the emergency room, a huge, empty space, for as long as six hours with acute abdomens, badly bleeding injuries, very severe burns, and eventually perhaps to be put in a bed, perhaps not and to be sent home, the bed not having any linens, which the family was expected to provide, and the sustenance for the patient also had to be provided by family. The medical care for the people in the hospital, I guess the less said the better, which by contemporary, even MGH standards.

I wound up examining political prisoners in the national penitentiary who had been tortured. There were three very important well-known political prisoners at that time, there was a question as to whether they had been tortured or not, a complex series of events that had got me into this role. The people who had not been tortured in that institution were being tortured. There were 500 men in one space with no sewerage, no running water. There was sort of a concrete area, a corner, of this room for the toilet facilities. 90% of the people in this institution had not been charged with a crime. Hepatitis, I couldn't say was endemic, I think everybody had hepatitis in this building, and AIDS was rampant. There were 12 children among the prisoners. The event that gave me an insight into the landscape that I'm relating to the loss of this little clinic in Chelsea was pointed out by a peasant, an illiterate peasant in a little community called Cap Haitien which is the second largest city of Haiti, who talked about how he was going to have to take his family and move several hundred miles to Port-au-Prince because the

farm on which he had been working as a rice farmer was being closed, and he pointed to the reason why it was being closed.

A bag of rice, large bag, maybe 20 pounds, I'm not sure, on which were the words, 'A gift from the people of the United States of America to the Agency for International Development'. This gift, by the way, was being sold, but sold at much cheaper rates than the rice grown at the farm that this man worked on, so that the farm went out of business, and this man had to go, joining approximately a million people in Port-au-Prince to live in Cite Sole, a slum the likes of which you can;t imagine by contemporary American standards. About 600,000 people, with very little running water, no sewerage, and a shanty town that doesn't deserve the word 'town'.

The reason that this is happening is not an accident. There was some contrivance in the closing down of that farm and that bag of rice that said 'Gift from the people of the United States of America,' and if you've learned anything about what's happening with foreign aid, and about the behavior of the International Monetary Fund and in the World Bank in the third world today, you will understand that all over the world, the third world, rural communities are being devastated by the systematic importation of crops to replace the crops being grown there, crops generally from the United States of America, for the purpose of generating a large industrial workforce that will service the very banks that are lending the money that create this flow of produce that undercuts the locally grown produce.

The factories, they do exist still, in Haiti, in Port-au-Prince, that are going to hire this man if he's lucky enough to get a job at 70 cents an hour, if he's lucky enough to get a job at 70 cents an hour. The factories make such items as familiar to us as The Gap, clothing for Sears, electronic items for Radio Shack, these are very familiar names to us, American organizations largely, and that quintessential American product, the baseball, is also manufactured in factories like this in Port-au-Prince.

The reason that these factory owners can get away with paying people 70 cents an hour and not have to run the expense of seven or eight or twelve dollars an hour here is because there are so many people desperate for work in Port-au-Prince and Nairobi and Sao Paulo and every other major city in the third world and that's the reason why every city in the third world has a little ring, a little center of something like a social infrastructure with a middle class community surrounded by a vast and growing ring of shanty towns, people desperate for work, making it impossible to organize people into unions, and making it possible for good old American companies to get away with paying 70 cents an hour or less in some environments.

The structural adjustment loans, this is what they're called at the IMF and the World Bank, are systematically oriented towards creating a large, unemployed industrial, urban workforce, the consequences of which are not, by the way, are not just the destruction of

rural communities, but AIDS, because every effort, including very aggressive and imaginative efforts on the part of the World Health Organization to distribute condoms cannot keep up with the flood of children coming into cities in the third world who are forced to act as prostitutes because there isn't enough work for them and their families. It's the reason for ten million, according to some estimates, homeless, familyless children on the streets of the cities of the world. Ten million on the streets, living, you can't say they're living like animals in the jungle because the jungle has more sense, it has more ecology, it has more rationality than the lives of these homeless children, running through the streets of these streets, acting at best as criminals. And it's the reason why the word "community" is increasingly not even having even a metaphorical reality.

This very systematic behavior on the part of the lending institutions of the developed world, it's not only the United States, it's also Japan, Germany and France, and Italy, that's what the World Bank is, and the IMF and their banks, our banks, and the corporations that are profiting from them to create what is called a development process in the third world is systematically destroying the ecology, speaking of Earth Day, the lives, not metaphorically, actually the lives, and certainly the communities of huge parts of the world. This is not an accident. This is not an effect like global warming, built into some obscure combination of economic development and refrigerators and cars, it is a carefully planned, contrived event of international capital.

I have to say, however, because David wanted us to talk about the reemergence of community in this country, that, as Dr. Freud and Dr. Marx taught us, things sometimes come out of their opposite, and I don't want to leave you with the sense that these forces are so vast and so implacable that they cannot be overcome.

I met Jean Bertrand Aristide in Haiti in 1991. He was then a priest who was running an orphan asylum for homeless children. He was known everywhere in the island of ten million people because he would give sermons on the radio on Sunday morning which were sermons about why there's so much suffering on this island, and he described in greater detail and more elaboration and with a slightly more spiritual emphasis these forces that were throughout the world. Not just in Haiti, but throughout the world, so that a peasant in Haiti, that an illiterate peasant, seemed to have a clearer understanding of the nature of the global economy than I have heard from people with Ph.D.s in economics in this country. It's not so complicated, by the way, when you're living the life of a farm being closed down then having to go into a city and knowing what's in store for you. It's very simple.

Well, Aristide, as you know, became the president of Haiti, still is the president of Haiti, but has been kicked out by the military who was in power when I was there, even before the elections. Aristide is not a depressed man, even though the CIA would like to

see him as an emotionally unstable person. He is probably a saint, if such people exist. He actually reminded me a lot of Erich, I have to tell you. He had the capacity to talk so simply and straightforwardly, and by the way was such a genius--he has a Ph.D. in psychology, incidentally, and speaks eight languages fluently, and they can't seem to kill him. They keep trying, you know they used to send the Tonton Macoute into the church and shoot at people, in one case 37 people were killed, he's like smoke, he sort of fades out and comes back again, recrystallizes, and he cannot be killed. I am convinced that he cannot be killed.

