

This article is from the journal

Communal Societies

Volume 36, Number 1

We hope you enjoy the information included, and will consider becoming a member of the Communal Studies Association.

Please consult our website
www.communalstudies.org
for more information

**Communal Studies
Association**



**Encouraging the Study of Intentional
Communities**

Founded in 1975, the CSA publishes *Communal Societies*, a journal concerned with historic and contemporary communal societies. It hosts an annual conference at historic and contemporary sites. Awards and fellowships promote research and honor those who help achieve a greater understanding of communal living.

Join Us!

Communal Studies Association

P. O. Box 122, Amana, IA 52203

319-522-6446

csa@netins.net www.communalstudies.org

Camphill at Seventy-Five: Developmental Communalism in Process

DANIEL MCKANAN

Introduction

In 2014, the international Camphill movement turned seventy-five years old. From its beginnings in Scotland in 1939, Camphill has grown into a network of more than one hundred schools and villages, located on four continents, where more than five thousand people with and without developmental disabilities share daily life and work. This anniversary provides an occasion for a fresh examination of Donald Pitzer's theory of developmental communalism, which holds that communal sharing is typically just one phase in the evolution of a community or movement. Drawing on decades of study of communal movements in the United States and around the world, Pitzer observed that movements "that do not adjust their strictly communal efforts or adopt new organizational forms more suitable to changing internal and external conditions and the needs of rising generations can arrest their own development," while those that create "more pliable social, economic and administrative forms usually see their causes not only survive but flourish."¹ More

Dan McKanan is the Emerson Senior Lecturer at Harvard Divinity School, where he has taught since 2008. He is the author of four books, and will soon publish a new book on Rudolf Steiner's anthroposophy and the environmental movement. All images in this paper were obtained by the author through his work in Camphill communities and are used with permission of the communities.

¹ Donald E. Pitzer, "Developmental Communalism: An Alternative Approach to Communal Studies," in Dennis Hardy and Lorna Davidson, eds., *Utopian Thought and Communal Experience*, Geography and Planning Paper #24 (Enfield, UK: Middlesex Polytechnic, 1989), 68–76. For application of developmental communalism to a wide range of intentional community movements in the United States, see Pitzer, ed., *America's Communal Utopias* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997).

recently, Pitzer has predicted that the twenty-first century will be "a time when progressive ideas, ideals, and innovations" developed in the small intentional communities of the twentieth century will "become integrated into the general society."²

Camphill today is a living laboratory for Pitzer's theory because, although the movement is still spreading to new places, many participants fear that it is abandoning its most distinctive cooperative features. Notable among these features are the practices of income-sharing—in which people work without salaries and rely on the community for their economic needs—and life-sharing—in which people of diverse abilities occupy households in which meals, recreation, religious services, and seasonal festivals are all shared. Camphill has never been fully communal, in the sense of all assets being held in common, so these practices of income- and life-sharing will serve as the baseline for this consideration of Camphill's current developmental processes. Camphill founder Karl

König was referring primarily to income- and life-sharing when he declared that “the establishment of a true community” was one of the three “Camphill essentials,” along with “regard for the spiritual nature” of persons with disabilities and commitment to “inner development” on the part of their teachers and companions. König’s declaration notwithstanding, these practices are by no means considered “essential” by every Camphill community today. Yet König also used organic, developmental metaphors to describe Camphill: the three essentials were not fixed rules but “fruits and flowers” that would need to “unfold and grow” in order for Camphill to “develop and . . . keep its pledge to the handicapped child.” And though the current changes in Camphill may be in some respects a development away from communalism, in other respects they reveal a new unfolding of the founding value of “true community.”³

The account of Camphill’s developmental processes in this essay is based on seventeen years of participant observation, site visits, and formal interviews with Camphillers. My research on Camphill began

² Donald E. Pitzer, “Developmental Communalism into the Twenty-First Century,” in Eliezer Ben-Rafael, Yaacov Oved, and Menachem Topel, eds., *The Communal Idea in the 21st Century* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2013), 33. Oddly, Pitzer connects this argument primarily to “two waves” of twentieth century communalism: the hippie counterculture of the 1960s and 1970s and the co-housing and ecovillage movements of the 1980s and 1990s. Yet Pitzer’s own examples—such as the widespread acceptance of organic foods, alternative health practices, progressive education, and homeschooling—suggest that Camphill and the other enduring movements founded in the 1930s and 1940s are at least as significant for broader spread of community-based idealism.

