

THE UNDERGROUND NEWSPAPER: A CASE STUDY IN
SMALL GROUP COHESIVENESS

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
David Lawrence Courtney
August 1970

545070

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is not customary to recognize the aid given by committee members as a part of their normal teaching responsibility. However, when their assistance goes far beyond the usual demands made upon a professor's time, that fact cannot be ignored. Accordingly, the extraordinary patience and generosity of Associate Professor J. E. Dodson is hereby acknowledged with pleasure.

Grateful thanks is also due the Collective, without whose cooperation this endeavor would obviously have been impossible.

THE UNDERGROUND NEWSPAPER: A CASE STUDY IN
SMALL GROUP COHESIVENESS

An Abstract of
A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
David Lawrence Courtney
August 1970

ABSTRACT

A characteristic of all social groups, to some extent, is cohesiveness or solidarity. A case study of an "underground" newspaper in a Southern city provides an example of this phenomenon in a small group. Although the staff members are harassed and threatened by other persons in the community, and handicapped by the lack of funds and equipment, they continue to publish and organize leftist activities.

Threat from a source outside the group has been found to increase the cohesiveness of a group. It was hypothesized that threat was the primary factor in the creation of the great cohesiveness of the newspaper staff.

The method chosen was participant observation, combined with short, focused interviews and personal data schedules. The observer served as a photographer and photographic adviser to the group for approximately one year.

The hypothesis was not confirmed. The threats and violence directed at the group do not seem to have been primarily responsible for creating the cohesiveness of the group. While threat may have enhanced this cohesiveness, it seems to be the product of a structure of rewards for the group members and devotion to goals which could not be realized through their separate actions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	111
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
THE PROBLEM: SMALL GROUP COHESIVENESS	3
THE METHOD	13
THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE UNDERGROUND PRESS	18
2. <u>SPACE CITY NEWS</u>	23
THE COLLECTIVE	23
THE MEMBERS OF THE COLLECTIVE	26
Kathy	26
Phil	27
Eric	28
Valerie	30
Pat	31
Dan	31
Murray	32
THE ESTABLISHMENT OF <u>SPACE CITY NEWS</u>	33
THE OPERATION OF <u>SPACE CITY NEWS</u>	36
THREATS AND HARASSMENT	48
THE INTERVIEWS	54
3. ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS	58
ANALYSIS	60

Chapter	Page
REWARDS	64
THREAT FROM AN OUTSIDE SOURCE	69
OTHER RELEVANT FACTORS	70
Superordinate Goals	70
Primary Group Relationships	72
Democratic Structure	73
CONCLUSIONS	74
4. SUMMARY	76
REFERENCES CITED	79

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The study of the group is a primary focus for sociology. One of the attributes of human groups, which all possess to a greater or lesser degree, is cohesiveness or solidarity. This is a rather amorphous concept generally taken to mean the forces which bind the members of the group together. Reported here is a case study of a so-called "underground" newspaper (Space City News in Houston, Texas), and the factors which appear to be responsible for the great cohesiveness of the staff.

The staff of Space City News¹ is a small, face-to-face or "primary" group. The individuals who are members of this type of group interact with each other directly and frequently. The group is the most common form of social unit (Homans 1950:2), and thus is an excellent starting point for the study of society. Logically, if sociologists can understand the processes of the small group, they can understand many of the processes which take place in society. Perhaps the small group can justifiably be

¹Although the name Space City News will be used here for convenience, the name of the paper has actually been changed to Space City! due to the fact that a local scientific society had copyrighted the name Space City News for their Newsletter and threatened a lawsuit.

regarded as society in microcosm. Therefore, much can be gained from the study of the small group.

There are many features of the small group which deserve the attention of sociologists; group cohesiveness is only one, but a very important one. Cohesiveness may, in fact, be the most basic attribute of the group since there would be no group at all if there were not forces which keep the members together. Generally it is not too difficult to discover the reasons for the formation of groups--often they are related to the biological requirements of human beings. Human infants cannot survive without the care provided by an older person, and this forms the biological basis for the family. In other instances the reasons for the formation of a group will be explicitly stated by the members; for example, "We got together because there's strength in numbers." However, it may be considerably more difficult to specify the forces which hold the members together when the task which brought them together is finished, or when the continuation of the group's activities subjects the members to stresses they could avoid by leaving the group. The members of groups dedicated to unpopular causes are often placed under stresses they could avoid by simply abandoning the group and concerning themselves with other matters; in many cases the causes they promote will have little bearing on their own lives even if they are successful. Why, then, do they continue? The point here is not that there are no discoverable reasons for these phenomena, but that the

reasons are not immediately obvious. This is the major concern of the present investigation.

The "underground" newspaper, as it is popularly known, seems to provide an opportunity to examine a case of this type. It is an example of a small group which continues in spite of the fact that the group is often subjected to harassment from persons in the community and must endure financial hardships and other deprivations which could be avoided--often quite easily. Before pursuing this further, some attention must be given to the general concept of cohesiveness and to the underground newspaper as an institution.

THE PROBLEM: SMALL GROUP COHESIVENESS

The study of small groups constitutes one of the oldest and most respected traditions in American sociology. Charles Horton Cooley was among the first to focus attention on the small face-to-face or primary group as a fundamental unit of society. He was preceded in this direction by the efforts of William Graham Sumner and Ferdinand Tonnies (Martindale 1960:345). George Herbert Mead and W. I. Thomas worked along similar lines. Georg Simmel "...treated small groups as miniature social systems, worthy of study in their own right but also suggestive of insight into the workings of larger social structures" (Reicken and Homans 1954:786).

There are obvious advantages to working with small groups. As Reicken and Homans (1954:786) point out,

investigators can easily manipulate experimental situations and control variables when the size of the group is limited, and problems of observation and measurement are reduced to manageable proportions. The small group offers insights into larger social systems without the overwhelming technical problems involved in attempting to study a whole social system.

Cohesiveness (or solidarity) has been a concern of sociologists for some time; solidarity was a central concept in Durkheim's work. The empirical study of small group cohesiveness became popular in the United States in the early Fifties, when small group research of all kinds became popular. A landmark study in this area was that of Festinger, Schacter, and Back (1950). In this study of a housing project for married students at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the authors investigated group cohesiveness among the residents of the project and discussed the concept of group cohesiveness in general. The import of their study for the purposes of the present paper is in their discussion. They defined cohesiveness as "...the total field of forces which act on members to remain in the group" (Festinger, et al 1950:164). Of the many factors which might act on a member to remain in the group, they point to two which are easy to distinguish: the attractiveness of the group itself, and the extent to which a member can achieve certain goals through membership in the group. In regard to the former, they point to such

variables as the number of friends one might have in a group, which would make the group attractive. Regarding the latter, they suggest activities, such as bridge-playing, which are more likely to be realized as a member of a group given to that function. The important idea here is the attractiveness of the group, for a number of reasons. This is the basis of their concept of cohesiveness, and this conception has been the basis for most of the research on group cohesiveness (Lott and Lott 1965).

However, some investigators (including this one) disagree with this conception of cohesiveness. Gross and Martin (1952) point out that it poses two problems for students of cohesiveness. First, it concentrates on the attractiveness of the group when cohesiveness really means the tendency of the group to "stick together." They propose that cohesiveness should be defined as "the resistance of the group to disruptive forces" (Gross and Martin 1952:553). These things obviously may not be the same; a group might be very attractive to members and yet have almost no resistance to disruption. Second, they say that the operational definitions which stem from the Festinger definition do not measure the dimensions of cohesiveness as defined by the investigators, and are empirically deficient because single measures of cohesiveness are not correlated. The investigators usually measure the attraction to the group with sociometric techniques which measure the attractiveness of individuals within the group, but not the attractiveness of

1

the group itself. Gruen (1965) also points to the repeated failures of investigators to find correlations between the various measures of cohesiveness. Gross and Martin claim that instead of asking the question (for operational purposes) "How attractive is the group for its members?", what should be asked (using their definition) is, "How strong a disruptive force will be required before the group begins to fall apart?" (Gross and Martin 1952:553).

It would seem appropriate if this definition is accepted, to direct attention toward a group which is subjected to disruptive forces and to attempt to determine the effect of the disruptive forces on the small group.

There have been some previous efforts in this direction, since stress may be considered a disruptive force, and particularly relevant here is the effect of stress caused by threat from a source outside the group. Sherif and Sherif (1953) studied two groups of twelve-year-old boys in a summer camp and manipulated certain variables in order to observe the effects on the cohesiveness of the groups. When the twenty-four boys, of similar social backgrounds, arrived in the camp, the "counselors" took note of friendship choices and divided the boys into two groups, carefully splitting up the friends. Then rivalry was created between the two groups by the device of engaging them in a series of contests in which the investigators manipulated the points accumulated. After the creation of this rivalry, sociograms were constructed on the basis of

the counselors' observations, and it was found that the boys now preferred friends they had made in their new groups. In addition, the winners of the contest evidenced better organization and less disagreement between members of the group than the losers. The losers were judged a less cohesive group. Then the investigators created a situation in which one group seemed to have taken advantage of the other in the matter of the distribution of some refreshments, and this resulted in the onset of a kind of juvenile warfare involving apple-throwing and the like. After stopping the warfare, the investigators again measured the cohesiveness of the group (based on friendship choices) and compared the organization, and number of disagreements between members. They found that the losers, during the warfare, had become as highly cohesive as the winners had been; the threat of defeat by the other group and their concerted action in defending themselves had apparently enhanced their cohesiveness. It seemed that the losing team's involvement in the contest had made it a cohesive group, but its constant failure (caused by the manipulation of the scores) had created dissension. Then its success in the warfare (which was not manipulated by the investigators) again built solidarity. The investigators had thus been able to create cohesive groups even though they started by dividing friends.

Lanzetta, Haefner, Langham, and Axelrod (1954) worked with ROTC candidates in their investigation of the

effect of threat on group cohesiveness. They used forty-five teams of three men each. Thirty-six teams were told that their performance on a simulation of protecting an aircraft carrier from enemy planes (using a plywood grid and models) would be entered on their records. The other nine teams were told that their performance would not count on their records; they provided a control group (no threat). Observers, using a modification of Bales's interaction process analysis, watched the groups. They found that the groups under threat showed significantly greater concern with group acceptance and less autocratic and aggressive behavior. Other differences, which might have been the result of chance but were consistent among the many groups, included the finding that the groups under threat were more sociable, more cooperative, less competitive, less dominant, and showed less conflict and more informal friendliness. They summarized their findings by saying that, "Threat appears to result in a reduction of forceful, assertive, aggressive, interpersonal, as well as task-directed, behavior, and in a greater concern with group acceptance."