He is an optimist about Haiti and the world, and the reason that he's an optimist is very much the kinds of things we learned from Erich, and that is there are as vicious and implacable and greedy the forces of capital at work, and as powerful as they are with all of the guns at their command, there are equally implacable forces within the most beaten down, the most victimized elements of this whole process, and he said, 'let me tell you something about Cite Sole', which you saw, this open sewer that you saw of 600,000 people. These shanty towns consist of little tar shacks with corrugated tin at best, cardboard, wood, tires, there aren't enough of them for all of Port-au-Prince who need them, so that a spontaneous emergence of a cooperative system in Cite Sole wherein three different families will share a single shack over a 24-hour period, so that for eight hours the entire family has to vacate the shack, and live on the streets or beg or steal or work, whatever they can do to survive, for 16 hours and then come back for their rotation in the shack. This man, Jean Bertrand Aristide, became the president of Haiti because he said, 'you know, this is our future. They cannot destroy our capacity to cooperate. As much as they try, they cannot stop us from coming up with forms of social organization that are relentless, because they're relentlessly cooperative and communal and collective'. They are in every sense of the word communistic, a word that he's not afraid to use, which is why for some reason he hasn't been allowed back into his own country.

Well, what I wanted to convey to you is that the reemergence of community is not something that is very obvious to those of us who've watched our cultivation of it in the mental health sphere become so devastated. But it is going to happen. It cannot not happen, and I think that the very grimness of the scene that we're confronting now throughout the world, just as Aristide saw in Cite Sole, is the kind of thing where with the slightest recrystallization of forces, and something like grass growing. We will see new forms of social organization across the boundaries that have been so carefully drawn on the map, and making the people good or bad, the Welds and the Cuomos and all the rest, helpless, because they're so powerful and will be so universal. We must have some kind of communism, and we have to stop being afraid to use that word, because it's a decent word, and conveys very meaningful ways for us to do our business together, but that will probably be another lecture.

David Satin:

I would still like to see that as addressing the issue from the clinical point of view because there is a public health clinical point of view. As Erich Lindemann once said, 'You can't look at individual lives only'. Certain environmental influences affect individual lives, for instance, if you have a little war this affects people health--people's mental health as well as people's physical health, and as Matthew Dumont once said, 'when individual people are injured or are sick, it is a clinical problem. When whole populations of people become injured or sick it becomes a public health problem'.

Maurice R. Stein, PhD

Jacob S. Potofsky Professor of Sociology, Brandeis University

Introduction by David G. Satin, MD

Perhaps now we can build on these experiences of the individual and the collective world, what it does to people and what it does to their health, and bring it to the level of a social perspective, a sociological perspective. Maurice Stein is the Jacob S. Potofsky Professor of Sociology at Brandeis University, and his book in 1960 called, *The Eclipse of Community: An Interpretation of American Studies*.

Maurice R. Stein, PhD

My daughter who is looking at colleges gets these brochures from every college in the country and they all look exactly the same: there's a student sitting next to a professor, nose to nose on a grassy knoll, and around that student are people of color variously distributed, and then there's a list of all the wonderful courses that are being offered at this university. Then they list all the organizations, including these days, the gay and lesbian group, all making everybody feel they're going to be perfectly comfortable at this school, whatever school it is, and then of course when you get there as a parent visiting it turns out all they really want to do is get your money, and then when they get your kid, all they really want to do is grade your kid, and it's disgusting, this is the use of the word "community" these days.

I suppose the other use of it as our good leader, George Bush, is creation of a military affair in the Persian Gulf, where everybody wore a yellow ribbon and we dropped SMART bombs and nobody got killed and the community rallied. This was really a great day for America--only 18 Americans were killed, of course a lot of vets are turning up with all kinds of weird diseases, and we've just begun to institutionalize those diseases, a little earlier than Agent Orange. I myself was in World War Two and I can't hear these days because I was in the field artillery and I used to stand close to the Howitzers. Nobody ever told us that those Howitzers were going to do something to our eardrums. A very curious use of community.

I guess the most impressive thing for me was watching a film of the Dalai Lama address in Dharamsala the refugees from Tibet, and the difference between George Bush yelling about Saddam Hussein and mispronouncing his name after bolstering the character for many years, as we now know, and the Dalai Lama, when asked the question was he angry at the Chinese, this was a video in which he'd seen the Chinese beating up on the Tibetans brutally, and the Dalai Lama said, 'just a little bit,' which I thought was

marvelous. Then he said, 'I try to take their anger and return love, and return compassion,' and I think that was community for me in a very deep and profound way.

I think that I will come back to Buddhism again, because one of the most important communities that I find myself part of now is the Buddhist community, and the political Buddhist community, the community led by Thich Nhat Hanh and the community of insight meditators. Actually what I did when I tried to figure out what I would say, I must say I tried to write a book called 'The Reemergence of Community from 1960 to (I guess) 1985'. I had one moment in 1969 when I thought I could write such a book, and you all remember 1969, with the counterculture, a kind of protest that appeared to manifest qualities that were political in a good way, pacifist and antiwar, I didn't go with cries against the pigs and that stuff, maybe I did for a moment but it wasn't where my heart was, but also a sense of participatory democracy as a way of doing things politically in an anti-hierarchical sense. Also a sensual sense, a sense that you could dress in color as a male, you could let go a little of the burden us men carry of needing to be right all the time, I don't know if any of you understand what that is, but in my generation it's like a hump on your back.

I mean just having driven in with Louisa, I had to ask people for directions and it was very hard--we couldn't get here. We finally had to say it's near the gas company. If you ever want to tell anybody how to get here, remember it's near the gas company, because everybody in West Roxbury knows where the gas company is, but not many people know either where Wilmer Street is, or where the Massachusetts School of Professional Psychology is, but the gas company does it. If we didn't get here, we were going to go into the gas company and see whatever they could use us for. I'm sure there was something. We're all full of gas.

So I decided today I would not do my usual pessimistic number, and I would try to focus on openings and reemergence. Another opening for many of us I guess was the breakdown of the wall, and the hope that generated in 1989, and then again I thought I could write a book on the reemergence of community. It didn't take very long for the surfacing of all kinds of antagonisms and what we're now looking at Bosnia, I don't know if we're looking at it squarely, but certainly our president isn't, but much is happening in the world, much of what Dr. Dumont talked about. I have a colleague, Decima Wilson, who, Williams, who is dedicated to Aristide and to Haiti and we spent a lot of time trying to work with that movement.

So where's my optimism? Well, I got it here in my notes. (Laughs) I think that some things have deepened from the 60s, and the first things are for me are absolutely important, and I was thinking about the fact that you're all becoming therapists, therefore I tried to think of movements, as I did in *The Eclipse of Community*, where I have a chapter on psychoanalysis, that there had to be a basis for individual change for

social change to happen, and we had to have an understanding of individual change. So I asked myself, 'where was a understanding of individual change that seemed to me to be connected to social change?' Obviously the biggest movement is the women's movement, and that has gone far and differentiated itself in complicated ways. The big thing in the 50s was identity. Erikson was my teacher, and I did a book called Identity and Anxiety a long time ago, and everybody was worrying about facelessness, we would all wonder.

