

UC Berkeley

IURD Working Paper Series

Title

Urban Communes: A Study of Group Living in Berkeley, California

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6xv2275b>

Authors

Adamson, Lea

Armstrong, Phil

Fleck, Jack

et al.

Publication Date

1973-02-01

Working Paper 208

Urban Communes:
A Study of Group Living
in Berkeley, California

Lea Adamson, Phil Armstrong,
Jack Fleck and Larry Kozimor

February 1973

University of California at Berkeley

\$6.50

Working Paper 208

Urban Communes: A Study of Group Living
in Berkeley, California

Lea Adamson, Phil Armstrong,
Jack Fleck and Larry Kozimor

February 1973

University of California at Berkeley
Institute of Urban and Regional Development

FOREWORD

Two years ago, a small group of students in the Department of City and Regional Planning at the University of California, Berkeley undertook an independent study project of communes in Berkeley. This paper describes what they did and presents some of the results. At that time I believed that it was important for urban planners to be aware of new patterns of residential occupancy that might add to the choice of living arrangements available to people facing the loss of community in their lives. It was also evident that virtually nothing had been written on the subject of urban communes, although a substantial literature on both historical and current rural communal experiments existed. Although some studies of urban communes are now underway, the literature remains relatively small. Most writing on the subject either tells how to do it or else relates the experience of one specific case. Thus, I am pleased that the Institute of Urban and Regional Development is able to issue this working paper.

Though limited in size of sample and in the geographical scope of inquiry, the paper nevertheless represents what I believe to be a valid and useful picture of urban communes and their relationships to other cultural networks that have not been extensively described. The researchers were well aware of the methods that they were using and of their own sympathies and biases. In fact, two have since chosen to live in a commune. The project turned out to be a very rich educational

experience for all of us involved in it. It is our hope that it may stimulate other efforts to understand the complexity and variety of living arrangements that might be possible in a livable city.

Michael B. Teitz

SUMMARY

This investigation is primarily descriptive. Some basic information about both the internal functioning and the external relations of communes and similar forms of group living has been gathered and analyzed. There has been little or no systematic analysis of modern urban group living in the United States. Therefore, this work deals with as many of the activities of groups as we could conceive. Our goal is to describe the current state of communes, collectives, religious study groups and similar collections of people living together in Berkeley, California. From this base of knowledge a practical and constructive city policy towards groups may be developed.

The investigation was divided into two parts: 1) A search of the literature of psychology, sociology and other fields related to patterns of living, and a series of interviews with individuals representing institutions connected to groups from the counter-culture, the bureaus of the city government and the immediate neighborhoods of specific groups; and 2) A series of interviews with members of fourteen separate groups of people living together in Berkeley. No literature of significance about modern urban group living in the United States was located. A great deal of information was obtained by the interviews with individuals related to and inside of groups.

We did not construct a definition of groups. Because of the great variations between the groups visited and the subtlety of the common sense of family that distinguished these groups from rooming

houses and students' social clubs, no simple definition seemed possible. Nevertheless, we are satisfied that these groups had a common quality that makes them identifiable and different.

The memberships of the groups and the institutions of the counter-culture comprise a unique social system living throughout the general population of the city. This system is diverse and fulfills nearly all of the needs of individuals in it to some degree. It exists by the free choice of its members, and its members are generally free to participate in the conventional activities and institutions of the city. There are no specific laws or regulations governing this system.

Three types of groups were encountered: 1) Groups centered around an organized religion; 2) Groups focused on a non-religious purpose like ecology; and 3) Groups not focused on any particular goal. They varied in size from five to sixty members, all shared at least one meal daily and most shared rent and other expenses. Most group members were white males between the ages of 18 and 28 and came from middle and upper-middle socio-economic backgrounds. Most groups were one or two years old, and the average stay of members was about one year. No common solutions were employed to arrange for the execution of tasks like cooking, the maintenance of a fulfilling internal social environment and the resolution of conflict between members. The groups with stronger purposes tended to be more stable, larger, more authoritarian and more personally fulfilling to their members. They also tended to have more ritualized mechanisms for dealing with conflicts between members.

The bureaus of the city government have no formal policy that we found for dealing with groups. Groups present few unique problems to the bureaus, and an informal policy of cooperation and sometimes

official blindness has developed in the bureaus. The relations between groups and the Police Department are marked by muted hostility. We propose a comparative analysis of the relations between groups and the Fire and Police Departments to determine the significance of the hostility mentioned above.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to thank Abraham Copperman of the City Planning Department of the City of Berkeley for initially suggesting this study to our academic department at the University of California and subsequently offering his advice and criticism as our study progressed. Also, many other individuals in the Departments of the City contributed materially to this study by taking the time to answer our questions and offer comments.

At the University, Professor Donald Foley acted on Mr. Copperman's suggestion and advertised this study in the Department of City and Regional Planning as a directed study course. Without his efforts this study would not have taken place. Professor Michael Teitz acted as director for the course. He spent a great deal of time following our work, advising us on how to go about it and making recommendations on specific aspects of the analysis. His latitude on timing the delivery of the completed study allowed it to improve immeasurably over the work we completed during the quarters we registered for this study. Michael Wornum of the Marin County Board of Supervisors and also of the City and Regional Planning Department at the University spent a long and productive morning with us discussing legal and governmental aspects of group living. Professor Benjamin Zablocki of the Department of Sociology provided us with valuable advice and motivation.

Most of all we are indebted to the people of the groups and counter-culture institutions who received us openly in the spirit of friendship we all admire.

