

BEYOND THE GOOD SAMARITAN
Paper Presented to:
Rutgers School of Social Work, Rutgers University
Dr. Jose Carrasco
San Jose State University

The biblical story of the Good Samaritan (Luke, 10: 29) has become a traditional reference point in American culture. The idea of an unlikely stranger coming to the aid of a perceived enemy who has been robbed, beaten, and left to die on the roadside seems to capture the imagination of a society committed to charity. In spite of the numerous problems and differences of race/ethnicity and class, Americans remain the most generous and giving people in the world, both domestically and globally. At some point in our lives, regardless of cultural heritage, each of us learns some form of the Good Samaritan message. However, while the parable of the Good Samaritan might once have served as a challenge for people to performing “good deeds” through personal involvement, today its meaning is generally understood as promoting charity through compassion, tolerance and generosity towards the less fortunate.

In spite of race, class, and geography, a majority of individuals interpret the tale of the Good Samaritan as an illustration of charity in terms of contributing money to good causes. Some members of Evangelical congregations shared that their pastors used the parable to encourage increased tithing. When asked how their congregation or group carries out the intent of the message, most individuals referred to their “ministry to the poor,” usually including programs such as soup kitchens, clothing programs, day care, and perhaps advocacy programs for immigrants.

Where once the meanings of *charity*, *advocacy*, and *empowerment* were integrally related, today they seem to signify three different forms of activity. For example, the term *charity* usually suggests some form of financial contribution or fundraising on behalf of the poor or some other targeted group; such giving normally does not require the permission of those being served. Meanwhile, the *advocacy* perspective promotes the idea of speaking on behalf of people who are perceived as incapable of speaking for themselves, such as children, the elderly, and the poor. Consequently, while charity and advocacy might in some way serve to empower, they empower only in an individual and short-term capacity.

On the other hand, when *empowerment* is viewed in terms of community, it connotes the commissioning or sending forth of people. Their mutual understanding, preparation, and agreement to work in concert entrusts people with the authority to take charge and act on their own behalf. Without their active participation, people cannot be empowered in a manner that

enhances their self-respect and social bonding. In sum, it is the concept of *community empowerment* that underlies the practice of community organizing.

For this reason, it is the intent of this article to provide readers with an understanding of the Congregation-Community Based Model of organizing which is currently prevalent in major cities across the country. To understand the rationale of why there is need to organize, the article provides an initial examination of the landscape of America's cities where the organizing occurs. This is followed by a brief discussion on the role of *Faith Traditions and Values* in shaping the empowerment-based *Congregation-Community Based Organization* (CCBO) form of organizing. This section is succeeded by a discussion on the vision and challenge of *Democracy*. In turn, the article presents an examination of the CCBO model and its components, including a case illustration of its significance for individuals, families and community alike. Finally, this work concludes with a discussion on *Collaboration*. This will include an examination of the strengths and weakness of CCBO to initiate, engage in, and sustain cooperative ventures with other types of organizations. The effects of a Congregation-Community Based Organization's activities on youth are indirectly illustrated through examples of issues addressed by these organizations. In particular, further examples of issues relating to children/youth will be discussed in the final section on Collaboration.

Landscape of America's Cities: The landscape of America's cities is dubious, at best. According to Ann Hartman, there is little to celebrate when it comes to the conditions of our institutions and their current treatment of children and the poor. In her article, "Children in a Careless Society," (1994) she states:

"We should all be mourners. We can only hope that the millions of Americans who watch the nightly news might mourn a little and, even more important, turn that mourning into action. However, this does not seem to be happening. The plight of poor people, along with the plight of millions of children, in this country is so desperate and overwhelming that the American public may be using psychic numbing to protect itself from the pain and terror, in the same way that we have defended against knowing and believing in the possibility of a nuclear holocaust." (pp. 117-122)

"We should all be mourners." What observations could move the author to adopt such a pessimistic view? Hartman continues her article with an examination of the plight of children and poor families in the US. She points out that by 1988, under "Reaganomics" oriented policies, cuts in human services programs had "reduced the resources available to those in need." Moreover, "the average income of the 10 percent of families at the bottom of the economic ladder in 1988 was \$3,504, down 14.8 percent from 1977, while the average income of the top 10 percent was \$166,000, up 16.5 percent for the same period." Citing statistics from the Children's Defense Fund, she further points out that, "Black children born in inner-city Boston, a world

medical center, have less of a chance of reaching their first birthday than do children born in Panama or Uruguay.” The article continues with additional statistics critical to demonstrating the plight of children during the 1990s.

In The Prince, Machiavelli suggests that in every city we can expect to find two humours; that of the few who wish nothing more than to oppress the many and that of the many who wish nothing more than to be free from the few (p. 68). We are aware that Machiavelli’s thoughts about power in a society where rule and order are determined by might were intended to advise a new Monarch. Therefore, we are able to tolerate his views about the emerging state in the 15th century. However, as benefactors of a democratic ideology, we find it difficult to appreciate the idea of a system in which the few control the many. Yet, we are altogether capable of accepting and/or tolerating the existence of a system, which for all intents and purposes, results in a similar form of economic and political control, where the few direct the many. Perhaps our belief in the clause, “We the People,” has led us to think that, in fact, we do control even when we don’t. As Robert Samuelson states, “Entitlement is a Mirage. Its essence is the quest for control . . . We could create prosperity, eliminate poverty, cure disease, advance social justice, foster racial harmony, and ensure global peace.” Yet, he continues, “Americans are hypersensitive to life’s insecurities, precisely because we have imagined that we were banishing them” (1995; pp.49-50).

Americans prefer not to contemplate ideas of elite conspiracies. Nevertheless, the tremendous economic inequality between the Haves and the Have-Nots at the turn of the 21st century is staggering. Millions of Americans work at two jobs for minimum wage, their families forced to live in dilapidated housing, unable to afford adequate food, clothing, medical care, and transportation. Likewise, young working-class families find themselves with huge home mortgages that with a turn of luck, such as a serious medical problem, can leave them 1-2 months away from the street. Meanwhile, a CEO with the Bank of America can receive a \$50 million dollar bonus, even though the corporation claims a financial loss for the year (USA Today; 3/14/2000, p. 1A). Whether the inequality of wealth in our society is by design or by chance is irrelevant. The result is the same; the rich continue to get richer and the poor get poorer (Domhoff, 1998). In the meantime, more families become dysfunctional and incapable of providing the critical foundations necessary for raising healthy children and contributing to a functional democracy.

