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Leadership and authority are to be discussed in this report in the context of the local community. Therefore, it is urgent first to be clear about what is meant by "local community." It is a subject about which much has been written in sociology, social psychology, and anthropology, but close examination of the literature reveals an unexpected and astonishing lack of scientific information and tested hypotheses. The bulk of this literature is qualitative in approach (historical, descriptive, personal), and statistical in nature. The remainder reports isolated scientific studies. Not yet is there an area in this field so well surveyed in the field, researches in its laboratory, or clinical studies supplement each other. The result is gathering confusion about an area of social life, the importance of which is admirably acknowledged.

Unquestionably, adequate understanding of the local community, and of the leadership and authority, are indispensable prerequisites to effective planning of every type of program directed toward community improvement and development. Without it, as indicated in the first section of this report, such programs are bound to fail wholly or partially.

In our opinion, adequate understanding of the local community can be achieved only within the framework of a theory of social, or human, organization. In the second section of this report, therefore, we outline such a theory, developed by synthesizing many of the isolated scientific studies mentioned above, studies by sociologists, sociologists, social psychologists, and anthropologists. It is a synthesis that, so far as we know, has not been made for the audience we have in mind -- the many professional workers in education, groupwork, mental and physical health, libraries, and the arts, etc., whose main focus is the local community.

In the third section of the report, we apply this theory to analysis of the local community. In this analysis, leadership and authority become integral community processes, phases of its social, or human, organization, is best understood in relation to that organization, or as products of it. We offer our conclusions with full realization of their tentative nature but confident that the work we have summarized contains valuable insights that should be made widely available.

A word needs to be added about use of the word "theory" in this report. It is employed in the colloquial, rather than the scientific sense. A tentative formulation such as this is usually called by scientists a "working hypothesis," but this term serves the function in this case of generalizing the meaning in use of it only as a guide to further research. It is therefore at present time an incomplete form for the audience to which this paper is addressed. Professional community workers do not as yet conceive their programs as experimental designs. Their tradition is less that of science than that of social work: i.e., changing community institutions in the interest of making them conform more closely to an idealistic norm that has been derived from the social, economic, political, and historical origin.

The gulf between social science and social practice in the U.S.A. has been made wider than it is today, but no genuine confrontation between the two fields has yet been achieved, although attempts are being made in both direction which may eventually succeed. It is in the interest of [Annual Report, 1950 and 1951]
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Current Concepts of the Local Community

The first section of this report summarizes briefly current concepts of the local community. These are shown to be inadequate for genuine understanding of the social phenomenon. If in the effort to be concise, we have in this section to have disposed of a mass of work by eminent well-intentioned writers, we regret it, for we would be the first to concede that the authors mentioned have kept alive general interest in a social unit whose importance might otherwise have been completely obscured by high-controlled governmental, educational, and economic agencies.

Politics and sociology, cultural and social anthropology, sociometry and social psychology, offer descriptions of the local community. An analysis of its functions has also been made by an eclectic school of community activists chiefly concerned with community development or improvement. The local community is rarely mentioned in the literature of economics, although its economic significance is certainly as great as its political, cultural, and psycho-sociological importance.

A. The View of Political Science

As a political unit, three conflicting views of the local community are current today. That held in the United States is shared by countries in which some law prevails. It reflects the historical position of the community in our society and serves as a norm for the community activists who strive to strengthen its position in modern society. In this view the local community is a basic self-governing social unit, intermediate between the individual and the state. Its right to self-government is held to be inherent and general, derived from the vital character of the unity that evolved in human groups to living in the same physical and cultural environment with common interests, needs, and problems reinforced by intermingled purposes and activities.

A second view is held, with varying modifications, in societies strongly influenced by Roman law. This theory recognizes the local community as a social and political unit, but holds that like all other social organizations, it derives its sanction for existence from the sovereign state. History makes it only too apparent that this theory readily becomes a rationalization for supremacy.

A third view is that of Marxian political doctrine, in which the local community, like all other units of society, is regarded as a part of the state. The common class culture, with its own interests, purposes, and activities, is inferred, create... community but as an independent social and political unit, the local community has no place in Marxian political doctrine.

This category "community activists" is of our making.

Dr. Arthur Morgan, President of Community Service, Inc., Yellow Springs, Ohio, noted educator, is among the few scientists who have directed attention to the local community as an economic unit (55, 56, 57). For the importance of economic activities in developing European communities in the Middle Ages, see an economic and social history of the Middle Ages, by James A. Elliott Thompson, New York, 1928.

B. The View of Cultural Anthropology

Cultural anthropologists view the local community as a sub-culture, a subdivision of the underlying social reality: Culture. Its unity is therefore culturally determined. The elements that for political science are forces in creating unity are of negligible importance in this view.

The conclusion leaves wholly out of account the entire domain of inter-personal relationships. "We never deal with culture per se, but with culture as expressed in relationships in an inter-personal and inter-group context." (A, p. 287) Thus anthropologists make of culture an explanatory principle, human association becomes a mere automatic response to cultural imperatives, devoid of basis, or dynamic, social significance. Although the relation between the local community and culture is particularly close— for much of our culture has been developed in local communities and has been transmitted by them throughout human history (42, ch. 7, XIII-XIV; 56)— culture does not explain the local community (51, pp. 156-164).

C. The View of Sociology

Although not so explicit about its inherent right to self-government, the sociological conception of the unity of a local community is similar to that of political scientists. The currently dominant school of sociologists tends to stress heavily, and to regard as of supreme importance, the ineradicable interdependence of local interests, problems, and mores. For some sociologists this interdependence is conceived of as given, as existing, irrespective of whether or not the residents of a local community are to any degree conscious of it; it is an "idea" in the historic sense, the "essence" of a local community.

This is, however, the only metaphysical flightiness these sociologists inherit. When they describe local communities, one is struck by the close similarity between their outlook and that of the physicists who, prior to the merging of physics with chemistry and before acceptance of the Theory of Relativity, studied external aspects of the physical world, gross "matter" and "motion," which, some centuries later it was learned, are the external manifestations, or products, of underlying dynamic relationships between microscopic systems of primary elements. One is also reminded of the state

5. Of London Times, Jan. 11, 1946, describing the use of village and community groups in preparing nominations for the election of delegations to the Supreme Soviet. For a comment on this see Rogers, Harris, "United Nations and Local Groups," Journal of Industrial Sociology, Nov. 1946. See also (57, Ch. 8).

6. For the view of this school, consult the work of Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict, among others. For a different application of culture to human association, see (42a).
The early sociologists and pre-reflective psychologists, sociologists and psychologists, like this outlook study exhaustively external characteristics of local community. Their basic a priori assumption, that needs to be that a distinguished number of square blocks in an urban, or such-and-such a "neighborhood" in a rural, are to our as a local community. Their first step in undertaking research is to locate a community physically and draw its boundaries. Without making reference to the fact that this is an arbitrary operation, they collect "facts" about those rigidly defined geographic areas, such as, are they inhabited by specific-and-so many persons, subdivided into specific-and-so many age-sex-occupation groups, with such-and-such distributions of income and such-and-such ethnic backgrounds, containing so many dwellings, schools, churches, stores, factories, organizations, and facilities for various purposes or functions. With enough studies of this kind, statistical data can be accumulated, but rather close to individual studies or statistical treatment of miscellaneous of facts provide explanatory descriptions or scientific hypotheses from which postulates regarding leadership and authority, and other dynamic characteristics of the local community (33, ch. 2) can be derived. Such "social change" or "cultural lag" can be derived.

Essay about the peculiarity of such accumulations of facts, recently community sociologists have extended their factual inquiries to include social history; attitudes; status, prestige, and symbolic systems; values, norms, and stereotypes (65). But their positivist orientations were ignored than into treating these psychological products as mere or less visible entities, in the way early anthropologists conceptualized "culture." The insufficiency of the approach has been demonstrated time and again in major dictated by the ethical urgency, when social scientists have been asked by local communities to study social problems like racial clearance, social, economic, and educational policies, and conflicts between employers and employees, unemployment, race, divorce, and housing.

The practice is an example of "cultural lag." Formally, in the absence of racial segregation, the local community did, as a matter of fact, have definite geographical boundaries. But in the 20th century, inter- person relationships burst the bounds of neighborhood and it is now apparent that the local community is a complex of inter-personal relationships not necessarily confined by specific geographical boundaries. (20, p. 150)

This is as much beside the point as if a physicist were to reject as primary data about water the facts that it can be placed in a container, reflects the physical objects near it, or is "hot." All those facts about water are true, but they do not lead to understanding of what water is." (47, ch. 1.)

For example, such studies, consult any of the many community surveys published between 1915 and 1935, and books like Riddell's (1931)择, etc., for a definitive sociological review of the work of this positivist school, see (31)
D. The View of Community Activists

"But asks the local community a unique social phenomenon: in what ways is it distinct from the general society? Is it really significant in its own right, or is it a mere mechanical aggregate of localized activities, cultural, political power, peculiar institutions, etc.? These crucial scientific questions have not been answered by the positivist scientists of today."

In an attempt to answer one of them has been made by a very informal, eclectic "school" of thought, highly influential in the United States. Its location of the unity of a local community is similar to that of the medical scientists, but this school has suggested that the local community's reality is due to its performance of a unique social function. Ecologists and other social scientists, religious leaders, laymen, educators—particularly adult educators—seek philosophers, specialists in community development, recreation, health, group work, etc., engineers and social scientists, have helped to formulate this view. Contributions to the body of thought have been made by Edward Lindeman, Robert McCauley, Aristotol, John Collier, Arthur Fergun, Robert Greenmell, Use and many others. Terry Pfeill (14) was one of its early and militant leaders.

Their concern with the role of values and religion would qualify this school as "philosophical," were it not that most of these students are intent upon gaining knowledge as a means to discovery of methods by which the local community can be restored to the position of authority it enjoyed in this country prior to the early years of the nineteenth century. This emphasis on religion is so characteristic that, for want of a better name, it is used here to define the "school," which has hitherto not been so designated.

1. Such inclusiveness, community studies were numerous in the early part of the century. For an elaborate example, consult the many volumes of the Cleveland Survey.

2. The trend has become so pronounced that it was a matter for discussion at the National Governor's Conference, Gettlinburg, Tenn., 1951.

3. For a penetrating discussion of positivism, see (69). "The positivist has no foothold on which he can rely for speculation beyond the region of direct observation ... (this school of thought) has never been acted on. It can never be acted on, for it gives no foothold, ground which people can really stand upon." - Huxley, Alfred V., "Adventures of Ideas," Hamline, 1933, p. 159.
Some of those who have contributed to the viewpoint here outlined may be somewhat surprised to find that they belong to a particular "school."

These thinkers start with a concern for the individual as a member of society. Study of the processes of individual social maturation, and of the social conditions required for attainment of individual mental health—the sine qua non for effective participation in society—has led to the forming of this thesis: In the local community, the individual receives his first significant social experiences; in that restricted but complex environment, as in no other, he realizes most keenly the meaning of his membership in society. Most effectively he learns to exercise his liberty of thought and action as a socially responsible person, most fully develops the functional and cultural potentials that enable him to make a contribution to society. A corollary of the thesis is: the local community is indispensable to the healthy development of society as a whole.

Certain ethical convictions motivate much of the work of this "school." Leg of its adherents idealize equilibrating democracy and see in the face-to-face groupings of small local communities the only favorable locus for the training of the ideal. Paraphrasing Goldsmith, they would say:

"I'll farse that land, to hast'ning ills a prey; There cities accumulate and men decay."

Some assume that harmony and good-will are, inevitably, products of the small community and, for a few belief in its magically beneficent influence on human behavior amounts almost to a secular religion with strong utopian overtones (9). These writers are evangelists for the small community at a time when it greatly needs champions, and there is no question but that they are helping to redress the balance of scientific opinion in favor of the local community. They have effectively challenged the fatalistic assumption of some sociologists (7, pp. 413, 418, 461) that only large-scale social organization is sociologically significant.

In the light of these convictions, the progressive deterioration in the status of the local community—as large-scale economies, governmental, and other national organizations, become increasingly dominant in policy-making and social decision—cannot but appear highly alarming. Holding that it does constitute, in all probability, the gravest threat modern society faces—because loss of control over its own affairs vitally impairs the indispensability of the local community renders the individual and society—proponents of the thesis outlined in the paragraphs above, began about 1910 to suggest that deliberate efforts be made for the betterment, development, and recognition of local communities, with the aim of raising their morale, increasing their consciousness of their role in society as a whole, and improving the skills required to fulfill their unique function.

They developed the hypothesis that if a local community is to perform its unique function, certain programs of activities that demand and create an attitude of cooperation are essential. The assumption was made that if residents of a local community engaged in such activities for a limited period of time under the direction of professional experts, their value would become self-evident and local leaders would then carry them forward with local support (10).