Lanzetta (1955) used Naval Reserve Officer Trainees engaged in a reasoning and mechanical assembly task to investigate the effects of stress and motivation on group behavior and performance. The twelve groups of four men were divided into two classes: low motivation (hourly pay but no reward), and high motivation (hourly pay and a twenty dollar prize for the best performance). In addition, these

two classes were divided into groups performing under conditions of "non stress" (no special instructions given), "mild stress" (a time limit imposed and reinforced by periodic announcements of time remaining), and "high stress" (time limit, restriction of work space, subjects badgered and belittled by the experimenter). Observers recorded social-emotional and problem-solving behavior. The data indicated that as stress was increased, negative social-emotional behaviors, such as aggression, decreased, as did dissatisfaction, competition, and self-oriented behavior. Positive group-oriented behaviors such as cooperativeness, friendliness, group discussion and integrating acts increased. A slight interaction between stress and motivation was indicated. The important finding for the purpose at hand, is the increase in positive group-oriented behavior as stress increased.

Pepitone and Kleiner (1957) investigated the effects of threat and frustration on group cohesiveness using a design similar to that of Sherif and Sherif. They also worked with groups of boys in a summer camp. For the purposes of their investigation, they defined threat as "the probability the group will sustain a loss of status," and frustration as "the uncertainty of whether the group will gain a status position." They measured cohesiveness by the number of positive sociometric choices made into the team by members of the team. They advanced two hypotheses prior to their experiment; (1) as the probability of loss decreases

(threat is reduced), cohesiveness increases, and (2) as the probability of gain increases (frustration is reduced), cohesiveness increases.

They involved the subjects in a series of games, which were scored by team performance. There was to be a preliminary round and then a play-off. After the preliminaries, which created a group of winners and a group of losers, the investigators proceeded to manipulate the expectations of both winners and losers. The two teams consisted of boys from a number of different cabins, and each cabin contained boys from both teams. Some cabin groups were told (in "casual conversation" by one of the "counselors") that the team known as the Warriors would probably win the play-off round and thus the whole tournament; the others were told they would probably lose, although they were ahead at that time. This created four experimental groups: winners of the preliminaries who thought they would eventually lose; losers who expected to win; losers who expected to go on losing; and winners who thought they would continue to win. Observers watched the play-off games and looked for expressions of insecurity or hostility, rough play, group-oriented behavior, self enhancement, withdrawal, and power (emergent leadership). The findings confirmed the expectation that cohesiveness was an inverse function of threat (expectation of status loss). They questioned the generality of this, however, noting that it is important that the members of the group feel that the threat is from

an outside source, and not that some in the group have failed in their obligations.

In regard to the second hypothesis, their expectations were not confirmed. They found that an increase in expectation of gain (reduced frustration) does not increase cohesiveness, and they found evidence that low expectation of gain (strong frustration) produces a pattern of withdrawal involving reduced interteam competition and increased intrateam cooperation. There is an implication in this last conclusion which should be mentioned. If intrateam cooperation were itself regarded as an indication of cohesiveness, or contributory to cohesiveness, then strong frustration does aid cohesiveness even though it may not enhance competitiveness.

All of these investigations point to one important proposition: threat imposed by a source outside the group will result in an increase in the cohesiveness of the group. This, then, is the focus of the present investigation--Space City News provides an opportunity to study a small group in a situation involving threat from an outside source, and to examine the cohesiveness of the group, which appears to be very high. It may be hypothesized, in view of the previous research, that the threat will increase the cohesiveness of the group; at the least, it will not affect it adversely.

Although a case study cannot constitute a rigorous attempt to replicate any of the laboratory or field studies described above, it can add the weight of additional

evidence in support of the proposition that outside threat enhances cohesiveness. Or, this type of study might suggest alternative hypotheses for explaining cohesiveness. It may be that there are some conditions in which threat enhances cohesiveness and others in which it does not.

The larger issues on which this investigation touches are those of group cohesiveness--regardless of the presence of threat--and social solidarity. There are factors other than threat from an outside source which are believed to contribute to cohesiveness. For example, similarity of values and beliefs, commitment to a cause, and rewards for the group members.

Some investigators, such as Robert K. Merton, believe that rewards are the key element in group participation, while others choose what is known as "balance theory" (Lott and Lott 1965). Small group research contributes to the understanding of the larger phenomenon of social solidarity by testing general theories of group participation.

Reward theory assumes that people belong to groups because they reap rewards from so doing; the rewards may be economic or otherwise. Balance theory, however assumes that individuals seek associations with others according to whether or not their feelings about those others are in harmony with their perceptions of them. As Heider puts it, a balanced state exists when experienced sentiments and perceived units--in this case people--coexist without stress

(Heider 1958:176). This refers, for example, to the fact that one does not like or want to associate with someone who has some ugly or undesirable characteristic.

These two approaches constitute alternative explanations or bases for social organization. Reward theorists apparently see society as based on a system of rewards, while balance theorists view it as a process whereby groups of like individuals are created and maintained--a "consciousness of kind" approach in the Giddings tradition.

THE METHOD

As stated, this is a report of a case study. This method was selected for several reasons. It is an effective method for exploratory research which seeks to describe the total situation of a particular group. It provides a wealth of detail which may generate hypotheses for further investigation. In this case, the total picture was vitally necessary if anything was really to be learned about the cohesiveness of this group.

As Burgess said, "Just as in perception any object is seen in its total setting as a part of a larger pattern, so any act of a person or group gets meaning in its configuration, or frame of reference, in the life experience of that person or group" (Burgess 1927:107).

Case studies were first used to describe contemporaneous data from which inductive generalizations were formed. The method was made famous by Frederic Le Play,

who used it to study the family and other elements of the social structure in order to explain certain economic phenomena (Gee 1950:230). The case study as a method of sociological fieldwork was introduced by Thomas and Znaniecki in The Polish Peasant in Europe and America (Burgess 1927:116). This method has given sociology some of its most valuable contributions. In addition to Thomas and Znaniecki's study of the Polish Peasant, one may point to William F. Whyte's Street Corner Society, Anderson's The Hobo, and Thrasher's The Gang.

The case study method involves the intensive analysis of a single case. This is justified because it is only through this type of exhaustive study that new relationships are discovered or accurately described, and "every individual case has characteristics which may be regarded as typical or representative of a large number of cases" (Gee 1950:232).

The case study is a distinctive method in social research which is of value for reaching objectives that cannot be met as adequately by any other method (Elmer 1939: 129).

The particular technique used in this case study was participant observation, aided by short, focused interviews (tape-recorded) and questionnaires directed at biographical data.

Participant observation may be defined as "a process in which the observer's presence in a social situation is

maintained for the purpose of scientific investigation" (Schwartz and Schwartz in McCall and Simmons 1969:89). The observer is face-to-face with the observed and gathers data by participating in the activities of the observed. He becomes part of the social situation and both affects and is affected by his participation. His role as an observer may be concealed or not; it may be peripheral or an integral part of the social structure (Schwartz and Schwartz in McCall and Simmons 1969:91).

There are some obvious problems inherent in participant observation, not the least of which is the observer's effect on the situation. If he fails to exercise good judgement (or sometimes even if he does exercise it) he may change the situation in such a way that his data become useless. In addition, the observer's view of the situation may be distorted by the perceptual framework he brings with him, and his observations will not be accurate. The reports of several observers often must be combined to confirm the reliability of the information.

In spite of the problems of participant observation, the technique has enabled social researchers to add valuable qualitative data to often dry and sometimes meaningless quantitative material.

In carrying on this kind of uncontrolled observation (uncontrolled in the sense that the investigator does not systematically manipulate variables to observe the effects), the researcher, obviously, does not observe everything; he

brings his particular viewpoint with him to the situation and consciously or unconsciously selects from an unlimited range of possibilities just what he will observe and try to analyze.

In regard to the viewpoint of the investigator, it would be misleading to pretend that he enters the situation completely objective and unbiased. No individual is without his particular biases, and rather than pretending that they do not exist, the proper procedure, in the view of the writer, is to make them explicit so that those who follow can be aware of them in appraising his work. In accordance with this, it should be explained how this particular observer became involved with Space City News. It is important to do this, also, because the way that an observer enters the group he studies has implications for the kind of information he gathers and the way the members of the group react to him.

The writer first noticed Space City News when a street-corner vendor asked him to buy a copy. This second issue of the underground newspaper, a new phenomenon to Houston, was interesting to the writer and led to a great deal of curiosity about what such an organization might be like and how entrance into it could be gained. An opportunity came soon; the paper published in a subsequent issue a plea for help from the community in getting the paper better staffed and equipped. One of the specifics mentioned was photographic equipment. Photography is a hobby

of the writer, and an offer of help in building a darkroom was welcomed by the staff. Friendships were easily established.

It soon became apparent that this group of people was seriously committed, although they received no financial compensation from the paper and lived under rather trying conditions. Some time after acceptance as a photographic technician had been gained, the members of the full-time staff were asked if they would object to being made the objects of sociological investigation. They reacted favorably, and agreed to furnish personal data such as family backgrounds and educational experience and to be interviewed on tape about their involvement with the underground press. They were not told what the focus of the investigation would be.

There was no discernable change in anyone's behavior after this, probably because the observer had already been accepted as part of the group, and his presence was expected at staff functions. The writer visited often with the staff, attended meetings, and performed the other functions of a part-time staff member, such as preparing the pages on the night before printing. He accepted numerous picture assignments and covered peace rallies, strikes, and other events of interest to the Movement press. His photographs appeared often in the paper during the first year of publication--the period during which all of the material for this study was gathered.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE UNDERGROUND PRESS

In the last few years, the United States has been undergoing the development of what has sometimes been referred to as a "youth rebellion." Some of the manifestation of dissent have been demonstrations of various kinds and the emergence of a type of sub-culture whose members are generally known as "hippies." They are somewhat reminiscent of the "beatniks" of the Nineteen-Fifties.

Part of this diverse conglomeration of mostly young people is a constantly-changing, almost indefinable coalition known loosely as "the Movement." No attempt will be made here to specify exactly what the Movement is, but in general it constitutes an anti-establishment force which opposes the present war in Indochina, racism, and middle-class or conservative values in religion, politics, sexual matters, and the use of narcotics. In short, it is a loosely organized social movement which is mainly composed of college-aged youth. Whether or not the Movement constitutes a viable force for social change is not in question here, and no attempt will be made to analyze the Movement.

The reason for the above account is that there has emerged during this period, and in connection with the Movement, a new form of "grass-roots" or community newspaper. These papers are commonly known as the "underground press." They are not, obviously, truly "underground" since the papers are openly sold on street corners or from newsstands

and mailed to subscribers.