Society’s reaction to this *epidemic pattern of anomie* has been consistent with previous efforts directed at addressing social problems. For example, some responses have been to:

- propose *stricter laws* to protect children from their parents,
- print more “*How To . . .*” books on raising children,
- promote more *classes on Parenting*; and,

- *train more therapists* to help people adapt to intolerable conditions.

While each response individualizes the dysfunction, neither promotes an examination of the ecological-system that is contributing to the dysfunction of family-life or how to remedy the problems. The one academic area capable of dedicating itself to studying the social pathologies plaguing our cities, as well the academic preparation of community organizers, are the Schools of Social Work. Having evolved from the Helping traditions of individuals such as Jane Addams and Charlotte Towle, the Social Work profession is philosophically oriented toward addressing the types of problems affecting families and communities. Likewise, Schools of Social Work and the profession share similar theoretical foundations. Moreover, these academic programs have the kind of graduate level curricular structures that make it possible to provide students with solid theoretical knowledge and practical experience, both being necessary to prepare competent organizers for the field. There was a time when these programs offered specialized curriculums in areas of Counseling, Policy and Research, and Community Social Planning, where the latter aimed at producing social therapists capable of working with people outside of the structured, authoritative relationship. However, today these programs show a preoccupation with garnering government funding aimed at preparing clinicians. In the words of Specht and Courtney, in their book Unfaithful Angels (1994),

“There is a big split in the field between social workers who are interested in social welfare, social policy, and public programs, and those who are interested in practical social supports and public service. The clinicians tend to be more interested in individual diagnosis, intrapersonal development, treatment processes, and the uses of the therapeutic relationship. These two sets of social workers in social work education tolerate one another. The social policy people need the profession, and the clinicians need the policy and program adherents in order to be able to continue to call themselves social workers . . . Education for the profession of social work is an enormous enterprise. There are three degree levels at which one can be educated for social work, with approximately one hundred graduate schools of social work in the United States and over four hundred bachelor’s level programs. Not surprisingly, students at the bachelor’s level are perceived by most social work educators to be preparing for work in the publicly supported social services; graduate students are perceived to be preparing for specialized work, typically a euphemism for psychotherapy. (p. 100-104)

If in fact Specht’s and Courtney’s observations about the current state of affairs existing in Schools of Social Work are correct, these programs are not, at least for the meantime, places where we as a society can turn to for answers to the problems of our cities.

The feelings of disaffection and disconsolation that were once thought to be felt only by minorities have become pandemic. The cry for *identity and recognition* demonstrated in such works as Ellison’s Invisible Man, and Baldwin’s Nobody Knows My Name, is heard today

among children in our schools and neighborhoods, poor and middle-class, alike, as well as children caught up in the Foster-care system. A colleague of mine in the College of Social Work, at San Jose State University, shared an experience stemming from his interviews with children caught up in the Foster Care system. These children were in the midst of court proceedings on their future status. One child, in particular, expressing fear and frustration about his plight, was quoted as saying: “The judge only talks to the professionals. Nobody tells me anything! What are they going to do to with me?” In listening to his story, I recalled my years teaching in public schools and visiting students at Juvenile Hall and the Ranch. As I listened, I could picture these young people thinking similar thoughts to those of the child in the foster care situation. “What are they going to do with me?” For children, nothing can be more horrifying than having to be estranged, alone, and uncertain about the future. The tragedy is that once the child experiences problems in the schools, regardless of fault, in most cases the stigma follows and transfers to the child’s interaction with other systems.

Even parents would sometimes ask if I could inquire for them what was going to happen to their sons or daughters. They feared that their questions and lack of knowledge would provoke a judge or probation officer into sending the child away. Nothing was as terrifying for parents than having to negotiate with the legal system for their children, especially when they lacked the skills to do so. Parents initially struggled to cope with situations often beyond their control. But eventually the self-fulfilling prophecy syndrome kicked-in, and parents ended-up blaming themselves and/or the children for their problems. By this time, there was little to be done, as the kids had ceased to be kids, mentally. As suggested by Michael Lerner, much of what happens to families is due to pressures beyond their understanding and control. He states that, “until people come to understand the social and political roots to private unhappiness, they will remain immobilized in self-blaming, cynicism and despair” (1986; p. 102).

There is currently much discussion regarding the disintegration of family and the moral fiber of society. Nationally recognized critics such as William Bennett, William F. Buckley, Jr, and George Will, among others, criticize the moral character and behavior of the nation’s political leadership - Democrats, of course! Furthermore, they lament the moral decay of American society in terms of the preservation of civility and traditional values. Much of their ire is aimed at the education systems, including universities, for their perceived failure to promote discipline and impart traditional Western culture values in their curriculums. The collective view of these critics can be found in Arthur Schlesinger’s book, The Disuniting of America. Here, Schlesinger defends Western culture as a primary source for promoting a civil and moral society. On the

other hand, he criticizes what he perceives to be attacks on Western culture by minorities and others within our universities.

“But even in the United States, ethnic ideologues have not been without effect. They set themselves up against the old American ideal of assimilation. They call on the republic to think in terms not of individual but of group identity and to move the polity from individual rights to group rights. They have made a certain progress in transforming the United States into a more segregated society. They have done their best to turn a college generation against Europe and the Western tradition.” (1998; pp. 135-136)

Unfortunately, short of acknowledging the historical truth about slavery in America, the author fails to recognize that ideology in the United States is not new with the advent of ethnic studies. If anything, such ideological perspectives are simply extensions of the dominant culture ideology. These ethnic perspectives are born from people’s histories and experiences. In the case of American minorities, their histories are part of the American Pageantry, not some foreign tale unrelated to America’s past. Moreover, the search for identity and inclusiveness has been true for all ethnic/racial groups in immigrating to this country. All have sought to retain some degree of their individual identities and culture. Otherwise we would not have the diverse ethnic enclaves, which currently exist in all of our major cities. However, as Schlesinger also acknowledges, the opportunity of integration and assimilation for white European immigrants has historically been easier than for people of color. In referring to Gunnar Myrdal’s discussion of how the most conspicuous betrayal of the “American Creed” has been in the treatment of Blacks by White America (An American Dilemma, 1944), Schlesinger states: “Noble ideals had been pronounced as if for all Americans, yet in practice they applied only to white people” (p. 44). Little has changed when it comes to application of these “noble ideals.” Current statistics on school dropout rates, white-collar employment, and incarceration rates would attest to this difference in application of law and opportunity. According to Rollo May, in his book Power and Innocence, he suggests that what is important for a human being is,

“ . . . the necessity of having somebody listen, recognize, know him. It gives a person the conviction that he counts, that he exists as part of the human race. It gives him some orientation, a point where he can find meaning in an otherwise meaningless world.”