The point is forcibly made in (586).
To test the hypothesis and this assumption, the community activists initiated and participated in many field experiments that incorporated programs along these lines in local communities where they appeared to be needed; billions of dollars were spent by municipalities, state and federal agencies, foundations, educational institutions, and individuals. For the most part, in both rural and urban areas, such experimental demonstrations were disheartening failures. As soon as grants of money gave out and professional workers departed, activities ceased (10). In only a few exceptional cases did local leaders take over from professional workers and a local community with the necessary funds to continue or develop the experimental program. When this happened, it could be demonstrated that a mutually stimulating relationship had been established between the professional workers and local leaders, but the subtle factors in such a fruitful relationship eluded definitive analysis. They were not translated into principles of professional training.45

Despite the failure of field experiments, the thesis of the community activists as to the unique function of the local community struck a strong chord of sympathy in the public mind and a conviction peculiar to the United States developed: that to establish on a permanent basis, by using the long porch, the kind of programs designed experimentally by the community activists, would avert the threatened obliteration of the independent local community. The agitation for public community centers received strong support from this conviction (8), and the legion of current efforts to establish "citizen councils" and "community organizations" of every variety has grown directly out of it. Community development by such means has become a dogma with a certain school of professional workers.46 The movement by this has by no means come to a close, despite the fact that their efforts to revitalize local communities by these means prove almost uniformly abortive.

These abortive efforts underline the conclusions to be drawn from the clinical experience of early field experiments, i.e., that although the thesis as to the unique psycho-social function of the local community may be sound, professional programs for community betterment, as now conceived and directed, do not improve or enhance the ability of the local community to perform this function.

Summary

The prevailing views of the local community are confusing and do not refer to the framework within which the relationship between the local community of leadership and authority can fruitfully be discussed. This report concludes that the local community can be understood only in the light of a theory of human organization. In the next section such a theory will be described.

45. In consequence, the literature shows increasing preoccupation with the manipulative skills and techniques of "leadership."

46. The recently-organized (1950) Council for the Community, 19 East 19th Street, New York 3, is an example.
A Theory of Human Organization

A school of thought about society, gradually gathering force during the past quarter century, has begun to provide explanatory descriptions of social processes in organizational terms. These have recently been achieving general recognition, but as yet official programs of local community development have been affected by them. This report marks the first attempt, so far as we know, to utilize these explanations to frame a view of the local community as useful then as now current.

The explanatory descriptions of social process that have produced this theory are the work of sociologists, of social anthropologists, social psychologists, and social scientists, who subscribe to the assumption that the significant facts about society are external, and that with hypotheses obtained by uncovering society's minute, underlying, dynamic factors, advances can be made in realizing its surface manifestations. Or, to put it another way, that study of the small is required for understanding of the large (46, pp. 502-5). The work of students with this orientation is comprehensible in aim and purpose to the of the scientists who developed what was first called "depth-psychology" and now is usually designated as psychoanalysis, or analytical psychology, "sociology," "depth-sociology" (60) has been suggested to denote this new development. Another term is "micro-sociology" (24). Use of the phrase, "Sociology," to designate it is also highly appropriate, inasmuch as, with this approach, study is focused on every form of human association, real and informal. Two of the earliest attempts to label this development were "Sociology" (60, p. 10) and "the science of inter-personal relations," 19 the latter being particularly apt, as the starting-point for this branch of social research is the reciprocals, or two-way, emotional relationship that links one human being to another in aggregate of any size from two individuals to millions of persons (75). "Group dynamics" and "human relations" also refer to this emergent science (1, vol. VI, 2). Whatever the few exceptions have been noted in (11). 18

1. Official use of this phrase is to be credited to the Society for Applied Anthropology, 61 West 55th, New York 19, which in 1949 adopted it as the name of its quarterly Journal.
2. Used as the sub-title for the quarterly, Sociometry, established in 1937, 101 Park a.v., New York 16. The late Harry Stack Sullivan defined psychiatry as the study of inter-personal relations. 19
3. This phrase is employed by the experimental school led by the late Paul Loun. The Research Center for Group Dynamics is at the University of Michigan, See (46)
4. This term is much employed by applied anthropologists, social psychologists, and industrial sociologists. The Journal of Human Relations was established in 1947 under the auspices of the Research Center for Group Dynamics and the Pavlov Institute of Human Relations. "Group-psychotherapy," and "group-analytic psychotherapy," two exponents of which are, respectively, S. H. Skorton in the United States and Sir H. H. Foulkes, B.E., in England, are related to the trends described here, as are psychodrama, sociodrama and sociometry, developed by Moreno.
It is eventually called, it is already recognized as promising a much-needed disciplinary bridge between the sciences that study broad social categories—mental character, racial tension, marriage, "public opinion," culture, language, phonetics—authoritarian, authoritative behavior of the unique individual is lost—and those that study the psychology of the individual—its physiological, social, abnormal, emotional, and volitional aspects; overt behavior and covert processes—"character-structure," "performance" in diagnostic tests, etc.

In contrastdistinction to the first group of sciences, the emergent one studies interaction between individuals in minute social categories such as small groups (33), small "social units" (47, 72), "cliques" (50; 97; 98), committee meetings, 23 psychological networks (60), the "social item" (60), "the testing," etc., and psychological behavior like spontaneity (60; 62; 96), chance (36), friendship (1), roles, leadership, conflict, tension, etc., always in a context of the immediate interpersonal relations of the individual whose behaviors are described. Any conclusions drawn about the wider social world and its gross manifestations are based upon knowledge obtained in studying these small units of behavior (46, ch. 1).

In contrast distinction to the group of disciplines concerned with the psychology of the individual, the emergent one does not study the individual in the unique, independent (or inter-dependent) individual of intact lives and integrated powers—not even the individual as a "social"—but centers attention rather on the relationships between individuals, on the net of feeling that can bind human beings together as strongly as chains, but not consequences of the simple fact that one human being can project feelings of love, admiration, hatred and contempt toward others. These feelings are powerful dynamic forces, a new science is being created by study of phenomena that must be organized around categories of nature and nurture, playscripts and biographies, but have been so neglected by scientists that it is essential here to be very explicit in differentiating it from subject-matter from that of older and better-known sciences.

One concept is basic to this emergent science. It is "system." The term is defined as in modern physical sciences—i.e., an organization of interdependent variables in which each part is as related to every other part that if a change occurs in the relationship of any one part to all the others, there is a change in the system as a whole: it then becomes either a new system or a new state of the same system (5, pp. 77-74).

23. Cf. Sociometry, Vol. VI, No. 3, Aug. 1943, devoted to a discussion of this point by eminent social scientists, including Lurigan, Dodd, Burgess, Znaniecki, Chapin, etc. See also (61).

24. Such work on committee meetings has been done by the staff of the Research Center for Group Dynamics, particularly Ronald Lippitt and John E.F. French.

25. In practice, the distinctions drawn may not be as absolute as inferred here, but in general they hold true. They are, however, rather implicit than explicit and fully to appreciate them requires close study of the various texts. Many students have not wholly freed themselves from reliance on older mechanistic categories.

26. In what follows we have relied heavily on the work of Chester I. Barnard (1) and (6). These books show social organization is used as a background for discussion of executive leadership and other problems. A concise summary of the concepts is to be found in (1, Vol. V, No. 3-4, 1950).
12.

"The inter-dependence of variables in a system is one of the widest inducements from experience that we possess." [31, p. 86] The term is familiar as applied to gross phenomena that are matters of everyday observa-
tion, such as "the solar system," "systems of thought," "the nervous system," etc., but scientists working along the line described above apply this con-
cept to a new range of facts—to psychological variables, or elements, that can best be detected by specially-designed tests and methods of observation, comparable to those performed with the microscope [60, pp. 11-16; 165-166].

A specific assumption is also basic to this new science, viz., social phenomena, like physical phenomena, can be explained, or "understood," by discovering or predicting conditions that give rise to the social behavior. The one and the other have long been axiomatic in medicine and psychotherapy as applied to the physiological and psychological processes of individuals; they are indispensable to individual therapy of any kind.

In this connection, it becomes significant that a physician, Dr. J. L. Norman, founded sociometry, the most advanced outpost of the new science; that the first eminent American scientist to grasp the implications of, and promote, his work, was the late Dr. William Alanson White, another physician [60, Forward]; that important contributions to this new development have been made by colleagues and former students of the late Dr. Lawrence J. Henderson, noted physiologist of Harvard University, who was also a physician. [31]

It is obvious that the concept of system and the assumption that rela-
tionship can be an explanatory principle demand of students who operate with their aid a new range of abstractions. The variables that are the units of their systems can not be directly observed and therefore must be inferred or postulated. Their problems become those of changing relationships, of interesting forms, of emergent patterns, in short, of the organization of interdependent variable elements. Such problems depend for solution upon the acquisition of a new instrument, the ability to see into the plane of abstractions (81). Descriptions of the relations may be realistic or metaphysical, but not both. Not now and not in the future. It is one of the great research demands of the new science. Not only is it possible, but it is necessary, for all students of society who aspire to participate in the new knowledge to restate from concrete data which have long been familiar to students of physiological and psychological medicine.

Among them, Eliot Chaplin, George Homans, F. J. Roethlisberger, George Lombard, Jerome Scolar, and ex-Dean Donham of the Graduate School of Business administration. Elton Mayo, an Australian scientist who had worked independently along similar lines, was also influenced by Henderson after joining the faculty of the school in the early 1920s. [31; 52].
B. Outline of the Theory

1. Interaction as a Unit in Systems

a. The primary unit of behavior from which social organization evolves is interaction between two human beings.274 This is the vital starting point of social process and all social functioning is dependent upon it. "We are not individuals nor so but with the individual in relationships" (36, p. 287)

b. Motivations for interaction, viewed superficially, appear to be definitely varied, but actually only one is definitive: Every individual is complex of needs, wants, and desires, conscious and unconscious, whose satisfaction is essential in greater or lesser degree to the individual's social and psychological survival, physical and mental maturation, mental and emotional stability. He can attain satisfaction of his wants only by cooperating with others whose wants and desires coincide with his, are compatible with them, and/or complement them, for almost none of them can be satisfied alone, independently, in a social vacuum. Hence, interaction is an unavoidable consequence of the human predicament: the categorical imperative to cooperate with others or die.276 Survival, self-development, and enjoyment of living are assured only through cooperation.

c. Interaction between human beings, like all vital phenomena, creates an inherent order.278 Thus, the facility of interaction between individuals in a human population is not an inanimate mass, but an orderly emergent system composed of systems268 formed by the interaction of specific individuals (34, 71).

d. These systems are social organization. Social organization does not refer to individuals, nor to interactions, but to systems of interaction (ch. VI and IX). Although human beings are individual "members" of a society, and a society is an association of individual human beings, the system cannot be explained too strongly that in this theory the term social organization refers only to systems of interaction.

- Dewey and Bentley have argued that the term "transaction" is preferable.

- This is not meant to imply that all interaction is necessarily friendly; it may also be hostile. It is nevertheless still true that survival and enjoyment of life depend upon developing cooperative interaction.

- "It is a spontaneously attained order...of the highest degree of complexity...No constraint is applied specifically to the individual particles; (they) are free to obey the internal forces acting between all the internal and external forces...an ordered arrangement resulting by spontaneous mutual adjustment of the elements is (dynamic order)" (69, ch. 10).

- Some readers may prefer the term "regularities" to that of system.
2. Types of Systems: Informal and Formal

The unit systems of interaction that constitute a society's total
social organization are not all alike (47, p.91). They can be grouped
into two relatively different types -- informal and formal -- according
to criteria listed in the contrasting columns below:

a. Informal systems

1. Individuals view one another in interaction as persons in the full sense;
2. Activities are ends in themselves;
3. Expression of reason and emotion is relatively free and spontaneous;
4. Cooperation is implicit and activity is for the most part spontaneously coordinated;
5. Cooperation restricts the individual's liberty relatively little;
6. Systems are covert and private.

b. Formal systems

1. Individuals view one another in interaction as performers of functions;
2. Activities are means to ends;
3. Reason and emotion are channeled in the interest of achieving calculated or pre-
determined joint purposes;
4. Cooperation is explicit and activity is always consciously coordinated;
5. Cooperation restricts the individual's liberty to a high degree;
6. Systems are public and overt.

These criteria require elaboration. The task is fraught with
clinic purities. As operational studies of the two types of systems
are in number, the uniformities must be described largely in terms
which lend themselves to misinterpretation. It is to be hoped, however,
that the reader of this report will be indulgent in proportion to
his recognition of the difficulties involved in this subject-matter
which will be inspired by the W. F. F. or H. principle of seeking understanding
with terminological difficulties.