I. INTRODUCTION

This study grew out of a request from the City Planning Department of the City of Berkeley to the Department of City and Regional Planning of the University of California, Berkeley, for an analysis of communal housing in Berkeley. Contemplating a major revision of the housing element of the general plan for the city, the planners felt that they knew virtually nothing about the communes and other new forms of group living which have appeared in Berkeley during recent years.

Our study group consisted of four students in the Master of City Planning program at the University under the general guidance of Professor Michael B. Teitz. Three of us hold degrees in engineering and the other a degree in economics. All of us have had professional experience in science or engineering related activities. As the study developed it became apparent that we were all personally involved in the youth-oriented group living subculture existing in Berkeley either as active or potential members.

Our objectives were: 1) to help develop a practical and constructive city policy toward communal housing and living; 2) to determine the general nature of communal group living and whether it is a growing, viable phenomenon; and 3) to explore our personal feelings about communal groups as we learned more about them. Because of the large scope of our objectives, we adopted a research program covering the entire counter-culture (i.e. groups, institutions relating to groups, external relations between groups and private individuals, academic research and

popular literature) rather than an in-depth study of some particular aspect of urban group living.

The first part of the study was directed towards investigating the literature on communes and identifying institutions which had contact with groups. Predictably, we became snagged on the problem of defining a commune. Rather than be bogged down on definitional problems, we decided to acquire an experiential understanding of communes and other groups through extended informal interviews in the dwellings of a sample of groups living in Berkeley.

Because the label "commune" evokes the image of small and isolated rural settlements to some people, sex and drug oriented groups to others and other images to others yet, we use the term "groups" to describe the collections of people we encountered. This includes groups that called themselves communes, collectives, religious study groups or nothing at all. It does not include rooming houses, hotels, university dormitories, apartment houses, or fraternities and sororities.

Group living can be considered as an alternative living style of major significance. It is widely practiced in this country. It is compatible with living and working in urban areas. Just as industrialization and worker mobility resulted in the transition from the extended family to the nuclear family as the primary form of living, so the apparent instability of the modern nuclear family and the growing practice of group living styles may be linked to the post-industrial development of this country.

We believe that this addition to the choices of living open to individuals is good and should be allowed to expand. Understanding is essential to planning, and our overall objective is to provide a base for understanding the urban group living movement.

We describe the structure and methodology of the study in Section II and discuss the biases introduced by the methodology adopted. The external activities of the groups and the information and opinions obtained from individuals and institutions apart from the groups interviewed are described and analyzed in Section III. In Section IV the internal characteristics of the groups are presented in detail and analyzed. Our conclusions are contained in Section V.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

The investigation was divided into two separate efforts:

1) Determining what was already known about urban group living by reviewing the literature and contacting public institutions and academics in related fields; and 2) Gathering new primary information through extended informal interviews with groups located in Berkeley. This portion of the study was performed between October and December 1971. A brief follow-up study was executed three months later in March 1972.

Our first goal was to establish some base of knowledge about urban group living from which we could plan the actual investigation of groups in Berkeley. We contacted several departments of the City of Berkeley, alternative institutions like the Free Clinic, which provides low cost or free medical services to people in the vicinity of the University of California, and several departments of the University. In addition a search of the literature in sociology and psychology on modern urban group living and of the titles of theses and dissertations completed or in progress at the University was undertaken. The information obtained from individuals and institutions is discussed in the next section of the paper.

The literature search revealed nothing pertaining to modern urban group living in the United States. There is a great deal of literature on other forms of group living such as the Israeli kibbutzim, agrarian communes on the mainland of China and communal settlements of the Hutterites, a group of Anabaptists originally from Moravia, in Europe and

North America. However, these groups have little in common with the group living styles prevalent in Berkeley. Their members belong to different cultures and with few exceptions they are located in rural areas. There may be articles of significance which we missed in our search, but it is clear that no body of academic literature on urban group living in this country existed at the time we reviewed the literature.

After about a month's work, we met with Benjamin Zablocki, author of two books on rural communes and a faculty member of the Sociology Department at Berkeley, to discuss his work and the development of our investigation. He suggested that we had been working around the edge of the community of urban groups long enough, and that it was important to begin contact with groups immediately.

We first constructed an interview outline of information that would be interesting from our point of view and also likely to be forthcoming from group members whom we would not know well. We developed four major groups of questions: 1) Internal characteristics of the communes including physical characteristics of a group (number, age, sex and race of the members) and the processes by which they existed (incorporation of new members into the group, division of labor for upkeep and cooking, sharing of rent, sources of income, relationships between members, outside activities of members like schooling or work and use of the media for entertainment and information); 2) Relationships with neighborhood (acquaintance of neighbors or not, relations with other communes or groups for the purpose of waste recycling, food purchasing and distribution or any other collective activities); 3) Relations to institutions in the counter-culture (the Free Clinic, Free

University, Peoples' Architecture or other institutions); and 4) Relations with the formal city government Departments of Fire, Health, Police and Welfare. A final open question was also included: if you had the choice and means, would you prefer another type of living situation?

This set of questions spanned all of the activities that we could conceive of as influencing the development of a city policy toward group living in addition to fulfilling our private desires to explore group living.

Our interview procedure consisted of calling a group to explain the investigation, visiting in a team of two and conducting an informal open-ended conversation. We were always careful to explain that our interest was as much personal as academic and that it was controlled by students rather than by a faculty member. We chose to work in teams of two to overcome our individual shyness. This worked to our advantage by increasing the amount and accuracy of information we could recall after each interview. We avoided using forms, notebooks and other paraphernalia because we assumed the devices and procedures of a formal interview would alienate a collection of people who have generally rejected established conventional pursuits and living styles. Our interview outline is shown in Figure 1. It was followed only loosely during the course of each visit with a group.