³ Karl König, “The Three Essentials of Camphill,” in Jan Martin Bang, ed., *A Portrait of Camphill: From Founding Seed to Worldwide Movement* (Edinburgh: Floris, 2010), 28–36.

Camphill at Seventy-Five

27

in the summer of 1999, when I spent one month living at Camphill Village Minnesota and participating fully in community activities. Over the course of similar visits during the next three summers, personal curiosity evolved into scholarly interest, and I began conducting shorter visits to most other Camphill places in the United States. That research culminated in the publication of a comparative study of the Camphill and Catholic Worker communities.⁴ In the years following that publication, I returned regularly to Camphill communities for conferences, class field trips, and community events. During a sabbatical in 2013–2014, I entered a more intense period of research that included visits to approximately thirty Camphill schools and villages in the United Kingdom, Ireland, and Canada, along with more than one hundred semistructured interviews with Camphillers. My relationship to the movement is that of a sympathetic outsider, one who is enthusiastically supportive of the movement’s social and environmental ideals and agnostic about the spiritual worldview that led to its founding.

Scholarship on Camphill

Camphill has received far less scholarly attention than other communal movements of similar scope and longevity. A search on the JSTOR database, for example, generates more than one hundred times as many hits for the Catholic Worker movement (which is roughly comparable in age, number of participants, and geographical scope) as for Camphill.

the Shakers have forty times as many hits; Amana has ten times as many.⁵ Most of the academic studies examine Camphill in relation to other approaches to care for persons with developmental disabilities; although these studies highlight the importance of Camphill's communal dimension, they rarely connect Camphill to other communal movements or to scholarship in communal studies. Notable in this regard are the early work of Norwegian sociologist Nils Christie and more recent collections of essays edited by S. R. Baron, J. D. Haldane, and Robin Jackson.⁶

⁴ Dan McKanan, *Touching the World: Christian Communities Transforming Society* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2007).

⁵ The most direct comparison would be with the L'Arche movement, which was founded about twenty-five years after Camphill, claims a similar number of participants today, and similarly creates community among people with and without developmental disabilities. Unfortunately, the keyword "L'Arche" generates many hits that have nothing to do with the movement. L'Arche's founder, Jean Vanier, generates four times as many hits as Camphill.

⁶ Nils Christie, *Beyond Loneliness and Institutions: Communes for Extraordinary People* (Oslo: Norwegian University Press, 1989); S. R. Baron and J. D. Haldane, *Community, Normality and Difference* (Aberdeen, Scotland: Aberdeen University Press, 1992); Robin Jackson, *Holistic Special Education: Camphill Principles and Practice* (Edinburgh:

Camphillers themselves are prominent among the contributors to the

edited volumes, and have produced an enormous volume of semischolarly writing, most of it focused either on the founding years of the movement or on the practice of anthroposophical curative education and social therapy. The most comprehensive overview produced by the movement is Jan Bang's *A Portrait of Camphill*, which updates the previously published *A Candle on the Hill*.⁷ Founder Karl König has been the subject of one extensive biography and a few biographical studies, and his extensive writings and lectures are being released by the Karl König Archive in conjunction with Floris Books.⁸ Several volumes present the stories of other Camphill founders.⁹ A few individual communities have published histories, and a few Camphillers have published autobiographies.¹⁰ Camphill is also the subject of several master's and doctoral theses, many by current or former coworkers or persons raised in the Camphill movement. Among these, the works of Miriam Snellgrove, Noel Bruder, Manuela Costa, and Julia Wolfson are notable for their engagement with the historical evolution of the movement and with the meaning of community life for nondisabled Camphillers, though they do not engage extensively with the broader context of communal studies.¹¹ Leaders in the Camphill movement have become increasingly eager in recent years to promote scholarship, especially scholarship that highlights the benefits of intentional community for

Floris, 2006); Robin Jackson, ed., *Discovering Camphill: New Perspectives, Research and Developments* (Edinburgh: Floris, 2011).

⁷ Jan Bang, ed., *A Portrait of Camphill: From Founding Seed to Worldwide Movement* (Edinburgh: Floris, 2010); Cornelius Pietzner, ed., *A Candle on the Hill: Images of Camphill Life* (Edinburgh: Floris, 1990); see also Anke Weihs and Joan Tallo, eds., *Camphill Villages*, 2nd ed. (Whitby, UK: Camphill Books, 1988).