There are other tabloid-style newspapers which are sometimes called underground papers but which are not connected with the Movement; they cater to different audiences and rely on sensational stories of crime and sexual depravity. The National Enquirer is an example of this type of paper. In order to maintain a distinction between the type of paper which is the subject of this investigation and the latter type of paper, the term "Movement press" will be used hereafter to designate the first. Movement papers are predominately political in nature; the emphasis is on anti-establishment journalism and reports of the activities of the various segments of the Movement. These papers, also, should be distinguished from other papers which are connected in some manner to the Movement, but which are oriented to avant-garde music and art rather than to leftist politics, as are the Movement papers like Space City News.

The history of the Movement press begins with the Village Voice. The Village Voice was founded in 1955 by a group of New Yorkers, including novelist Norman Mailer, as an anti-establishment tabloid serving as an outlet for unorthodox views in politics, art, and the theatre (Sim 1969:140). It was so successful that it soon had imitators. The Berkely Barb (Berkeley, California), East Village Other (New York), the Los Angeles Free Press, and others followed in the footsteps of the Village Voice. These newspapers were all tabloid style and were filled with

unconventional material. They were the predecessors of the Movement press, at least, in their approach to journalism.

In March, 1967, with the organization of the Underground Press Syndicate (UPS), the Movement press began to flourish. The UPS is not an organization in the usual sense; it began as an alliance of six newspapers. They agreed to exchange subscriptions and to allow all UPS members to reprint all material without concern for copyrights. By May, 1967, the UPS could claim twelve members and a combined circulation of 264,000 (Newsweek, May 1, 1967). The latest UPS subscriber list includes 123 papers, some of which are in Canada and Europe. The combined circulation can only be estimated. Liberation News Service (LNS), the underground equivalent of the Associated Press or United Press International news services, listed 203 subscribers in its January 1969, list. Membership in LNS and the UPS is often given free of charge to new papers with financial problems.

Not all of the newspapers joined by these alliances are Movement papers. Some are more concerned with new art forms than leftist politics. The great majority of LNS/UPS papers are, however, Movement papers to some extent. The Village Voice, by comparison, is almost non-political. It is not a member of the UPS (which requires members to forego copyrights). Movement papers are the voice of the radical left, and thus the term "Movement" papers; they are the media of the Movement.

New Movement papers appear regularly near army bases and in minority-group communities. Due to the low cost of publication, provided by modern offset printing techniques, very little capital is required for the establishment of one of these newspapers. Almost anyone with the desire to do so can get into the newspaper business on this scale, and the present trend seems to be toward more Movement papers.

Space City News was first published in the summer of 1969. Volume One is dated June 5th. Space City News might be considered to have grown directly from the involvement of certain staff members with The Rag. The Rag, published in Austin, Texas, was one of the first members of the UPS, and among the first few Movement papers established. Three of the editorial staff members of Space City News began their involvement with the Movement press on The Rag, and eventually conceived the establishment of a paper in Houston.

For reasons such as this, Space City News may be considered representative of Movement papers as a whole; no two are identical, of course, but several of the founders of Space City News have been involved with the Movement press since its inception and helped to set the style for many of the other papers to follow.

The group formed by the editorial staff of Space City News, in addition to being representative of Movement papers in general, would seem to be an ideal group in which to study small group cohesiveness. As will be developed in the following report, it has functioned under conditions of

relative hardship and yet has managed to gain, rather than lose, staff members.

Chapter 2

SPACE CITY NEWS

As was stated in the previous chapter, the focus in this study is on the editorial staff of Space City News, the members of which refer to themselves as "the Collective." Throughout this work, that term will be used.

THE COLLECTIVE

The number of people working on the paper varies from one issue to the next; usually there are ten to fifteen. Some of them are part-time volunteers and have other time-consuming interests or occupations; many are students. The seven people who compose the Collective are the only full-time staff members. The Collective is the core of the paper. Describing the Collective as the "editorial" staff is only partially accurate. This group not only determines the content of each issue, but the members write many of the stories, take pictures, and perform the bulk of the physical labor involved in laying out the pages, taking the material to the printer, picking up the papers, and distributing them to sales outlets and vendors. They also do much of the actual street-corner selling. The others assist the Collective, on an irregular basis, by contributing articles, photographs, information, or labor, according to their

personal inclinations.

The Collective is a remarkably homogeneous group. Its members are all young, white, native-born Americans. There are three females and four males. The range of their ages is narrow; five of the seven are twenty-four, one is twenty-three, and one is twenty-five. They have more than average formal education; each of the seven has attended college for at least one year. Three hold the Bachelor of Arts degree. Their college studies were usually related to the humanities; of the three who were graduated from college, one majored in journalism, one in English, and one in psychology.

Most of the members of the Collective have had previous experience in some field of communications. Four worked on their high school or college newspaper, and one was also a reporter for a metropolitan daily newspaper in Minnesota. Of the five with previous experience in communications, four had worked with other underground media; three for The Rag in Austin, Texas, and for Liberation News Service (LNS) in New York, and one for LNS only. The three who worked on The Rag were co-founders of that paper; hence, Space City News was the second Movement paper they helped to establish.

The families of the members of the Collective reveal further similarities. According to the 1960 Census, 72.4 percent of the workers in the United States belonged in the categories of unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, or clerical

occupations. None of the fathers of Collective members belong in any of these categories. They are all professionals, managers, or proprietors. Only two of the mothers work outside the home, and they are professionals.

Except in one case, these families also receive incomes well above average. In 1959, again according to Census information, only 4.6 percent of U. S. families enjoyed an annual income of fifteen thousand dollars or more. Of the seven families in the present study, only one had an income under fifteen thousand dollars. The others ranged from fifteen to fifty thousand.

In addition, these parents reveal the attainment of higher than average educational levels. Of the seven sets of parents, both partners hold at least the Bachelor of Arts degree in four cases, and one partner does in another case. Only 7.7 percent of the U. S. population twenty-five years old and over had had four or more years of college in 1959.² Three of the remaining parents attended college for one to three years, and the remaining two (mothers) finished high school. In terms of education, therefore, these parents again represent an elite group.

According to the members of the Collective, their parents tend to be moderately conservative in their political views. A few of the parents were reported to be

²Census data from summaries in Broom and Selznik (1963:196-198).

tolerant, however, of their children's involvement with Space City News and its leftist politics.

THE MEMBERS OF THE COLLECTIVE

Kathy

Kathy, one of the three females on the Collective, is twenty-four and married to another Collective member, Phil. Kathy was born in Madison, Wisconsin, but her family moved to Houston when she was four. Her father is a partner in a Houston dry-cleaning plant. He has a degree in business administration. Her mother is a high school graduate and a housewife. Kathy estimated the family's annual income at five or six thousand dollars.

She said that her parents engaged in no overt political activity, but that her mother is sympathetic to the Movement and occasionally sets type for the paper. Her father does not approve of her connection with Space City News, but does not actively oppose it.

Kathy attended the University of Texas for three years, majoring in English and history. She was active in drama and was a member of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). She was one of the first staff members of The Rag, and later worked for LMS in New York. Like the other members of the Collective, Kathy is very interested in the women's liberation movement. She is also concerned with the other aspects of the Movement; she regularly reads other Movement papers and supports the local Pacifica Foundation

radio station, which broadcasts dissenting viewpoints. She enjoys fiction, too.

Kathy is at present the paper's bookkeeper; she is one of the two people authorized to sign checks, and she is responsible for receipts and expenditures. Although she does not particularly like the job, she seems to have less need to write than some of the other members of the group. The bookkeeping constitutes a major contribution to the paper because none of the other Collective members are very interested in financial matters.

Though generally in the same good spirits as the others, Kathy sometimes seems slightly more sensitive to the troubles which beset the Collective, and, on occasion, is visible worried. She never asks others to share her concern, but she usually provides an indication of the day-to-day situation at Space City News.

Phil

Phil, Kathy's husband, counters her occasional gloominess by staying in unshakable good spirits. Nothing ever seems to disturb his equanimity. Phil is one of the best writers on the paper, and especially loves muckraking articles on the Houston power structure. He becomes particularly enthusiastic when the paper is preparing an expose of a local institution.

At twenty-five, Phil is the oldest member of the Collective. He was born in Austin, Texas, but has spent

most of his life in Houston. He was quite active in extra-curricular activities in high school; he was involved in service clubs, sports, and the school newspaper. He attended the same Houston high school (Bellaire) as Kathy and another Collective member, Eric. Phil attended the University of Texas for three semesters as an English major. Like Kathy, Phil was involved in the establishment of The Rag in Austin and worked with LNS in New York prior to returning to Houston. He and Kathy have been married for four years.

His father is managing editor for a Houston publishing company and earns approximately fifteen thousand dollars annually. Phil's mother is a housewife. Each of his parents holds the B. A. in journalism. He described his parents as conservative Democrats, but said that they engage in little political activity other than voting. They do not approve of his association with the paper.

Eric

Eric, the third Collective member who attended the University of Texas and worked on The Rag, has been active in the Movement press for several years. He was one of the underground newspaper editors who attended the first underground media conference in San Francisco in 1967. The Rag was one of the six papers which formed the Underground Press Syndicate.

Eric is twenty-four and legally single, but he and Valerie are constant companions and form one of the three

couples which made up the original six-member Collective. Eric sees his involvement in Movement media as a natural extension of his long-time interest in drama and communications, combined with his radical politics. He was editor of the yearbook in high school. He completed one semester at the University of Texas after enrolling many times and withdrawing. He is an articulate spokesman for the group, and his flair for dramatic expression suits the tone of the paper.

Eric was born in Houston and has spent most of his life here. His father is a journalist, employed by one of the Houston daily papers. His mother is an artist and operates an art gallery on the lower floor of their home. She attended college for three years, studying art and architecture. Her husband also completed three years. Eric estimated the family's annual income at twenty-five thousand dollars.

His family has no political party affiliation, but his mother has been slightly involved with organizations opposing the present war in Indochina. Their attitude toward the paper is positive, even though the paper has published material highly critical of other Houston media, including the paper which employs Eric's father.

Eric stays informed by reading both of the Houston daily papers, other Movement papers, and random periodicals, and by listening to Pacifica broadcasts. Eric seems to derive a great deal of satisfaction from his radical

activities, and usually exhibits an irrepressible enthusiasm.

Valerie

Valerie, who came to Houston with Eric from New York, is twenty-four. She was born in South Bend, Indiana, and attended the University of Minnesota, where she earned the B. A. in journalism. Her family lives in Minneapolis, where her father is employed as an engineer. Her mother is a housewife. Valerie estimated the family's annual income at eighteen thousand dollars. She said that her parents are political independents who worked in Eugene McCarthy's presidential campaign in 1968. She described their attitude toward her connection with the Movement as "negative, but not hostile."