Other direction was Riesman's concept, and everybody was worried about the fact that we didn't have identity and we needed to get identity. The 60s moved into identity in a much more direct way, rather than the generalized way, 'we don't want to be organization men, we don't want to be other-directed'. Voices began to be heard that hadn't been heard in the culture--the civil rights movement, the movement among black people, the movement among native Americans, the beginning of the disability rights movement, and I think essentially the women's movement, and the beginning of women's issues posed not by white, middle-class women, but posed by black women and Latina women and Asian women, and the beginning of a kind of politics of identity which was connected to a therapy of identity.

I remember the first consciousness-raising group was met in my living room in Los Angeles when I was dean of an art school, and I would ask my partner at that time, 'what did you talk about?' She said, 'oh, nothing--cooking'. And, 'What'd you talk about?' next week, 'we discussed men'. And I said, 'what'd you talk about?' the week after, I realized this was getting a little close to home, 'child care'. I had the good fortune at that time, I was dean of an art school at that time, and I was trying to hire Herbert Markouza, the art school was sponsored by the Disney family, and Roy Disney had heard at that time that Herbert Markouza had shot somebody in San Diego, this had come through the John Birch newsletter. Actually somebody had tried to shoot Markouza in San Diego, but the John Birch newsletter got it wrong and Roy Disney took it as gospel, and I'm on the verge of being relieved of my deanly duties, which had occupied me for 80 hours a week, and I went back to being a faculty member at that time, which occupied me about three hours a week, and the child care issue suddenly fell in my lap, and I did enormous amounts of child care. I was very pleased to have done, and I am grateful to the women's movement for that. I am also grateful to the women's movement for having the kind of thinking about Western society which locates patriarchy as a major dimension of difficulty and terror and everything else that patriarchy does. I'm grateful for Carol Gilligan and her notion of relatedness, for the Belenke people and women's way of knowing, for Rianne Eisler, and The Chalice and the Blade, because the job of sociology has been in the past understanding how we got where we are, and I think the real insights into how we got where we are have been coming in important ways from women theorists.

Ok, I'll be brief. The three other areas which I saw connect individual work with social change: the self-help community. I spent ten years doing reevaluation counseling, which is a self-help group in which people alternately listen to each other and work as clients, and it involves the assumption that ordinary folk can do the job or work that you professional psychotherapists are being trained to do at such great cost to yourselves and to the world. It was an interesting experience. I mean, I spent ten years at it. It dribbled off in the political correctness at some point--it was a non-hierarchical movement that had a guru, and it got into its own contradictions, but while I was doing it I learned a great deal. And so I think the self-help movement, even though I'm not at the moment for the 12-step person, they haven't yet formed a Readers Anonymous group. Books for a Buck has nearly destroyed my house, it's practically destroying my life. I mean who can go into a store where everything is a buck and not walk out with quite a few books. But anyway, the 12-step movement seems to me to be important.

Another important movement which seems to be catching on now, and I'm a little suspicious of it, is the neo-pagan--Star Hawk and Wicca, Care of the Soul, Tom Moore, archetypal psychology--all these things seem to be becoming popular, and I worry about their politics. I was pleased to see Hillman write a book called *A Hundred Years of Psychotherapy and Nothing Has Changed*, with a columnist from the LA Times called Michael Ventura. It's a very strange and powerful and scary book, but something to think about. But I think there's something to this archetypal psychology. I teach in the humanities, and it's really been wonderful. Jean Bulloven's book, *Goddesses in Every Women*, straightened out my relationship with women, and *Goddesses in Every Man* helped me figure out what goes on with me. I don't know where it goes politically.

And the last is the Buddhist community, which I am part of now in a very loose way. There, it seems to me, the issue of looking at oneself and looking at the values of this society goes very directly to the issue of mindfulness. As one Buddhist says to me, 'don't worry about reincarnation, most people on the planet have never incarnated'. It strikes me as perfectly logical. We are all, most of the time, in out-of-body experiences, if we're honest with ourselves. How many of you are really in your body? I mean, raise your hand if you think you are really in your body. What are you hearing? Nobody raises their hand. I can barely get mine up. I'm in my body partly because sound gets amplified and I hear my own voice and can't really avoid it.

What I would like to leave you with is a set of reflections from the Tibetan tradition, which is one that I don't practice, but I respect, and these are the reflections which, even in this devout community, people seem to need to think about because whatever culture they are in works against it, and the first reflection is that it's a great thing to have been born, and everybody, every morning, might want to get up and say, 'it's a great thing to

have been born'. Now, that's not as hard, because if I don't do it before I read the newspapers, I'm dead in the water, but if I can look around at my kids and at my partner, or look at the fact that I'm even with whatever physical infirmities I suffer from, I'm still there, and that's all rationalizations. It's a great thing to have been born—that's the first thing. The second thing is that everything is impermanent. Everything—even the Massachusetts Society for Professional Psychotherapists, and even this building, and even the United States of America, and even the USSR, to take a case where we notice the impermanence, and even the planet, and that is a deep thought. I think that everything in our way of being, my way of being anyway, resents this impermanence. The third thing is karma--what goes around, comes around, and I don't like that either, but here I am, stuck with it. It does do that. And the last thing is suffering, and as a Jewish person, you can go either way with suffering. You can just revel in it. Suffering? Oy vey. I come from a community where you can have a whole interaction...I remember my mother and her friends saying nothing but 'oy vey' to each other in various gradations and intonations without ever really getting to the content of what they were dealing, but they really shared a lot, so suffering...you can either go with that suffering, or you can see suffering in a way that I think the Dalai Lama did, that suffering is part of the whole game, but not the whole game, and the game, whatever it is, is a valuable and important one.

I don't know if I spoke to the issue of reemergence of community. But the other community, for me, I see reemerging is a very powerful community of young people, and I think the devastation wreaked upon young people in this society is to me the real tragedy, the inconceivable tragedy. In the universities now everybody's concerned with political correctness. The kind of political correctness that stuns me is the kind of political correctness that is so stupid that it can sit and put six billion bucks into police forces and a couple of trillion into the Pentagon, and nothing into welfare, and welfare, God forbid, and nobody questions this--the liberals go along with it in their way, and the conservatives go along with it in their way. That's political correctness. Thank you.

David Satin:

It's interesting to have a sociologist speak about community in terms of self-help organizations and self-assertion, and in terms of philosophy. Faith, in a sense, or a perspective on the world, and he sees this as the spirit of society that he reads. We have had views from people working in the field, whether it be a community organization or a public health view of clinical work. We have had views from a social perspective of what's going on in society and society's ideals. I guess it's time to get practical, and see what of this can we expect to come out in terms of hard reality, and one of the hardest realities I know of, and people have referred to, is economics. What will society afford? My own perspective on economics is that financial or economic issues usually end up to be social

philosophy realities: what you can afford is, to a certain extent, what you want to afford, in terms of social and societal ideals.