⁸ Hans Müller-Wiedemann, *Karl König: A Central-European Biography of the Twentieth Century* (Camphill Books, 1996); Peter Selg, *Karl König's Path into Anthroposophy: Reflections from His Diaries* (Edinburgh: Floris, 2008); Karl König, *My Task: Autobiography and Biographies*, ed. Peter Selg (Edinburgh: Floris, 2008).

⁹ Friedwart Bock, ed., *The Builders of Camphill: Lives and Destinies of the Founders* (Edinburgh: Floris, 2004); Johannes M. Surkamp, *The Lives of Camphill: An Anthology of the Pioneers* (Edinburgh: Floris, 2007).

¹⁰ See, for example, *Shining Lights: Celebrating Forty Years of Community in Camphill Village* (Copake, NY: Camphill Village USA, 2001); and Veronika Van Duin, *A Child in Community* (Leicestershire, UK: Upfront, 2002).

¹¹ Miriam Snellgrove, “The House Camphill Built: Identity, Self and Other” (PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2013); Noel Bruder, “Valuing Camphill” (master’s thesis, Dublin City University, 2012); Manuela Costa, “Camphill—An Island of Promise: Myth or Reality?” (master’s thesis, University of Strathclyde, 2008); and Julia Wolfson, “Snakes and Ladders: Emergence of Deep Power in Transformational Change” (PhD thesis, Australian National University, 2013).

Camphill at Seventy-Five

29

persons with intellectual disabilities.¹² The book by Michael Luxford and Jane Luxford, *A Sense for Community*, is an internally generated study that highlights the developmental transformation of Camphill as a network of intentional communities.¹³ The internal researcher who has done the most to link Camphill’s development to that of other communal movements is Andrew Plant. He identifies the movement’s current transformation as a third developmental phase (succeeding the “pioneering” and “organizing” phases) that involves the integrating of past changes and the creation of more inclusive structures and broader connection to the world beyond the community. He has also conducted an extensive survey of Camphillers in Scotland, addressing questions of community life.¹⁴ The recently established Camphill Research Network maintains a comprehensive bibliography.¹⁵

Scope of Camphill

Camphill is one of the largest networks of intentional communities in the world today. It is an international movement, with about half its communities in the British Isles, one quarter on the European continent, one eighth in North America, and the remainder in Botswana, South Africa, India, and Vietnam. The communities range in size from a few dozen to a few hundred residents, which suggests that the total population of the one hundred communities is at least 5,000.¹⁶ As of this writing, the Camphill movement has never attempted a comprehensive census. In 2015, Camphill Scotland reported 850 residents at its eleven communities, about half of them persons with special support needs. The websites for Camphill Village Trust (in England and Wales) and the Camphill Association of North America each report populations for about half of their constituent communities: about 500 persons at

¹² Maria Lyons, “Ordinary or Meaningful Lives: ‘Deep Personalization’ and the Under-Explored Contribution of Village and Intentional Communities,” *International Journal of Developmental Disabilities* 61, no. 2 (2015): 113–18; Jan Goeschel and Diedra Heitzman, “Providing Quality of Life through Intentional Community Living,” 2010, a report for the Camphill Association of North America, available at <https://s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/research-reports/Goeschel-and-Heitzman-AmeriCorps-QoL-study.pdf>.

¹³ Michael Luxford and Jane Luxford, *A Sense for Community: The Camphill Movement* (Directions for Change, 2003).

¹⁴ Andrew Plant, “Communities in Transition: Change and Development in the Camphill Communities in Scotland,” <https://s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/research-reports/Communities-in-Transition.pdf>; Plant, “Experiences of Community: A Study of the Changing Experience of Community in the Camphill Communities in Scotland,” https://s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/research-reports/Experiences-of-Community_Plant.pdf.

five of the nine Camphill Village Trust communities; about 600 persons at five of the thirteen North American communities. The website for Camphill Communities of Ireland reports 325 people at ten of its seventeen communities. Jan Bang similarly indicates the population of about half the communities included in *A Portrait of Camphill*.¹⁷ He reports approximately 1,500 persons at twenty communities outside the four networks just noted. Thus, there is a reported total population of 3,775 persons at roughly half of the Camphill places worldwide. Since all of these sources are more likely to report populations for the larger communities, I have estimated about thirty residents at each of the remaining Camphill places to generate an overall estimated residential population of about 5,250. About half of these residents are children or adults with developmental disabilities; one quarter are “young coworkers” in their late teens or early twenties, volunteering for a year or two either just before or just after college; and the remaining quarter are adult coworkers who are there along with their children and who have made a long-term commitment to Camphill. To these groups one might add the employees, nonresidential students, and disabled adults participating in day programs who swell the Camphill population during working hours.