At some point we must come to realize that, just a people without a history cannot exist, minorities of color cannot assimilate without being accepted by the dominant culture of a society. As such, minority children born and/or raised from an early age in this society cannot be expected to achieve a healthy state of self-recognition, and esteem without first knowing who they are. As further stated by May,

“Inherent in power-to-be is the need to affirm one’s own being.” “ . . . Consciousness is the intervening variable between nature and being. It vastly enlarges the human being’s

dimensions; it makes possible in him a sense of awareness, responsibility, and a margin of freedom proportionate to this responsibility.” (pp. 137-145)

Consequently, for these children to achieve such a level of consciousness and self-awareness, their history, as Americans, has to be included into educational curriculums. Many of us who experienced the Civil Rights movement, whether African American, Asian American, Latino American, or Native American, clearly credit our sense of personal being and strength to having learned, through ethnic histories, about ourselves, who we are, how we came to be here, and our experiences as Americans. While it has caused us to raise serious questions about the “social contract,” as well as prompted us to express through dialogue and civil disobedience the need for change based on principles of *equity* and *justice*, it has not reduced our desire to be Americans. I believe that what we observe happening to children in our inner cities is evidence of a lack of both the necessary curriculums as well as the needed self-awareness among many minority youth.

Whether one chooses to agree or disagree about what is to blame for society’s ills is irrelevant. The surging rate of domestic violence, divorce, adolescent pregnancy, and the growing institutionalization of children, continues to occur. We can only wonder about where children are supposed to learn to be adults. From whom do they derive their models of civility and moral behavior? How are they expected to distinguish between normalcy and deviancy when the lines between the two become more and more obscured?

According to Durkheim, social deviancy is a result of anomie. He suggests that as society grows and changes, the norms become less clear and people become more diverse. In addition, the old norms are no longer applicable; and because people cannot function without norms, they may even commit suicide (1966). The Annie E. Casey Foundation report on children seems to support Durkheim’s position in that, “the number of children removed from their homes by the Welfare system continued to grow from 260,000 in out-of-home care in the 1980’s to more than 500,000 in 1995. In addition, where teen deaths due to accidents fell from 8,202 in 1985 to 6,623 in 1995, the number of teen homicides increased from 1,602 to 3,292 during the same period (“Juvenile Jailhouse Rocked”; 1999, p.1).

Thus far, educational institutions have generally proven ineffective in preparing Americans to be informed and active citizens. As previously suggested by Hartman, this is especially true among the poor and working class. As a result, families residing in our inner cities are plagued with crime-ridden streets, blight, vacant houses serving as refuge for drug dealers and users, and poorly “regulated” rental rates. These are communities:

- Where families lay on the floor to watch TV, for fear of random drive-by shootings.
- Where young people who have never been in trouble with the law join gangs in order to seek revenge for the death of family members killed in random drive-by shootings.

- Where people no longer call the police because they [police] either fail to show or they respond hours later only to treat family members as suspects.
- Where police responding to drug-related calls turn on their sirens two-blocks before arriving at reported drug scenes.
- Where police respond to reported crimes by arriving at the home of the caller, in spite of policies to the contrary, only to have gang-members knock on the family's door after the police leave, to tell the family that, "we know You called the police! The next time you do that we will burn down your house."
- Where school dropout rates exceed 40% and higher among minorities.
- Where latch-key children of the working poor have to be left alone because families lack the money for adequate food and rent, let alone child-care.
- Where undocumented immigrants struggling for survival cannot afford to become vulnerable by seeking assistance, medical or otherwise, from government agencies that they cannot risk trusting because the consequences are too great.

In brief, these are communities that police, politicians, bureaucrats, and civic leaders criticize for being cynical and distrusting. Then, we wonder why families continue to flee these communities for the suburbs.

Meanwhile in our inner cities, far from the public eye of middle class America, *the angst*, revealed by Cornell West in his book Race Matters, continues to devastate individuals and families, alike, spawning a nihilistic generation of empty-eyed and visionless youth. He suggests that the exodus of industrial jobs from our urban centers to cheaper labor markets has resulted in unemployment, hunger, homelessness, and sickness for millions. In addition, West adds:

"And, a pervasive spiritual impoverishment grows. The collapse of meaning in life --- the eclipse of hope and absence of love of self and others, the breakdown of family and neighborhood bonds --- leads to the social deracination and cultural denudement of urban dwellers, especially children. We have created rootless, dangling people with little link to the supportive networks --- family, friends, school, --- that sustain some sense of purpose in life. We have witnessed the collapse of the spiritual communities that in the past helped Americans face despair, disease, and death and that transmit through the generations dignity and decency, excellence and elegance. The result is lives of what we might call "random nows," of fortuitous and fleeting moments preoccupied with "getting over" --- with acquiring pleasure, property, and power by any means necessary."

It would seem that the legacy of T. S. Elliot's "hollow, hollow, men" has taken root in twenty-first century America to spawn an offspring of lost, angry, and dreamless souls.

An example of this meaningless waste is the shooting of a 10 year-old African American boy in New Orleans, LA. The boy, along with his mother and sister are walking home along a busy street, not far from the City's civic center. Each is carrying a bag of groceries when they are confronted by a group of teen-agers, also African Americans. According to the 13 year-old sister, when the family was ordered to "drop the bags!" the brother froze in hesitation. Before she could knock the bag from his hands, he was shot in the head. Nothing was taken. The group of teens

just walked away laughing (Film: “Blessed are the Peace Makers”, 1998). As a result of this family tragedy, the mother became involved in the organizing effort of their parish, while the daughter assumed a leadership role in the ACT (All Congregations Together) federation’s Youth Organizing Project. Her testimony in the film, addressed to the Mayor of New Orleans, is part of the ACT federation’s Youth group’s action to apprise the Mayor of the needs of youth in his city. Paradoxically, the producers of the film chose to delete the section about the brother’s death, in spite of the availability of a police report. According to Joe Givens, director of the New Orleans’ ACT federation, the producer could not fathom that such things happen today in our cities.