In dealing with informal and formal systems, we are of course
dealing with two inter-dependent aspects of the same phenomenon -- human
organization. Whether they are construed as a continuum or as two
different types, the essential thing is to be clear about the distinctions
between them. This is of vital moment for professional workers desiring
work with a community.
Informal systems are invariably formed by interaction between two or more individuals who see each other as personalities — i.e., as unique individualizations of physical, biological, and social characteristics — as individuals per se, or persons in the full sense.

Although a variety of aspects of the individual are brought into play in these interactions, for example, intellect, skill, personality, or love, interaction is conceived as an event in which individuals participate as persons per se. This fact is taken so much for granted in thinking about interaction that it may appear superfluous to emphasize it here. Its extreme importance appears when it is contrasted with the meaning attached to interaction in formal systems.

Formal systems are invariably created, not by interaction between two or more individuals per se, but only by such interaction between individuals as is concerned with the efforts and activities they are required to make, or engage in, to the end that the explicit purposes for which the system is called into being, may be attained (p. vii). Thus in these systems the meaning of the term "interaction" has a different content from that implied when it is used in regard to informal systems. In formal systems, interaction is functionally focused and therefore relatively de-personalized. If the individual cannot bow to this necessity, he cannot cooperate in these systems (5, 866).

To say that formal interaction systems are de-personalized in the sense of being functionally-focused appears to arouse "resistance" that makes acceptance and comprehension of this criterion difficult. In this de-personalization is a matter of common, everyday experience, as often made very obvious by the resentment against it expressed by participants in a formal organization such as an army, a factory, a business office, or a university department. "They don't think as human," is a common complaint. "What do they think I am — a machine?" is asked in moments of exasperation when a participant becomes aware of the tension caused by this functionally-focused interaction.

Naturally and de facto, the individual still remains a unique person, but only outside the cooperative activities in which he appears as a member of any specific formal system. The same individual whose interaction is functionally focused may also interact...

20(16, ch. XII). The difference can be illustrated by contrasting the two responses one individual makes to another individual in the two different contexts: (1) "I, Mary Jones, feel towards you, Jenny Smith, this and so ..." (informal process); (2) "I, as a psychologist, feel towards you as a psychologist and co-worker, thus and so ..." (formal process).

The association of uniforms with functionally focused interaction has often been noted. The army, red cross, police departments, many schools, and voluntary formal organizations use uniforms to accent or enforce "uniformity" as an aspect of de-personalization.
was ascribed above to informal systems, but this interaction is
necessary; it should not, conceptually or theoretically, be regarded
as integral to the formal system. Formal systems for purposes of
discussion and discussion must be regarded as existing apart from, and
independently of, informal systems and vice-versa. There is much inter-
action between the two, but the relationship between them is
that of mental reciprocity only. Theoretically, the one must always be
conceptualized as distinguishable from the other because the basic criterion
of the interaction that creates the one system differs in kind from that
that creates the other. The relationship is something like that between
married pair. However fusion the interests and activities of the pair
may be, each partner inevitably remains a distinct individual with dis-
tinctive attributes, first among these being differentiation in sex. So
with informal and formal systems. However much in practice the two may
grow - and this is so pronounced that some observers construe this as a
southern (29) - the point can not be over-emphasized that theoretical
clarity is facilitated by recognition that one is to be differentiated
from the other.

In practice we tend to regard the difference as merely relative. We
are not trained to think otherwise. But the difference between the
system is definitive from the standpoint of the individual, and results
highly important for society flow from it.

The social consequences of the difference are so vast and ramified,
so fraught with danger to both the individual and society if not
understood, that its grave importance must be emphasized. For the problems
attacked in this paper, the theoretical differentiation is crucial.
Here, with full appreciation of the fact that for many practical purposes
the differentiation need not be made, we shall in this report treat the two
systems as differing from each another in kind. Some of the major
assumptions will be noted in a later section. The other criteria noted
here are infinitely easier to deal with than the one just discussed.

b. The Respective Views of Activities

In informal systems, activities are pursued largely for the
indirect pleasure they afford the individuals concerned. They are not
aimed for predetermined, calculated long-term ends. The activities
themselves are ends, rather than means to ends. In consequence, these
goals allow for much liberty of individual choices and variation in regard
to activities, goals, and purposes. Choices and decisions tend to be
selective, or at least free from explicit purposefulness.

But in the formal systems, activities are almost exclusively means to an end,
which are planned and directed for achievement of predetermined goals. The
activities may be - in fact, often are - pleasurable in themselves to
the individuals who participate in them, but this is, so to speak, an
incidental. The fact remains that in formal systems, impor-
tance and the activities associated with it are essentially means
(i.e., VII), not ends in themselves as is true to a high degree

c. The Respective Emphases on Emotion and Logic

Spontaneity, emotion, and impulsiveness play an important part in interaction in informal systems. The flow of feeling and the use of these are to a much higher degree spontaneous and free in these systems than in formal systems. Informal interaction has immense subjective importance for the individual. In it, his emotions can "live awhile, and have their being"; it is the field where choice counts, where the individual is not compelled to subject himself to the demand of formal systems that he be only a function. Nor is the norm for his behavior exclusively rational or logical (5, ch. IX).

In formal systems, on the other hand, both emotion and reason are dammed by the demands of the joint purpose to be achieved. The individual is required to express to the maximum his logical, rational, scientific abilities, to grant them ascendancy in control of his behavior, and insofar as possible to base his decisions on rational and logical considerations (5, p. 119). In return, he finds his chief outlet for such abilities in these systems.

d. The Respective Degrees of Awareness in Cooperation

Despite their emotional or subjective importance to the individual, part of the interaction that creates informal systems makes no particular conscious impression on the participants. In this respect it resembles the physiological processes of the living body. Like them, it is not wholly conscious, is in great part self-regulating, and largely functions independently of the conscious will of the individual.

Most of the cooperative activity in these systems is a matter of impulse or habit; some of it is dictated by the mores, only a fraction is deliberately purposeful. Individuals may be painfully, or joyously, aware of the emotions involved in cooperation, but they are not often conscious of the fact that they are cooperating.

The dichotomy End-means is not wholly satisfactory but has been used as any other, such as play-work is equally so. We appear to be dealing here with a phenomenon that lies in the area under scrutiny by students of "perception", such as the researchers at Dartmouth. In informal systems, the individuals who interact "see" goals and the activities associated with them as wholes and identify with them so spontaneously as to make them appear to be "their". In formal systems, activities and goals are not seen as wholes — the goals may indeed be only vaguely apprehended — and the individuals do not identify with them spontaneously but only after a period of time in which habit and self-discipline and the process.

Barnard warns, however, that logical or rational behavior is inextricably interwoven with non-logical behavior (5, pp. 302-322).
A person could not be expected to think much about his everyday, social or impulsive cooperation with others. It must run in a groove, under little conscious direction from him. This is a matter of psychological self-protection. It would literally be impossible for him to give conscious attention to every detail of every interaction. Instead, the complications of cooperation between members of a society are so great that they must largely be kept in order by habit. The human relationships must to some degree be stereotyped. The ability of communicating and having court behavior understood depends on conformity to habitual patterns and commonly accepted norms, and upon tradition to mutually held conceptions. (6, ch. VI).

In formal systems, on the other hand, cooperation is explicit, and conscious coordination of effort to achieve a purpose is definitive. Analysis, analysis of purposes into graded steps of accomplishment, in right place and the right time for action, have to be determined by general factors that do not take the momentary impulse or mood of the individual into account. Inducements to make individuals willing to cooperate have to be devised. The persons in the systems must necessarily be highly conscious of the fact that they are part of a cooperative game and, in order to remain part of it, (59) they must be specifically aware of the role they are expected to play, must deliberately utilize the prescribed rituals and symbols the formal system demands.

c. The Respective Restrictions on Individual Liberty

In informal systems, the individual enjoys considerable liberty to examine what part of himself will be expressed in interaction, or his mode and manner of participation in the system. It is commonly assumed that, in contradistinction to formal interaction systems, informal games welcome and encourage expression of the "whole self," the "total personality" but it is probably more accurate to say that in informal games, the individual is relatively free to determine his own manner of participation and his roles, whereas in formal systems he has to accept group's ends and the role that develops for him in relation to these, and behave as if these ends were wholly wanted by him and must define whatever desires of his own that might be in conflict with them.

Distractive to informal systems is liberty of choice in activity, society, purpose, and individual self-expression. However much the man, manner, or code which the individual accepts may limit this liberty, as well as the controls the system themselves develop, his own liberty of thought and action and his potentialities for self-design are free to unfold in these systems.

Formal systems, on the contrary, circumscribe the individual's liberty to determine his role and manner of participation. He anticipates because he is capable of performing certain kinds of

*The distinction seems similar to that made by Talcott Parsons between autonomous and representative roles.*
Formal systems, on the contrary, circumscribe the individual's liberty to determine his role and manner of participation. He participates because he is capable of performing certain kinds of activity. Within other narrower limits, his roles are proscribed, patterns for his behavior are set, and both the manner and the method of his participation are determined for him. So much is this so that it is a feature of these systems for individuals to develop an "organization personality." (5, p. 88, 174, 259, 251).

1. The Respective Public or Private Character of the Systems

Intimacy and privacy are characteristic of informal systems. They are not covert by intention, but inherently so, because of the character of the psychological processes that create them. Being so largely unself-conscious or having so low a degree of self-consciousness, these systems could not well be anything but private, personal, and intimate.

Formal systems, on the contrary, are explicit and overt, hence public as well. Their public character is so complete that they are often charted and blueprinted. Everyone knows the place of everyone else in the hierarchies required for formal cooperation. Every effort is made to be explicit about the interaction systems, who is to interact with whom, when interaction is to take place, and what is to be accomplished by it. The are clearly the relationships are defined and the more conscious individuals are of the relationships, the less confusion about the activities they carry on (55).

2. Summary of Characteristics

To summarize, the major specific uniformities that mark informal interaction systems are: (a) interaction is conceived as an event between two unique persons; (b) activities are ends in themselves rather than means to ends; (c) interaction is spontaneous, emotional, and impulsive to a high degree; (d) cooperation is largely implicit and spontaneously-coordinated; (e) intrinsic to the systems is liberty of choice and decision in regard to activities, goals, purposes, and individual self-expression, all of which are ends in themselves rather than ends to means; (f) relationships are covert and private.

The major specific uniformities that mark formal interaction systems are: (a) they are formed by interaction between individuals viewed exclusively in their functional aspects; (b) activities are explicitly proscribed; (c) they require that his rational aspects control the individual's behavior to the maximum extent; (d) cooperation is highly conscious; (e) the individual's activities and roles, the manner, the method, and the character, of his participation, are proscribed; (f) relationships are public and overt.

In conclusion, it must also be noted that the reciprocal interplay between the two kinds of systems is highly complex. They reinforce and support one another in a contingent fashion. Each strives to approximate characteristics of the other. Informal systems invariably grow up within formal systems (44) — and when these do not impair efficiency they impede the effectiveness of the formal system. Informal systems show a
tain tendency to convert themselves into formal systems, apparently for
consequent benefits of superior prestige, status, and improved access to
mental resources. Ideas or programs informal systems develop can often
be expanded and developed by conversion of the informal group into a
formal organization (15). Or often, formal Organizations possess facilities
needed by informal systems, which can be utilized only if they place them-

3. Outline of Theory, continued:

3. Patterned of Systems of Interaction

a. Informal Systems

Informal interaction-systems are of three types or patterns. These are:
(1) the incidental or transitory pattern; (2) the associative pattern; (3)
the network pattern. These patterns are highly important in our argument,
and a different kind of leadership is associated with each.

(1) Incidental or Transitory Pattern

Incidental or transitory interaction-systems are widely prevalent, being,
as it were, the raw material of social intercourse. They arise at any time
when individuals are thrown together. Such systems are formed by inter-
vention precipitated by merely casual, random encounters, incidental to other
purposes, or occasioned by accidents, personal and social emergencies, and
like. It may be friendly or hostile, and the degree of intensity of
motion involved in these systems depends upon the reaction of the individuals
concerned to the occasion that precipitates interaction.

Leadership may be associated with this pattern of system when crowds
form, riots or other violent disturbances break out, accidents and
disasters occur, or whenever human beings are fused into a "mass" (6, ch. III).
Indeed nothing is known of the process by which leadership emerges in crisis
situations, but it may be remarked that when leaders are not chosen, or do
not impose themselves upon the "mass," we have the social phenomenon known
as "anarchy." Ordinarily, this form of leadership is not lasting, but when, as
infrequently happens, such leaders are consciously accepted, lasting results
may follow.