Rahsi Fein, PhD

Professor of the Economics of Medicine, Department of Social Medicine, Harvard Medical School

Introduction by David G. Satin, MD

Our final speaker is Rashi Fein, who has his bachelors and doctors degree from the Johns Hopkins University, is Professor of the Economics of Medicine in the Department of Social Medicine at the Harvard Medical School, and has been involved in very practical affairs: he was on the senior staff of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisors, and in fact on the staff of President Truman's Commission on Health Needs of the Nation. He is a charter member of the Institute of Medicine, of the National Academy of Sciences, a founding member of the National Academy of Social Insurance, Chairman of the Technical Board of the Committee for National Health Insurance in Washington. His books include *The Economics of Mental Illness* in 1958, *A Right to Health: The Problem of Access to Primary Medical Care*, which he wrote with Charles Lewis and David Mechanic in 1976, and *Medical Care, Medical Costs: The Search for an Insurance Policy*, published in 1986 and 1989. Some of his articles include *The Impact of Social Science on a Changing Health Delivery System*, *Entitlement to Health Services Reappraised*, and *Health Care Reform*. Professor Fein.

Rashi Fein, PhD

The introduction suggests that you should not be misled—I'm not practical. I suppose I was thinking about why I am here, and the first reason is that I deliver a number of talks during the year that do not, it seems to me, confer any status upon me. I go and I talk. The name Lindemann meant something, so to be involved in that kind of a setting and that kind of an event, I didn't have much choice. Second, I wasn't invited to talk about health reform, which is kind of nice, I would like a little vacation. The third is that I get an awful lot of invitations these days to attend symposia and conferences, none of which I accept, but they come from groups that have been in business, now that health reform is before us, roughly speaking six months, so to be involved in something that is been in existence 17 years or so means you're legitimate, and you're not here just to make money. And, finally, of course, I was intrigued, since I despair, I wanted to hear about the reemergence of community, because from where I sit, there is the reemergence, or emergence, of all kinds of communities, but I regret to say that from where I sit, they are communities only in reference, or primarily in reference, to their anger and opposition to other communities, and that is not exactly what I have in mind when I talk about

community. I think it's great to have communities, but not to have so many that are designed to destroy other communities.

So maybe reemergence of community would give me heart, but in the old days we had much smaller, less knowledge about greater...things very distant. Today, thanks to the power of television, we really know that there's a community out there in the Caribbean called Haiti, and a community out there called the former Yugoslavia, and that in some real sense, I believe, and I am not qualified, it's just a gut reaction, I'm only an economist, I believe that if we watch people being killed in the former Yugoslavia, and people living the way they do in Haiti, and watch it in our living rooms, it also affects the way we behave towards people who, in the old days, would have been defined as our community, much closer to us.

But I will first give you my credentials how wrong I can be, so that you can take heart so that when I say something depressing, you can say, 'well, he's wrong'. Many years ago I was walking through Harvard Square on a Sunday morning with two Israeli public health officials from the Ministry of Health. They had both been trained in the United States. In the old days one would have said they'd been educated in the United States, but since so much education has become a matter of training instead of education, they were trained in the United States. We had been speaking, as a consequence of their knowledge of the US, about national health insurance in the United States, a subject that has preoccupied me since Harry Truman's days, and we were walking through Harvard Square on a Sunday morning, and walking up Mass. Ave. in front of the Coop, towards the corner there, and I burst out because I'd been kicking aside the Coke cans, a couple of beer bottles, and those big plastic containers of popcorn from the movie theatre. I was kicking aside the remains of Saturday night, and I burst out, 'but we're not going to have national health care in the United States 'til Harvard Square is clean'. They looked at me, and I felt I had to explain, and I guess my explanation rested on the idea that we wouldn't have universal national health insurance in the United States 'til in fact we were concerned about others, not just about ourselves, and that evidence that we are concerned about others might be that we didn't throw popcorn cans and Coke bottles in our neighbor's backyards. Seemed to me that the two were interrelated. Well, I want to report to you that Harvard Square is as dirty as it was, but we are talking about national health insurance in spite of that, so I was wrong. On the other hand, we're not talking about the kind of national health insurance that I would favor, so maybe I was right.

I want to say a word or two about health reform and community, and then I want to say a few words about the role of economics in building community, and conclude with a few words about the role of economists as distinguished from economics itself. Now there are some good things in the discussion of health reform. I will not say in the

Clinton program, because it's not a very important data. By now I think everyone understands that the Clinton program made an important contribution--it was specific enough that people had to talk. It is not the program that is going to come out of the House Ways and Means Committee, it is not the program that is going to come out of the Senate Finance Committee, it is not the program that is going to be enacted. It was perhaps necessary to have it in order to get anything enacted.

So, I want to talk more generically about health reform rather than about the Clinton program in itself, and it's a mixed bag. Many people are in favor it, maybe Harvard Square can still be dirty and we can be talking about national health insurance because in the old days I had an image that national health insurance would come to the fore when we cared about our neighbor. Well, now all you got to do to be in favor of national health insurance is care about yourself, because all of us have become what once were our neighbors. We are all threatened. There is not an adult that I know, I don't know all Americans, but there isn't an adult that I know, no matter how good her or his job, who isn't concerned about the kids. I got it made—I'm a professor at Harvard and I know this whole system forward and backward, and we have four children and every one of them has a health insurance problem, a problem that I can't solve, and therefore even if I don't have my own concern, my flesh and blood's concern is still there. So the risk has expanded to the point where in fact all of us are affected.

There are some characteristics that I think those in favor of universal health insurance have come to understand as important, and one of those characteristics when I wrote this book on national health insurance in '86 is a long discussion of something which, then, seemed to me to be central, and yet I have learned from students and from colleagues is considered obscure. Now it is both central and well-understood, and it has the word 'community' in it. And what can be better? Community rating. An old concept which basically said, hey, we're all in this together. Not quite all, you had to be able to afford to pay the community rate, and obviously some people couldn't, but at least we all who could afford paid the same rate, instead of saying, you will pay a rate that is based on your own health condition.

Most people in Washington understand that concept now, and only time will tell whether most people in Washington like the concept well enough to buy into it, but there is a larger group than there was the case a year ago who understand that in fact you cannot achieve what you want to achieve unless you have some mechanism that gives you a community rate, and that is what Clinton's alliances were about, and while they will not survive, something will have to be generated to achieve that community rate. But we don't have it yet.

There's a second concept which, I'm distressed to say, is better than the existing system but it is not what you, I can't speak for you, it is not what I mean by community.