By the 1990s, white middle-class families decided that they had had enough of the nightly news depicting the violence of our inner cities. They began demanding that less reality be shown on TV news and media headlines. They desired more pleasant information. Yet, by the turn of the century, families residing in the comforts of America’s middle-class suburbs are experiencing their own difficulties. In the past, they were concerned that their children might not be accepted into the right universities or that they might not find a suitable mate. Today they carry their own angst. Many live in fear that their children, whether out of boredom or resentment, will turn to drugs, contract AIDS, and/or become pregnant. And more recently, these parents live in fear that some distraught kid attending their children’s school will someday randomly harm and/or kill their child. There was a time when we might have attributed acts of murder and suicide to adults and/or psychopaths, including hate groups. But in today’s world, more and more young people seek meaning and security by belonging to subgroups. We see young people committing suicide, kids killing kids over designer clothing with sport team logos, such as Sharks jackets and Michael Jordan tennis shoes. Yet, even these acts of violence seem to pale when compared to the meaningless acts of fury recently committed by young people. For example, students gunning down classmates, without explanation, in Conyers, GA, Littleton, CO, and Springfield, OR, to name but a few. The sadness of it all is that we continue to pretend that each occurrence is an aberration that won’t happen again, especially to us. As recently expressed by a mother of two preschoolers in reaction to the latest shooting in Mount Morris Township, Michigan, “This just sickens me. It’s amazing that it keeps happening over and over again . . . What is it going to take now for people to wake up? Next time it may be your child” (San Jose Mercury, 3/1/2k, p. 1A).

In the meantime, while crime erupts across the country and parents struggle to cope with the events affecting their children’s lives, our institutions continue with business as usual. We see nationally syndicated TV programs such as the Ricky Lake Show, Jerry Springer, Jenny Jones, and a host of other shows, compete to exploit the views of one side or other of every

peripheral type of eccentric behavior. At other times, these programs might portray out of control teenagers that beat and terrorize their mothers and siblings. The host and some invited “expert” then proceed to publicly browbeat and humiliate the youngsters, but to no avail. In the end, the only solution for these teenage abusers is to threaten to punish them with *boot camp*. At times, after watching these programs, the audience is left wondering what constitutes normalcy. One might almost question whether a climate of moral decadence is good for business? Thirty-years ago, in his work *Power and Innocence*, Rollo May, in his discussion of “Innocence and the end of an era”, suggested that:

“One feels that the younger generation gets particular gratification out of simply attacking the establishment as such. Is it a reaction-formation to their own unease at the affluence of their parents and to their dependency on their parents for sustenance? But this is an unnecessary battle, if for no other reason than that the establishment is dying anyway.” “. . . We have a new morality, most obviously in the areas of sex, marriage, and the role of women. No one can doubt that a new electronic technology is fast revolutionizing our economic and communication systems. Religious practices are also involved in profound change, what with ersatz Buddhists, Yogis, and Hindus springing up on all sides. One age is dead and the other not yet born --- ours, which includes both youth and age, is in limbo.” (p. 60)

I cannot help but wonder what parents and young people seeing these programs think. It is hard for me to imagine bringing an out of control child into such a public setting, like TV, while his/her friends are watching, and not expect them to hold the “tough guy” line. Subsequently, young people grow up like their parents, fearing the stranger and avoiding the discomforts of poverty and the diversity in our cities. The solution they learn to dealing with pain is *escapism*. Whether escape means alcohol, drugs, gangs, street-life, or moving to suburbia, kids get the message. The choice remaining - become like their parents and live in fear, or, find other avenues of coping. Regardless of family income, education level, and race, one thing is certain - children are too bright to willingly accept as role models anyone who lives in fear and runs away from life’s predicaments. This is what children see when adults barricade themselves; hide behind locked doors and fail to act in seeking more creative and permanent solutions to life’s problems.

Still, we remain perplexed about children joining gangs and hate groups in search of security, self-identity and recognition. In his book titled *The Disuniting of America*, Schlesinger quotes the conservative German historian, Michael Sturmer as saying: “Loss of orientation and the search for identity are brothers . . .” Schlesinger continues with his own thoughts by stating: “Anyone who believes that this has no effect on politics and the future ignores the fact that *in a land without history, he who fills the memory, defines the concepts, and interprets the past, wins the future*” (p. 57). It is exactly this need that individuals and families have to participate in

defining their lives and environments that is addressed by community organizations. Control over the future of these communities has historically rested with politicians, bureaucrats, and special interests that do not reside in these neighborhoods. The results of this external control are evident. Children need to know that the adults in their lives are in control. They have to see adults publicly involved and acting on those values that they profess. Otherwise, the silent suffering of both child and adult reinforces the oppression and pain. As suggested by Simmel, people need to oppose oppressive forces that impinge on their lives, otherwise, the oppression increases. In his book, Conflict: The Web of Group-Affiliations, Simmel proposes that, “Our opposition makes us feel that we are not completely victims of the circumstances. It allows us to prove our strength consciously and only thus gives vitality and reciprocity to condition from which, without such corrective, we would withdraw at any cost” (p. 19). Simmel’s point is complimented by Jaime de Ayala, president and CEO of the Ayala Corporation. In discussing the rising middle-class in emerging democracies and their development of a political order resembling that of Western democracies, de Ayala states:

“The sequence of change is fairly simple to follow. In order to enforce their demands for a better quality of life, the rising middle classes need democratic government to govern them and their society. They need the freedom to be and to do within the limits of civilized society. They thus need an accountable but limited government. In a word, they need citizenship in a free society.” (1998)

In brief, while American democracy serves as a model for countries abroad, in cities across the United States its expression is frail. For example, in the community of Flatbush, an area in Brooklyn, NY, a candidate running for City Council won with a total vote of approximately 850. Like other inner city neighborhoods throughout the US, rural and metropolitan, alike, families in Flatbush struggle to sustain themselves. Parents struggle to protect their children from criminals, drugs, and predators, while surviving in politically and economically disenfranchised communities. In the meantime, everything keeps getting bigger, including our cities and the problems of dysfunctional families and children. Likewise, our confidence level toward politicians, government, and corporate entities, continues to wane, adding to our fears and disconnectedness from each other. Consequently, if these communities are going to improve, they will need to develop the power to act and to attain the resources necessary to improve their conditions. Moreover, if they are to express the “opposition” suggested by Simmel, they will need to have power. In order to have power, they will need to be organized.