(2) Associating Pattern

It is very difficult to find a self-explanatory term for the second type
of interaction system, although systems of this pattern are among the most
important units of society. They have been variously called, in different
scientific disciplines, minute social systems, informal^), voluntary, or

3. This is the most widely-used term, but as our discussion shows, it is
not sufficiently descriptive.
autonomous34 groups35; ingroups; psychogroups (36, ch. XII); friendship
circles; "cliques,"36 "gangs," "street-corner boys" (37). "Natural" groups
were formerly used also, but is losing favor. Sociometrists identify such
systems on their sociograms as circles, squares, and triangles (60). The
social system does not use these terms (nor do scientists, usually), when
referring to the groups which they are studying but the Layman indicates
an acquaintance with what is meant by them when he says: "our bunch," "
by gang," "that crowd," etc.

These systems are formed by repeated, successive, voluntary interaction
between number of persons to whom interaction is a matter of choice, mutually
agreeable to achievement of self-determined objectives or
purposes is definitely secondary in importance to interpersonal association.
Hence, therefore, chosen to call them "associative interaction systems",
being invention of a less cumbersome designation.

The systems usually number no more than twelve, or at most fifteen,
with eight or ten as the average, and may be as small as two or
three. T. Ferguson Rodger has called associative interaction systems "the
normal size for human activity."38

Continuity is integral to these systems. Incidental interaction does
satisfy the need of human beings for stable relationships, understanding,
agreement, harmony. These can be best satisfied by successive
movement through a time-sequence, in which individuals get to "know" one
other or "get used to" one another. Interaction between individuals sicken
gratification of these needs is definitely a consequence of choice.
Laymen may enter into incidental interaction also, but whether this is
relevant to is not at present certain. Successive interaction between
these individuals who choose each other and interact more or less regularly
therein is a whole produces these systems. Most individuals belong to
more such associations, but appear a fraction in almost every
concerned relies to none-- possibly between 10%-15% of the population;

1. This term has been popularized by the Committee on Autonomous Groups.
2. Autonomy is specific to informal systems. The term was originally used
to distinguish such groups from those deliberately formed or fabricated
by welfare agencies as units for their activities.
3. Group is a term much too loose to be useful in exact description; it
should never be used if another is available, as it can be applied
as well as in smaller aggregates, and to aggregations classified by
some criterion.
4. Much used in anthropological literature (85, ch. V, VI, XV).
5. Jennings has found experimentally that groups larger in size than twelve
had to break up into cliques, a conclusion confirmed by the work of
6. In his closing address to the First International Congress on Mental
Health, Aug. 1928; quoted in the New York Herald-Tribune, August 22,
1928.
In associative interaction-systems, the individuals concerned enjoy one another's company. These myriad social constellations are also outlets for a limited variety of personal interests and pursuits, aesthetic, recreational, sentimental, avocational, and/or intellectual. They embrace a wide range of human interests that are consecutively pursued and relate of social action not explicitly organized to achieve long-term, calculated purposes, which demand formal systems.

In these systems, recurrent interaction builds up common ways of thought and action, involving use of common symbols and a common stock of concepts and the things symbolized. All this results in common ways of looking at things and doing things, in consistent ways of communication and dependability, in the things symbolized. In these systems, recurrent interaction builds up common ways of thought and action, involving use of common symbols and a common stock of concepts and the things symbolized. All this results in common ways of looking at things and doing things, in consistent ways of communication and dependability, in shared attitudes, mutually accepted traditions, and mutual expectations regarding others' behavior. The precision and intensity of the interaction is rarely discernible by direct observation and by an extremely small part of the aggregate of interaction is even available at all to the observation of "outsiders." (6, ch. VI).

Associative interaction-systems promote mutuality in states of mind and action; they shape and mold the person's behavior and set limits to it. In this way, they contribute to the unity and order of a society. So far as the individual is concerned, they afford him freedom of thought and action. On the one hand, and on the other, the common outlook that he himself helps to shape has no necessary restricts both. Nevertheless, in this kind of society, with its mutual friendliness and confidence, the individual experiences a feeling of emotional security as essential to achievement of psychological maturity and mental health (I, Vol. III, no. 6). And in a few society, with a certain degree of mobility, he has the opportunity in associative interaction-systems to compensate for restrictions he finds too irksome in social contexts. This is one of his crucial liberties in a free society. The individual regimen uniformly grown upon or even suppress freedom to form associations.
Interpersonal relationships within these systems may be more or less intense. In some cases, all of a person's private activities may be carried on with the same persons; in other cases, he may divide his time and interests between a number of such associations (1552, pp. 108-110).

Although his experiences in systems of this pattern profoundly affect the individual's knowledge, attitudes, and emotions, although, as a person and as a member of society, he is largely bound up in his relationships in such associations, the individual is often aware of the part they play in his life. He may become conscious of it only when he no longer enjoys such relationships.

Many of these associations are inter-connected through overlapping memberships (25). Sometimes these interconnected relationships become sufficiently close to make the several associations involved act as one, occasionally through federation or more often through temporary cooperation arrangements, but there seems to be no general tendency to develop permanent composite or complex informal organizations.

Leadership is invariably associated with systems of this kind. Immense research projects have been devoted, over the past quarter-century, to the effort of determining whether specific personality traits can be uniformly identified in leaders of associative interaction types (76). To date, the results are nil. The best opinion is that activities of each system, the situations in which it finds itself, the character of the inter-personal relations between the associated individuals, largely control choice of leaders (36; 28). They derive spontaneously from the whole group and every member of it, but different individuals achieve or are awarded leadership as activities change. The phenomenon will be discussed at greater length in a succeeding section of the report.

(3) Network Pattern

The chain or network pattern of interaction-system is familiar to us by the colloquial terms, "grapevine" and "underground" (31). Sociologists call the phenomenon "psychological networks" (15, 25c-26a); Chester I. Barnard, "Endless Chain Interaction." And here, the term network pattern applies to the widest possible social distribution of interpersonal relationships. These chains of reaction are immemorably, spread over wide territories, and while they persist for long periods of time, they may or may not be potent in their definition — they are effective even when transitory. They are the principal means of inter-communication in the community between teams, families, associative interaction-systems, cells of incidental interaction and composite and complex formal ones. Some aspects of network appear in less lasting form in the mental or transitory pattern of system and in a more lasting but more broad form in the associative pattern.

Chain interaction ignores every kind of self-imposed exclusiveness. In addition to functioning as the communication system in any one unit, it provides a fundamental means of intercommunication between different societies, being nonchalantly indifferent to geographical
boundaries, oceans, mountain ranges, and deserts. Chains are not
affected by any climatic condition that man can endure.

Along these chains fly "the news," gossip, rumors, and jokes;
blues, resentments, enthusiasm, admiration, and suggestions;
reactions of men and events, "inside information," "the low-down,"
as the influence of individual upon individual. Reputations are made
and lost along these chains; an individual's prestige is there built up
or diminished bit by bit. Into chains are thrown for circulation new
ideas developed in associative interaction-systems or teams; along them
we record the successive judgments that doom old ideas to oblivion.
Arts, who has studied chain interaction experimentally, and is among
us few social scientists to have done so, calls them "the kitchen of
public opinion." Whatever the mixture, it is brooked there, propaganda
and deliberate efforts to manufacture public opinion to the contrary
understanding.

Networks are a person-to-person phenomenon. Interaction is strictly
personal-significant silence, gestures, speech, notes, or other kinds of
long-distance communication.

Networks, as interaction-systems, are almost completely covert. All
the individual himself is aware of is that he receives, or passes on,
news, stories, impressions or judgments. In many cases he remains ignorant
of the sources of his informant's items; only rarely can he trace the
exogenous career of items he himself releases. Thus he is alert to
only a few immediate links in indeterminate chains in which he is one
participant.

Networks have another covert aspect. Some items of news passed
along them often eventually produce social effects that attain public
significance. Yet each individual who helps to produce such an
effect may be totally unaware that he had a part in causing the event.

Some networks are short, linking only a few persons. Others are
infinitely long. Some may come to a stop at one end, like the branch of
a tree, but connect with a trunk of networks at the other end. A
network of inter-relationships from person A to B to C to D, for
example, can be a small piece of chains extending around the world.

Next, chain or network interaction is a matter of choice and
also fairly stable. We choose the individuals to whom we pass on jobs,
inside information, evaluations of individuals, reputations, or suggestions.
However, in times of stress or emergency, or when we share a common
part with certain individuals with whom we are not otherwise in
continuous relations, we may interact, more or less regardless of
distance, with total or partial strangers who will help meet the crisis or
steal the secret alike - as in the "underground" during World War II.

Networks have another characteristic, of high importance socially.
Individuals exercise a certain discrimination in their acceptance of
material passed on to them. This factor of discrimination plays a
In this connection, Moreno says of networks: "By virtue of (see effects) they are the controlling factors in the development of the community. The older and more mature the society, the more the social network system becomes a controlling super-organization." (50, p. 159) This statement indicates the extremely important effects of systems of interaction of the network pattern. Regarding this matter, Dexter Barnard says: "Although the number of persons with whom any individual may have interactive experience is limited, nevertheless the mass-chain relationship ... results in the development in many respects, over wide areas, and among many persons, of uniform states of which crystallize into what we call moral, customs, institutions." (5, p. 123)

Recognition of the network pattern of interaction system throws light on current theories of "neighborhood" and "community". As Barnard expresses it: "The local district or neighborhood is only a typal group unit. ... Local districts are, so to speak, transversed by psychological currents which bind large groups of individuals ... together, irrespective of neighborhood, district, or borough boundaries ... in one part of a community, a person has the sensation of honesty, in other part, of dishonesty. Whatever the actual facts may be, this impression is due to two different networks along which two different systems of action about him travel" (50, p. 285).

In networks, leaders are evaluated, their performance informally scored, their capabilities assessed, their prestige built up -- or torn down. Thus systems of this pattern play a highly important part leadership, and will be discussed later in more detail.


b. Formal Systems

There are three types or patterns of formal systems: (1) Team or unit pattern; (2) Family or kinship pattern; (3) Composite or
(1) Team or Work-unit Pattern

As formal interaction-systems arise to perform specific tasks, they are basically work-units. A wide variety of terms is used to designate the varying with the type of work that is undertaken. In the army, they are "squad"; in politics, the precinct organization and "cell"; in Communist Party term; in deliberative organizations, "working committee" or subcommittee, "section" or "department", when these refer to working units, in religious institutions, "vestry" is one form of a voluntary unit; in business, industry, and construction enterprises, "work-shop" or "team". In England "working-party" or "education committee" are used.

We suggest that the word "team" best describes this type of unit. The word indicates their small size, the closeness of their organization, the intensity of effort invested in such systems by the associated individuals, and their rigid connection with a specific task. Hence we title it here as the general designation for this primary form of formal interaction-system.

All the work of the world, in which activity and interaction are consciously coordinated to achieve an explicit purpose, is done by men, whether the goal or purpose is victory in battle for an army, section of the individual's soul for a church, production of material goods and services by industrial and commercial enterprises, education of the child to behave appropriately in his culture, winning of power by political party, or achievement of their programs by welfare and propaganda organizations (5, ch. VI).

Teams may be formed by several persons who spontaneously accept an explicit purpose, and agree to conscious coordination of their efforts toward it; or they may result from the individual associating himself with a few others to achieve a purpose he has envisaged and they accept; they may be formed by an administrator who arbitrarily groups together individuals who have in common only specialized skills required to fulfill a purpose. Necessity for adequate communication imposes a limit on the size of persons who can form a team. In highly specialized work, more than five or six persons may be impractical; the upper limit is usually about fifteen (5, pp. 105-107).

Teams cannot function without specified leaders, whose functions vary with a specifically defined by the nature of the task (5, p. 33, 110-115). The formal leader is rarely chosen; usually he is imposed on the team by the exigencies of the work. However, although he does arise spontaneously from the membership, he must be accepted by the members. 'Sociogroups' are teams in which participants have had the opportunity to choose each other in relation to a work-criterion. For an excellent discussion of the nature of interpersonal relations in such teams, or sociogroups, see 26, ch. XIII.
(2) Family or Kinship Pattern

Of recent years, there has been so much discussion of the desirability of companionship between parents and children, or the values of spontaneous and freedom in family life — all characteristics of informal interaction-systems — that it may astonish some readers to find the family included here among formal interaction-systems. History supports this classification, however. The very fact that the family is invariably referred to as an "institution" indicates its historical position as a formal interaction-system. One need only recall the "nuclear families" of India and China, the importance of kinship systems in primitive societies (62a), the feudal family, kinship villages, etc., to become fully aware of this.