She worked on both her high school and her college newspaper, and was a reporter for the St. Paul Dispatch for a short time after college. She left St. Paul to work in the SDS national office in Chicago, and then moved to LNS in New York. There she met Eric. She said that she disliked New York, and a primary reason for her coming to Houston with Eric was to escape from New York's "noise pollution."

Valerie has an easily aroused sense of humor, but occasionally becomes disturbed over political events. She is somewhat emotional and takes her work with the Movement quite seriously. Valerie is the most vocal member of the Collective on women's liberation, and likes to write on related topics. She is vehemently opposed to male and white

supremacy, "the two pillars of imperialism." She reads the Scientific American on a regular basis and occasionally reads Fortune and The Wall Street Journal.

Pat

Pat and Dan compose the third couple of the original Collective. Pat is twenty-three and was born in St. Paul, Minnesota. Her father is an attorney and a board member of a bank there. Her mother is a housewife. Pat estimated the family's annual income at fifty thousand dollars. Her father has a law degree; her mother, the B. A. in education. Pat said that her parents are Republicans, but that their political activity is limited to voting and making small contributions. She also said that her parents are negative about her association with Space City News, but are willing to accept it.

While attending Stanford University (where she received the B. A. in psychology), Pat did volunteer work in the black community near the campus. In contrast to the other members of the Collective, she and Dan seem to be more oriented toward the specific problems of the poor than to the Movement itself. They became involved in the Movement through their interest in the problems of poor people rather than through radical journalism. Pat worked on her high school yearbook but had no other media experience.

Dan

Dan, Pat's husband, was born in Houston. He attended

Stanford University and received the B. A. in English. Both of his parents hold liberal arts degrees. His father is the foreman of a large cattle ranch owned by an industrial firm; his mother is a housewife. Dan estimated their annual income at fifty thousand dollars. He said they are "Goldwater Republicans," but their political activity consists only of voting. He described their attitude toward the paper as "somewhat negative."

Dan was active in sports in high school and was sports editor of his high school paper. Like Pat, he reads both the Houston daily papers regularly and as many Movement papers as he can. They listen often to the Pacifica radio station.

Pat and Dan are both rather quiet, sensitive people who appreciate subtle humor. Phil once remarked that he did not feel he knew them very well. They are the only two members of the original Collective who had not previously been involved in radical politics.

Murray

Murray, the seventh member of the Collective, joined the group after the paper had been established. He is twenty-four and single. He was born in Springfield, Massachusetts, but was reared in Houston. His parents have lived here for nineteen years. He was active in sports in junior high and drama in high school. He attended a Houston junior college for a year, but does not plan to continue.

Murray's father is an insurance agent; his mother,

a guidance counselor in a local high school. She holds the M. A. degree in psychology and has finished the course work for a doctorate. His father, too, holds a master's degree and some doctoral credit in bio-chemistry. Murray estimated their annual income at twenty-five thousand dollars.

Murray described his father as being politically conservative; he is active in conservative civic organizations, and is violently opposed to Murray's connection with Space City News. He refuses to discuss it. Murray said his mother is a liberal. She supports his radical activities but avoids provoking his father.

Before he came to Space City News, he had been working as a laborer at a local refinery and had become very active in union affairs. He said that he decided to leave because he felt that his union activity was not going to effect the radical social change that he feels is needed in this country. Murray works very hard for the paper, and lives in a downstairs room at the office so that he can act as a night watchman. Because of the fact that he volunteers for more projects than he ever finishes, he is teased sometimes by the rest of the Collective and used as an example of inefficiency. This is strictly a joke, since Murray does a great deal of work. He has few interests outside of the paper.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF SPACE CITY NEWS

The six original members of the Collective joined

forces to found Space City News almost by chance. Eric, Kathy, and Phil had worked together on The Rag in Austin, but had separated to pursue other interests. Kathy and Phil went to the West Coast, where Phil worked in a retail store and Kathy in a bank. Eric went to New York to study acting. He started working at LNS after a few months at odd jobs, and he and Valerie met there. Phil and Kathy went to New York to visit in early summer, 1969, and decided to stay and work with LNS.

At an underground media conference in Atlanta, Georgia, in the summer of 1969, Eric and Valerie met Pat and Dan, who were attending the conference because they were interested in starting a "poor people's" newspaper in Houston. They were working there at the time on an anti-poverty project in the black community. Eric and Valerie persuaded them that Houston needed a radical paper, and that it could serve the interests of poor people, too. Pat and Dan agreed to join them. Kathy and Phil had already expressed their willingness to come to Houston.

Having agreed to establish a Movement paper in Houston, the six members of the original Collective gathered in Houston in late April to find an office and to prepare to publish. Their preliminary work consisted of finding places to live and securing basic equipment such as desks and typewriters. The equipment was obtained mainly by foraging and borrowing. They made some advertising agreements and arranged to receive LNS material and UPS papers. An old

House in poor condition was rented (from a University of Houston professor) to serve as an office. The first six months were free: thereafter rent was to be paid when funds were available.

Phil and Kathy found a small apartment not far from the office, and Eric and Valerie shared a large old house on the north side of the city with Dan and Pat--a good distance from the office.

By the end of May, the office was furnished fairly well, the layout tables had been built (of scrap lumber, plywood, and old doors), and the staff went to work on the first issue. This first issue was twenty-four pages long and had a drawing of Pancho Villa on the cover. About half of the articles were written by the Collective, and the rest were from LNS and other underground papers.

The paper was poorly equipped at that time, and producing each successive issue was difficult. The Collective had to write almost all of the local articles, sift through LNS packets and other papers, choose materials, edit it, lay out the pages, have the paper printed, distribute it to the newsstands, and sell papers on the street with very little help from anyone. After the fourth issue, eight weeks later, they decided that things were too poorly organized to continue. They elected to skip two issues and start again in a month. They spent that month working on the office, finding more equipment, and thinking of ways to improve the operation. When they began publishing again, they

were much better prepared.

THE OPERATION OF SPACE CITY NEWS

Space City News conducts its business in an old two-story house in one of Houston's transitional neighborhoods not far from the central business district. The neighborhood is transitional because it is now a mixture of small businesses, office buildings, and residences; it is gradually becoming wholly commercial. It is also on the margin between white and Negro areas.

The lower floor of the house has been altered very little; there is a kitchen, a bedroom (where Murray usually stays at night), another bedroom now used as a library, a bathroom, and a large parlor or living room used for meetings and occasionally as a bedroom for out-of-town guests.

The second floor has been converted into work rooms. Three of the four bedrooms are now offices exhibiting the usual paraphernalia--desks, file cabinets, and typewriters. The other bedroom is used as a lay-out room and contains long, slanted tables resembling extended drafting tables. The upstairs bathroom has been converted into a photographic darkroom.

All of the rooms in the house have assorted "revolutionary" posters on the walls, including pictures of Ché Guevarra and ugly caricatures of policemen. The house and the offices are usually in disarray, in spite of the

efforts made by the Collective to keep them neat. The aura of the place is definitely not that of a modern, efficient newspaper office; the floor is unpainted, the furniture is old and battered and of diverse origins, and the darkroom and layout room tables are homemade and in need of paint.

Space City News is published on alternate Thursdays. On the Sunday following publication, the Collective and those who want to work on the next issue gather in the layout room and conduct an "issue meeting" to plan the content. One of the Collective acts as issue coordinator and chairs the meeting. The task of issue coordination rotates among the Collective members, with allowances made for vacations or other projects. The meeting, very much a social event, is conducted informally and the content of the coming issue depends largely on what people would like to contribute in terms of their particular interests and what issues are currently important.

The meetings are very democratic, and the proceedings are slow. There is usually a good deal of joking and camaraderie, also, and someone eventually calls for a return to business.

A list of the articles planned is made by the issue coordinator and later posted on one of the office walls as an aid to the Collective in seeing to it that the material is ready on schedule. Anyone who is interested can attend these meetings and offer his help on any of the projects

discussed. Frequently, those involved have an interest in a particular area, such as ecology or women's rights. Everything is completely voluntary, although an individual is sometimes asked to do a certain project.

The deadline for the submission of copy is the Thursday or Friday following this meeting, and two or three days later for artwork, photographs, and other material which does not have to be set into type. The copy is sometimes submitted handwritten, but usually typed, and it is typeset into columns by one of the Collective.

The typesetting is done on a leased IBM Selectric Composer which justifies the margins and provides various type styles and column widths. Before there were enough funds to lease this machine, typesetting was one of the major problems of publication. Commercial typesetters and other small newspapers were not very cooperative, because they considered the material subversive in some cases, pornographic in others; if these problems were resolved, typesetters often were reluctant to fit the extra work into their regular operation. The volume was considered too small.

Space City News, like most tabloid-size newspapers, is printed by the offset process. In this process the columns of typeset copy, artwork, and half-toned photographs are pasted onto sheets of paper the size of the finished pages and taken to the printer. The printing plant makes a photographic plate of each page and then, through an

etching process, produces metal plates to fit the printing press. The method is considerably cheaper than conventional printing, and the low cost of this process is one of the technical developments which has accelerated the growth of the underground press. It costs Space City News approximately two hundred and fifty dollars to print five thousand copies of the twenty-four page paper.

The pasted-up pages are taken to the printer the day before the paper is to be printed. The papers are called for by staff members on Thursday afternoon and brought back to the office for the vendors to purchase and for distribution to the newsstands and other establishments which stock the paper on a consignment basis. A few hundred copies are mailed to subscribers and to other Movement newspapers.

When the freshly printed papers are brought back to the office, the vendors, whose number varies from issue to issue, pay for their copies (half of the selling price of twenty cents) and go to their favorite spots to hawk the papers. All of the vendors do not appear on the first day that papers are available; many come on an irregular basis.

Papers are sold on street corners and anywhere that young or Movement-oriented people are likely to be found. Theatres showing movies aimed at these audiences, concerts by "rock" musicians, and leftist political gatherings provide places to sell papers. Many of the vendors are high school or college students. There have been some weeks

when Collective members were the only vendors. In addition to newsstands, a few bookstores and shops which cater to the young provide space on their shelves for the paper. Between seven thousand and ten thousand copies are presently being sold through these various means.

Eric reported that he generally is able to sell twenty-five or thirty papers in an hour at one of his favorite corners, and as many as eighty per hour at one of the youth-oriented movies. He considered this to be a vendor's typical experience. He said that the vast majority of those who buy from him are young, but that people of all ages and descriptions buy papers.

Insulting remarks are occasionally made to vendors, but there has never been any serious trouble from the public. High school administrators sometimes threaten to call the police if vendors appear on school property, which is seldom.

Space City News is printed at the same plant as several other tabloid-size papers, including the University of Houston's Daily Cougar. This printing plant is Negro-owned. The management has on occasion expressed mild alarm at the content of the paper when it was critical of the city administration, but so far it has not refused to print it except on one or two occasions when technical problems arose.