Values of faith traditions: Fortunately, the traditional ideals of American society continue to exist within the hearth of family-life, perhaps at times as embers, but still there. Spiritually induced from faith traditions, values are unconsciously inculcated at an early age and

not easily discarded. The principles of “justice,” “dignity,” “freedom”, and “charity” are inherent within our moral perspective and emanate from these spiritual traditions. In turn, it is these values that underlie the moral foundations of American democracy. Without these principles to draw upon, the moral indignation that engenders public demonstration, protest, and confrontation against dissolute and unethical corporate and government-sanctioned activity, would not be legitimately and/or morally possible. Tyranny would be left to reign. Would the Civil Rights, Farm Worker, Chicano, Feminist, and other human movements been possible if the values to which we so consistently turn for guidance and measurement had not inherently been part of our nation’s Constitutional Bill of Rights? Our very sense of social consciousness stems from these values inculcated in us during early childhood. Otherwise, from where would the magnificent language and provoking themes of great American leaders have sprung?

Yet, in spite of the virtuous foundations inherent in the American mind, our history of violence and inhumanity is beyond comprehension. As stated by West, “Race still matters!” When children, regardless of social status, are presented with historical facts concerning the American Holocaust, they can only respond with the same innocence and helplessness that we as adults might have felt when first apprised about America’s history of violence toward minorities. As frequently expressed by students enrolled in Ethnic Studies classes, “How could things like this happen? I don’t understand! How could these things happen?” It is *these intrinsic values of human dignity and worth*, which evoke such disbelief. Would anyone be capable of feeling such reactions if these values were not already internalized? Likewise, without these underlying principles of American democracy, we would lack the mandate and moral foundation for challenging tyranny and injustice. In brief, the values inherent in our democratic principles provide the mirror by which we perceive and hold ourselves accountable to each other.

Democracy’s Vision and Challenge: Where we witness “emerging democracies” which lack the inherent values of American democracy, little freedom or justice exists for the citizen let alone the stranger. Certainly the newly emerging “democracies” within Kuwait, Malaysia, Latin America, and Africa, provide a glaring contrast to what democracy ought not to be. While such “democracies” have emerged under the auspices and political support of the US, they seem to accommodate and serve the economic interests of American and other multinational corporations (Kaplan, pp. 55-80).

In his book [The End of History and The Last Man \(1995\)](#), Francis Fukuyama suggests that democracy is normally sought for reasons of human dignity and freedom, not economics.

“The process of economic modernization may bring about certain large scale social changes like the transformation of tribal and agricultural societies into urban, educated, middle-class ones that in some way create the material condition for democracy. But this

process does not explain democracy itself, for if we look more deeply into the process, we find that democracy is almost never chosen for economic reasons. For example, France and the United States; their opting for the rights of man could not have been conditioned by the industrialization process.” (p. 132)

Furthermore, according to Fukuyama, there is no reason to expect industrialization to produce “liberty” or lead to a “stable democracy”. Nor is democracy necessary to achieve economic growth. He further states:

“But while modern natural science guides us to the gates of the Promised Land of liberal democracy, it does not deliver us to the Promised Land itself, for there is no economically necessary reason why advanced industrialization should produce political liberty. Stable democracy has at times emerged in pre-industrial societies, as it did in the United States in 1776. . . In many cases, authoritarian states are capable of producing rates of economic growth unachievable in democratic societies.” (p.xvii)

Consequently, while a stable democracy might require a healthy economy in order to stabilize, democracy is not a prerequisite for a vibrant economy (Kaplan, 1997). Cynics criticize our efforts to export our democratic form of government to other countries where citizens are unprepared to meaningfully participate in democratic decision-making. As suggested by Fukuyama and Kaplan, the end result is an economic growth at the expense of an uninformed and ill-prepared citizens serving as cheap labor. What is suggested is that a successful democracy requires an educated populace (Dirkeim). Moreover, since, as suggested by Fukuyama, the pursuit of democracy is fostered by a quest for freedom and dignity, e.g., “the rights of Man,” then the realization of a stable democracy must also provide the people with vision as well as a foundation for hope. However, such a vision requires the willingness of the people to struggle, both for its birth as well as its subsequent existence. Furthermore, when you have a democracy based on representation, the need for accountability between representative and the represented becomes equally vital. Certainly, past Presidents of the United States have suggested such positions. For example, Thomas Jefferson’s assertion that the people need to periodically rebel, as well as Dwight D. Eisenhower’s warning that the American people take heed of the emerging “industrial-military complex,” is evidence of the need for a vigilant citizenry predisposed to struggle and prepared to act upon its collective self-interest. However, for citizens to respond in such a manner requires that they have the public skills and knowledge about bureaucratic systems to act in an informed and organized manner.

Community organizing provides the vehicle by which the elements of knowledge, skills, and experience are attained by families and neighborhoods. Moreover, these elements are the democratic pre-requisites of an educated and vigil citizenry, which serve to warrant the practice of community organizing within a democratic society. Without a vehicle by which citizens

become empowered to act on their own behalf, Jefferson's assertion of the need for periodic upheaval of government becomes wishful thinking. In brief, democracy is not free. It must be desired, exercised, and struggled for. Its promise rests in the experience of citizen self-fulfillment. If positive outcomes are to result from public outcry, the people need power; and to have power, they must be educated and organized. As stated by a Chinese director of Suzhou Garden Design Institute, Huang Zhen Yan, "We are in the chain of history," . . . "as we face the future, behind us is history. We inherit our cultural traditions when we begin to apply them" (Gragg; 2000).

Organizing and Empowerment: Different forms of community organizing currently exist within the US. There are perhaps even *more* perceptions of what community organizing is supposed to be. Aside from the few constituency-based models, including neighborhood and race/ethnic based groups that focus their activity on the active participation of their membership; there are also bureaucratic service agencies, public and private, that claim community organizing as part of their activities. In addition, social service programs and Schools of Social Work might also interpret the planning and implementation of programs directed at serving and/or advocating for target populations as community organizing. The diversity of views among social workers about "community organizing" is evident in a book edited by Michael J. Austin and Jane Esacs Lowe (1994). The book includes a wide compilation of discussions ranging from topics on, "Community-Base Organizations Give Priority to Building Coalitions Rather Than Building Their Own Memberships," to, "Should Clients Have Control over the Policies of the Agency."