That's the concept of universal. When the president, when Mr. Rostenkowski, when others say, 'it's gotta be universal,' they mean something different from what I mean. They mean there ought to be a series of programs out there, funded from different sources, funded in different ways, and we ought to be sure that everybody is in one or another program. What I mean by universal, I mean there is one program and we are all in that one program. The social security system is universal, and that is a much healthier community program, it seems to be, than the other alternatives, because one of the great characteristics of the social security system is that there is no way that I can screw the poor without screwing myself. It doesn't depend on the milk of human kindness. I wish it did, and we were nice, but I'm not so certain that we are so nice so often as to prepare me to take that risk.

Most of the programs being discussed today, I shouldn't say 'discussed,' because there is Senator Wilson, and there is Congressman MacDermott, most of the programs that I'd be... to note that this morning I heard Dan Rostenkowski in a small breakfast, maybe 20-25, and then in a large lecture at the Harvard School of Public Health, and Chairman Rostenkowski is a necessary but not sufficient condition for getting national health insurance, and he said what is now a refrain that we hear all over the place, 'well, let's be absolutely clear: single payer is certainly the best way to go, but it isn't going to happen,' and went on to systems of universality that are based on one group will be in this program, one group will be in that program, one group will be in that program, and we're going to work very hard to make sure that all of the programs are adequately funded, and we're going to have to continue to work very hard so that those people who are in the predominantly poor programs, I'm sorry, in the program for the poor, don't define that as a poor program. The ease with which we depart from 'but it can't be done,' and therefore make compromises, nonetheless, even so, to say that there would be a program for every American, every resident of America who is not here as an illegal, as an undocumented alien, is substantial progress in its own way, although Dan Rostenkowski's definition of universality was a most intriguing one.

He was asked, 'is it really going to be universal?' and, 'what about the undocumented aliens?' He acknowledges how undocumented aliens do get sick, which is an acknowledgement. You remember when Medicare passed, it did not cover people who were part of the Alger Hiss Amendment, that is communists, in the initial days of Medicare, because we didn't get sick. The Supreme Court said they do, and so they ended up being covered. But Mr. Rostenkowski then went on to say that there were problems. One of the big problems for him is that he differs with President Clinton in a most dramatic way, and a healthy way. He said, we will have a bill, it will come out of the House Ways and Means Committee, it will be as big as I can have my members make it, but as I figure it, we are going to need 40 or so billion dollars of taxes, and we're not

going to get it from cigarettes. We're going to be honest about it and say there has to be a broad-based, general increase in taxation. I think that's a healthy approach because I think the president was being overly optimistic, and I think that debate should be joined.

In the course of that reference, Mr. Rostenkowski said, 'my definition of universal is as many people as you can include for the money you've got,' which is an odd definition of community--as many people as you can have to the dinner table. Well, the definition of community that some of us were more familiar with was that somehow or other, everybody got to the dinner table and everybody had a little bit less than they might have had if other people hadn't dropped in and hadn't been considered members of the family. I think economics has a lot to do with public policy, and I think the public policies we elect, choose, opt for, have a lot to do with our sense of community and with the definitions that surround us of who is and who is not in the community. That's a hypothesis, I do not claim any expertise in this. I think the simple part is to say, to make the casual observation, that it is easier to build a sense of togetherness, if you will, community, when times are good and we're sharing with others does not require having less for yourself, you just get a little bit of an increment, they get a lot of an increment.

When I was in the Kennedy Council of Economic Advisors I resented that point of view, I didn't want to accept it, I felt we ought to be doing good things because they are good, but as I look back, it really was a lot easier during the periods of economic growth to accomplish all kinds of things that are much more difficult when people are hunkered down and they are scared. I commend to you a column the other day by Russell Baker, who argued the point that people are not scared of crime, they're scared of jobs, and they don't know what to do about it, and so it lashes out into all kinds of other manifestations, including crime. I don't know that there's an awful lot of reason to be particularly optimistic about our economy. It is growing, according to the feds, too quickly. According to the guy...I stopped the other day and got a shoe shine. I don't normally get a shoe shine, but I did, and I was talking to the shoe shine fellow, and 'what do you teach?' and I said, 'economics'. Too complicated to say 'economics in the medical school,' so I said 'economics'. He said, 'well, I'll tell you, it isn't doing well. I know, I know, all of the figures say it's doing well, but the guys who stop here, they're scared'.

Okay, let me suggest that I think the economy has a lot to do with it. I think the way we are willing to tax ourselves, or unwilling to tax ourselves, is the clearest manifestation of our feeling of community. I think economists have something to do with that. Economists, and I will concur with that, are a curious breed. They are very important. They are, for reasons that are not intuitively obvious, listen to us. They turn to us, we know how to manipulate data, we know how to deal with abstractions, and everything comes down, presumably, to economics. So, it's worth noting something about economists.

Last year a study was published that was done by one economist and two psychologists at Cornell University. They did a series of experiments with economists and students of economics, and students in other disciplines, and they were very interesting little experiments from which they learned that economists are different and not necessarily community-oriented. Let me read from the report: 'Students of economics are trained to regard self-interest as the force that decides economic choices. It's easy to imagine cases where cheating is advantageous. The economists view is that others will see that the logic of the situation calls for cheating, so you had better cheat also'. This idea pervades the literature, and there is a disturbing thing that may be having some effect on the economists. For example, in one experiment, first-year graduate students in various fields were asked to take part in the following experiment: they were given some money, and they were told to divide it into two accounts. One account was labeled 'private,' the other account was labeled 'public'. Money in the private account was back to the student at the end of the experiment. Money in the public account was pooled, multiplied by a factor of more than 1.0, and then divided equally among the students. For a society as a whole, the obviously thing was all people should put all money in the public account. It's going to be merged, it's going to be multiplied by more than 1.0, so there's going to be more money at the end, and then you're going to divide it up, and you're going to have more money than if you put it in the private account and just gotten it back, because that creates the biggest pie. Of course, for each individual student, the best thing is to put it into the private account, because that way you get back your stake, plus a full share of the money that all those other people put into the public account. Right?

Okay, so the study found that on average the economics students contributed 20% of their money to the public account, and students of all other subjects contributed 50% to the public account. The researchers then asked the students to explain their action. Had they worried about whether their action was fair? Nearly all the non-economists said, 'yeah, I really worried about it because, you know, other people are going to put money into the public account. I should to'. The response from the economists was quite different. Over a third of the economists refused to answer the question regarding what is fair, or gave very complex, uncodable responses. Seems that the meaning of fairness in this context was somewhat alien for this group. Those who did respond were much more likely to say that little or no contribution was fair.

I give you a second, there are only three stories that I want to tell you. The second one, there was a second experiment. I'm not going to go into it. It has essentially the same characteristics. The economists came out worrying about their private behavior, not the public--call it community--behavior. A survey asked 245 randomly selected college professors how much they gave to charity each year. About 9% of the economics

professors gave nothing. The proportion of professors in other disciplines giving nothing ranged between 1.1 and 4.2 percent, despite generally lower incomes than the economists. The median gift of economists to big charities such as the United Way or to viewer-supported public television was substantially smaller than the median gifts of non-economists.