The sample of groups was drawn from several sources. Newspaper articles on communes named and located well known groups like One World Family which operates a restaurant near the University. Personal contacts, including those acquired as the study progressed, were another source. Several smaller and unpublicized groups were located through

Figure 1 -- Outline used for structuring interviews with groups

Outline for commune rapping/information:

Develop contact through food conspiracies. Describe personal motives for studying communes within school context. Rap through four constellations of information:

Internal commune
 Neighborhood
 Alternative communal infrastructure
 Relations with formal City Government

I. Internal Commune

- A. Number of people, types of relationships, ages, sexes.
- B. Relationships between people (leadership, meetings, group activities).
- C. Incorporation of new members (transients).
- D. What they are into (jobs, school, transient).
- E. Division of labor, upkeep.
- F. Rent (how much landlord, manager, tenants' union, about the right amount).
- G. Media linkages (newspapers, T.V., radio stations).
- H. Problems, complaints, praises.

II. Relations with Neighborhood

- A. Know you neighbors. Good relations or bad.
- B. Relations with other communes:
 1. Food conspiracies
 2. Recycling
 3. Collectives
 4. Perceptions and suggestions

III. Relations with Alternative Communal Infrastructure

- A. Free Clinic
- B. Free University
- C. Peoples' Architecture
- D. Other

Figure 1 (cont.)

IV. Relations with City Government

Interface with departments (Health, Police, Fire, Welfare-Food Stamps, Public Inspection):

1. Problems
2. Cordial relations

V. Conclusions (as appropriate)

"If you had the choice and means, would you prefer another type of living situation?"

After interview, write up impressions of four constellations. How do they relate to the commune?

public lists of food conspiracies which are discussed later in the report. The people interviewed in each group were simply those present when an appointment was made or when we visited unannounced.

We tried to develop as much trust as possible in the persons interviewed by carefully explaining our objectives in the Berkeley style, a judicious mixture of committed interest and low key motivation. Sometimes an interview would progress to a far ranging discussion of life and politics ending with our acceptance as welcome guests and a symbolic upraising of clenched fists. Other times if the respondent was particularly tired or preoccupied, the discussion would be a simple brief interview. After leaving, the interview team would write up the interview recalling as accurately as possible all information and impressions that were obtained.

This methodology worked quite well. We were able to relax and talk freely, and almost without exception this was reciprocated. Some political groups were quite tense, but none of the groups visited were hostile, nor did any of them reject us after we made the initial contact. We did not sense any demands for something in return for the information given us other than our personal interest. Nevertheless, the investigation was subject to several biases.

First, our sample of groups was small and we had no way of assessing how well the entire community of groups in Berkeley was represented. Large and well known groups were probably over represented, and older stable groups may have been entirely missed. The group with the longest continuous existence was three years old and the average was less than two years. Also, groups composed of racial and ethnic minorities and groups independent of the student-youth community were completely missed if any existed.

Second, during the extended interviews our team was usually closely integrated with the interviewees so that our own values and perceptions strongly influenced the development of the conversation. Substantial variations of our individual feelings from week to week and differences between members of the separate and fixed interviewing teams undoubtedly imposed biases on the information obtained.

Finally, our informal procedure usually constrained us to interviewing just one or two members of each group so that only a narrow perception from within each group was seen.

Three months later, six of the groups were visited again briefly, and three neighbors of each of those groups (with one exception) were also interviewed. The objective was to estimate the magnitude and direction of the changes that had taken place in the groups since our first visits and to gather information on neighborhood perceptions of local groups which we had not obtained earlier. The person making these final interviews was clean-shaven, had relatively short hair and dressed conventionally; it is not likely that he would have been associated with the counter-culture community by the neighbors interviewed.

Some of the informational biases could have been eliminated by alternating team members and visiting each group a number of times. An effort could have been made to locate people from minority groups living together and groups outside the student-youth culture that predominates in Berkeley. Great insight into the structure of the community of groups could have been obtained by recording the personal history of members of several groups. Limitations of time and experience on our part accounts for these weaknesses. Perhaps the most important failure was our reluctance to inquire about personal matters like variation of sexual partners,

use of illegal drugs, disciplinary policies towards children of group members, the nature and allocation of personal material possessions and modes of transportation. The last is considered personal because automobile transportation is regarded as harmful by much of the youth-student culture although it is widely used by everyone in the area. Curiously enough, inquiries by people familiar with the investigation but not part of the urban group-living community reflected a vicarious interest in the sexual and drug use activities of the group members studied.

III. EXTERNAL ACTIVITIES OF THE GROUPS

During the interviews we discussed three areas of external contact common to all groups: 1) The relation of the group to the neighborhood; 2) The relation to the network of counter-culture institutions in Berkeley; and 3) The relation to the city government. We gathered information through interviews with the departments of the city government, visits to the institutions associated with the counter-culture and discussions with residents of various neighborhoods in Berkeley as well as the interviews with separate groups.

Neighborhoods

We found the relations between groups and their neighbors to be neutral or favorable. In three of the fourteen groups visited, group members did feel that some of their neighbors bore hostile feelings toward the group. However, in follow-up interviews with fifteen neighbors of five groups including the three mentioned above, only one neighbor expressed hostility. Over half of these neighbors expressed friendly attitudes towards their group neighbors. In cases where groups had occupied houses formerly belonging to fraternities and sororities (social clubs that serve as boarding houses for male and female college students, respectively) relations were impersonal but not hostile. The usual situation was one where the group kept to itself as did the neighbors. Relations were cordial but not intimate.