Checked by every one of the criteria for formal systems, the family qualifies in this category. It performs indispensable functions in society, preeminent among them, rearing of the next generation, passing on the cultural heritage, and conditioning the young for mature life — all explicit purposes; the activities relating to these functions must be consciously coordinated to achieve these ends cooperation restricts the liberty of the individuals involved; the system is public and overt; the family cooperation makes severe demands upon the rational aspects of its members' personalities. However much this severity is softened by cultivation of the amenities, of affection and deep devotion between the members of the family-group, it still remains true that sociologically considered, the family is essentially a formal interaction-system according to the criteria selected.

Some explanation appears to be needed of why the essential and indelible formal character of the family is so rarely mentioned today by certain writers. The cause seems to lie in the progressive loss of the family's self-directed economic activities, as a consequence of the move taken by the Industrial Revolution in the U.S.A. (3). Loss of its important function has weakened the family's status. This has resulted in the American emphasis on informal association to diminish the family's significance as a formal unit and to magnify its potential as an informal interaction-system. Nevertheless, in its aspect as a social unit with responsibility for nurture of its young, the family is a formal interaction-system. A function so crucial to the welfare of society can be entrusted only to an organization of formal character. Attempts by revolutionaries and radicals to "abolish the family" in the interest of some "freer", more fluid system have always failed.
Dare is now considerable confusion about the family's role in modern society. A confusion reflected in the life of many families in the country. Parents no longer have an "ideal" formal pattern to guide their decisions—making. Therefore, they are endeavoring to remodel traditional type of family life by giving full play to the qualities characteristic informal interaction-systems. The strain this induces on parents has been noted ad infinitum.

The result of the confusion about the status of the family has been corresponding confusion about authority and leadership in the family. Past families, authority was, or is, formally lodged uniformly in a male, who in patriarchy was usually the mother's brother and in matriarchy the oldest male member of the family. There is much due to the effect that the position required special training, usually was this true in aristocratic and feudal families. Nowadays, in the small conjugal family, there are vestigial remains of this relation in a shadow of authority for the father, but proponents of the idea as an informal interaction-system contend that influences, rather than authority, is proper to the role of both parents. It is presumed influence is best exercised jointly by both parents.

Another result of the American family's loss of formal status and its trend towards informal status has been its progressive surrender to the paradise of functions that can be performed only by interaction-systems. Chief among these is the formal community devising to play appropriate roles in society. A great part of the agency's responsibility for this function has been assumed by formal organizations—schools, private and governmental agencies for "charact-building," recreation, etc., courts and youth rehabilitation projects. As a result of this development, the semicompentent State acquired almost preponderant control over the young and pressures upon family at every turn. As a formal system, it is in a precarious situation.

However, students still agree that the family has advantages superior to any other formal organization in respect to cultural conditionings of the young. Some effort is therefore now being directed towards securing principles of nurture that can be taught to families as well-recognized agents of society charged with this function (3); 9).

(1) Composite and Complex Patterns

A striking characteristic of formal interaction-systems is their tendency to form composite and complex patterns, both vertically and horizontally.

The strain has caused wide concern for the family on the part of social agencies—federal, state, and private—and inauguration of family counselling services by all of them. Almost uniformly theirs is the value of informal interaction and stress the advantages of the influence, rather than the authority, of parents.
Like all living things, organizations grow in size by multiplication of single units, families or teams. The first step in increasing size is development of such close inter-relations between two or more single units or mixtures of them as composite. Still larger organizations can then be created by combining groups of units to make of them a composite and the combining groups of units and/or composites into vast complex structures. This tendency results in the massive formulation which make those systems so highly visible in the obvious case of a structure of this kind is an army (5, ch. VIII).

Insurable are the varieties of the process by which composite and complex systems are produced, as indicated by the many terms used to designate it: amalgamation, assimilate, merge, federate, confederate, capture, annex, conquer, subjugate, "buy-out", etc. The resulting systems are variously called by such terms as: League, federation, confederacy, union, united (so-and-so), association, associated (so-and-so), universality, company, "chain", etc. "Church", "King", "Government" are, etymologically speaking, collective nouns referring to complex systems.

It is a common delusion that large organizations are themselves units and are subdivided by a secondary process (5, 101-105). The contrary is true. Immunological microscopic investigations of large formal organizations within recent years have shown that the minute interaction-systems, closer, intermediate between the individual and the highly conspicuous whole, are the genuinely significant units that explain their behavior of the whole. 48

Different varieties of leadership are associated with the different varieties of combinations. These will be discussed later.

(a) Family Composite Patterns

Formerly, in this country, families were composite formal interaction-systems. Up to the 19th century, as a matter of fact, this form of family organization was practically universal. In societies whose local organization has not yet fully felt the impact of the industrial revolution, this is still the typical form of family association as in the great families of China and India.

But today in the United States, loss of its economic function, and progressive loss of other functions, has made the conjugal family a rather isolated unit. There are some indications that families are seeking some new principle by which they can form new composite systems through which they conceivably might regain their former formal role. 49 This has been shown by the response evoked by a number of these studies have been mainly of the army and of industrial establishments, but the principle holds good for other formal organizations. (11; 20; 53).

The growth of cooperation between veteran families and suburban families is marked; Nدرك has noted it in new housing developments (5).
reconstruct the family to its formerly central position in regard to nurture. These experimental efforts are, however, hampered by the current theoretical confusion about the family's status in modern society. Moreover, the vested interest of the State in the nurture of the child has become so pronounced that even groups of cooperating agencies (new composite systems) attempt to assert their position as a "true" organization, they find themselves faced by the most formidable challenge of all—State (3). The whole situation is of new consequences and a challenge to professional workers concerned with family and health.

(b) Team Composite Patterns

Teams are rarely found in isolation, for the nature of the work has to do usually requires the association of larger numbers of individuals than can form a single team (5, 110-111). Especially is this true when highly technological processes, requiring ever more mixed specialization and division of labor, control the production of goods and services, the diffusion of ideas, political activity, etc. This makes imperative coordination of the work of many teams and thus formation of large organizations.

It is somewhat less difficult to coordinate the efforts and activities of a team than to coordinate the work of a composite system, for the function of coordination in large complex structures makes still far demands on the logical and rational faculties of men. It must not, however, be assumed that the demand for logical and rational behavior increases merely in proportion to the size of organizations. Very large organizations ordinarily carry on the highly specialized activities in our society, but this is not necessarily so, and it is fairer to say that leadership in smaller organizations with highly complex purposes is equally demanding in respect to ability to coordinate the efforts of a number of people. This is what is termed "executive" leadership. It is not the kind of leadership developed in composite and complex patterns on a vertical scale. Various kinds of technical leaders with specialized roles are essential as operations become more complex. The matter will be fully dealt with later.

B. Outline of Theory, continued:

4. The Two Complexes of Social Organization

All of a society's interaction-systems of the Incidental, Associative, and Work patterns can be conceived as one vast complex, termed by Peter L. Barnard the "Complex of Informal Organization."

The Family Community Projects of Dr. Regina Westcott in Addison, Michigan and Milwaukee, Wis., The Family Health Club Housing Society of Coventry, England, The Peckham Experiment in London, are cases in point (33; 34; 4; 66).

(8) is a thorough and definitive study of what is involved in executive leadership.
All formal interaction-systems, of familial, team, and composite complex patterns can be conceived as forming the "Complex of Formal Organizations." These dual and interdependent complexes comprise a society's social organization. (Id, chap VII).

Day are apparently universal, for ever since man first began to see society at all, the theory has been advanced that there are "roles of mentality and behavior and two different types of society." Proponents of this theory, from Confucius, Plato, and Aristotle in ancient times to Tonnies, Cooley, and Chester I. Barnard in our own, have agreed fairly well that the contributions to be assigned to the two types, although their terminology varies (73). Everyone is familiar with the "Gemeinschaft" and "Gesellschaft" categories and with their "primary" and "secondary" character (46, 15). "Primary Groups" and "Secondary Groups" in Cooley's terms for approximately the same types (12,23). The term "Informal Organization" and "Formal Organizations", 47 The dual terms appear to be preferable on several grounds, chief of which is their simplicity and relatively self-explanatory character.

2. The Informal Organization: Complex

Although the two complexes are interdependent, Informal Organization is primary, underlying reality in every society (5, pp. 295-296).

A complex, genuine, and the source of societal development, A mix of persons constitute a society only when they are made into a complex 48 by Informal Organizations. It brings a society into being (6, p. 31), and so long as it functions the society continues to exist. Society is because of Informal Organization and its products (6, Chap VI).

Jennings has distinguished experimentally two different types of interpersonal relationship which he terms "psychogroup" and "Dickogroup" respectively (36, ch. XIII).

This Commission finds that Barnard's classification is to be preferred to those of his immediate predecessors, despite the fact that they are older and better known. His fits such facts as have been accumulated more precisely than do the older classifications, especially the facts of American social organization. It provides a more flexible framework and permits inclusion of new facts more readily than do older categories, as we have found by experience. (41, vol. V, 304). Both Tonnies and Cooley show definite bias against the Gesellschaft or Secondary Group type, which they regard as inherently hostile to social organization of the Gemeinschaft or Primary type. Barnard, on the other hand emphasizes that the two types are mutually dependent, complimentary and reciprocal. This seems to be a more accurate picture of the relationship than is furnished by either Tonnies or Cooley.

The generalized sense of a common "character," "agreeableness," "personality", irrespective of the spatial distribution of the individuals concerned (69).
These products are the social phenomena usually grouped under the terms "community" and "culture": norms and customs, conventions and codes of behavior, commonly held axioms and persistent beliefs, rites and ceremonies, folkways and language, arts and architecture, folklore and symbol systems, folk opinions and styles of behavior (6, ch. VI). Informal organization guides the ultimate order of action, in the sense that laws are informal rules that embody customs. It is equally true (as long as the omnipotent, omnipresent state does not repress its functioning) that informal organization makes laws, for no law can be long enforced that public opinion does not sanction.

Community and culture are not the only offspring of the protean informal organization complex. It is the matrix from which the complex of formal organizations springs. The attitudes, customs, and values of informal organization are partly expressed through formal organizations which, once organized, continue to nourish and qualify (5, p. 116, 100). Without informal organization, formal organizations could not come into being and could not exist. The relationship of the two complexes is symbiotic; they are interdependent aspects of the same phenomenon. 62

b. The Complex of Formal Organizations

Formal Organizations—beginning with teams and families and ending with great composite formations of State and Church—develop to provide utilities the general society desires, or needs for survival, which informal organization cannot provide because production of them requires conscious motivation of human effort towards explicit ends. Formal Organizations—such as our predominately rational character—constitute the structural underpinnings of society (95, p. 151) and are indispensable for general social cohesion. They are "structural expressions of rational action" (72, p. 25) through them such social abstractions as law, culture, ideology, and feeling attitudes are, so to speak, "baked out." But it is vitally important always to remember that the complex of formal organizations is never cohesive with the complex of informal organization and must be viewed, under circumstances, as performing only certain specialized functions in a society.

In contrast to informal organization, which is largely covert and of low utility, formal organizations are conspicuous. Families are easily identified as are Churches and States, the most comprehensive single Formal Organizations. During the past 100 years, the complex of formal Organizations has magnified as the industrial Revolution has caused progressive transfer from family and small community to corporate enterprises. The Formal Organizations, such as educational institutions, political parties, propaganda agencies, and labor unions, are equally distinct in form society.

6 "The source of law is not rulers, legislatures, or courts, however constituted, but the people as organized in families and communities of various kinds." Ehrlich, Fundamental Principles of the Sociology of Law. (5, p. 10). 6 a.

In analogy could be drawn with the psychic processes termed "unconscious" and "conscious."
The tremendous contemporary proliferation of, and emphasis on, Formal organizations has led some sociologists to embrace the fallacy that Formal organizations have superseded or eclipsed Informal Organization, to infer that the former are "higher" than, "superior to," or "dominant over," the latter (7, p. 111, 118, 141). The tendency is sufficiently widespread to merit restatement of the fact that Formal Organizations are in the most general sense dependent upon Informal Organization.51

This is true not only in the sense already noted, but also in another fully significant. To persist at all and to perform the functions for which they are created, Formal Organizations are dependent upon the concurrent presence within them of informal systems of interaction that regularize the impersonal relationships of their members and/or personnel, who in small groups develop mutual understanding, intercommunication, common inferences, habitual ways of doing things, and common expectations regarding another's behavior. The symbiotic relationship of the two complexes is not better illustrated; the sooner does a Formal Organization arise of the informal Organization complex than it depends for survival upon the development of associated systems of informal character to sustain its data. Thus the complex of Informal Organization comprises not only the mass of interaction from which Formal Organizations emerge, but also the associated systems that develop within each Formal Organization.

c. The Complex of Formal Organizations as a Social Problem

Because interaction in the systems comprising the complex of Formal Organizations is exclusively focused on function and in that sense is de-personalized, Formal Organizations are, per se, social problems. One could not say that at the very moment in which man—perhaps unwittingly—discovered or invented the principle of formal organization, he created for himself a major social dilemma. Formal Organizations are indispensable to society that progresses beyond the food-gathering stage but participation

1. It is a curious fact that in so-called "free" nations, the importance of Informal Organization is rarely explicitly recognized. But in modern totalitarian States under Party dictatorships, awareness of Informal Organization is so marked that among the first decrees when such a Party "takes power," there is invariably one that revokes all existing rights to free association between individuals, which is the legal basis on which Informal Organization rests. On his third day in office, Hitler took this step, and the measures of Lenin and his successors are too well known to require citation. It is the peculiar distinction of the modern totalitarian State that, in contending that of ancient forms of tyranny, it seeks to obliterate Informal Organization and to force all human association into officially designated channels. The "ideal" is a society mechanismically or functionally organized; technocracy, communism, and fascism are so conceived.