So now you ought to be getting worried because remember I began by saying, now we don't want to talk just about this curious thing, who are the economists, I began by saying, we are important. People listen to us. And now you're beginning to discover we're not the people that should be listened to, given that set of values. Now I give you the worst. Does training in economics make you mean, or is it just that mean people are somehow attracted to economics? So to find out the Cornell School did a further experiment to find out whether students became more or less honest in a hypothetical situation after doing some economics. They compared three sets of students. The first took a course in mainstream economics, taught by an instructor with an interest in industrial organization and game theory. The second took a similar course, but taught by a specialist in development in Maoist China, and the third took a placebo, astronomy. Across a range of questions, the pattern was consistent. The first set contained the largest proportion of students who became less honest, next came the second set. Honorably in the rear came the astronomers, with the smallest proportion of students who became less honest. So *The Economist Magazine* concludes, perhaps then there is a public interest in curbing the study of economics, or alternatively, in conclusion, this column would prefer to endorse economics needs to take psychology more seriously.

The fact is that people do cooperate more than the self-interest model, useful though it is, seems to predict. And as the Cornell team points out, recent research sheds some light on one reason for it, and then it goes on with a small experiment in which they hypothesize some reason that others, non-economists, do cooperate. It would seem to me that if I am right, that public policy reflects in no small measure not only lawyers but economists, and if I am at all accurate in relating public policy measures to sense of community, and if the Cornell people are correct that economists are meaner and have a different set of values about the importance of honesty, fairness, justice and community, then it would follow that your task and mine is to do as good a job as we can in articulating to those who make public policy that there is more to the making of public policy and more to the society than just the GNP and just the economic dimensions and just that set of attitudes that economists traditionally bring to such discussions. Thank you.

Discussion

David Satin:

We have an interesting array of ideas here. I wonder, I've been trying to think of whether we ended up being optimistic or pessimistic. We've heard about how a sense of community and caring among people have gone to hell. We've heard about efforts to revive it, to create communities, to create caring. We've heard, interestingly, about how ideals can lead us to a sense of community, as much as "scientific facts", and we ended up with the hardest headed kind of person that we could have, the economist, saying that there ought to be more idealism in determining public policy, and implying that we can institute that, we can do something about putting more idealism, more humanity into society and into developing caring communities.

So I guess I'm still unsure about whether things are getting worse because humanity and community is being lost to utilitarianism and exploitation, or whether things are getting better because humanity and idealism are springing up around the bomb craters and the paving stones and redeveloping, and maybe I'm confused because things are confusing. I wonder whether people could talk with one another to clarify their points of view and to give us a start to bringing our experience into it. Let me bring this over to you so you can be heard now and later. Would you please grab this when you want to say something so people can hear you?

Cheng Imm Tan:

I guess I have to comment on that. I think that there is a systematic plan, as Matt put it, that there is a systematic machine that really focuses mainly on private profit, and will go to whatever extent to make that private profit at the cost of a large majority of people. I think that happens here, that happens all over the world, I think you're absolutely right. I also think that the human spirit is such that we will not take that as what is and as something that cannot be changed, so that I think that what we're seeing is that people are organizing all over the place to actually change things, that we will actually not take that.

I think there are two elements that are important here. One is whether people are going to sit and say, 'this is the way things are and we cannot change it,' and be victims and have victim mentality, or you break through the victim mentality and say, 'something has got to be done, and I'm not going to wait for somebody else to do it,' and that the leadership has to come from yourself, that you have to be the leader yourself and start doing something, at least articulate a vision so that somebody else could also follow you.

Maurice Stein:

I guess the issue should not be posed as optimism or pessimism, and the issue is that we're all here and we're on a planet that is in trouble. Earth Day is not, it seems to be...the focus of the issue is not cleaning up the debris in Harvard Square, it's cleaning up levels of debris that the industrial world that we've created. While it's a good idea to clean up Harvard Square, the magnitude of the kind of debris that has been generated, the nuclear debris is really...I don't know what to say about it, the major issue, the debris that is radioactive for 50 thousand, 100 thousand years, which is scattered, and which was generated by a cold war that was itself a complete fraud. The only community that can deal with that is the world community, and there is no organ of the world community in a position to organize the steps, take whatever steps, if there are any steps, that can cope with it.

I think one of the problems of being a sociologist is that you get up there on the level of the large issues and you look for the forces that can change them and they aren't there. On the other hand I do have a sense, I share with Matt that, that the whole structure is itself much less powerful than one would have thought, and I think 1989 was a measure of that. One thought from the best intelligence the CIA received that the Soviet Union was invulnerable, was massively militarily equipped, was a society of robots, and that eastern Europe was under the tight grip of that society of whatever the elite in the Soviet Union was thought of, and it turned out to be not the case in any way, and I suppose in some parallel way the machine that was described, which seems to have the world in its palm, which, from a sociological view looks omnipresent and omnipotent, probably is another myth, and the transformation that could happen, the transformation that starts with a...I suppose, what was Chairman Mao's statement, that a journey of a thousand leagues starts with a single step. It will involve a lot of people making that single step, and we do not know what will lead to those steps being taken.

The fact that health care impacts on everyone, and I agree with the argument that people have turned to crime rather than other issues, rather than joblessness and other circumstances of their lives. That is correct. What will happen if people turn to and understand the larger issues? For me, the issue remains, can you spend this kind of funding on so-called defense against an enemy that's no longer there, or do you need to create circumstances in which people can live and not become criminals, as many of our fellow Americans are forced to become by the circumstances under which they live.

Matthew Dumont:

I've been a leftist all my life, and if I've learned anything, starting a long time ago, growing up in a Communist family, I learned that it is a matter of responsibility for leftists not being despairing, that if there's anything that defines a commitment to social

change and a commitment to some kind of socialism, obviously not the kind that exists in the Soviet Union, but some kind of socialism, if you really believe in that, if you really believe that that's the kind of arrangement that makes the satisfaction of human needs a little bit more possible, then you cannot afford the luxury of despair, and nihilism and despair are the ultimate vindicating states of mind of reaction. It is functional for reactionary forces that people get cynical and despairing, and I think that for those of us who have a vision, regardless of how cloudy it is by realities and facts, we have a responsibility not to give in to the temptation of despair--it's much too easy.

The question then is, what kind of optimism? I do not have the kind of optimism that Buddhists and Christians have. I do not have an optimism about divine intervention and I'm not even sure I have any kind of optimism about human nature, because if I've learned anything about psychiatry in all the years I've been a psychiatrist, it is there's no such thing as human nature. We are capable of being monstrous, and we are capable of being celestial, and the forces at work that define one or the other are quite arbitrary and sometimes exist at the same time, that good and evil are very capricious forces at work in all of us all of the time, and many of the differences in the best of us and the worst of us are not much greater than the differences within each of us at various times, or maybe the same time, but that's post graduate...