From the City departments we learned that some complaints about groups had been voiced by local residents. One source was apparent

tension between young white group members and middle class black families. Reportedly, black families feel threatened by young people who can collectively pay very high rental charges and thus raise the rents for an entire neighborhood. We did not explore this further, since none of the groups interviewed were located in a black neighborhood, although some were in low income areas. No group member or neighbor volunteered this complaint to us in the course of the primary or follow-up interviews.

Also, according to the City staff, some residents feared that the arrival of a communal group would change the neighborhood atmosphere through poor maintenance of housing, increased nighttime noise levels and increased traffic congestion. This fear does not appear to be justified in light of our interviews with neighbors. Most of the groups visited valued the middle class traditions of cleanliness and care of property. The City indicated that these complaints often originated from older residents who had lived in the neighborhood for several years. We found little confirmation of this.

About one third of the groups visited had made strong efforts to become acquainted with their neighbors and develop a sense of community in their neighborhood, but in those cases the sense of community was found to be declining or changing in character due to the transiency of neighborhood residents.

However, another block where two members of our study team live has nine communal groups and numerous other residents who relate to communal living. The people on that block know each other well and carry out many activities together. People take pride in the physical and social development of the block as shown by the organization to create a park at one end of the block and the development of the yards

facing the street. The residents maintain a vehicle for everyone's use and practice the BEEP system. This is a well known security system in Berkeley. Residents carry a loud whistle and blow it if endangered by someone. On the block discussed here, it is common for 20 to 30 people to respond to such a signal for help.

This last neighborhood exemplifies the sense of community that may follow the spread of communal life-styles in the city. This could increase the stability of population and housing structures and the livability of many neighborhoods in Berkeley. The communal movement in Berkeley seeks to be a rebirth of urban community in which the immediate neighborhood meets nearly all of the social needs of its residents.

The Counter-Culture

Extending out from the communal neighborhoods is an entire network of communal or collective projects and enterprises throughout the city. The term "counter-culture" is used to describe the youth oriented culture in America, of which hippies, yippies, drugs, religious mystics and communes are a part. We use it to describe the people and style of life in Berkeley in communes and other forms of group living.

The institutions of the counter-culture exist as alternatives to the services traditionally available in the city. They are intended to provide goods and services at a lower price and to foster the growth of a sense of community. As a part of the investigation, we visited several groups and institutions within this network. They are described briefly below. In every case the information was obtained by direct interviews of the personnel of each organization.

Food conspiracies. These are loosely structured organizations usually of about 20 to 30 families, communes or other type of group, which buy their food collectively at wholesale prices. The food is purchased and distributed weekly, and all members of the conspiracy contribute to the cost of the food and its transportation and distribution. Some of these organizations serve as many as 1000 people weekly, and roughly half of all conspiracy members live in some form of group.

The Free Clinic. This organization, located in the basement of a church, provides a 24 hour emergency medical clinic and specialized afternoon and evening medical clinics. It operates on a cash budget of about \$5000 per month and the equivalent of \$50,000 in labor donated from the community each month. The special services include a dental clinic, women's clinic and psychological emergency program. The clients and the non-professional workers are nearly all from the counter-culture community. Members of about three-quarters of all the groups visited used the clinic's services from time to time. One of the staff doctors felt that over half of the clients served were from a transient population of travelers and street people, i.e. short term residents who live -- or seem to live -- on the street, so that the clinic was part of a counter-culture network that extends well beyond Berkeley.

The Free University. The Free University holds classes scheduled to parallel the University of California's quarter system. Anyone in the community with a skill to teach or an area to study can organize a course. Four times a year a catalog is published with about thirty courses offered. The courses range from arts and crafts like macrame to vocational skills like carpentry and automobile repairing. Areas of popular interest in the counter-culture like Tarot card reading and

astrology are usually topics of study as are traditional fields like politics, history, dance and literature. The Free University was located near several communal groups at the time this study was begun and serves people primarily from the counter-culture.

The Youth Hostel. This is a place for transients to "crash," i.e. sleep for a night, for \$1. It is subsidized by the City but operated, as well as used, by members of the counter-culture.

Ecology Action. This is a city-wide garbage recycling service operated by a communal group living in Berkeley. They collect waste paper, metal and glass for ultimate reprocessing into finished products. They estimate that 200,000 people have used their recycling center.

People's Architecture. This is a group of anti-professional young architects living together and working with the counter-culture community on various projects. They publish a newspaper, New Morning, irregularly. Typical of their activities is the provision of the design skills in an effort to build a local commune related park.

Other counter-culture institutions in Berkeley include a taxi service that provided free transportation during the People's Park crisis, auto mechanics' collectives, several alternative schools for primary and secondary school students and public boxes for the collection and redistribution of used clothing. The April Coalition, a diverse collection of residents favoring radical change of the city government which succeeded in electing three of its members to the city council during the last general elections, is in part an outgrowth of the counter-culture movement.

It is difficult to view group living independently from this network of counter-culture institutions. People who live in groups have

an entire life-style centered around their group homes and the counter-culture institutions. As we began this study we were aware of these institutions but did not have any sense of the completeness and connectedness of the network. Through these alternate institutions an individual can obtain food, clothing, shelter, physical and psychological health care, transportation, education and entertainment. Many of these goods and services are available from several sources so that an individual has a variety of alternatives all of which are delivered by members of the counter-culture. These activities, which are external to the existence of any one group of people living together, provide an environment favorable to the creation and growth of group living systems. In turn, the groups provide most of the people delivering these goods and services.