3. These take the form, using the terms in this paper, of associative interaction-systems, network systems, and systems of incidental interaction.

4. Differentiation of Formal Organizations is apparently one of the distinguishing marks of societies above the food-gathering level. The conventional concept of "social progress" is associated with magnification of Formal Organizations.
formal systems necessarily involves psychic strain for the individual. It compensates its members for this strain has been a central problem for any society, if not the central problem. Formal Organizations must be kept from disengaging society can not dispense with their services and products, but this is only a matter of degree. One,scope of Formal Organization is so limited that there is relatively little interaction in which individuals are compelled to view each other formally or functionally, so there is little occasion for them to evidence stress; or, two, the Formal Organizations have developed such highly sophisticated compensations for any discomfort the individual may experience as feels rewarded to a nicety for the conformity to prescribed roles, norms, and rituals which he must accept in order to contribute his efforts to Formal Organizations.  

The fact that formal systems are created exclusively by interaction between beings operating in this prescribed way, although relatively unimportant, is not too difficult to grasp. It is, however, much more difficult to accept a corollary of this fact, that the impersonal type of organization is the "ideal" of Formal Organizations.  

Cultural conditioning serves to obscure, to make unpalatable, to implode summarily to reject this truth. It has, nevertheless, been made apparent by the analysis of modern societies, with their as highly developed Formal Organizations. Much of Western history is a record of events precipitated by the attempts of one or another extremely powerful organization to realize this "ideal" fully in practice.  

The Organization with great power is free to behave completely logically. It becomes a matter of course to make the "ideal" an axiom of administration to treat individuals who participate in its activities as nothing more than cogwheels in function. Social reformers and humanists, looking at such a phenomenon, are appalled and saddened. For instance in American Indian pueblos, villages or regional enclaves in European states, primitive "tribes", or Indian and Chinese villages, ethnological literature relative to such units consistently stresses the satisfaction received by participants in the activities of what we call Formal Organizations—e.g., in ceremonial rituals and economic exchanges. (66, 82, 49, 50, 176). The central problem of Formal Organizations is always that of maintaining an equilibrium between "efficiency" and "effectiveness." (Z, ch. V).  

The phrase of the Communist Party expresses the situation perfectly: "creative leaders are turned "functionaries." It is an article of faith in the Communist Party to find satisfaction in being a "functionary." Leaders are required to do more than merely accept this status as a matter-of-fact; they must transmute it into a moral principle, i.e., the person must be willing to be judged morally by his ability to conduct himself as a function of the Party. The Moscow trials of '37 showed conclusively how strong was the moral commitment of the functional type. (16, ch. 2).
in a powerful head of such an organization, and holding him responsible for the acts of the organization, has called this phenomenon "exploitation", "oppression", etc. But looking at it from the standpoint of social organization, and without moralistic bias, it appears rather that the powerful organization is set free to carry its logic to extremes.

With the strictest logic, an omnipotent State reduces its citizens to objects without individual rights; an omnipotent Church with great temporal power and equal logic, ruthlessly stamps out individual value-judgments and value-thought; or highly powerful industries "rationalize" their operations so completely that their employees are nothing but "workers", or they use the customers! (76, 77)

Some or other, informal systems whose members will not brook the cold, Meistert logic of de-personalized status revolt in concert against it, and with explosive repercussions. They overthrow tyrannical governments; 46 new, free established churches; restrict industrial output, join labor unions, resort to strikes and sabotage. So does Informal Organization tear away and repudiate one or another of the Formal Organizations it sets up and then to make a new start. Because it is vulnerable to dissolution of this sort, any particular Formal Organization is essentially ephemeral, derivative, expedient, and secondary. As a type of human association, however, the insubstantiality of Formal Organizations is made only too manifest by history, when one Organization is deliberately overthrown, a substitute is always ready in its place, save when the functions it performs are no longer served by Informal Organization—as apparently was the case with some of the real organizations under French feudalism, which were never "restored" after a dissolution.

Such violent attacks on Formal Organizations are by no means inevitable. They occur only when a Formal Organization gains overweening power. When power of any one Formal Organization over society as a whole is restricted, there is a plurality of Formal Organizations available. The compulsory limits that participants in Formal Organizations themselves throw up to limit their integrity can provide a sufficient bulwark against any Organization's tyranny.

Unless such governments are semicompetent and omnipotent, in totalitarian States, Informal Organization is reduced to impotence, its marginal remainders being driven "underground."

The only Formal Organization in the Western world more than a thousand years old is the Catholic Church.

This is one of the consequences of revolution that produces disillusionment with the belief that "society can be reformed." The startling similarity of Formal Organizations before and after a Revolution has created the concept "counter-revolution," or "restoration." Strictly speaking, however, a Revolution actually does mark the destruction of one Formal Organization and creation of others in their places with different personnel, whose inter-personal relations create the new Formal Organizations. Only to outward appearances are they the "same" organizations.
For it is universally true that participants in formal systems, mostly
what explicit awareness, develop their own protections against carrying
referred to as de-personalization too far: they spontaneously organize the
ideal systems mentioned earlier in this report as invariably associated
with formal Organizations. These are absolutely indispensable to mitigate
systematic participation in the activities of a formal Organization;
that the individual personality is in danger of disintegration.

But-and this is the all-important aspect of these informal systems from
an standpoint of planning for mental, health, education, or any form of social
affairs-are highly vulnerable. They have not yet attained standing in
oral Organizations, where their function is as yet imperfectly, or not at
all understood. The public is equally ignorant about them. As a conse-
quence of the new scientific studies, however, alluded to in the opening par
graphs of Part Two, experimental practical programs directed towards aiding
have been initiated. But in general, what associated informal systems
asplain today is achieved against the formidable odds of misunderstanding,
derivation, and lack of recognition of their indispensable role in
(20, 51, 52, 53, 70, 86). They are in the precarious position of any
organization that exists by sufferance.

If heads of Formal Organizations are "easy-going" and/or intuitively
aware of the importance of informal systems, or are too enlightened to use
police against the infringement of organization to exploit people, and do not arbitrarily
meet or interfere with the functioning of informal systems, these become
heads to the Formal Organization, contributing towards achievement of its
goals in many ways. When administrators do not recognize the human

"It is undeniable that major executives and even entire executive
organizations are often completely unaware of widespread influences,
attitudes, and agitation within their organizations, (whether they be)
political organizations, governments, unions, churches, or universities." (p. 121)

These are taking two forms: (1) study of such groupings in industry,
the army, colleges, schools, etc.; (2) bringing informal systems to the
surface by giving the clientele of Formal Organizations the opportunity
to choose team-mates. (37; 60; 61)

But informal Organization can also become so strong that it helps to
create what is known as "bureaucracy", when the operations of a Formal
Organization accrue to the benefit of its personnel instead of its
disks because the operations come to be considered in the interests of
the informal associated-systems. A recent interesting example was the
temporary rule exercised by Community in the New York Welfare Depart-
ment. Via-one of the Welfare Department, the community "cells" were
associated informal systems.

"Wild-cat strikes" are a different kind of manifestation of informal
associated systems. Here the activity is not bureaucratic, but an
attempt is made to abort the operation of the Formal Organization.

About informal associated systems must be prevented from "taking over
power" in a Formal Organization, nevertheless they must be given ample
hope for performing their indispensable functions and their indispensa-
ness as means of communication and cohesion must be recognized. (6,
ch. VI)
Full comprehension of the facts set forth here as to the function of formal interaction-systems in Formal Organizations are of the very highest importance to layman and professional leaders interested in programs for social welfare. We desperately need multi-discipline research to discover principles by which the strains of participation in Formal Organizations or best be minimized, so that these principles can be taught to executive leaders, to the end that in our culture we can establish patterns of administration that will create conditions of harmony which approximate those of primitive societies. The current move the world over to raise the State to such dominance over all Formal Organizations offers no promise whatever of solving this problem; on the contrary, it could only exacerbate it.

PART THREE
Application of the Theory to Leadership and Authority in the Local Community

We shall now apply to the local community the findings of the theory we have described. These findings indicate that as a social organization a local community is a localized complex of small interaction-systems of both formal and informal types with overlapping memberships, whose inter-communica-
tion and interdependentoulings define the community’s boundaries.

Included in Informal Organization are all the small systems in which interaction, and the activities and emotions associated with it, are pri-
marily ends in themselves rather than means to ends. Included in Formal organizations are all the formal, teams, and composite systems which require various coordination of human effort towards explicit ends.

Three different forms of leadership are associated with the three different patterns of interaction-systems in Informal Organization. These are generally categorized as informal leadership, but the term defines only one of our characteristics. Since the complex of Informal Organization is the foundation on which informal leadership arises, and the complex is primary or original, we can postulate that Informal Leadership is primary of original, as well as real.

2. Emergency Leadership

When normal functioning of the community is disturbed, the incidental, spontaneous, pattern of interaction system gives rise to emergency leader-
ship. Panic results if leaders do not emerge from, or impose themselves on, the "mass" created by accidents, emergencies, violent disturbances, or breakdown of a Formal Organization, etc. The influence of these leaders, of course, ephemeral. Precipitated by the emergency situation, it passes out that situation, unless some form of more permanent interaction-system
helps as a result of the emergency, when the leader may have an opportunity unusual to exert influence.

An interesting example occurred recently in New York in an area in which were precipitated a hostile demonstration by Negroes against whites. Violent disturbance was perceived by a white social worker who telephoned a politician with much influence, but the latter wisely relayed the news to a Negro preacher, who rushed to the scene and succeeded in calming the angry mob's prestige among whites to whom he was previously unknown was nearly strengthened by this performance.

b. Nuclear Leadership

The associated pattern of interaction-system gives rise to a more stable and leadership, as systems of this pattern comprise the bulk of informal systems, and are therefore of the highest importance of society. Leadership in these systems might well be termed nuclear leadership. The highly complex phenomenon when viewed microscopically and recently some silent studies about it have been published. These should be consulted for more information on the subject, as space does not permit summarizing of material here. (28) All that will be attempted is an outline of more pertinent findings of these studies.

All the reports agree on one fundamental point: that nuclear leadership organizes configuration into which many variables enter. It is not a matter of pure or static traits of the leader's personality; it is one of the dynamics of the interpersonal relations that create associated interaction-systems. (25) (36)

In reports also agree that leaders are spontaneously chosen by the other men of the system. A variety of reasons combine to accord high rank (status) to specific individual. First among these is the high degree of emotional and personal traits in his associates. He protects their ego-needs (not merely consciously), while satisfying his own, helps to give them emotional equilibrium while he seeks it for himself. (36). He senses his direction in that men are striving to move. He intuitively grasps the total situation in which the system is involved. He helps the system attain any concrete which the leaders may from time to time select. He endeavors to maintain the system in equilibrium (33, ch. 6; 67, Part III).

Secondly, the leader conforms more closely to the norms of the system than the other members. Whatever may be the control he exercises over the man of the system, he is equally controlled by them, for retention of his leadership is contingent on his conforming to the norms the system evolves with expectations of the members regarding the behavior proper to his role (ch. 9). Moreover, he constantly reinterprets this in line with the various expectations of his associates.

For bibliographies, see (71, 21).
One notable feature of this form of leadership, highly important psychologically, is that the psychological processes that enter into the notion of leadership are often not within the awareness of each member who participates in the process. So much is this so that reliable students of the phenomenon have discovered many leaders quite unaware of being leaders, many systems whose are not at all alert to the high rank they have reaped their leaders. Hence, all these people perform the indispensable odd function of maintaining order in the primary interaction-systems of the community without being aware of doing so.