The regular chores, such as picking up and delivering papers, are made difficult by the Collective's

lack of help and equipment. There is a chronic shortage of supplies, and all of the vehicles are old and troublesome. The only truck owned, an old van belonging to Dan and Pat, caused so many problems by continually breaking down that they finally gave it away. Space City News has not shown a real profit to date, and funds are available for the purchase of only the most basic items. The Collective members are constantly burdened with broken typewriters, defective photographic equipment, and too few ashtrays, erasers, and pens. This too is accepted as part of the struggle, and the Collective continues to work and meet the deadlines.

There are rewards which seem to help maintain morale. Readers send encouraging letters on occasion, and new subscriptions are reassuring. As of this writing, there were approximately four hundred and fifty paying subscribers. The hostile reactions of certain influential people also constitute rewards; the Mayor of Houston was reported to have told a local civic club, "Space City News is not worth wrapping fish in!" This made the Collective members happy, and they re-printed the Mayor's remark.

The day-to-day routine of the Collective members consists of writing stories, selling papers, answering the telephone, attending meetings, reading other Movement papers, and going through the packets of news received every few days from LMS. A large portion of the copy in each issue is taken from these last two sources.

There are no pre-determined hours for anyone on the

staff. They often work through the night when the pages are being laid out, but most work is done during the daylight hours and the early part of the evening. The greatest difference between this and normal newspaper production is that no individual is assigned any specific function such as reporting or editing. Routine tasks are shared by the Collective members; one person takes the responsibility each day for staying in the office and answering the telephone.

Publishing the paper is not the sole activity of any of the people connected with it. Some of the volunteers are members of Students for a Democratic Society and other radical organizations. Space City News has been active in organizing political rallies and other projects not directly related to the paper. Even the Collective members have other interests which occupy some of their working hours; in addition, they have to perform routine chores such as going to the market.

At the time of this writing, the Collective is sharing a home not far from the office with three other people (one single male and a married couple) who work for the paper on a part-time basis. They all take turns with the routine tasks of managing a household. In spite of the fact that they see each other quite often in the course of their work, they all seem to enjoy living together. There are remarkably few disputes over the division of labor; a schedule is regularly made out, and everyone usually follows it. When someone does not live up to the rules of the

house, someone else will remind the offender by putting a note on the bulletin board. The notes take the form of announcements; for example, "Phil left a dirty plate on the table this morning--this is the second time this week!"

The tasks of cooking and grocery buying are shared equally by men and women, and the meals are usually a one-dish affair. The house is sparsely furnished; the beds consist of mattresses on the floor without bed frames or box springs.

Each couple has their own room, and privacy is respected. The sexual relationships are strictly monogamous. The group members enjoy jokes about exchanging mates, probably because the public (they believe) has such a distorted view of what takes place in the communal living arrangements that some young people prefer, and they like to pretend that they are even worse than the public pictures them. They also like to refer to themselves in the language of the opposition. Eric often hawks papers by shouting, "Read all about the freaking fag revolution!"

Another way in which these people differ from the popular conception of "hippies" concerns the matter of narcotics; none of them indulges in the use of drugs beyond the occasional smoking of marijuana, and this is nearly always reserved for parties.

Although the paper does not pay any salaries, the Collective manages to extract some expense money from the treasury, which is spent on their share of the food and

other expenses of operating the house. Money for personal articles has increasingly become a problem for the Collective members since they began to publish the newspaper. They have all earned money by selling papers, but this occupies time that could be better spent on the preparation of the paper. None of the parents of the Collective members contribute to their support, except in the case of Eric. His parents occasionally provide articles of clothing and a little pocket money, which he shares with Valerie. Phil and Kathy came to Houston with some money that they had saved, but it was exhausted after seven or eight months. Murray also had some savings when he joined the staff, but he has no means of support except his earnings from selling papers. Pat and Dan receive a small monthly salary from the anti-poverty project which originally brought them to the city.³ In addition, Dan has a small income from investments his parents made for him several years ago.

None of these sources of income provides more than one hundred dollars a month for any single individual, and the Collective members have often spent their personal funds to keep the paper solvent. They all hope that eventually the paper will earn enough to pay small salaries.

In only one instance has a philanthropic organization or individual ever made a gift of any size to the paper. On this occasion, an anonymous donor channeled a

³The sponsor of this "project" is not mentioned in order to protect the privacy of those involved.

two thousand dollar gift through a local tax-free foundation. This was immediately spent for the type-setting equipment and payment of outstanding debts. The gift was apparently in response to the second of two letters appealing for funds which had been sent to subscribers.

Several benefit performances by local musicians have been held to raise money for the paper, but no more than two hundred dollars have been collected from all of these efforts. One other event was such a financial disaster that the paper lost money. In this instance, the paper sponsored an appearance by one of the defendants in the trial which followed the demonstrations in Chicago during the 1968 Democratic Convention. It had been hoped that this appearance, by Abbie Hoffman, would raise enough money to aid the paper and provide a donation of twelve hundred dollars to the fund for the defense of the accused. Receipts were so minimal at an afternoon rally and a speech the same evening that the expenses totaled three hundred dollars more than the gross profit, and nothing was available for the defense fund.⁴

The chronic shortage of money is usually seen by the Collective members as one of many problems which slow the development of Space City News, and not often as a personal hardship.

⁴The writer heard a local newscaster announce the next day that Hoffman left Houston with a twenty-five hundred dollar speaking fee. Local news media often made gross errors in their reporting of Movement activities.

In all of the activities of the group, there is a lack of any clear-cut leadership; no individual could be identified as the central figure. Because of the previous experience of a few of the members, they are consulted on the technical problems of publication, but decisions about the direction of the paper or the allocation of funds are always made in group discussion. This arrangement does not always work smoothly--sometimes decisions are reached only after much discussion or not reached at all. Eric, Valerie, and Phil seem to be more assertive than the others at times, but no one consistently fills the role of leader. Work is always divided as evenly as possible, and unpleasant tasks are rotated. The only exception to this is Kathy's keeping of financial records, which she evidently does not consider really unpleasant.

Equality of the sexes is carefully observed. No jobs are regarded as reserved for males or for females, unless there is something heavy to be moved. In this case, the males are asked for help. This equality involves more than just work; the females are no less given to outbursts of profanity when something is unpleasant than the males.

The Collective members realized early in the year that the males were assuming more responsibilities than the females, especially in contacts with outsiders, and a concentrated effort was made immediately to restore full participation for everyone. Phil related how difficult it had been for them to deal with this, but said that it

was necessary; not only were the men doing more than their share of the work, but the paper could not be male-dominated because male supremacy was one of the faults of American culture. In addition, the paper often printed articles on the oppression of women, and to have any vestiges of male supremacy on the staff would have been hypocrisy. They even changed the rules of touch football, a frequent Saturday afternoon passtime, to enable females to participate on an equal basis.

There is almost a complete absence of conflict between the members of the group. There are disagreements, but they are settled by open discussion of the problem. No one displays any serious antagonism toward another member, except in instances when someone is tired from a night's work or not feeling well, and these episodes are never taken seriously.

The Collective members work very hard on the projects they undertake, and sometimes work for several days or weeks without stopping, except to eat and sleep. After these long sessions, they take short vacations. Generally, each couple leaves separately to visit relatives or spend some time away together, but on several occasions the whole Collective has taken a few days off to camp out as a group away from the city. They always seem to be able to leave the pressures of operating the newspaper behind.

In general, the Collective members do not seem to get very upset about the hardships they suffer, such as the

theft of the typewriters, and the poor financial condition of the paper. Nor do they consider the fact that their lives could be more comfortable if they had chosen some other work to do.

In sum, then, the Collective is a group of people dedicated to a cause, living under trying conditions, seeing each other almost constantly, and generally being happy with their circumstances and seldom at odds with one another.

THREATS AND HARASSMENT

During the first break in publication, on the night of July 26th, 1969, the newspaper office was bombed. Two people were in the office at the time, but no one was hurt. The explosive device was thrown through the front door, and the explosion shattered many of the windows on the front of the house. This was the first in a series of acts by terrorists.

Threatening telephone calls were a common occurrence throughout the first year of the paper's existence. Some were serious, such as the one which followed the bombing by a matter of hours. According to the Collective, it contained the message that, "You're gonna be dead mother fuckers if you don't quit messing around!" Those who called to threaten sometimes identified themselves as "the clan," evidently referring to the Ku Klux Klan. Many other calls were received from time to time which did not threaten lives, but merely vented the caller's hostility toward the

paper.

Judging from these calls, many Houstonians seem to regard Space City News as a combination of pornography and Communist propaganda. Some time after joining the staff, the writer answered the telephone and was treated to a stream of invective about the way that newspapers like this were "poisoning" children's minds and would not be tolerated in the community; the female caller refused to discuss the matter after she had made her allegations and hung up.

The staff members are often interrupted by irate or threatening telephone calls, although this does not seem to seriously disturb any of them, and by acts of terrorism. Some of these are rather extreme. In mid-August--about three weeks after the bombing of the office--someone burglarized the building, taking typewriters (which were not insured and were very difficult to replace due to the financial condition of the paper) and various files containing story material and poetry. Even the subscription list was taken, but fortunately there was a carbon copy which was missed. Other, less serious, incidents occurred regularly. The people connected with the paper became very careful about unlocked windows and doors, and automobiles parked on the street near the office.

At times, when terrorism was expected, such as during or near the time of an anti-war rally, the staff would post an armed look-out in a darkened upstairs room of the office. No shots were ever fired, but on one occasion

Murray intercepted some intruders and sprayed a chemical repellent at them. A firearm and a supply of this chemical spray, known as "mace," were kept at the office.

The home telephone numbers and the addresses of the Collective members are revealed only to trusted friends, and never given in a telephone conversation--only face-to-face. The telephones at the office are believed to be under surveillance, and care is exercised in using them. Repeated checks for attachments to the telephone lines on the premises have never revealed any such devices, so it is supposed that they must be tapped at some other point, such as the exchange to which the lines are connected. Whether or not the telephone lines are actually monitored has little significance; the staff believe they are. They consider this a nuisance.

Although they are careful about using the telephone, the Collective members take few precautions to protect themselves from friendly strangers who appear at the office. The lower floor of the house is often made available to transients who need a place to sleep, and many people who casually walk into the building are presumed to have business there and allowed to wander about freely.

For a three or four month period in late 1969 and early 1970, the planned activities of the Collective and of other local anti-war groups seemed to become known to the terrorists in advance. Telephone calls were frequently received at Space City News and at the local SDS

headquarters in which the caller, often identifying himself as "the clan," revealed extensive knowledge of matters which were believed to be confidential.