Most Camphill schools and villages are legally incorporated as nonprofits, either individually or as part of multicompany organizations. Two of the largest of these, Camphill Village Trust and Camphill Communities of Ireland, encompass nine and seventeen communities respectively. There are also regional networks of legally independent communities, such as Camphill Scotland and the Camphill Association of North America. Historically, however, nonprofit boards have exercised relatively light oversight, entrusting most community decisions to interlocking, consensus-oriented committees composed of full-time residents.

Today’s population of Camphill residents is probably triple the peak achieved by the Amana Community thirty-eight years into its communal phase, and it is well above the Shaker peak, achieved sixty-three years after that movement’s founding. Camphill is a bit more than a decade younger than was Shakerism when it closed its first village and than was Amana when it enacted the Great Change ending communalism. Camphill, in other words, is at an age when even the most enduring communal movements typically experience a weakening of communal bonds. By nineteenth-century standards, it would qualify as an astonishingly long-lived communal movement, but it is also part of a

¹⁷ Bang, *A Portrait of Camphill*, 139–228.

roughly the same age as Camphill and still thriving. A close study of Camphill might thus provide a starting point for a broader, comparative study of third- and fourth-generation communal development.

Camphill's Philosophy

Like Amana and the Shakers, Camphill is rooted in a spiritual impulse. Karl König and the other founders were students of anthroposophy, a “spiritual science” introduced by Rudolf Steiner in the early decades of the twentieth century. Steiner, who had previously led the Theosophical Society in Germany, drew on Theosophy, esoteric Christianity, the scientific writings of Goethe, and his personal spiritual experience. Anthroposophy is the source for a host of contemporary social initiatives, among them Waldorf schools and biodynamic farms, as well as for Camphill.¹⁸ Steiner provided Camphill's founders not only with a method for developing the potential of persons with disabilities but also with a rationale for organizing on a cooperative, communal basis. Steiner laid a foundation for life-sharing in his stress on the healing

¹⁸ For a general introduction to the spiritual impulse of Rudolf Steiner, see Robert A. McDermott, ed., *The Essential Steiner: Basic Writings of Rudolf Steiner* (Great Barrington, MA: Lindisfarne Books, 2007). Students of Rudolf Steiner have published at least a score of Steiner biographies, the most recent and comprehensive of which is Christoph Lindenberg, *Rudolf Steiner: A Biography*, trans. Jon McAlice (Great Barrington, MA: Steiner Books, 2012; first published in German in 1997). To my knowledge the most comprehensive studies of the anthroposophical movement produced by anthroposophists are Bodo von Plato, ed., *Anthroposophie im 20. Jahrhundert: Ein Kulturimpuls in Biografischen Porträts* (Dornach, Switzerland: Verlag am Goetheanum, 2003), which is a collection of individual biographies rather than a narrative history; and Rahel Uhlenhoff, ed., *Anthroposophie in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag, 2011). There is also an excellent history of anthroposophy in the United States: Henry Barnes, *Into the Heart's Land: A Century of Rudolf Steiner's Work in North America* (Great Barrington, MA: Steiner Books, 2005). Non-anthroposophists have written far less about anthroposophy than insiders, but in English there are two excellent, semisolarly biographies: Colin Wilson's *Rudolf Steiner: The Man and His Vision* (Wellingborough, UK: Aquarian Press, 1985) and Gary Lachman's *Rudolf Steiner: An Introduction to His Life and Work* (New York: Tarcher/Penguin, 2007). There is a single movement overview in English: Geoffrey Ahern, *Sun at Midnight: The Rudolf Steiner Movement and the Western Esoteric Tradition* (Wellingborough, UK: Aquarian Press, 1984). It is heavily weighted toward Steiner's biography and writings. The German academic Helmut Zander has recently published both a five-hundred-page biography, *Rudolf Steiner: Die Biografie* (Munich: Piper, 2011) and a two-volume study entitled *Anthroposophie in Deutschland* (Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007, 2008). Despite the title, this work is primarily concerned with the historical background of Steiner's ideas, though several chapters include epilogues covering events after Steiner's death.