The counter-culture network is unusual for several reasons. It is not physically segregated from the rest of the community although it strives toward self-sufficiency as a supplier of goods and services to itself. The distinctiveness of appearance and values of counter-culture members and the limited mobility of outsiders to participate in counter-culture activities that we observed are suggestive of ghettos in this country and elsewhere. However, the counter-culture exists by the choice of its members rather than being imposed by socio-economic or military forces. It exists nearly independently of the city government in a relative sense; the counter-culture inhabitant is subject to the same laws as are other citizens but not to any special laws as one might expect in the case of such a distinct social subsystem. Finally, members of the counter-culture are generally free to use institutions outside of their network as they need without being subjected to ostracism or reprisals by other members.

The City Government

There are two types of relations between groups and the city government: 1) Political, through members of the city council elected with support from members of groups; and 2) Bureaucratic, through the activities of the departments of the City. Many people in the counter-culture supported April Coalition candidates in the last election, and the coalition's candidates made public statements indicating sympathy towards counter-culture members. However, we did not study in detail the political relations between groups and city council members.

To learn about the bureaucratic relations between groups and the City, we interviewed personnel in several departments of the City as well as discussing relations to the City with each group we visited. In only one case were there specific problems. This involved the Inspections Department which found a large sign posted on one group dwelling to be in violation of a public nuisance ordinance. Generally, there were no problems and relations were routine, e.g. safety inspections were usually intended to educate group members rather than to penalize them for the absence of necessary facilities such as fire extinguishers.

The Inspections Services Department has much contact with groups. Their present policy seems to be mainly to ignore the existence of groups. The Department staff feel that many of the groups are in violation of the public safety code, but no massive investigation or enforcement program has been implemented. One enforcement problem is that when groups share rental charges, it is difficult or impossible to identify a single person responsible for the dwelling having a problem. The Department indicated that when there were complaints from neighbors about

a group, their policy was to introduce the group to the offended party so that the problem could be informally resolved if at all possible.

Relations between groups and the Police Department are complex. Based on interviews with group members and with policemen, there is a feeling of mutual hostility. Yet, many of the groups we interviewed are located in neighborhoods with high rates of crime. The counter-culture has no institution comparable to the size, authority and strength of the Police Department, but the existence of the BEEP system discussed above is evidence that counter-culture members perceive a need for controls on certain kinds of aggressive, destructive behavior. Generally, the police seem to operate no differently in areas where there are groups than they do in other areas. The sergeant and patrolman interviewed felt that the transiency of group members was a problem because of the difficulty in locating people wanted for questioning or arrest. However, this is a problem only because there is crime and is not by itself a social problem. Most of the group members interviewed expressed no concern for the legitimate problems facing the police. The exceptions were some of the large and stable religious groups which maintained cordial and open relations with the Police and other City Departments.

The director of the Health Department stated that groups presented no special problems beyond any other kind of group living together. For example the occurrence of a single instance of food poisoning would be more serious in the case of a group than a smaller family because more people would be exposed to the poisoning in the group. Similarly, the transmission rate of communicable diseases is directly proportional to the population density both in a dwelling and across dwellings in a neighborhood. Generally, the Health Department felt that groups presented no serious or unique health problems.

Although this study was stimulated by a request from the City Planning Department of the city government, we had little contact with that department. The Department had little knowledge of the group living phenomenon and was interested in the immediate and quantifiable aspects, namely hostility between single families and neighboring groups and the frequency of groups by census tract. As was the case with our study team, the Department had little sense of the connectedness and completeness of the counter-culture network and community of groups.

Conclusions

Our investigation of the external activities of the group reveals a unique system: the counter-culture. The counter-culture is a self-sufficient set of institutions and people which is physically dispersed throughout the city. It exists by the will of its members as opposed to some exclusionary or oppressive action by the mainstream of culture in the city. Its members are largely free to use institutions that are not part of the counter-culture. There seems to be little conflict between members of groups associated with the counter-culture and their more traditional neighbors. Conflict between group members and the departments of the city government is not great and seems to be due as much to poor communication as to conflict over values or resources.

The conflict between groups and the Police Department is worth further careful study. It is clear that group members have substantial need for the controls provided by the police. The conflict between the two sets of people may be due to fundamental ideological differences. On the other hand, it may be that unfavorable publicity about police

in other cities and states has conditioned group members to dislike police and vice versa. This condition could be exacerbated if delivery of the needed police services was less effective in neighborhoods where there are groups than elsewhere. It might be useful to examine the attitudes of group members and firemen towards each other. Fire protection is needed everywhere, but the firemen have a much less politicized image in the general population that may also prevail in the counter-culture and among groups.

Finally, there are no formal regulations governing groups that do not apply to the general population as well. It is surprising to us that such a distinct and independent sub-culture with a full range of social and economic activities exists in a relatively unfettered way. Based on a discussion with Michael Wornum of the Marin County Board of Supervisors and also of the Department of City and Regional Planning at the University of California, Berkeley, it is difficult if not impossible to legally differentiate groups like communes from families with servants living in the same dwelling or from less tightly knit groups like boarding houses. This may explain the relative freedom of the counter-culture from specific regulation. However, we feel that the presence of the University of California and the variety of people living in Berkeley are responsible to a significant degree for the atmosphere favorable to group living.

IV. INTERNAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GROUPS

After the initial interviews had been completed, we chose to divide the activities of the groups into those involving the group and other institutions like the Police Department, the Free Clinic and neighboring families and those involving only the group and perhaps other individuals but not other institutions. Now we discuss this last set of activities under the heading "internal characteristics." Our division of activities and the labels we chose for the two categories are somewhat arbitrary. Our purpose in this section is to classify groups and examine how they work. The reader should keep in mind that the information in this section is closely related to that in the previous section.