By contrast, central to the Faith-based model is the notion of organizing to build a constituency and the development of leaders (Von Hoffman). The model is driven by a vision of *community empowerment* aimed at preserving quality of life by engaging families to act on their own behalf in the communities where they reside. By working together, they mutually discover and help shape each other's gifts. They take charge of their situations by learning public skills and becoming centrally involved in determining the future of their families and communities. In sum, community empowerment is an awakening of spirit in the "common good." Its synergism inspires the forging of new relationships among people generating greater imagination and power to act. Consequently, community empowerment serves to mend and engender the spiritual and social fabrics of our communities while enhancing the foundations of democracy.

For the purpose of clarity and brevity, the following section about organizing is written from the perspective of the faith-centered Congregation-Community Based Organization (CCBO) model, which currently dominates the organizing environment in the US. To date, these organizations have proven their capacity to attain and sustain a power base for a longer period of

time than other organizing forms. As a result, they are able to sustain long-term energy and focus on issues that enable them to become major power players within their power arenas. In part, much of their power and success stems from their institutional base within churches, temples and synagogues; these are traditions with historically vested interests in their neighborhoods, residents, and congregations. Additionally, this paper will utilize the terms *federation and faith-based organizing* in referring to the CCBO model.

Congregation-Community Based Organizations: There was a time when we believed the problems in our society could be measured in terms of dollars and cents. We simply had to put money into the problem; the issue was, “how much?” However, as suggested earlier by Samuelson, the problems did not go away, they just lingered and fermented. Problems plaguing our families and cities are no longer simply social and economic, but also spiritual. As such, in order for organizations to effectively address the needs of families and communities, they require the capacity to affect them spiritually and socially. One would think that after all these years we might have discovered that no matter how much money government puts into the cities, the wealth will continue to flow in the same inequitable fashion. The power-relations, which underlie and drive the economic structures of cities, are configured so as to reinforce the existing patterns of distribution of wealth and power. Because organizing is reorganizing, before money can be expected to truly alter the current conditions of cities, the existing power-relations will first have to be altered. Nevertheless, as stated by Thucydides in The Peloponnesian Wars, “You never have to worry about people who are far away from the problem, because they will always wait until it is too late to defend themselves.” History tends to substantiate this point. It certainly seems that the burning cities of the 1960s provided decision-makers with a powerful incentive for performing the impossible and passing the historic “War on Poverty” legislation. For true change to occur, the power-relationships in our cities will first need to be altered.

There are currently four different networks in the US that are perceived by various foundations as being Faith-based. The larger of the networks are the Pacific Institute for Community Organization (PICO) and the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF), both of which have a national presence. The other two smaller and more regionally based networks are, GAMALIEL which is situated primarily in the mid-West, and the Direct Action, Research and Training (DART) Institute that is primarily situated in the Florida region. While there are distinct differences between the four networks, particularly between PICO and the IAF, to the casual observer the four sound alike. Nevertheless, for the purpose of examination, the PICO perspective will serve to direct the author’s observations.

PICO is a national network of thirty-two CCBOs situated in 85 cities, spanning twelve-states. Each CCBO is a federation of locally dedicated member congregational-community organizations representing specified geographic areas of the city and/or metropolitan area. These organizations are inter-faith/denominational, non-sectarian, non-profit, and non-political; but not neutral when it comes to the issues they pursue. While all the federations in the PICO network are Faith-based, some have as members non-congregational units such as neighborhood organizations, parent-school groups, youth projects, etc. However, where this is the case, the number of non-congregational members within a federation is seldom more than a few; moreover, each shares the federation's vision of community empowerment, spiritual renewal, and pedagogical process.

Principles of Faith-Based Organizing: When it comes to the practice of community organizing in the US, credit must be given to Saul Alinsky who is considered by most organizers to be the grandfather of community organizing. As such, many of the PICO principles that underlie Faith-based organizing can be found in Alinsky's book, Rules for Radicals. While most professions operate within well-defined environments governed by authoritative relationships, community organizers must operate in uncertain environments governed by power-relations. As a means of providing discipline and guidance to their work, organizers in the Faith based model adhere to a set of select principles.

An example of these principles follows:

- Empowerment is a spiritual awakening inspiring peoples' imagination towards creativity.
- Organizing is about people, not issues.
- You work with people where they are, not where you want them to be.
- Never do for others what they can do for themselves.
- The power is in the relationship.

The local congregation-community level is where the organizing process begins. This process includes leadership training in organizational models, vision and values clarification, one-on-one visitation, issue assessment and research, action planning, action engagement, evaluation, and conflict resolution. All local organizations have their own leadership and address their own local issues. Moreover, representatives elected by each of the local organizations serve as part of the federation's governing body, which sets policy and oversees the federation's activity. In addition, a full-time organizing staff is hired and maintained by the federation to advise, provide training, and to assist in the development and implementation of the local and federated organizing process. Moreover, unlike other organizing models, central to the CCBO model is an active and participatory constituency.

A Case Example: We have all been taught the platitudes of acting “individually”, being “responsible” and “working hard” as a means of succeeding. However, aside from instructions on voting, at times not even that, people have not been provided the training and skills to be active participating citizens. Nor have we been taught to understand that power is a pre-requisite for exercising our democratic rights and responsibilities. Without power, whatever values we might profess will in time atrophy due to non-adherence. As a result, we either internalize the blame and feel guilt for things being the way they are; or, we put the onus on someone else (Learner). The following case serves to illustrate the nature of the CCBO model:

Ruben and Betty had been married 18 years. Born in Mexico, Ruben was a naturalized citizen while Betty was born and raised in East Los Angeles. The couple had three children, the oldest a 16-year-old high school student named Johnny. Like others in poor and working communities, Ruben had questions regarding the organizing effort as well as the church’s participation. He lacked trust in community organizations. Moreover, he felt that the only people these organizations ever did anything for were lazy welfare recipients who didn’t want to work.

For Ruben, attending church had become a waste of time. He felt himself and the family up to their necks in problems and struggling to survive; “en pura cagada” (in crap), as he put it. He seldom attended or participated in church or school activities any more, except on special occasions directly involving the children. He readily complained about the bad public schools that produced young illiterate thugs for gangs participating in daily violence around neighborhood parks, drive-by shootings, drugs, break-ins, and other social afflictions. Moreover, he was concerned that they might be losing their son Johnny to gangs and feared that his daughter would eventually take the same direction. Given the money and opportunity, Ruben would have moved his family elsewhere a long time ago, like so many others he had watched depart the community. In short, he was skeptical about both his neighborhood and his family’s future. Meanwhile, Betty, whose family was from the neighborhood, was a frequent churchgoer and did volunteer work at the school. Although she was as aware and concerned about all the problems they were facing, Betty saw the neighborhood as home. The barrio provided her and the children with social and spiritual connections. However, like her husband, she could only complain about the problems. Neither had ever been involved in any form of community activity.