potential of person-to-person encounters and for income-sharing in his critique of wage labor, which he saw as inimical to human dignity. He also articulated a principle now known as the “fundamental social law,” according to which the well-being of any community will be enhanced “the less the individual claims for himself the proceeds of the work he has himself done” and “the more his own requirements are satisfied not out of his own work done, but out of work done by the others.”¹⁹ Many Camphillers see this “law” as the heart of Steiner’s social teaching, and they often say that the possibility of working out of love rather than for the sake of money was a major factor drawing them to the movement.

Other Steiner-inspired initiatives, including hundreds of non-Camphill homes for persons with disabilities, do not interpret this law quite as communally as does Camphill. Camphill communalism also has roots in the Moravian upbringing of cofounder Tilla König, as well as in the socialist affinities of several of its founders.²⁰ Some students of Steiner are troubled by the quasimonastic aspects of Camphill life, seeing

¹⁹ Rudolf Steiner, “Anthroposophy and the Social Question,” part 3, translation of “Geisteswissenschaft und soziale Frage,” *Lucifer-Gnosis*, 1905/1906. Like the bulk of Steiner’s writings, this essay is available in English translation at the Rudolf Steiner Archive, www.rsarchive.org/. To avoid confusion among diverse translations and editions, each original item is assigned a unique Gesamtausgabe (GA) number; this item is GA 34.

²⁰ Robin Jackson, “The Camphill Movement: The Moravian Dimension,” *Journal of Moravian History* 5 (Fall 2008): 89–100; Robin Jackson, “The Origin of Camphill and the Social Pedagogic Impulse,” *Educational Review* 63, no. 1 (January 2011): 95–104.

Camphill at Seventy-Five

33

these as incompatible with Steiner’s emphasis on individual freedom, but virtually all anthroposophical initiatives are committed to some form of economic cooperation, making anthroposophy an important source for Camphill’s exploration of new forms for its ideals today.

Camphill’s founding practices of income- and life-sharing provide one baseline for interpreting the movement’s subsequent development. Another baseline is that, from the beginning, Camphill carried a vision of social renewal that transcended its specific communal structures.

Karl König and the other founders of Camphill came to Scotland as refugees from Nazi-occupied Austria, and they saw themselves as a sort of Noah's ark, carrying the authentic spirit of central Europe to safety. Many Camphillers today speak of their movement as a "seed of social renewal" that will eventually blossom in other contexts, and they also quote König's prediction that Camphill might disappear in the twenty-first century as its spirit diffuses through society as a whole. Camphillers often connect the fundamental social law to Steiner's "Spiritual Law," which rejects "separatist" movements in favor of that which is "generally human," and to his "Sociological Law," which holds that social units begin by sacrificing individual interests to those of the association but evolve toward the "unrestricted development of the needs and capacities of the individual."²¹ So there is a sense in which the founders of Camphill were preparing for its postcommunal phase from the very beginning.

Communal Transformation

König's hope for a future society transformed by the Camphill spirit raises a fundamental question for developmental communalism. When a movement moves *away* from its original communal structures, what exactly does it move *toward*? Under what circumstances are postcommunal movements able to bring something radically new into the larger society, and under what circumstances do they simply fold back into pre-existing, more or less conventional, social forms? Both Mormonism and Christianity used relatively brief communal phases to leverage the emergence of new, and very large, religious movements that were in some ways unlike anything the world had seen previously. But Amana, with its much longer communal phase, evolved into a religious congregation on the one hand and a business corporation on the other.²² In certain respects, it was an unusual congregation and an unusual

²¹"A Spiritual Law, A Fundamental Law, A Sociological Law," handout compiled by Claus Sproll in 2001 and revised in 2009. The Spiritual Law comes from "Das Schicksalsjahr 1923," GA 259; the Sociological Law from "Freedom and Society," GA 31.