We began the analysis of internal characteristics of the groups by compiling from our records of the visits a list of variables that describe these group-only activities. From our data we identified several characteristics. We assigned a value to each characteristic for each group and from that constructed a matrix. This allowed us to compare the groups to each other by their profiles of values over the characteristics and also to evaluate each characteristic by its range of values. The data describing internal characteristics is shown in Table 1. We discuss the characteristics first and then the groups.

Discussion of the Characteristics

The groups ranged in size from 5 to 60 members. Six groups had less than ten members, and three groups had more than 20 members. The

TABLE 1. Internal Characteristics of the Groups

	Group Identification ^a													
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
COMPOSITION^b														
Total People	6	60	12	24	35	7	14	9	50	6	5	11	6	10
Men	3	34	8	6	16	4	8	3	27	4	2	6	1	5
Women	3	20	4	6	15	3	6	2	15	2	2	4	3	5
Children	0	6	0	12	4	0	0	4	8	0	1	1	2	0
Students	4	30	0	1	12	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	8
Couples	2	1	0	0	3	0	0	1	10	2	1	1	1	2
Animals	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	6	1	35	1	2
GROUP CHARACTERISTICS^b														
Years in existence	.8	3.2	1.7	1.7	.5	1.2	1.5	1.0	3.0	.5	.5	1.0	2.0	1.0
Means of support														
Jobs (outside commune)	X	X			X	X	X	X		X	X		X	
Public Assistance				X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X
Independent wealth	X	X		X	X	X						X		X
Communal jobs		X	X	X	X				X					
Means of recruiting														
Friendship			X				X	X		X	X	X	X	
Advertisement	X			X		X								X
Religious conversion		X			X				X					
Admission of Transients														
Yes						X	X	X		X		X		
Yes, with problems				X										
No	X	X	X		X				X		X		X	X
Turnover														
High	X			X		X		X		X	X			
Low		X	X		X		X		X			X	X	X
INTERNAL FUNCTIONING^b														
Chores														
Assigned		X			X				X	X	X			X
Sign-up			X	X				X		X			X	
Unassigned	X					X	X					X		
Common meal														
Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No														
Focus														
Religious		X			X				X					
Political			X	X							X	X		
Anarchist							X							
None	X					X		X		X			X	X
INTERNAL CONDITIONS^c														
Cleanliness, 1-5, cleanest=5	3	5	3	2	5	3	3	2	4	3	3	4	3	3
Familiness, 1-5, closest=5	2	4	5	5	4	3	4	2	5	2	1	4	5	2
Authoritarianism, 1-5, strictest=5	2	5	1	3	5	2	2	1	4	2	4	2	3	2
Desirability, 1-5, most desirable=5	2	1	5	4	2	4	4	1	2	3	1	5	4	3

^aGroups A through F were interviewed by two study team members. Groups G through N were interviewed by the other two members.

^bOn the basis of information supplied by members.

^cOn the basis of interviewer rating, scale of 1 to 5, 5 corresponding to maximum level of variable.

number of children present in each group ranged from 0 to 12. Six groups had no children and three had more than 5. Every group had at least 2 women, and one had 20. Only one group was comprised of 50% women while six groups had memberships consisting of one-third or fewer women. The groups generally had few student members. Only four groups had more student members than women members, and in only two groups did students comprise 50% or more of the membership. The number of hetero- and homo-sexual couples ranged from 0 to 10, but in only two groups were there more than 2 couples. Half of the groups had 1 or 2 animals, five had none and the remaining two groups had 6 and 35, respectively. In the last group there were three times as many animals as members.

The groups used three primary mechanisms to acquire new members: 1) By word of mouth through friends; 2) By advertisement in newspapers or public notice boards; and 3) By religious conversion. Although advertising of some form was often the initial step leading to religious conversion, the process of conversion required subsequent education and acceptance of doctrine by the new group member. It seemed to us that the process of entering some of the non-religious groups required the acceptance of doctrine, but in those cases the doctrine was not written or formalized, and the act of acceptance was not ritualized.

The age of the group was taken to be the number of years that the members had lived together as opposed to the number of years they had resided in their current dwelling. Their ages ranged from one-half to slightly over three years. Ten of the groups were 1 year of age or older. The rate of turnover of membership of the groups was ranked

high or low. Six groups had high rates of turnover and eight had low rates. We considered each group's policy toward the admission of transients separately from their turnover rates. Six groups admitted transients, and only one group felt that it caused the group problems.

The neatness and cleanliness of each group's dwelling was ranked from 1 to 5. A score of 5 corresponds to a very clean dwelling. Two groups were rated 2 and the rest from 3 to 5. Next, we called the sense of closeness and personal intimacy that we perceived "familiness," and ranked each group from 1 to 5. A score of 5 indicates a very closely knit group. The observed range of familiness is from 1 to 5. The variation seemed to us to be substantially greater than that of the cleanliness of groups. By inspection, the relationship between cleanliness and familiness seems to be weakly positive.

Routine tasks like maintenance, cleaning and cooking were designated "chores," and we found them to be formally assigned, voluntarily performed or allocated by a list that members signed before the time when the task was to be performed. These three arrangements were used with equal frequency among the groups. The groups that used sign-up lists generally felt that that arrangement was quite un-authoritarian. Professor Teitz suggested that the public-ness of the lists created real or perceived peer group pressure on individuals to work as much as the rest of the group. Upon reflection, we agree that this is quite possible, but it also seems likely that such pressure would be attributable to the entire group and in that sense impersonal in distinct contrast to direction by an authoritative individual with whom one could identify personally the source of pressure to perform tasks.