The Collective conferred at length after several of these incidents, trying to determine how the information, some of which had never been discussed over the telephone, could have been learned so quickly. They finally decided that a young man known as "Mike" was the best suspect, and they accused him to his face of being a "Klan" informer. He denied this, but after a heated argument with Murray, Dan, Phil, and another staff member, he disappeared and the knowledgeable callers were not heard from again. Whoever the callers were, the people at Space City News believed them to be the Ku Klux Klan, and lumped various acts of vandalism and terrorism together as Klan-originated.

The activities of these people (the Ku Klux Klan, if that is who it is) do not affect just the Collective and other Movement groups; innocent bystanders are sometimes involved. During an afternoon of anti-war speeches in Houston's Hermann Park, on November 9, 1969, the tires were slashed on a number of automobiles parked near the site of the rally. Some of these belonged to people who were not attending the rally, but who were visiting the planetarium nearby. This was reported in the local papers, but no arrests were ever made.

Very early in the morning of the same day, a car belonging to a local SDS member was destroyed in front of

the office by an incendiary bomb. The fire department was called to extinguish the blaze, but the police made no investigation. Those people who rushed into the front yard when the explosion was heard said later that there were two police cars parked down the street in the next block at the time the fire started, but the police did not approach the scene. No report to the police was ever made of most of these acts of vandalism, because the Collective members were convinced that nothing would be done.

There is one exception to the usual lack of interest on the part of the police. While Abbie Hoffman was speaking at a hall (a Negro night club rented for the occasion) on Houston's east side near the University of Houston, a number of strange cars were parked across the street in a stadium parking lot. The cars each had several men in them, and the Movement people who were present assumed that they were Klansmen. One of the watchmen outside the hall was hit by a rock thrown at him from the dark. Trouble from the Klan had been expected for Hoffman's appearance; a telephone call to the paper had warned that he would not leave Houston alive, and early in the morning on the day of his arrival an arrow from a crossbow had been shot through the front door of the newspaper office.

The atmosphere of impending disaster, combined with the small number of paying listeners in the hall, had everyone disturbed. As Kathy put it, "Everybody is really freaked out!" This phrase has several meanings; in this

case it meant they were worried. However, there was no trouble. This may have been related to the fact that even the Houston Police were concerned that Hoffman might be killed in Houston, and, according to one of the organizers, "create a bad image for the city." One of the Mayor's assistants had even attended the rally in the park, earlier in the day, and conferred with the organizers about security precautions.

The police often reinforced the staff's impression of them as "the enemy" by harassing vendors. In Pasadena, a suburb of Houston, two vendors were arrested one day for "blocking traffic." They were standing on private property, not in the street, and the owner of the property had given them permission to be there. Dan was one of the two arrested; a third person, a juvenile, was released because of her age. Vendors have often reported trouble with the police, but few are actually arrested.

There are other, more subtle, ways in which the Collective has been hindered. Finding retail stores which would display the paper is always difficult; many businessmen have refused because they disapproved of the content. In one instance, a merchant in a suburban shopping center, who was sympathetic to the Movement, was forced to refuse by his landlord, who threatened to cancel the merchant's lease. He had found a clause in the lease agreement which gave him the authority to prevent a tenant from selling any type of merchandise which was not of the same nature as that for

which the premises were originally let. Since the premises had been leased to sell leather goods, newspapers were not permitted. As far as anyone knew, this clause had never been invoked to control the merchandise carried in any of the other stores in the center. It seemed that the neighborhood civic club had brought the matter to the landlord's attention.

The Collective accepts these things stoically as part of the struggle against "repression." They publish the stories of the bombings along with their regular reports of clashes between black militants and police in other cities and violence on college campuses. The theme of struggle is a dominant one in the pages of Space City News. Every issue has one or more stories which play heavily on oppression. Otherwise, the group does not dwell on the threatening aspect of their environment. In fact, they seem almost always in a good mood to an observer, and often mix business with pleasure during their daily activities by maintaining an atmosphere of humorous detachment.

THE INTERVIEWS

When they were interviewed about their involvement with Space City News and about the purposes of the Movement press, the answers given by the Collective members were strikingly similar and revealed common altruistic motives. They all seemed to have a very clear sense of what they are trying to accomplish in Houston, and about the purposes of

the Movement press. The two themes that recurred in these interviews were "bringing a community together" and "fighting oppression."

Eric's answer to the question about the functions of the Movement press is both enlightening and typical. He said,

The purpose of the Movement press is to further the revolution; the media is a tool to reach more people . . . to communicate ideas to more people--it certainly is not a business to make money!

Valerie's reply was a little more specific:

There are a number of purposes . . . to coalesce a community of people, to raise issues, to advocate around issues . . . give communication to a community and between communities. The Movement press has no future unless it deals with real issues--male and white supremacy. They are the basic issues of the revolution. These are international issues.

The Collective members are aware that they are involved in a kind of combat with certain segments of society, and they sometimes stress this in editorials: the "letters from the Collective," which they publish from time to time, are always signed "Love and Struggle" rather than "Yours truly."

Whether or not they applied it to their own situation, they were also of the opinion that struggle against a common enemy creates group solidarity. Dan mentioned this in his interview. In discussing the harassment of Space City News and its vendors, he related this to the repression of the Movement in general, saying,

As repression continues, it's that much easier for white . . . well it's obviously easier for black and

brown people to realize that they have got to stick together and fight together and fight back . . . but it's also a lot easier for white people to realize what's going on in the country and exactly how it's turning . . . and that, in one sense, it's because of that repression that the Movement is growing, and is learning a lot, and is becoming a real force to deal with."

Dan and Kathy both mentioned the fact that the Movement press is, as Kathy put it, "an alternative institution which the Movement has created," and which can sustain people and provide a means for them to earn a living.

On the subject of this revolution and how it might come about, the Collective members unanimously agreed that the present politico-economic system in the United States must be replaced--that it cannot be made to work because it is based on competition instead of cooperation. They were not sure exactly what the new system would be like, and felt quite comfortable with the idea that some experimentation would be necessary.

No one was convinced that there had to be violence involved in this revolution, but they were aware that there might be violence at some point. They accepted that possibility. As Eric said,

I think that the change has to be structural, because I think that most of the problems in the society stem from the structure of the economy . . . as long as you have an economic system which is based on exploitation, on competition, on struggling for profit, on the need to exploit foreign markets, you're not going to change anything--all you're going to do is maybe gloss things over. You can make things better for a little while, but they only get worse somewhere else. I think ultimately [the change] is going to

happen pretty quickly, but America's such a weird, unprecedented sort of monster that no one knows how the revolution will take over in this country . . . I don't think we're ready for it now, because if it happened right now, we don't have enough people on our side. I think there has to be a lot more educational work--we need a lot more Space Citys. We need more patience . . . more tolerance of people we consider to be "rednecks," and things like that. I don't think there has to be violence in a revolution. I don't think there has to be, [but] I think there almost always will be, because the people who control the wealth just won't give it up; the psychology that comes from being in that kind of position is so overwhelming--it so distorts their basic humanity that they're just not able to see the demands of the people.

(Note: The names of the Collective members were changed to protect their privacy.)

Chapter 3

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

Following Gross and Martin (1952), cohesiveness has been defined as the resistance of a group to disruptive forces. Disruptive forces may stem from any of several sources. Internal conflicts constitute a disruptive force, as do obstacles to the achievement of the goals of the group. Any type of threat to the members, physical or otherwise, is also a disruptive force. In short, any force which acts as a deterrent to the activities of the group or discourages the members from continuing their association with the group is a disruptive force; a pressure exists, however small, for the members to sever their ties to the group.

In order, then, to arrive at an explanation of the cohesiveness of a group, there must be an examination of the disruptive forces which exist with respect to that group. It is possible to imagine a group for which no disruptive forces exist; one in which the members receive nothing but pleasure and satisfaction from their association. However, it would seem that at least minor dissatisfactions would occur from time to time in even the most favorable circumstances. It would be impossible, of course, to determine the resistance of a group to disruptive forces if none

existed.

In the case of the Collective, there are numerous disruptive forces. These include the shortage of money and equipment, and the harassment of various types. The lack of suitable equipment (particularly automobiles) makes the physical task of publishing difficult. The harassment from the police, the individuals who are annoyed by the paper, and (evidently) the radical right makes the environment stressful. As detailed in the previous chapter, the Collective is engaged in a constant struggle.

In addition, the fact that the parents of these young people are almost unanimously opposed to their involvement with the paper would seem to impose an additional hardship. Murray's father, for example, refuses even to discuss the matter with him, and Murray never mentioned visiting his parents, although they lived in Houston. None of the members of the group ever voiced any feelings on this subject; it may be that they were not distressed by this parental rejection.

There is ample evidence, then, that the Collective is a highly cohesive group. In spite of the disruptive forces, the group continues to function and generally to exhibit a high level of morale. Some of the disruptive forces would appear to be quite powerful, as in the case of the bombings and death threats.

If this was not a highly cohesive group, the members would surely have abandoned it; certainly Space City News

is not a profitable business venture--the Collective members have often spent their personal funds to allow continued operation. At the end of the first year of publication, they were in worse personal financial condition than they had been at the beginning.

For the members to abandon the group would not have been difficult; they were occupied with other projects before they established the newspaper, and they could have returned to those or found others.

ANALYSIS

The central problem to be addressed here is that of explaining the existence of this cohesiveness. That is to say, why do these people continue their participation in this group in the face of so many obstacles?

The literature on small groups reveals two theoretical orientations toward the explanation of group participation. Following Lott and Lott (1965), one of these may be designated "balance theory," and the other "reward theory."

Reward theory is based on the assumption that individuals belong to groups because they reap rewards from so doing. There are several forms which these rewards may take. They may be economic, as they would be in the case of a business organization. They may be psychological; one may join a high-prestige organization simply for the ego enhancement which would be derived from the fact of

belonging. They may also be social, such as they would be in the case of one whose esteem from his neighbors is increased because of his membership in an exclusive club. More than one type of reward may accrue to an individual through his participation in a single group; a businessman might be economically rewarded through his association with other businessmen, and, at the same time, psychologically rewarded by the pleasure he derives from their friendship.

Balance theory, on the other hand, rests on the principle that people tend to seek a balanced state between their perceptions and the feelings which accompany them. According to Heider, who conceived this system, "The concept of a balanced state designates a situation in which the perceived units and the experienced sentiments co-exist without stress..." (Heider 1958:176). A unit refers to a set of two or more separate entities which are perceived as belonging together (Heider 1958:176). This might be a family group, a person and his personal beliefs, or a man and his automobile, to name a few examples. Sentiment "...refers to the way a person feels about or evaluates something" (Heider 1958:174). A person may evaluate something either positively or negatively.