Nuclear leadership is, as a rule, rather fluid. As changes occur in entities, or in the environmental situation of the system, or in the mutating personalities, leadership may be transferred from one individual another. On the other hand, a highly adaptable personality may prove satisfactory as a leader over a long period of time and retain his rank many years (67, Part III).

One additional observation must be made. Although nuclear leadership is called "grass-roots" leadership, it must not be assumed that it is necessarily "democratic". If the members of a small interaction-system have no objection to it, the nuclear leader may give free rein to his wish to dominate others and some leaders are extremely autocratic in his behavior. So long as this does not disturb the equilibrium of the group, and its activities satisfy its members, so long as the followers receive a necessary emotional support from the leader, and he conforms to the norms which they subscribe, the leader's autocracy, or even at times tyrannical, control will not be challenged. This is normally the situation in "groups". In other words, so long as the satisfactions that the members draw from being part of an interaction-system evenly balance or outweigh the satisfactions they might gain from withdrawing from the system, even the most autocratic leader can retain his rank. (33, ch. 8).

The fact that such is the case, however, does not warrant drawing the conclusion that these systems deny liberty to the individual. The very social expressions of individual liberty of choice and action. Within these systems, the individual is potentially free to move as he pleases, to create his own psychic environment, to give rein to his inclinations. He is under no constraint subject himself to an autocratic rule. In doing so, he merely shows that such leadership does not prevent the securing satisfaction of psychological needs highly important to him.

So long as only a minute fraction of its associative interaction-systems is controlled by autocratic leaders, the liberty of a community is not impaired. But if autocratically-controlled groups become statistically numerous so that they can be marshalled for social action in their own self-interests, or the leader's interests, against the general community.

B. Studies conducted by John Shen of the U.S. Department of Agriculture for a purpose of discovering latent leaders of a local community seem to indicate that persons in informal interaction-systems need to be made aware of who their natural primary leaders are before they can give recognition. See also (66, p. 171.)
General liberty is correspondingly endangered, no matter what services continue to be paid it, or what legal protections it enjoys, and even, "a chain is only as strong as its weakest link." It applies to liberty. Liberty is only as strong as the liberty of the individuals organized in the community's associative interaction-systems.

Leadership and Chain-interaction of Networks

The role played by networks in leadership has not been studied sufficiently to provide many generalizations about it. There is no doubt that in chain-interaction, the performance of the individuals who hold leadership positions in associative interaction-systems, or have behaved as such in emergencies, is evaluated and analyzed, as is also the performance of formal leaders. Along these chains passes the news of who is, and who is not, a leader, the leaders of associative interaction-systems of teams or work-sets of families, of composite and complex systems, in this way coming to be recognized by other persons as leaders of their system. It can be no doubt that the prestige of both informal and formal leaders is at least partly, if not wholly, a product of chain-interaction, as chains may accord a leader prestige, others may deny it, and still others may accord the same person with approval, an informal or a formal leader's reputation on the chains where he is favorably known is essential in his career and often a decisive factor in his promotion from one position to another in the community's organizations.

The informal networks within Formal Organizations are particularly potent in this respect. The judgments of networks are always taken into account by the wise executive in making promotions from one grade to another in the hierarchy of Formal Leadership. Political performance similarly is a product of chain-interaction. At the polls different chains of opportunity publicly to register their opinions about candidates constitute some degree at least—possibly in great degree—on their nominations. The regulations built by chain-interaction, but much of the evaluation leaders on networks is characteristically covert, as is so much promotion in the Informal Organization complex. Chain-interaction leaders have been called "the underground" by accident.

A very interesting subject for study of the part chain-interaction plays leadership would be the primary stages of the "underground" organizations during World War II. That they began with the activities of local leaders and local networks is strongly indicated by such facts as have been said about them. Only after numbers of local networks had been interlinked did local leaders did an underground organization emerge sufficiently to be formalized and work under the direction of a hierarchy of secret leaders. The objeets of bands and revolutions, networks become active and important factors in leadership. They link the leaders of local bands of revolutionists with one another, and similarly link together groups of sympathizers. Only where networks break down or fail to achieve linkage of local leaders do one another the opposition drive a wedge between the revolutionists.

B. Formal Leadership

1. Formal Leadership is Secondary

In formal interaction-systems in a local community (as in a society) are conceptually grouped in the comprehensive complex of Formal Organizations: families, schools, church-membership corporations such as the legion, labor unions, etc., professional or welfare organizations.
Formal leadership can not be further described without coming to grips with the concept which invariably induces controversy—authority. It is essential to analyze this concept, as the mere word itself often sparks an argument, so it is necessary to proceed cautiously.

2. Authority—What Is It?

Authority may be defined either psychologically or sociologically. Unfortunately, writers are not as careful as they might be in distinguishing between the two. Often they use both meanings indiscriminately in a single sentence, thus creating inextricable confusion. Our concern here is only with its sociological aspect. The Oxford Dictionary says that

Authority may mean:

- Power or right to enforce obedience;
- the right to command;
- the right to give an ultimate decision;
- derived or delegated power;
- legal supremacy;
- expertness.

Authority comes from the Latin, meaning "the author or prince mover of a thing, originally the inventor or grower, signifying that power which is used in the prime mover...authority includes the idea of right non-neglectful, as in...office and relation give authority." (I1) (Our italics)

Influence, also from the Latin, "rules the state or power of setting an object so as to set it or move it, but is altogether connected with any art to direct. Personal attachment and a variety of circumstances give it, commonly acts by exclusion. Ascendancy and sway are mode of action, differing from it only in degree. They both imply an executive and some degree of influence over the mind, independently of reason." (11) (Our italics)
In the light of these definitions, Oxford's list of possible meanings might to "authority" can be arranged in two categories: (1) meanings having to do with the right to direct, with force or consent, delegated or not; (2) meanings having to do with influence, ascendency or sway. 46 meanings falls in both categories. One who is an expert may be delegated to power associated in the column on the right; or he may possess only the powers listed in the other column.

3. Authority and Formal Leadership

The definition makes clear that the basic meaning of authority is the right to direct. Whence arises this right in society?

A hint is given in the original meaning attached to the term—"the power derived from the property of a person"—on which the meaning is based that authority is associated with social position. Only by virtue of having a position of power can a person be invested in the one who can change or make grow. Simple sociological evidence supports the proposition that the phenomenon of authority, like that of leadership, is associated with the social system. But it is not associated with every interaction system. It is the power of a specific kind.

We have seen that Formal Organizations are deliberately created to satisfy a need not satisfied by the system of Informal Organization; that their purpose was necessarily explicit. To achieve an explicit purpose, conscious elaboration of human effort is required. Conscious coordination requires action to be effective, direction must be coupled with the right to direct, with authority. Hence, authority is obviously essential to Formal Organizations.

a. The Source of Authority

Whence do Formal Organizations universally derive their authority? The question we must address ourselves before we can understand the basic use of authority in formal, or secondary, leadership.

Formal Organizations could receive the necessary grants of authority, for instance, in only one way from the Informal Organization complex. It is the primary, undifferentiated source of authority; the form of organization with power to create authority and to delegate it. Authority it delegates is always implied in action to that necessary to the purpose; grants are specific and not general.

In some cases Informal Organization makes grants of authority spontaneously, directly, as to families and Churches; in others, formally and indirectly by issuance of charters or other authoritative documents, which are good until explicitly revoked. These are granted by States to Formal Organizations on

But Chris From has termed this "extra" form of influence "irrational power," thus further complicating an already confused term.
In order to receive then, organizations are required to state their purposes explicitly and define their limits. But the State is itself another formal organization which has derived its own authority, and yet to delegate it, from informal organization, from "Seed, The People," as will be seen in this formal document, the Constitution of the United States. Hence, as will be seen, authority is derived from informal organization. 5

b. The Delegation of Authority

Authority of authority is made to an organization as a whole, and once each enters into social organization it becomes its determining principle or form of organization called "authoritarian," or more explicitly, "executive organization." (58, ch. III).

In practice, authority is lodged in the officer at the top of the formal hierarchy, who is finally responsible for coordinating the activities of the teams or units that compose the organization (59). It is delegated limited amounts of authority to his subordinates, who in turn make use of their authority down the line. By virtue of this vertical arrangement, the officer at the top of the hierarchy is the "cohesive leader." Executive leadership has only recently been studied scientifically, but students agree that it must be acknowledged by each team or unit as the informal associated systems of each organization or despite the individual formal grant of authority from the informal organization as executive authority in any particular organization can not be main- (6, ch. IV; 19; 6; 59, ch. I-III; 33, ch. 16). The inter-relationship is extremely complicated and lack of space prevents its being discussed further.

4. Other Forms of Authority

Before concluding this analysis of the meaning of authority from the point of view in our theory of social organizations, another meaning attached to "authority" must be noted, as it reflects the activity of networks. We speak of "authority of a good wind," of virtue, or scholarship; of Mr. So-and-So's "authority" on a certain subject; of the "authority of the dictionary." This way of speaking is not merely metaphorical, as in the case of wind, but refers to the consensus built up by intercourse among networks. Language of this kind of "authority" are gradually formed by the people whose "views" are so important. For example, networks of communication between different groups of interaction-systems vary in authority they accord virtue. Whole segments of the social organization, not all networks, do not grant authority to virtue. Mr. So-and-So's "authority" holds good only on networks whose participants are willing to concede to other networks the opposite opinion might prevail that Mr. So-and-So's "authority" is not met with in networks with the same segments.

Afterman's famous—and much misunderstood—reservation to the people of right to replace an unsatisfactory government is an explicit recognition of fact.
Don't know what he is talking about. And the "Authority" of one
identity is often opposed to that of another, depending upon the networks
with which participants in such an argument see: their conviction that one or
other is the superior authority. Disagreements as to authority are at
the heart of such community conflict.

7. The Problem Posed by Authority in the Local Community

In the local community, we find any number of Formal Organizations,
occupying specific amounts of authority, which has been granted to them.
Local organizations, either directly or indirectly. Among such Formal
structures are local government, churches, educational systems, industries, business enter-
prises, political parties, labor unions, membership corporations for
church, welfare, or other general purposes, etc.

We have noted before that because of its peculiar nature, the complex
formal organizations as, local politics, a social problem in every advanced
industrial society. Nowhere is this more sharply evident than in the
local community.

During the past century, extraordinary developments in technological
means have occurred—en production of industrial goods, in long-distance
communication and transportation, in manufactures, in dissemination of
knowledge, etc. New types of Formal Organizations to manipulate these
means have in consequence changed the social scene—such as great
industrial industries, national labor unions, large-scale publicity and
advertising agencies, and highly centralized "welfare" governments.
A complex of Formal Organizations comprising such units may still be dependent
somehow on the whole complex of informal relations in any one society. But as a practical matter this relative
autonomy definitely does not hold when Formal Organizations of national
scope confront the informal organization of any one community.

Their authority, separate or combined, is often so great that the local
community is helpless before it. Formal Organizations possess inherent life
structures that must expand their activities. When this expansion takes a
form that is at variance with the wishes or desires of the local community, the informal
organization, the latter has not yet evolved means of controlling it.

Indeed, Formal Organizations in any one local community received their
sense of authority from the Informal Organization of that community, as the
source of power to constrain and control them. But almost everywhere
this is no longer true.

Moreover, the high degree of specialization now characteristic of
societies, exacerbates this situation. As we have noted Formal
Organizations require associated informal systems to maintain cohesion and
balance the behavior of the participating personnel. The specializations
usually involve highly specialized jargons, and the activities of the
local systems associated with each Formal Organization vary widely.
The former unity of informal organization is being broken down through
plagues of innumerable secondary informal organizations with customs
languages of their own central around one or another Formal Organization.
The aggrandizement of Informal Organization creates barriers that seriously interfere with the development in our day of that unity and common culture that have been the products of Informal Organization from the timeless, non-economic, and non-partisan crusader to the control and restraint of the Informal Organizations which, in the last analysis, use their authority to it.

The symptoms of the problem become especially noticeable when we take most of Informal Organizations like the welfare departments of federal, state, and municipal governments, public school systems, and voluntary or religious agencies. These public and private organizations are directed directly by formal organizations. Their powers are so great that executive function of them in particular and due to lack of appropriate education most executives are even of the source of their authority can take of these institutions entire structure so which the public that are organized to such business are more than a double of "formalism plus.

The public school systems of many cities are a case in point. Parents put out of the schools their children attend in effect absolutely that only sense of their authority is what the public are willing to take with what they regard as usurpation of authority by executive function of the public schools. To protect themselves from violent spontaneous family violence, school officials are now "organizing" communities. So, under similar reasons, are public welfare departments, health departments, recreation agencies, etc. It is obvious that "community organization by authoritarian executive hierarchy can never be anything more than an organization of "captive communities." Moreover, duplication of such types by authoritarian Informal Organization accentuates the situation used by the aggrandizement of Informal Organization previously discussed.