²²Peter Hoehnle, *Amana People: The History of a Religious Community* (Iowa City, IA: Penfield, 2003); and Jonathan G. Andelson, "The Community of True Inspiration from

business, but American congregations and businesses as a whole were not transformed by Amana's innovations. Similarly, the nineteenth-century community at Hopedale was succeeded by a more or less conventional business and a more or less conventional congregation when it ceased to operate as a cooperative village.²³ The Oneida Community, having erased the distinction between congregation and community, was simply succeeded by a business. More recently, twentieth-century communities with strong service missions often evolved into more or less conventional nonprofits. The pacifist community known as Koinonia gave birth to one very large nonprofit, Habitat for Humanity, and is itself currently organized more as a nonprofit than as a community. Sojourners in Washington, DC, is still thriving as a magazine but not as a community. Several of the most enduring Catholic Worker communities, notably Haley House in Boston and HOPE Community in Minneapolis, have evolved into highly innovative social change organizations in which

nonprofit bureaucracy is tempered by a communal spirit. But even they have failed to catalyze a broader transformation of the nonprofit sector.²⁴

Many Camphillers imagine—or fear—a similar future for their movement. Indeed, some express levels of pessimism, even despondency, that would seem out of step with the outwardly thriving state of Camphill communities today. Many say that they feel more like mere service providers than members of a cohesive community. There is less sense of solidarity between the people with and without disabilities, one Scottish Camphiller told me, and it is more difficult for an entire community to share a festival together.²⁵ In England, where many Camphills are staffed primarily by employed persons, one Camphiller told me, “the traditional Camphill model of coworkers running a community has almost completely disappeared.”²⁶ Another English Camphiller said he struggled to identify positive aspects of the recent changes in Camphill: “There is a lot of maintaining going on. And that maintaining is becoming threadbare in places. . . . [It is] a maintaining of outer things rather than inner values.”²⁷ At an American Camphill that has resisted the trend toward employed staff, coworker Guy Alma says he still feels a sense of Camphill-ness at the places run by employees but doubts that it

Germany to the Amana Colonies,” in Donald E. Pitzer, ed., *America’s Communal Utopias* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 181–203.

²³ Edward K. Spann, *Hopedale: From Commune to Company Town 1840–1920* (Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1992).

²⁴ Dan McKanan, *The Catholic Worker after Dorothy: Practicing the Works of Mercy in a New Generation* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008).

²⁵ Interview with Judith Jones, summer 2013.

²⁶ Interview with Philip Curwen, August 2013.

²⁷ Interview, summer 2013.

Camphill at Seventy-Five

35



will still be there in a generation or two. The experience of “living with individuals with developmental disabilities day in and day out,” he said, “is the seed which everything else grows from.” Without it, “you’ll have echoes in the architecture and the rest of it, but don’t think that presence will be tangibly there anymore.”²⁸

Many Camphillers, in other words, have a sense of the intrinsic value of communal structures that would have made immediate sense

to the Anana residents who voted against the Great Change and to the Shakers who mourned the closure of villages in the late nineteenth century. This raises another question for developmental communalism: must communal evolution always be one-directional, so that when one segment of a movement abandons communalism, the others will all follow sooner or later, even if hundreds or thousands of people still cherish shared life? Or are there ways in which communalism can be preserved as one option among many, even when it is abandoned as the universal norm? Here the Christian and Mormon examples suggest two tantalizing possibilities: Christianity has retained a vital monastic component, working symbiotically with the nonmonastic mainstream, for millennia, while the communal dimension of Mormonism has been preserved most intensely by splinter groups such as the Fundamentalist Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints that are locked in bitter antagonism with the mainstream movement.

Those who expect Camphill to evolve steadily from a communal movement into a network of nonprofit corporations point especially to developmental processes that took place in central Europe in the last

²⁸ Interview with Guy Alma, April 2014.

decades of the twentieth century and in the United Kingdom since the turn of the millennium. In Germany and other central European states, governments effectively forbade the Camphill practice of income-sharing, ruling that workers in homes for persons with disabilities must receive salaries commensurate with their particular professional responsibilities. Most Camphillers responded by creating voluntary income pools: each person received a state-mandated salary, which was then turned over to the common pool, out of which every person drew funds according to need. Unfortunately, they sometimes discovered that there was “a close relationship between the amount you were putting in freely and the amount you were taking out.”²⁹ In other cases, the people with fewer dependents pulled out of the pool, leaving inadequate funds to support the needs of those with large families.³⁰ Because this change began at a time when the Camphill movement as a whole was exceptionally strong, other aspects of Camphill life, such as the sharing of living space, were relatively unaffected. Nevertheless, the change did provoke a modest exodus of idealistic Camphillers to Camphills in the British Isles or North America, where income-sharing was still in place.