Every group shared at least one meal daily. Had we chosen to construct a definition of the kinds of groups we were considering, this

would have been an element of it. However, groups like fraternities and boarding houses have common meals but were not considered in this study. Perhaps it is surprizing that none of the groups we encountered were so loosely organized that they did not share meals.

We tried to determine if each group had a purpose or focused objective. Six groups had no focus, three were religious groups, one was an anarchist group, and the remaining four groups had orientations that we called political. Although the anarchist group is certainly political in the usual sense, they were not intent upon achieving some social objective outside their group as were the other groups that we labelled "political."

Members in each group related to each other in various ways that reflected the presence or absence of an authoritarian figure or hierarchy. The degree of authoritarianism was ranked from 1 to 5. A score of 5 corresponds to a highly authoritarian structure. The religious groups were the most authoritarian without exception, and the non-focused groups were generally the least authoritarian. Only two groups scored at each of the extreme ends of the scale. The remaining ten groups were rated from 2 to 4.

Each group was supported by private funds of the members, income from group operated businesses, income from members with jobs unrelated to the group or public assistance payments. Only two groups had no members with some form of paid work. Six groups received some amount of public assistance. All but four groups had income from at least two of the sources listed, and none existed only on public assistance.

Finally, each group was subjectively rated according to "desirability" by the two individuals who did the interview. The sum

of their votes is represented on a scale of 1-5, with 5 corresponding to strong favorable feelings towards joining the group. Three groups were rated 1 or least desirable. The three major types of groups were all represented at that level; religious, political and no-focus. No religious group received a score of more than 2. Political and no-focus groups received highly favorable scores as well as some low unfavorable scores.

The numerical scores for the characteristics Cleanliness, Familiness, and Authoritarianism were made by a process of discussion and consensus of the interviewing team. Thus they are subjective in the sense that other interviewers might have scored the groups quite differently on these characteristics. We tried to maintain a sense of the normal level for each characteristic in society as a whole rather than describe purely relative variations. Thus the average of the ratings for Authoritarianism, 2.7, is below the middle score of 3. This reflects our opinion that, on the whole, groups are less authoritarian than more common living arrangements. The average of the scores for Cleanliness and Familiness are 3.3 and 3.4, respectively. We feel that groups generally have a stronger sense of family than society taken as a whole, but we do not feel that groups are significantly cleaner than society. Therefore, our attempt to approximate absolute levels of the characteristics may not be successful. In fact the notion of absolute levels representative of society taken as a whole may be an abstraction with almost no meaning in everyday life. The purpose of this discussion is simply to inform the reader of our objectives in constructing these formal symbolic profiles of the groups.

Discussion of the Groups

Among the fourteen groups we could identify three distinct types: 1) Religious; 2) Focused; and 3) Unfocused. Three examples will illustrate the main characteristics of each type.

Group A (see Table 1, p. 23) in the hills of north Berkeley is typical of groups without any focused activity. Six people live there. Three are women, two of whom are part of heterosexual couples with male group members. They have two pets. Four members are students. At the time of our first visit, midway through the Fall academic quarter, they were in the process of interviewing for new members. They had lived as a group in their rented house for nearly a year and had a high turnover of members. However, they did not admit transients and were very deliberate in evaluating prospective new members. We did not record the media they used for advertisement, but it was successful because at the time of the interview several responses were being received daily. While we were talking with our initial contact in the group, another member came into the living room to relax. He ignored us. The comments of our initial contact indicated that there was some conflict between group members. We rated their sense of group familiness low. The degree of authoritarianism seemed to be low, and our host stated that this was the case. Three months later one of us returned for a brief follow-up visit. Two members had left recently, and the group was again interviewing for new members. The contact this time was the same person as we met on the first visit. He stated that no major changes had taken place within the group since our first visit. The interior of the house appeared to be cleaner and to have been redecorated since the previous Fall.

Group C is an environmentally oriented group located south of the University campus. This group is typical of the focused groups, They operated a communal business which was their sole source of income. Twelve people lived in the group at the time we visited, but the membership had been much larger during the previous summer. The group comprised four women and eight men. There were no couples, students, children or animals at the time of the visit. This group was very sensitive to sexual discrimination against women and went to great lengths to eliminate it within the group. They also tried to minimize the level of authoritarianism. For example they used a signup list to arrange for the execution of cooking and cleaning only after a completely voluntary arrangement had been tried for some months leading to frequent lapses in the provision of meals for the group. They had expelled two members earlier in the year. The two people were less committed to the philosophy of the group and had tended to occupy roles of leadership and authority without the consent of the group. Like group A, this group lived in a neighborhood that was made up of predominantly single family dwellings. The houses were more expensive than in group A's neighborhood. Group C's house had been bought by a patron to whom they made monthly payments. They had existed as a group for a little more than one and one half years. Their sense of familiness appeared to be quite high, and we also rated their desirability from our personal point of view high. The level of authoritarianism appeared to be very low.

Group E is typical of the religious groups. About 35 members live in their dwelling, an old fraternity house above the University campus, but many more live privately throughout the area. They study the teachings of an Asian religion under a master of the faith who

immigrated to the United States several years ago. They are located among older but expensive single family dwellings. Although all of the members had studied together before, their identity as a group living system began when they moved from private residences into this dwelling six months before the interview. This group was authoritarian; the decisions of the master were considered absolute and final. However, he exercised little authority over the routine affairs of the group and concentrated his attention on teaching the religion to the members. Group E obtained new members through friends as did group C, but their master decided who would and wouldn't be admitted. In a follow-up visit three months later, we were told that two members had recently been ejected by the unilateral decision of the master. Another person, a member's wife who did not practice the religion herself, had also recently left by her own choice. We felt that this group had a strong sense of familiness, but neither interviewer felt much inclined to live there.