6. The Need for Equilibrium

A equilibrium between the equal x of Informal Organization and that local organizations must eventually be re-established in the local community the community must inevitably succumb to the disintegrating effect of fragmentary Informal Organizations. Conceivably there are some combinations that, forces, and insights—though probably not easy—by means of which a stable equilibrium could be obtained (6, chap. V).

This would appear to require at least, first, widespread recognition of the logical dependence of Formal Organizations on the Informal Organization in the local communities in which they are located, together with change in roles and functions of great national organizations of every kind. Second, would require encouragement and support of the associative interaction both within and outside Formal Organizations, as the development of a common culture in a local community depends in large measure upon the vigorous functioning of this pattern of interaction-system. Such a shared in every local community in the which the uncontrolled activities of Informal Organizations, or excessive mobility, have not reduced all human
The extraordinarily rich resources of privately-supported Formal Organizations, which institute of research, universities, museums, adult education, unions, recreation and "character-building" agencies, etc., could be placed at the disposal of the associative interaction-systems of local community by a mere change in administrative policy, whereby their activities served without invasion of their autonomy. Instead, these sessions, despite their announced cultural aims, now pursue the policy of formal organization-centered programs of activities that completely ignore other organization of the community. Participation in their activities apart of their services is contingent upon the individual's disassociation himself from his intimates (1). Thus, although they are supposed to serve local community, in their own way they help seriously to weaken its informal fabric and further complicate the problem posed by authority.

6 The inability of the citizens of a local community to control or restrain activities of Formal Organizations which they feel injure their interests, lose of unity in Informal Organization, and the low status accorded these interaction-systems, combine to affect adversely the mental health of individual members of every community where these tendencies have begun.

The community's feebleness relative to its Formal Organizations works upon the individual's faith in the power of the local community to defend those forces that are beyond its control. Supplication of its own organization robs him of the sense of confidence in himself and his faith that is generated when all of a community's interaction-system share ideals and perspectives. The low regard in which assciative interaction-systems are held makes for awkward, feeble, self-indulgent and socially insignificant, the disheartening conviction grows ground that only participation in the "desirable programs" of Formal Organizations is worthwhile. To such a disintegration, association, with the psychological support it is, is daily sacrificed.

The result is that almost everyone feels frustrated, or uncomfortably and, about his way of life. This can not but be reflected in the state and health of the members of the community, for the association between health and satisfying intimate interaction with others has been firmly firmly.

7. The Leadership Situation of the Worker or Professional Worker

In the past quarter-century, there has grown up in the United States a "expert" leadership in welfare activities 67b that has assurred such programs in nutrition, dental hygiene, school nursing, maternal health, family counseling, adult education, child welfare, etc., public housing, agricultural extension, etc.
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sections that no analysis of leadership and authority in the local community is complete if it were not discussed. The number of such leaders is in a neighborhood of two million, which makes an average of about one professional in every 75 persons in the population.

These professionals are employed by Formal Organizations dedicated to work on the community, state, and federal level. From the beginning, these professionals have been employed in a variety of capacities, often they are not members of the communities in which they work. If these, their professional training has successfully supplemented community values and norms with values by professional norms and values. Furthermore, each of the clients in which experts are grouped have developed their own related systems for professional purposes, and constant contacts with other professionals reinforce the conditioning received in training institutions.

Next, these professionals from one community to another with sufficient rapidity to meet their "putting down roots"—i.e., becoming committed members of any of community's associative interaction-systems. Hence, they are in the study but not of it. (27; 73).

At our society has delegated authority to the Formal Organizations for the professionals work and the authority professionals exercises affects daily life in important ways. Moreover, they also enjoy the authority exercised by the associative interaction-systems in the community and in a different way with professional experts, even when the purpose of the Formal organization for which the latter work is presumed to be helpful to the society. The ideas, aspirations, and aims of a small associative interaction-system look at best feeble and at worst silly, when viewed from the lofty and attained by "scientific" training in a specialty—e.g. it clinical psychology, public education, maternal and child welfare, nutrition, or education. In general, associative interaction-systems give experts a wide berth, especially, the clients of experts usually numbers, not members of the society's associative interaction-system, but "laziesters" and near-laziesters, in whose close relationships with groups, are lonely host of the time, and they are friends. This section of the community—a floating crowd of distant persons—receives the bulk of the ministrations of the welfare agencies and swells their attendance figures. It is such persons on whom the client's expectations on the "leadership", and validate the authority, of experts. That leadership is rarely integrated with community interactions, and as yet there is little awareness of the desirability or need in any of the many professions to teach community welfare closely despite the fact that this type of "leadership" has been almost exclusively studied. A small beginning however has been made by the pursuits of "action-research" towards re-orientating the attitudes of experts towards leadership.

---

15a: 80 and publications of the National Training Laboratory for Development; University of Michigan; of Toystock Institute, London, and less well-known attack on this problem is that of Nelson Footo, University of Chicago, who in a forthcoming book argues for "participant observation."

The college foundation awarded several sizable research grants for the leadership role of school administrators in community affairs. A research project on this subject will start this year at Ohio State University under Dr. Remington. Dr. Truman M. Price at the Superman Institute is also working on this problem in the Southern States.
Outstanding exceptions to the prevailing professional apathy regarding minutia social organization can be found among many librarians. Members of this profession have gone further than any other in integrating their unions with the needs and desires of interaction-systems, both formal and informal. Their cooperative attitude toward informal systems is particularly emerging, as they have endeavored to find sound principles for this kind of practical work. They have thus facilitated the discovery of methods upon the training of future professional leaders can be based.

Since public libraries were first established in local communities, they have been warmly welcomed. Students of the situation agree that this is due to the library's never having been an overhead agency with a program to sell. As services have been given on request and librarians have not regarded their professional status as a justification for taking initiative away from the users of a community's own social organization (35, 23, 79). Librarians have set out to promote a demand for their services as "exposure." Their relationship to the community has been through its interaction-systems, which have served as counselors, advisors, helpers, or specialized aides, with the accent on authority reduced to a minimum (11). Authority has not been claimed; it has been accepted by satisfied recipients of service.

Experiments outside the library field have been made to discover how sensitive interaction-systems can best take use of professionally-trained experts. The role in which they are most successful is that of counselors or advisors on demand, the leadership function in the system being attained with skill by the leaders chosen by the members (11). So many such experiments have been successful that the advisability of effecting a new approach between experts and these systems is strongly indicated.

The ability of the system to utilize effectively the help of experts has been demonstrated again and again. But time is required to clarify the relationships between systems to which autonomy is generic and experts are authority is reinforced by their designation by Formal Organizations. In progress has been made to this end, but much remains to be done.

The necessity for a new approach cannot be over-emphasized. When tried, exports into local communities began, we did not have the scientific knowledge of social organization we have today. But we have now acquired sufficient knowledge to guide us in developing more valuable forms of professional action than we have seen in the past. We have well-supported evidence to the effect that if a local community is to make good use of experts their advice must be asked for by its interaction-systems.
FURTHER:

Recommendations for Action

This report has called attention to the set of major social factors that are taken into account in planning local programs for mental health—factors that enter into the social organization of a community.

We shall now briefly discuss some of the recommendations that follow from the facts we have presented.

These facts make apparent the advisability of the following integrated steps:

4. Experimental research designed to discover ways of approximating in the social the equilibrium between the Informal Organization and the Formal Organizations attained by older and less complex societies.

Formal Organizations perform invaluable functions and provide indispensable services in any society, for any explicit goal requires for its attainment the discipline, rationality, and consecutive impersonal coordination of effort that such systems of interaction make possible. But we must learn to deal intelligently with those—which means establishing a relationship among the two complexes that will protect the best interests of human beings in the mental hygiene standpoint.

The alternative to solving our modern version of the age-old dilemma posed by powerful Formal Organizations is already clearly discernible: One can, of course, all-embrace Formal Organization—the State—which pretends missions—will swallow up, or at least control, every other Formal operation in society and use its resultant concentrated power to crush, suppress, and outlaw Informal Organization.

5. Mental health programs that will foster such understanding of formal organization as will fortify and strengthen the efforts of human is to all groups to protect themselves from the integrating consequences of social systems of interaction. This goal is already vital in the new social therapies now being developed by applying the scientific hypothesis of sociology, industrial sociology, social anthropology, human relations, etc., but it needs to be made explicit and general institutional sponsorship, for which the World Federation for Mental Health likely fitted.


This is necessitated by the spread—through direct action like the Point Program or by more gradual diffusion—of Western technological processes across the world in which an harmonious equilibrium now obtains between formal organization and informal organizations.

The history of the past one hundred years has provided much evidence for the introduction of machine processes into 'underdeveloped' or as yet indigenous systems of social organization based on manual labor,
It is evident that the whole scale of values of a society and sets in motion a process of social disintegration which much personal disturbance can be blamed. (20)

Until very recently our knowledge of the strategic role of social organization in the formation of value-systems, norms, social control, development of effective leadership, and social motivation of the individual together with satisfaction of mental security and stability was limited and, predominantly, negative. But the developments in social research and theory which this growing attention have made the integral relationship between social organization and healthy social functioning of individuals and communities beyond doubt. They have also provided indisputable evidence that many social and social problems are indissolubly linked with disintegration of society's or a society's social organization (33).

Social crisis of vast proportions is therefore being precipitated by urbanized diffusion to non-industrialized areas of the world of Western technological processes and facilities, unaccompanied with suitable precautions social organizations of the area concerned.

To develop a program that will provide such protection demands scientific research, experimentation, and education on a world-wide scale. It could be undertaken only by the one world organization with a coordinated interest in aiding the W.H.O.

The existence of or access to brain drain specialists in primer exercise therapy by Formal Organizations.

Such training should provide the kind of understanding that will assure that formal organizations, and fluid, healthful interaction, are developed and formal systems. The training must ensure that the demands of social leaders functioning are directed toward the local community, augmented by informal contacts, and further disrupting its formal organization.

Training of top executive leaders of Formal Organizations for exercise therapy responsibilities has always been undertaken by great civilizations. Paris Churches, for example, subjected potential leaders to severe tests, so have armies and navies. Although men who went into public full of promise in former years may not have been specifically trained, a recent wriggling has recorded that the close association of specific leaders with specific communities and the kinds of skills in which they participated, equipped them adequately for work in national affairs, (78) The funders of the American Republic were in point.

In our own day has it become a commonplace to heap executive snap in a local community to experts who not only have had limited experience as members of a local community but also no preparatory training whatever to make them respect its institutions and ways of life or understand the compositude of its social organization.

The idea of training executive leaders of economic enterprises inspired many university graduate schools of business, but it is highly elastic whether these as yet generally provide training beyond the merely
It is not too soon to say that some form of training institutions for other professions attempts to yet to provide contact with the essential theory on which effective executive leadership in a local community must depend.

Really important is similar training for specialists who are to work with the general public, whether as adult educators, recreation workers, health educators, nutritionists, group workers, teachers, clinical psychologists, or mental health workers. These are given the kind of understanding that will enable them to work creatively with the associative interaction-systems of the local community, to help them develop their potentialities and aid their own self-directed efforts to cope with the problems of our pathological age.

Training of this nature is indispensable to help meeting the crisis of alienation. The peculiar situation of the modern local community vis-a-vis its Formal Organizations imperatively demands training institutions which develop leaders who not only understand this crisis and can help meet it, but are much more than mere technicians with a specialty, and brave to work with associative interaction-systems, upon which cultural development of a community so largely depends.

Surgery

It appears that we are on the way to general recognition that the mental health of a community is integrally linked to certain civil processes, and these of organized interpersonal interaction. It now behoves us to develop our professional resources and to exercise our creative ingenuity in trying to attain the quality of interaction in social organization in local areas that will assure mental and social health.

The goal is clear. To attain it the guidance of an objective, public-minded organization like the N.F.R.L.A. which has a particularly stake in meeting the crisis with which we are confronted—is needed. It is evident

5. The Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration and the Wharton School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University, accomplish exceptions in this regard.

6. Professor at a prominent American university who has dealt with mental psychologists in training programs supported by V.H. funds, recently had in private conversation: "Primarily experience, these curricula are a misorientation with respect to social organization, and one of the faults of these programs, when I have seen, show an amazing lack of insight into the dynamics of community groups...export technicians they may be, for what I have witnessed they succeed only in antagonizing the necessities of the very public... with whom they theoretically should work to cooperate."
At the root may not be not by the lesser organizations, organizations with minor purposes. A new orientation to the problem is essential. This initiative the W.F.W.K. could supply, aided by, and allied with, all professional associations concerned with mental health and community develop-

(signed) Maria Rogers, Secretary
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