More recently, the Camphill movement in the United Kingdom has experienced a set of interrelated, fast-moving changes. First, greater societal concern for persons with disabilities has led to a vast increase in bureaucratic oversight of Camphills. Initially, Camphill operated under a regime of benign neglect; today, each Camphill school and village in the United Kingdom must submit individualized care plans for every resident with a disability and must undergo both scheduled and surprise visits by inspectors. Camphillers are expected to spend more time on health and safety paperwork and to obtain an array of professional credentials just to do the work they’ve been doing, in some cases, for decades. Moreover, because social care authorities generally prefer that people with disabilities be “mainstreamed,” some Camphills

have focused on very high-need individuals who require highly trained support or constant one-on-one care. This sort of care work doesn't always fit easily with intentional community.

All this has happened at a time when the worldwide flow of new volunteers to Camphill —especially of new volunteers who are open to spending a lifetime, rather than merely a year or two, in community— has slowed. Those who are drawn to long-term communal life are rarely interested in conforming to bureaucratic requirements; their preference is to focus on building human relationships. Almost all Camphills have responded by hiring employees to perform at least some functions

²⁹ Interview with Philip Curwen, August 2013.

³⁰ Interview, summer 2013.

Camphill at Seventy-Five

37

traditionally held by unsalaried coworkers. Typically, this begins with clerical and maintenance employees and extends to employed teachers and workshop leaders, followed by salaried community managers with executive authority. The final step is for even the “houseparents” responsible for residential life to be replaced by employees who spend only eight-hour shifts in the houses they oversee. Only a minority of Camphill schools and villages have gone that far, and it is important to stress that even these are not fully postcommunal, as they are home to persons with disabilities as well as to young coworkers who spend a year or two immersed in Camphill life.

In most places, the shift from unsalaried coworkers to employees has been gradual and only semiconscious. Increasingly, however, regulatory authorities have directly attacked practices of both income- and life-sharing. Income-sharing, especially in contexts where the overall standard of living is relatively high, is hard to reconcile with tax laws that presuppose individual incomes. It is also in tension with nonprofit laws that require funds to be spent directly on the purpose of the nonprofit, which is usually defined as care for persons with disabilities. It is quite legal to spend funds earmarked for social care on professional salaries for the persons doing the care, but it is not necessarily legal to spend it directly on private school tuition for the children of the caregivers, including in many cases caregivers whose functions would not ordinarily be highly remunerated. Life-sharing, moreover, can create special difficulties when a community needs to investigate an accusation of sexual abuse, because in order to remove the accused perpetrator from contact with the victim, the community must disrupt the household rhythms, which affects several other people, and must find the accused a new place to live. All of the new regulations are subject to diverse interpretations, and in many places Camphills and regulatory authorities have worked cooperatively to find structures that honor the law while preserving income- and life-sharing. In other places, however, the nonprofit boards that hold ultimate legal authority over Camphill places have forcibly dismantled both income- and life-sharing structures. In several cases, this has occurred in response to internal crises that made it impossible for long-term coworkers to continue living with one another anyhow. Currently, the nonprofit body that owns about half of the Camphills in England and Wales, Camphill Village Trust (CVT), has enacted a set of policies that eliminate income-sharing and transform

³¹The new CVT policies are described in “Factsheet detailing changes in CVT,” <http://www.cvt.org.uk/news/37/62/Factsheet-detailing-changes-in-CVT.html>, posted June 30, 2014, accessed September 22, 2014. This document is very clear about income-sharing:



Because Camphill Village Trust is one of the largest single entities in the Camphill movement and controls some of the largest and oldest Camphill places, many anticipate that its present situation is the future of Camphill as a whole. If so, this would validate a version of developmental communalism predicting that most enduring communal movements will evolve into pre-existing social forms, just as Amana and Hopedale and Oneida did previously. Some Camphillers are horrified by this possibility, in part because they find the bureaucratic structures of conventional nonprofits to be inconsistent with human dignity.