I think we have to see things quite clearly, and I think we have to see things in the right scale. I do not think the Clinton health program, even if it's not going to be enacted, is progressive. I think it's regressive. I think it's an expression of the same vested interest that have dominated health care and everything else in this society. And by the way, I'm not even sure the single payer system is progressive, because if you know about it's mental health program in Canada, as one example of a single payer system, as good as it would be to have the single payer system, the mental health program is extremely doctor-dominated, so that psychologists are not paid for psychotherapy, but GPs are, and social workers are not considered psychotherapists, and it's a hospital-oriented, medically-dominated, extremely reactionary mental health system that's just a little more available to people because they have universal coverage.

What's wrong about talking about socialized medicine? If the republicans are calling Clinton's program socialized medicine, and Clinton is calling single payer socialized medicine, somebody at Harvard should say, let's look at socialized medicine. Twenty years of the Thatcher government has not been able to undo what is apparently a very popular program, the largest organization in the world that's a national health service. You would be healthier in England than here despite the crumbling of economy in England, as it's crumbling here. We have to stop being afraid to use the word "socialized medicine". There is no other kind. Forgive passion.

Rashi Fein:

I will forgive you your passion. That's not the problem. The problem is that I agree about how dangerous it is to become not only cynical, but even before the cynicism, but to despair. On the other hand, the observer in me, I don't want to dignify it with analyst, but the observer in me, looking at the society, finds very few reasons not to despair. I don't want to set forth a litany of what's wrong, lest you become convinced that you should despair. I don't want that as the outcome.

On the other hand, if you're strong enough to hear the litany, and you're at least without despairing, then you recognize how serious, not only are the obstacles, but in how many areas they exist, and that, it seems to me, is useful. I may disagree with you, I do disagree with you on the Clinton program, it is not my program, I do not call it regressive. It does less good than I would like, but I think an awful lot of people would be better off than they are in the existing crumbling system. The only basis on which I could reject it would be if I were convinced that it somehow would delay an even better program in the very near future, because I don't want to play God about generations. I am not prepared to say it is ok to sacrifice today so that we can even call on others to make the sacrifices, because I'm sitting at Harvard with good insurance, and to say to others that don't have insurance, 'wait...'

I think that the talk show hosts are doing on a daily basis far more damage to call it progressive medicine, call it socialized medicine, to any sense of competence on the part of government, and therefore, if I believe, as I do, that you need that instrument to organize us to any possibilities of organization, and while I may be optimistic that in the longer run this will all regenerate. My life expectancy is not so long as to give me an awful lot of optimism in time for me to see it. I'm healthy but, my God, the forces arrayed against one are formidable indeed, and I don't sense, and that's the disturbing thing, I don't sense the makings of a force in opposition from groups that logically would be there, but the poor are poor and they are working very hard to survive, and so on down and up the line, and those organizations that once upon a time, it seems to me, provided a nucleus no longer exist or are weakened.

A study was done last year, was published last year, by a political science professor at Harvard who had a remarkable opportunity some 25 years ago. There were changes in the structure of federalism in Italy, and they were dividing into regions, and he began with a large team of individuals to study those regions and the way they performed, and they performed in all kinds of dimensions, like getting your automobile licensed, that became the locus of government for lots of purposes, and they are remarkably different-- in some cases you get an answer like that and in some cases you get a busy signal for two days. In some cases units of government are responsive, some are not, and it apparently had nothing to do with the state of the economy or with any of the measures that one

would conjure up, and finally they came to a measure, it had a lot to do with whether they had, and whether they had had for hundreds of years, choral societies. Now, choral societies turned out to be a community. It turned out to be a way of building a social infrastructure, but I don't know how choral societies are faring in the United States. Even bowling leagues aren't doing as well as once they did, thanks to television, and thanks to our ability to insulate ourselves from neighbors, so that I don't despair because I can't afford to despair, because it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy, but I'm pretty close to despair.

David Satin:

I wonder if people in the audience have some ideas and some experience.

Participant:

Do you think that volunteerism has sprung up, now that baby boomers have reached a point in their lifespans where they have more time to give the voluntary organizations?

Rashi Fein:

No, I'm serious. And I'm perfectly prepared to admit the following: that that which television portrays on a daily basis, it isn't the volunteer part but other parts, that which one sees, that which one hears on the talk shows, may drown out the emergence of a set of forces, and I may simply be a lousy observer, I may be seeing all of the bad and very little of a good.

Cheng Imm Tan:

It's actually no accident though. You know, Thich Nhat Hanh calls that poison, calls reading the newspaper everyday poison, that it really poisons your mind and your psyche because it doesn't give you a very balanced picture of what reality is. It only gives you one side of it.

My experience in terms of working with suburban churches and trying to connect urban issues with suburban churches, suburban issues, are that there are many problems, but one of the more uplifting things for me is that I think my feeling, my gut feeling, is that people are genuinely interested, that they want to help, but they don't know how and they're too scared, and too often, wait for somebody else to hold their hand and tell them what to do, that there is no initiative, that I need to do it, even if I look stupid, I'll just try something, and I think that it's actually the inertia is one of the main obstacles.

Participant:

I'm intrigued with the experiment with astronomers who turned out to be more altruistic and fair-minded. It might have something to do with those people who dream, dream and look at far distant places and perhaps imagine far distant times, and who imagine the possible, not that what is here now, but the way things could be, and is this most despairing as the generation of ours is, that they have so little to dream about in the sense of remaking the world around them, the sense that it's possible to struggle for and create... The comment about health care, it isn't whether or not a single payer system, but you shouldn't even talk about it because it isn't going to happen. Now, we don't know if it isn't going to happen, we know a lot clinically and experimentally that people self-fulfill prophecies, we know you can stop things from happening and can stop from advancing. The conventional wisdom touted by pundits is that we're never going to make it, and there is this quality so many people wanting to go along with what pragmatic cycles are going to happen, to be on the wings, and I wonder if people have any choice as to what we need to do to build.

Maurice Stein:

We've just eliminated Don Quixote from the curriculum by a study of the humanities. I think there aren't that many students doing the...I don't know if its...but the other people are really...I find that really hard to deal with and I think a lot of the news that filters back to them, because they do read the papers, is that there isn't a future out there, or if there is it's those three planets rotating around that pulsar that they just picked up, it certainly isn't in the environment that they have...