My first contact with Ruben was through a nun who taught at the parish school where two of his children attended. Following several calls and much resistance on his part, I was able to visit Ruben at his home, where I noticed a group of youth loitering about the street nearby. As I entered the home, his teenage son was going out to join the group of young people.

During our conversation, Ruben was courteous but showed little interest and quickly informed me that his intent was to listen. So, I provided my credentials and pointed out that the pastor and Sisters at his parish were also involved. I proceeded to inquire about his concerns; his response was that, “everything is fine.” When asked if he ever felt concern about his children leaving the house or whether the groups of young people standing around the streets had ever been a problem, his response was the same, “no problems.” At this point, Ruben let me know his views regarding community groups, his lack of confidence in the church, and how doubtful he was as to any remedy. He finished by politely informing me that he and his wife were too busy to become involved and that they were thinking about moving from the area. During all this time, I could see Betty in the kitchen seemingly going about her business, but making sure she could hear the details of our conversation. Recalling the young people outside, the disarray of the neighborhood, and his son leaving the house, I decided to risk the possibility that Ruben’s love of family was still greater than his pride. Rather than accept the thought that this intelligent, caring, and perplexed individual did not care enough about his home and family to act on their behalf, given the opportunity, I decided to challenge him. At worst, he would ask me to leave. Moreover, with luck, his wife might be ready to intervene with some thoughts of her own. As I stood to leave, I stoically suggested to Ruben that it was probably for the best that his schedule was too busy for any involvement, especially since the group of young people hanging around the corner outside probably had plenty of time to give his son. As I proceeded towards the door, the wife suddenly entered the room asking if there was a way to contact me if they wished to talk again.

I received a call from Ruben two days later; we met at Mc Donald’s near his home. This time he shared his anger about the neighborhood and his sense of helplessness about the family; in particular, he expressed fear of losing his son to gangs and the difficulty it was causing for the family, including difficulties between him and his wife. Then, as if embarrassed by his confession, Ruben said, “So, now that I’ve told you all these things, what are you and your committee of ministers going to do about it? Are you going to be like everyone else and promise to solve all the problems, then forget about it?”

The Result : “What are you going to do about it?” Perceiving Ruben’s question, in part, as an expression of frustration and helplessness, I hesitated, then responded: “No! No promises! You’re asking the right question, Ruben, but the wrong person. The question is not, what am I, or the Committee going to do about it; but rather, what are you going to do about it? So, no promises; just an opportunity to do something for yourself and the family. But if there were a promise, it’s that you will not have to do it alone.” Consequently, both Ruben and Betty became

involved in the organizing effort. He visited friends and neighbors as well as participated in much of the research activity around the organization's issue regarding crime and the need for youth programs. In addition, during their action with the Area Police Commander, Ruben assumed a leadership role by bringing others and providing personal testimony during the meeting. However, the payoff for Ruben and Betty came after the action when the leadership was convening to briefly evaluate the meeting. Suddenly, Johnny came up to his father, hugged him, and said; "I didn't know you could do things like this! I want to be like you! . . . I want to be like you!" As a result, the whole family became involved. Ruben and Betty remained active in their parish organization while their son and older daughter helped to form a youth organizing group that participated on youth issues with the broader organization. Consequently, not only was the organization able to bring about significant improvements, but it also succeeded in bringing a family back together.

Organizing is about people. It is about tapping the anger that numbs and holds us hostage to fear because we lack the necessary understanding, skills, tools, and experience to effectively respond against forces that impinge upon our lives. In CCBO, it is the people who matter; their spiritual health and social well being remain central to the task of both the creation and long-term maintenance of the faith-based organization. Equally central is the notion of one-on-one visitation by leadership. Beginning with the organizer, everyone, including pastors, is expected to conduct visits. "Reach out and touch someone," as so brilliantly suggested by the AT&T television commercial, is what good organizing is about. It is about connecting and reconnecting families, friends, and neighbors who share the consequences of common social environments. It is about re-igniting the embers of faith and hope that continue to simmer within people struggling to sustain meaning in their life. In brief, it is a means of re-weaving the spiritual and social fabrics of our society.

Power is in the relationship. Organizationally speaking, the term "relationship" implies an inherent affinity, respect and trust between the organizational leadership. As stated by H.H. Perlman, "relationship is the catalytic agent that aids individual shift and changes in the sense of trust, self-worth, security, and linkage with other human beings . . . it is relationship that warms the intelligence, sustains the spirit, and carries the person forward."

The PICO perspective perceives "power" as a strength and/or capacity resulting from relationships among the leadership of the organizations in the local federation. It is this sense of power which gives people the opportunity to actively participate in defining the issues impacting their lives and to act on their shared self-interest. Stemming from their conversations with neighbors, leaders discover two important insights; first, each discovers that he/she is not the only

one concerned about the problems; and second, that while others are skeptical, like themselves, they are willing to listen and to share their personal concerns. In addition, the visits yield both new prospective leaders as well as reveal insight into common issues to be addressed by the organization.

Collaboration and Stretching of Relationships: Individual CCBOs have historically collaborated with other CCBOs, community groups, and institutional bodies, including government agencies, schools, universities, and private corporations, in addressing specific issues, but remaining independent. In several states like California, Florida, Louisiana, and Texas, local CCBOs have developed statewide federations to broaden their voice and influence in democratic tradition. Because the leadership of these state-level federations share overlapping relationships, common faith-community based visions, as well as organizational cultures and structures, they maintain communication and meet periodically to share, plan, and assess their strategic efforts. For example, in California where there are seventeen CCBOs operating from the Mexican border to Sacramento, the statewide federation was successful in persuading the State Legislature to approve two statewide referendums for the 1998 election ballot. One measure was to get voter approval on a \$100 million Bond measure to support after school homework centers; the other was for approval of a \$3 billion bond measure to build and repair schools. With the support provided by the leadership of each local federation, in conjunction with numerous other groups, including school boards, teacher unions, PTAs, private corporations, and politicians, both measures won by a healthy margin. There were two reasons why the CCBOs decided to focus on the issues of schools buildings and after school programs. First, because they represent the multiple interests of a racially/ethnically, economically, and politically diverse membership whose concerns about their children spanned across a number of areas, including their childrens' academic achievement levels, the needs of some children for a place to study, the need of others for a place to meet and socialize, and the reality that latch-key kids might also need a place to be. Consequently, since the CCBOs were already dealing with these diverse issues at the local levels, they simply elevated their focus and energies to the statewide federation level as a means of leveraging the power necessary to promote statewide policy.