In the context of small groups, this principle of a balanced state has several implications. For example, it means that people tend to seek the company of others with similar values and beliefs. A person and his values and beliefs constitute a unit; an individual with values and

beliefs which differ greatly from one's own would usually be negatively evaluated. This would mean that if one liked this other individual and yet perceived the difference in values and beliefs, then an unbalanced state would exist; the perceived unit would not be congruent with the experienced sentiments. According to the theory, then, there would be pressure to change either the sentiments or the perception of this unit; one would either start to dislike the other person or begin to believe that his values and beliefs were not different from one's own.

Another implication is that a person tends to like someone whom he has benefited or who has benefited him. To dislike someone who has done one a favor, or to have done a favor for one who is disliked, would be incongruous; a state of imbalance would exist. Another implication is that a person tends to like those who are familiar to him and those whose behavior is congruent with his own code of behavior.

Festinger's theory of cognitive dissonance is very similar to Heider's formulation. The theory of cognitive dissonance assumes that if an individual is experiencing simultaneous cognitions which are inconsistent (cognitive dissonance), then he will attempt to reduce the dissonance by changing one of the cognitions in the direction of consistency with the other (Festinger 1957).

As would be the case with balance theory, this means that if an individual finds that he is associating with someone he dislikes, he will begin to like the person

(which may involve altering his beliefs about him) or he will end the association. As an alternative, he might try to change the other person in such a way that he could begin to like him.

In addition to the basic principle of a balanced state which underlies these theories, there is another assumption; this is that people belong to groups because they like the people in them. If membership in groups were not based on liking the other members, it would make little difference if people disliked the other members of the group. Indeed, there are readily available examples of groups in which likes and dislikes must be subordinated to other criteria, such as is likely to be the case in a business organization. This does not affect the utility of the theory for voluntary associations.

It is possible, it appears, to subsume balance theory under the reward theory framework. If one accepts the postulate that association with others who have similar values and beliefs is rewarding, then balance theory can be seen as a special category of reward theory. This proposition is certainly not difficult to accept; in fact, it would be difficult to accept the opposite--that association with others of similar values and beliefs is not rewarding.

At least one former proponent of the balance theory, T. M. Newcomb, now seems to have accepted reward theory as the more powerful of the two theories and cited evidence for his contention (Newcomb 1956). Newcomb

conducted a study of the friendship choices of college men residing in a dormitory in which the residents were provided rent-free housing in return for their participation in lengthy interviews and the answering of questionnaires. Observers lived in the same house to observe friendship choices and interaction. The men chosen for the study (from an abundance of applicants) were given room assignments which paired individuals of dissimilar backgrounds. On the basis of friendship choices and the results of observation and interviewing, Newcomb concluded that the men chose friends on the basis of perceived similarities and that this was due to the fact that association with others of similar values and beliefs was rewarding (Newcomb 1958).

REWARDS

Before preceeding to an examination of the role of threat from an outside source in the production of the cohesiveness of the Collective, attention should be given to the rewards which the members gain via their membership.

The rewards which accrue to the members of the Collective take several forms. There is recognition of their efforts by other individuals who are sympathetic to their cause; people write letters to the Collective praising their accomplishments and offering suggestions. A few telephone good wishes or appear at the office to offer assistance.

These rewards are direct; there are others which

might be termed indirect. The fact that they seem to be making enemies of certain persons in the city would be a reward of this type. The Mayor's derogatory comments about the paper were rewarding to the Collective members, as are the other negative reactions from particular segments of society. These things made the members feel that they were reaching someone, at least, and that they were making local conservatives uncomfortable. The Mayor's slap at them was an acknowledgment that they had succeeded in striking an enemy.

One type of reward which is not available is financial; although the Collective is able to save money by living communally, the publication of the paper has been unprofitable on the whole.

A relevant factor here is that the rewards mentioned come to the group as a whole, not to specific individuals. The importance of group reward, as opposed to rewards given individually, seems to be quite important in the promotion of group cohesiveness. When individuals compete for the available rewards, the result is divisiveness and unfavorable attitudes toward the group.

A study by Deutsch (1960) exemplifies the studies which support this contention. Using volunteers from an introductory psychology course, Deutsch created a number of "discussion groups" which were allegedly to help in research to improve the course.

The participants were given puzzles and human

relations problems to solve as a group. They met for fifty minutes each week for five weeks. Half of the groups were told that they were competing with the other groups for a reward (credit for a term paper with a perfect grade) which each member of the best group would receive.

The other groups were told that the competition was based on the contributions of each individual in the group, and that the person who contributed the most would be given the reward; this competition was not with other groups, but only between individual members of each separate group.

Observers recorded the interaction which took place, and rated each group's performance at the end of every meeting. The subjects filled out a questionnaire after each meeting, and one more a week after the last meeting. The questionnaires elicited responses about the member's experiences and his satisfaction with the work of the group. The members of groups in the group-reward situation reported more favorable evaluations of the group and its products, and the observers reported that these groups showed more coordination of efforts, friendliness, productivity, and attentiveness to fellow members on the part of the participants.

There are, of course, rewards for individuals in the Collective. But these are related to individual preferences, not achievements. Phil, for example, enjoys "muckraking" articles, and probably gets more satisfaction from this facet of the group's activities than anyone else.

This does not constitute, though, the type of individual reward which would be divisive.

Perhaps most important to the Collective members, in terms of rewards, is the opportunity they have to express their altruism and to pursue their idealistic goals. It is quite plain that these are very altruistic individuals. Their verbalizations and their willingness to make the sacrifices that they do provide ample evidence for this. It must be rewarding, then, for them to be able to pursue these ends on a daily basis. In some cases, they are able to see the results of their efforts; they have been successful in creating greater interest in the Movement in Houston, and they generally have felt they are making progress toward their avowed goals, which they expressed in the interviews. Deutscher and Deutscher (1955) stressed the importance of both altruistic membership and the feeling of success in promoting the cohesiveness of a group in their case study of an organization seeking racial integration in restaurants in Columbia, Missouri.

Assuming that association with people of similar values and beliefs is rewarding, there must be great satisfaction for the members of the Collective in their daily association with each other. They are people whose values and beliefs are not just similar but almost identical. They unanimously feel that the economic system of the United States leads to the oppression and exploitation of certain groups in the society, and that a change must be

made. They are uniformly anti-materialistic, and care little about personal possessions or property. Their styles of dress and speech are similar.

There is, possibly, an interaction between their shared values and their continual association. As Merton and Lazarsfeld say, "Common values make social interaction a rewarding experience, and the gratifying experience promotes the formation of common values" (Merton and Lazarsfeld in Berger, Abel, and Page 1954:36).

The personal characteristics of the members of the group are also important, according to the principles of balance theory. The members of the Collective are indeed strikingly similar in many respects. They are all native-born, white, young people. They have all been college students, even though all have not been graduated from college. Their families are similar in many respects, too. The fathers are all businessmen, excepting the one journalist; in most cases the mothers are housewives. The annual incomes of the families are in the same general range.

The educational achievements of the parents are also quite similar. Only one of the fathers has not completed at least four years of college, and this one has finished three. Five of the seven mothers also attended college, although one did not finish. None of the parents are particularly active in political matters, and most were described by their children as moderately conservative.

Certainly none were radical leftists like their progeny. Newcomb's study (1958) showed the importance of perceived similarities.

In view of the foregoing, it would be difficult to conceive of the Collective as anything other than a close-knit group. It is, of course, possible to imagine instances in which a person would not like someone who was similar to him. For example, if he saw in the other person a quality which he did not like in himself--but this would seem to be the exception rather than the rule.

THREAT FROM AN OUTSIDE SOURCE

The findings of earlier investigators in this area point to a positive relationship between group cohesiveness and threat from an outside source. Lanzetta, et al (1954) and Lanzetta (1955) offer impressive evidence for this conclusion. The studies by Sherif and Sherif (1953), Pepitone and Kleiner (1957), and Sherif (1958) indicate that there is a causal relationship between these variables; the imposition of threat appears to have created cohesiveness in the groups involved.

In the case of the Collective, however, it is not possible to posit a causal relationship. There is convincing evidence of the great cohesiveness of the group, and certainly there was threat from an outside source, but no concomitant variation was seen in these two variables as the immediacy of the threat changed from time to time during the

course of this study.

Since there was no control group (a Space City News Collective which was not threatened), it is not certain that the cohesiveness of the group was affected at all by the threat. However, the threat apparently did not reduce the cohesiveness of the group, and quite likely it helped to maintain it.

The threat does provide an additional shared characteristic for the members of the group (they are all threatened), and the presence of a common enemy may minimize conflicts within the group. Conflicts between group members would be a disruptive force, and anything which which minimized a disruptive force would thereby contribute to cohesiveness.

OTHER RELEVANT FACTORS

Superordinate Goals

In addition to a common enemy (the radical right), the Collective also shares common goals, and these goals can only be achieved through group cooperation. There is evidence that common goals which require cooperation for their realization will minimize intergroup conflicts, and there is no reason why this should not also apply to intragroup conflict. In fact, if factions developed within a group, the situation would be more analagous to intergroup than to intragroup conflict.

In the third of his series of studies of boys in

summer camps, Sherif (1958) was able to demonstrate that cooperation between groups in the attainment of superordinate goals reduced conflicts which had been created between the two groups. Superordinate goals are:

. . . goals which are compelling and highly appealing to members of two or more groups in conflict but which cannot be attained by the resources and energies of the groups separately (Sherif 1958:349).

Having created conflict between two groups of campers, Sherif and his assistants placed the boys in a series of situations which required them to cooperate to achieve solutions to shared problems. One of these problem situations, for example, required the boys to act in concert to pull a truck which would not start and was needed to secure food. Observers noted a cessation of name-calling and derogatory remarks by the boys, and questionnaires before and after the series of problem situations revealed a significant decrease in the strength of negative stereotypes of members of the opposing group.

A commitment to clearly defined goals was mentioned by Deutscher and Deutscher in their study of the group dedicated to racial integration (1955). A common sense of purpose was also found to be relevant to group solidarity in a historical study of American communal-living experiments by Kanter (1968).

The Collective, of course, is committed to the goals of the Movement, which, shared by the group, provide a sense of purpose. In addition, due to the character of these

goals, they also add to the willingness of the Collective members to endure hardship and privation. The Movement stresses optimism, hope for the future, building a better society, and cooperation and love. This optimism and belief in building a better world could account for their lack of concern about their present situation.

Primary Group Relationships

The Collective is a face-to-face, or primary, group and this is also relevant to their individual willingness to remain in a stressful situation. In discussing the characteristics of successful 19th-Century utopian communities, Kanter (1970) states that, "Possibly because they developed such strong group ties, successful...groups stayed together in the face of outside persecution, financial shakiness, and natural disaster."