An Overview

A review of our complete notes of the interviews (only part of which are shown in Table 1) suggests that: 1) The typical group member is a white male from a middle or upper-middle class socio-economic background. He is in his twenties without a wife or permanent partner and without children. There are some women in groups, typically as members of heterosexual couples, a few children and very few non-whites and older people; 2) The religious groups are quite unlike the non-religious groups. They tend to be larger, cleaner, more stable and more authoritarian. However, the memberships of all groups were quite similar in age, sex, race and socio-economic background; and

3) The average age of groups is under two years. This may be due to the non-existence of groups older than the ones we encountered, or to the independence of older groups from the information sources that we used to locate groups.

Given the rapid growth and changes taking place among the groups in Berkeley, the durability or survivability of each type of group will have a major impact on the future patterns of group living here. An internal social environment fulfilling to a group's members is probably a necessary condition for the continuation of a group. This is particularly important because none of the groups mentioned financial problems as a threat to their existence. However, no group chose a focus or purpose to develop and improve their internal social environment. Their central purposes (if they had any) came first and internal environment second. The religious groups were the most authoritarian and narrowly focused, and they had the largest and most stable memberships. Next were the non-religious groups with a focus, and, finally, the unfocused groups were the smallest, least stable, youngest in age and lowest in sense of familiness.

We obtained some information on the mechanisms used by groups to resolve conflicts between members. The largest religious group visited generally settled such problems "in favor of the member who was spiritually more advanced," according to the group's leader. However, in religious group E such problems were often circumvented by an informal rule that members in conflict avoid each other. In both cases it appeared that the process for dealing with internal conflicts was well understood by group members although we did not see an example of conflict resolution in either of these groups. One of the focused groups

solved internal conflict by staging meetings as the need arose in which the members talked until the conflict was resolved. The unfocused groups seemed to be more haphazard in dealing with conflict. Although our information was limited to the opinions of our hosts, who, in the religious and focused groups, may have been motivated to be more optimistic, it appeared that silent antagonism and vocal hostility occurred most often in the unfocused groups.

The pressure for members to conform in attitudes and behavior is the last factor we considered. Not surprisingly, religious and political groups seemed to be highly conformist. Outside friendships were usually discouraged. The common reason for a member's departure from a group was a lack of commitment to the values of the group. Likewise, there was nearly uniform disparagement of conventional employment with regular hours, entertainment like television and aggressive competitive sports. This seems to reflect the current values of the youth oriented counter-culture in Berkeley and elsewhere across the country. However, it is equally important that lack of respect for, and aggressive intolerance of, deviations in attitude and behavior seem to prevail in the general membership of both the middle and upper-middle socio-economic classes in this country. This subjective opinion leads to the tentative conclusion that, except for a limited number of different values, individuals in groups behave in a manner essentially similar to the general population.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The memberships of groups and the institutions of the counter-culture in Berkeley comprise a unique social system living throughout the general population of the city. A wide range of goods and services and employment opportunities exist in this system. The members of the system remain in the system by free choice and are generally free to participate in the conventional activities and institutions of the city. Although this system seems to have some characteristics in common with American and European ghettos, it is distinguished by its physical dispersion throughout the general population, the absence of oppressive forces in the roots of its origin¹ and the absence of overt system-specific regulation by the government in power. Our analysis of these aspects of group living has been qualitative. Prediction of future states of this system would require quantitative analysis.

2. Three types of groups were encountered: 1) Groups centered around a formal religion; 2) Groups focused on a non-religious purpose like ecology; and 3) Groups not focused on any particular goal. A variety of arrangements was employed to deal with the internal problems of groups. More highly organized and regularized groups tended to possess

¹Although some group members feel victimized by oppression in society, they are in groups because they rejected society rather than vice versa. We met no one who wanted back "in" or who felt he was pushed out of the mainstream of society. However, some people in groups may well have these feelings.

stronger survival traits, e.g. size, age, stability of membership and internal happiness. These groups also seemed to exhibit a higher pressure for members to conform in attitudes and behavior. We reach the tentative conclusion that, except for a limited number of value differences, members in groups behave similarly to members of society at large. This is based on the subjective opinion that conformity is prevalent in this country in the middle and upper-middle socio-economic classes.

Our analysis of the internal aspects of groups has been both qualitative and quantitative. We feel that little is to be gained immediately in further quantitative analysis of this facet of group living. An important area that we did not investigate is the history of separate individuals in the groups. Because group living patterns seem to be growing and changing rapidly, any common ideal types of personal histories could well have a significant effect on the development of group living.

3. We found that the bureaus of the city government have no formal policy for dealing with groups. Groups present few unique problems to the bureaus and almost without exception maintain satisfactory relations with their neighbors. The bureaus have an informal policy of cooperation, and occasionally official blindness has developed to further this cooperation. However, the relations between the Police Department and groups are marked by muted hostility. This is an important problem because most groups are located in high crime rate areas and therefore have a need for the services provided by the police. Because of the similar need for and delivery of services of the Fire Department and

the probable lack of hostility between groups and firemen, we believe that a comparison of the functions of the Police and Fire Departments might reveal if there were local causes for the hostilities that exist and their nature. This is in our opinion the most immediately needed area of future study.