On the other hand, when collaboration is in the form of a coalition between a local CCBO and other non-faith-based groups, the interaction between leadership will continue until the issue is resolved. At this point, such transitory cooperation is consistent with the nature and purpose of coalitions. Once the specific issue that prompts the various groups to coalesce is resolved, the groups disperse and return to their individual programs and agendas. By design, coalitions are issue-driven and temporary constructions consisting of various types of organizational groups and

individuals who might not even like and/or trust each other. Moreover, some of the groups might see each other as competitors for space, clients and money. Nonetheless, confronted with a common problem, often the need for money, they are faced with the decision of whether to act alone or to collaborate with others in a showing of force.

In conclusion, the CCBO model is a vehicle for providing people with a means by which to empower their children, their neighborhoods, their society, and, simultaneously, themselves. In essence, it is about providing adults, young and old, the opportunity to exercise their sense of dignity and civic responsibility, as well as to serve as role models for their children. When done effectively, the subsequent results can be healthier families, improved communities, responsive institutions, and an invigorated democracy. Moreover, any form of constituent organizing aimed at empowering people serves to invigorate and nurture a democracy, which inherently embodies a promise of justice for all. A promise, which nevertheless burdens individuals with the responsibility of making democracy work while not assuring them the power, is required to exercise such responsibility. Where do people acquire the public skills, tools, and experience necessary to exercise citizenship responsibilities to support as well as hold institutions, public and private, accountable? These are the skills and behaviors required to effectively exercise, nurture, and maintain a healthy democracy.

REFERENCES

- Alinsky, Saul D. (1946). *Reveille For Radicals*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Astin, Alexander W. (1996). *DEMOCRACY AT RISK: What Higher Education Can Do*. College Park: Eisenhower Leadership Program, Gettysburg College.
- Austin, Michael J. & Lowe, Jane Isaacs (1994). *Controversial Issues in Community Organizations*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Barker, Sir Ernest (1967). *Social Contract*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Beachum Bilby, Sheila (1999). *Making After School Count: Grassroots Army in California Works on Education Issues*. Flint: Charles Stewart MOTT FOUNDATION.
- Blea, Irene I. (1992). *La Chicana And The Intersection Of Race, Class, And Gender*, Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.
- Boyte, Harry C. (1980). *The Backyard Revolution*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Brueggemann, Walter (1987). *Hope Within History*, Atlanta: John Knox Press.
- Cose, Ellis (2000, April 10). Cracks in the Thin Blue Line. *Newsweek*, p. 33.
- Domhoff, G. William (1998). *Who Rules America: Power And Politics In The Year 2000*. Mountain View: Mayfield Publishing Co.
- Fukuyama, Francis (1992). *The End of History and the Last Man*, New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Fukuyama, Francis (1995). *TRUST: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. New York: The Free Press.
- Galper, Jeffrey (1980). *Social Work Practice*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Greider, William (1992). *Who will tell the People*, New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Hamilton, Alexander, Madison, James, and Jay, John (1787). *The Federalist Papers*. A Mentor Book, (1961). New York, NY: The New American Library of World Literature, Inc.
- Hartman, Ann ((1994). Children in a Careless Society. *Reflection & Controversy: Essays on Social Work*. Washington, DC: NASW Press. pp. 117-122.
- Kahn, Si (1982). *Organizing: A Guide for Grassroots Leaders*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Kahn, Si (1991). *Organizing: A Guide for Grassroots Leaders*. (2nd.ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Kalb, Claudia and Rogers, Adam (1999, June 14). Stress. *Newsweek*, pps. 58-63.
- Kaplan, Robert D. (1997,December). Was Democracy Just a Moment? *Atlantic Monthly*. pp. 55-80.

- LaCugna, Catherine Mowry, Editor (1993). *Freeing Theology*, New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers Inc.
- Lerner, Michael (1986). *Surplus Powerlessness*. Oakland, CA: The Institute for Labor and Mental Health.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo (1961). *The Prince*. (Trans. by George Bull) Baltimore: Penguin Books.
- May, Rollo (1978). *Power And Innocence*. New York, NY: Dell Publishing Co.,Inc
- May, Rollo (1975). *The Courage To Create*. Toronto: Bantam Books, Inc.
- Parenti, Michael (1995). *Democracy for the Few*. (6th ed.) New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Pierce, Gregory F. Augustine (1984). *Activism That Makes Sense*. Chicago: ACTA Publications.
- Rust, Bill (1999). JUVENILE JAILHOUSE ROCKED: Reforming Detention in Chicago, Portland, and Sacramento. ADVOCASY: The Annie E. Casy Foundation.
- Samuelson, Robert J. (1995). *The Good Life and its Discontents*. New York, NY: Times Books Random House.
- Schlesinger, Arthur, Jr. (1998). *The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society*. (revised eddition). New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Schneider, Robert L. & F. Ellen Netting (1999). Influencing Social Policy in a Time of Devolution: Upholding Social Work's Great Tradition. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 44, 339-357.
- Schubert, Richard F. & Little, Rick R. (1998) Our Children Are the Community of the Future. In F. Hesselbein, et. al. (Eds.) *The Community of the Future*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass Publishers.
- Sleeper, Jim (1990). *The Closest of Strangers*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Simmel, Georg (1955). *Conflict & The Web of Group-Affiliations*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Specht, Harry & Courtney, Mark (1994). *Unfaithful Angels*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Thomas, R. Roosevelt, Jr. (1998). Diversity in Community. In F. Hesselbein, et.al. (Eds.), *The Community of the Future*. (pp. 71-81). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Tocqueville, Alexis de (1981). *Democracy in America*. (revised eddition) New York, NY: MacGraw Hill, Inc.
- Von Hoffman, Nicholas (1993). *Organizing*. Summer Issue
- West, Cornel (1993). *Race Matters*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.