Previous investigators have reached similar conclusions about the ability of individuals to withstand extreme stresses when they are enmeshed in a web of primary group relationships.

Shils and Janowitz, after examining the reasons given by German soldiers for their resistance to Allied propaganda, concluded that:

When the individual's immediate group, and its supporting formations, met his basic organic needs, offered him affection and esteem from both officers and comrades, supplied him with a sense of power and adequately regulated his relations with authority, the element of self-concern in battle, which would lead to disruption of the effective functioning of his primary group, was minimized (Shils and Janowitz 1948:231).

Samuel Stouffer, et al, in studying American combat veterans, reached essentially the same conclusion:

The group in its informal character, with its close interpersonal ties, served two principle functions in combat motivation: it set and enforced group standards of behavior, and it supported and sustained the individual in stresses he would otherwise not have been able to withstand (Stouffer, et al 1949:130).

The importance of primary group relationships, then, in addition to superordinate goals and the other factors related to group cohesiveness, should not be minimized in attempting to explain why the Collective members continue their activities in the face of so many obstacles.

Democratic Structure

As related in the last chapter, the Collective members believe in the principle of democratic decision-making, and structure their activities accordingly.

Evidence exists that democratic structure increases the attractiveness of a group for its members, which may be assumed to increase the group's cohesiveness. In fact, the attractiveness of a group for its members has often been used as a measure of cohesiveness (Lott and Lott 1965).

A study of several groups of boys working on classroom hobby projects, conducted by White and Lippit, reveals the effect of different decision-making methods on the attractiveness of the group. The boys (age ten) were organized into four groups of five boys each. They met weekly to work on their projects, and were subjected to different leadership patterns. Each group experienced

"democratic," "authoritarian," and "laissez-faire" leaders. On the basis of conversations with the boys and observations of their behavior, the investigators reached the conclusion that while the boys produced slightly more under an authoritarian leader, the democratic leadership condition produced much more friendliness, group-mindedness, and satisfaction among the boys. The authoritarian system produced hostility and aggression while the laissez-faire pattern was inefficient and much less satisfying than democracy (White and Lippitt 1960). A study of government and industry conference groups by Berkowitz (1953) supports this conclusion.

The Collective, of course, not only practices democracy, but also rotates unpleasant tasks. Kanter (1968), in her study of communes, reported a positive relationship between task-rotation and the longevity of the commune. This practice would appear to reduce member-dissatisfaction caused by unequal sharing of unpleasant duties, and to increase the members' sense of participation.

CONCLUSIONS

The evidence indicates that the Collective is a highly cohesive group. The group has resisted numerous disruptive forces and continues to function effectively. This cohesiveness, which may have been enhanced by the existence of a threat from an outside source, does not appear to have been caused by this threat.

Instead, it appears to be the product of several

factors. First, there are the rewards provided by the group for its members. The members of the group may be rewarded by the opportunity to associate with people of similar values, beliefs, and backgrounds, and by the chance to express their idealism and altruism.

Second, the cohesiveness of the group is probably promoted by the minimization of internal conflicts through the member's commitment to a common purpose and the existence of superordinate goals.

In addition, the attractiveness of the group may be enhanced by its democratic structure. The willingness of the members to endure the privations they suffer is probably increased by their optimism and their strong ties to their primary group.

Chapter 4

SUMMARY

The primary group seems to be an excellent starting point for the study of society; it may be said to represent society in microcosm. A characteristic of all human groups, to some extent, is cohesiveness or solidarity. Groups which lack this element do not survive. At times, groups survive for long periods in spite of forces which tend to disrupt them.

An "underground" newspaper in a Southern city provides an excellent example of this phenomenon. Although the staff members are handicapped by poor equipment and lack of operating funds, and are harassed and threatened by other persons in the community, they continue to publish and to organize leftist activities.

Earlier investigators have found that threat imposed by a source outside the group will increase the cohesiveness of the group, and this was hypothesized to be a primary factor in the great cohesiveness of the group under consideration.

Gross and Martin (1952) defined cohesiveness as the resistance of a group to disruptive forces. Using this definition, it was decided that the proper foci of the present study would be the disruptive forces and the

evidence of the group's cohesiveness. The method chosen was participant observation, combined with short, focused interviews and personal data schedules.

The seven-member, full-time staff of Space City News, known as "the Collective," provided the small group which was the object of this investigation. Space City News is one of numerous "underground" newspapers which are the communicating and proselyting media of a social movement known simply as "the Movement."

Because of their left-leaning, anarchistic editorial stance and their affiliation with the youth-oriented subculture often called "hippie," these Movement newspapers frequently arouse extreme reactions from the conservative elements of society. Space City News is no exception. The newspaper office has been bombed, burglarized, and shot at (with a cross-bow). A staff member's automobile was destroyed by an incendiary bomb. The collective has been the target of many threatening telephone calls.

In addition, those who publish the paper receive no salary for their efforts, and suffer from the problems of poor equipment and a chronic shortage of money.

The Collective established Space City News in Houston with full knowledge of the difficulties they might encounter. They are a group of dedicated young people with more than average formal education who come from quite similar social backgrounds. Their families are nearly all in the upper income bracket. The members of the Collective

agree almost completely on the purposes of the Movement press and the necessity of a social and economic restructuring of the United States. They feel that corporate capitalism is the main cause of America's social problems, and believe that it must be replaced. The newspaper openly advocates this goal, and does not pretend to be unbiased in its viewpoint.

Although the Collective members have had to endure continual harassment and a poverty-level existence, they have continued to maintain the group. They have published for one year and begun the second at the time of this writing.

In view of their resistance to numerous disruptive forces, the Collective must be judged a highly cohesive group. Previous studies have shown that group cohesiveness can be created or enhanced by threats from a source outside the group. In this case, however, the threats and violence directed at the group do not seem to have been the primary factor in creating this cohesiveness. Instead, it seems to be mainly the product of a structure of rewards for the members of the group, and their devotion to goals which could not be realized through the efforts of each of the individuals acting alone. It could not be determined if the threats contributed to the cohesiveness of the group, but it is probable that they did.

REFERENCES CITED

- Albert, Robert S.
1953 "Comments on Scientific Function of the Concept of Group Cohesiveness." *American Journal of Sociology* 59 (November): 231-234.
- Berkowitz, Leonard.
1953 "Sharing Leadership in Small Decision-Making Groups." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 48 (April): 231-238.
- Broom, Leonard, and Philip Selznik.
1963 *Sociology*, 3rd ed. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Burgess, E. W.
1927 "Statistical Case Studies as Methods of Sociological Research." *Sociology and Social Research* 12 (November-December): 103-120.
- Deutsch, Morton.
1960 "The Effects of Cooperation and Competition upon Group Process." Pp. 319-358 in Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, eds., *Group Dynamics*, 2nd ed. Evanston: Row, Peterson and Company.
- Deutscher, Verda, and Irwin Deutscher.
1955 "Cohesion in a Small Group: A Case Study." *Social Forces* 33 (May): 336-341.
- Elmer, Manuel C.
1939 *Social Research*. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Festinger, Leon.
1957 *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Incorporated.
- Festinger, Leon, Stanley Schacter, and Kurt Back.
1950 *Social Pressures in Informal Groups*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Gee, Wilson.
1950 *Social Science Research Methods*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.

Gross, Neal, and William E. Martin.

- 1952 "On Group Cohesiveness." *American Journal of Sociology* 57 (May): 546-554.

Gruen, Walter.

- 1965 "A Contribution Toward Understanding of Cohesiveness in Small Groups." *Psychological Reports* 17 (August): 311-322.

Heider, Felix.

- 1958 *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Homans, George C.

- 1950 *The Human Group*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss.

- 1968 "Commitment and Social Organization: A Study of Commitment Mechanisms in Utopian Communities." *American Sociological Review* 33 (August): 499-517.

- 1970 "Communes." *Psychology Today* 4 (June): 51-57, 78.

Lanzetta, John T.

- 1955 "Group Behavior Under Stress." *Human Relations* 8 (February): 29-52.

Lanzetta, John T., Don Haefner, Peter Langham, and Howard Azelrod.

- 1954 "Some Effects of Situational Threat on Group Behavior." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 49 (July): 445-453.

Lott, Albert, and Bernice E. Lott.

- 1965 "Group Cohesiveness as Interpersonal Attraction: A Review of Relationships with Antecedent and Consequent Variables." *Psychological Bulletin* 64 (October): 259-309.

Martindale, Don.

- 1960 *The Nature and Types of Sociological Theory*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Merton, Robert K., and Paul F. Lazarsfeld.

- 1954 "Friendship as Social Process: A Substantive and Methodological Analysis." Pp. 18-66 in Monroe Berger, Theodore Abel, and Charles H. Page, eds., *Freedom and Control in Modern Society*. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc.

Newcomb, T. M.

1956 "The Prediction of Interpersonal Attraction." *The American Psychologist* 11 (November): 575-586.

1958 "The Cognition of Persons as Cognizers." Pp. 179-190 in Renato Tagiuri and Luigi Petrullo, eds., *Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Newsweek.

1967 "Underground Trips." *Newsweek* 69 (May 1): 65.

Pepitone, Albert, and Robert Kleiner.

1957 "Effects of Threat and Frustration on Group Cohesiveness." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 54 (March): 192-199.

Riecken, Henry W., and George C. Homans.

1954 "Psychological Aspects of Social Structure." Pp. 786-829 in G. Lindzey, ed., *Handbook of Social Psychology*, Vol. 2. Farding, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc.

Schwartz, Morris, and Charlotte G. Schwartz.

1969 "Problems in Participant Observation." Pp. 89-104 in George J. McCall and J. L. Simmons, eds., *Issues in Participant Observation: A Text and Reader*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Sherif, Muzafer.

1958 "Superordinate Goals in the Reduction of Intergroup Conflict." *American Journal of Sociology* 63 (January): 349-356.

Sherif, Muzafer, and Carolyn Sherif.

1953 *Groups in Harmony and Tension*. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers.

Shils, Edward A., and Morris Janowitz.

1948 "Cohesion and Disintegration in the Wehrmacht in World War II." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 12 (Summer): 280-315.

Sin, John Cameron.

1969 *The Grass Roots Press*. Ames: Iowa University Press.

Stouffer, Samuel A., et al.

1949 *The American Soldier: Combat and Its Aftermath*, Vol. 2. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

White, Ralph, and Ronald Lippit.

1960 "Leader Behavior and Member Reaction in Three
'Social Climates'." Pp. 585-611 in Dorwin
Cartwright and Alvin Zander, eds., Group Dynamics,
2nd ed. Evanston: Row, Peterson and Company.