Participant:

And that's real, and if you talk to the parents it's also real. I've been carrying on a conversation for almost 20 years now with a particular gas station attendant, and I become aware that the world had changed in 1973 when for the first time he said something to me that I'd never heard before. He was worried whether his kids were going to make it. I grew up in a society in which my parents assumed that they would do better than they did. It never entered their minds, would they make it? Young people don't know what the future holds. They do know that mortgage rates are high, they do know that housing is expensive, they don't understand when I tell them, our first house was \$17,000 and I had a 4% mortgage, and my pay was \$4,100 a year, but that's a better ratio than they pay today.

I don't have the answer, but let me give you a suggestion. It comes out of 1972. In 1973 I began to take the T to work, and I found it very interesting. I stood in Waban, and I went at roughly the same time every day, and there, standing on this long platform, waiting for the green line, were the same people every day, and we never exchanged a

word to each other, never said anything to each other, and it kept bothering me, that this was very different than at least I remembered when I used to take the streetcar in Boston, and I concluded that perhaps we had lost our capacity because after all we had not had to interact with strangers, that is people on the same platform, for many years, because we'd been in our cocoons in our cars with the radio, and that was a very different kind of thing. Out of which I have been doing research, not dignified by those in the federal government to get money. I still use public transportation, and I try and count the people who are talking to each other. I commend that to you. If you want to despair. There's where it begins. If you want to do something about it, start talking to people. People do not speak to each other. The only conversations I see on the bus are young people, and occasionally adults to young people, but that is very young, little children, because adults are frightened of the high school aged people, so they don't talk. Adults don't talk to each other. They're still on the don't despair side, there still are lots of young people who get up and offer me a seat, which I refuse because I don't need it, but I think it's wonderful they're being raised the way I was. They don't pick up pennies. They aren't raised the way I was. They leave that for me to pick up. They will not bend down for a penny—it's not worth it. But start talking. My diagnosis of part of our problem is that there is just not very much conversation among people who don't know each other, and if you're going to build community, you don't build it just with the people you know.

Participant:

Unfortunately, according to some studies, there isn't as much conversation in families...

Participant:

That's also true.

Participant:

...and I think that we also have to acknowledge the possibility that this thing, television, may be the most pernicious instrument of social control ever invented, and that systematically made it impossible for us to communicate with each other, and somebody should start...

Rashi Fein:

In 1963 I was working for Kennedy and on the day of the assassination I went home, and the kids said, 'are you going down to the...' and I said, and I'll never forget this, 'no, I'll see much more on television,' and I did, but I defined myself as a spectator, not as a participant, and that I was not aware of at the time, and that's a pernicious quality as well.

Participant:

I want to...I was very... about what Reverend Tan had to say. I happen to know quite a lot about programs, and I see that part of my life as being very strong community. I have watched it grow and develop over the years. I joined what was considered to be a very small church in the town on the verge of...The most important part of it for me was it did and does do for the youth, and what the urban ministry is doing in the inner cities for youth, a very strong movement in Jamaica Plain and Roxbury which provides a number of alternatives to life and hope for urban youth, but I think that as much as I don't like things that are very conservative, provide similar opportunities clearly do, and you look at the mental health movement and see that...get together... I was in Virginia over the weekend, and, well, I was very struck by the culture of togetherness and the raising of family. I was in the supermarket and they talked to me, and I...Boston... But I had wonderful conversations with these people, and it had something to do with this sense of community, the sense of commonality, obviously. I do think that there are communities out there you need to...

Cheng Imm Tan:

You know it occurs to me too that the community is somewhat related to class issues. When I lived in Cambridge, I lived in Cambridge for five, six years, I didn't know any of my neighbors. I moved to Hyde Park, the very next day people came up to me and asked me, 'how much did you pay for your house?' I mean, it was a much, much different community, not the intellectual, upper middle class community. It was a working class community, working and lower middle class community. A very different sense. I mean, there's a sense of togetherness and people being neighbors to each other in a way that's not Cambridge.

Participant:

Well, there's a study that David referred to, started by Erich Lindemann, the South End was considered to be the ideal community in America, in terms of central togetherness, the ethnic community, and let's face it, even Erich didn't acknowledge, and that is the collaboration of the Mass General Hospital and some very unwholesome real estate and banking interests for greed.

David Satin:

And church interests.

Participant:

All right.

Maurice Stein:

There's a book about it by Herb Daniels, it's an interesting study. Some of the old...still gather together in one of the buildings, the left side of the large apartment complexes, they're quite familiar to me. I guess...optimism...students I teach. The only thing that got everybody's energy going was this protest against Columbus Day. It seemed like a good idea, if we were going to talk about biculturalism, you really should...who discovered America, and protests that were generated around that have considerable amount of energy around them because it was quite clear that Native Americans knew they were here, they weren't waiting to be discovered by Columbus, but the unfortunate event was that he turned up on their shore and did all kinds of damage. I think that making the direction of multiculturalism view... this...I now teach in the humanities, and when we teach Genesis, which is monstrous territory to get hold of, you really wouldn't want to meet... the...at least for the first part of the book, he does grow up in some ways, but we teach this...creation that's called the...beautiful, complicated story in which...create a balance in nature and humans, and between men and women and animals and humans, is the...heart of the mirror... and it's amazing to see that this is really...that and to see that the issue of balance is something that we've lost track of. So it isn't all a waste to see or to think, but the resources that we need turn out to be very multicultural, and they might turn out to be politically correct. One of the advantages of this moment is that these kinds of resources are increasingly available, and I see in that some kind of hope.

Cheng Imm Tan:

I just want to say one last thing, which is I think that it's hard to talk about community without talking about an "ism"--the "isms", you know, classism, sexism, racism, and ablism, and all the other "isms" that are put in place to really divide and separate people. If we talk about...it doesn't make sense. It only makes sense if you look at it in terms of how you relate to another person, whether they are fitting in whatever category they come, and whether you can relate to somebody as a human being, and whether you can go around the boundaries or through the boundaries that are set up to relate to somebody as a human being.

David Satin:

I guess that's the conclusion that we have come to, that there are forces that are opposing people's contact with one another, and there are forces that are encouraging or allowing people to contact one another. I suppose they are all representative of communities--there are communities preventing communities and communities encouraging communities, so maybe there is an unending ebb and flow and opposition of

forces, and I guess it is a contentious society, and we have to see which side, which forces, which tendencies we want to encouraged.

I must say I end up a lot more encouraged and hearing a lot more optimism than I expected out of this topic at this time, and I guess that it's a tribute to human spirit that it keeps going.

Thank you all for coming, thank all of the speakers for sharing their ideas and for looking into this issue in the midst of busy lives, and I hope that all of you will appear again next year at the Eighteenth Annual Erich Lindemann Memorial Lecture, and a small commercial announcement, do look for the book of the first ten lectures. Betty Lindemann and I were saying before this lecture began that those first ten lectures, some of which go back to 1974, still appear, at least to us, to have very vital interest and very great relevance to our lives now. Thank you for coming.