It is at least equally likely, however, that Camphill will evolve in multiple directions simultaneously, with some communities abandoning communal elements, some holding fast to traditional structures, and still

“A review of the legal advice made it clear we had no choice if we want to stay within the law and follow the Charity Commission instructions but to move co-workers to employees.” It is less clear about life-sharing, asserting that there is a general trend away from life-sharing but that “we will examine the possibility of continuing to provide support and living arrangements similar to the shared house model for those people who want it and where it is the right kind of support environment.” Coworkers who have mobilized in opposition to these changes describe them somewhat differently, asserting not only that coworkers were told they must become employees or leave Camphill but also that they received no promises about whether they would be allowed to continue life-sharing. It is clear that both sides agree that income-sharing is being abandoned and that life-sharing is, at best, being relegated to an exceptional practice, allowed at the discretion of managers who are not themselves life-sharers. (See “The Ultimatum,” <http://www.actionforbotton.org/The-Ultimatum>, accessed September 22, 2014.)

others devising new but still identifiably communal social arrangements. Currently, the number of people who want to be long-term Camphill coworkers is far short of the number that would be needed to staff all one hundred Camphill places fully, so it is probably inevitable that at least some will be employee-run, at least for the immediate future. Even these places will remain somewhat communal, in the sense of integrating work and residential life, for the disabled residents and short-term volunteers that call them home, and they may be able to retain some of the community ethos of traditional Camphills.

In my visits to Camphill schools and villages managed primarily by nonresidential employees, I have sometimes witnessed levels of enthusiasm, purpose, and harmony comparable to what I saw at Camphills where income- and life-sharing are still thriving. Camphills that are evolving into conventional nonprofits typically retain a commitment to instilling aspects of the Camphill vision into the larger nonprofit arena even if they do not inspire revolutionary changes in that arena. Indeed, some of these Camphills are leaders in promoting practices, originating elsewhere in the world of disability advocacy and social care, that could enhance life in other Camphill places. The leaders of Camphill Soltane, for example, are not troubled by the trend toward the use of more employed staff, but they are passionate about promoting self-advocacy for persons with disabilities. Working with a non-anthroposophical organization called the Council on Leadership and Quality, they have trained coworkers and employees in the practice of “reliable interviewing,” which helps individuals, including those with limited communication skills, to articulate what they value and need to build a meaningful life. This has empowered the whole community to work together to foster the goals of each individual.³² And in Scotland, Camphill Blair Drummond, which is managed entirely by employed staff, has far more caregivers who are from the local community than other Scottish Camphills, thus serving as a beacon for those who hope to see Camphill identify more strongly with local cultures and communities.

Future Developments

Although it seems likely that Soltane and Blair Drummond represent tendencies that will become more widespread in the Camphill movement, there is also evidence to suggest that the future of Camphill will *not* be as one-directional as the current evolution of Camphill Village Trust might suggest. Other prominent trends within the movement point to a much more multifaceted version of developmental communalism.

³²Interview with Adrian Bowden and Sabine Otto, spring 2014.

One trend is organized resistance to the seemingly dominant developmental process. In the years since Camphill Village Trust enacted its new policy, long-term coworkers have become more militant in opposing that policy; thus they offer a counterweight to similar processes elsewhere. This is a significant departure, because activism and organized resistance to injustices in the larger society have not historically been major components of Camphill practice. The epicenter of the new resis-

tance is Botton Village, a North Yorkshire community that was the first Camphill place created for adults (as opposed to children) with special needs and that has long been the largest Camphill place in the world. Unlike most CVT places, Botton still had a large number of long-term, income-sharing coworkers at the beginning of 2014, and they organized Action for Botton immediately after being told they would have to accept employee status or leave. On July 23, 2014, most Botton coworkers signed “The Botton Declaration,” which articulates a vision of Camphill as primarily a communal movement seeking the transformation of society as a whole:

For sixty years, Botton Village has shone as a beacon to the world. It has united the learning disabled, vocational volunteers and their families as equals in one community-building endeavour. It has inspired a worldwide movement, and touched the lives of tens of thousands. In a world of deepening loneliness and alienation, Botton is living proof that modern mankind can recreate the human bonds of community that make us truly human.³³

The Declaration goes on to affirm the values of both income- and life-sharing, and declares a “parting of the ways” with CVT leadership. The declaration might be compared with the official mission of CVT, which is “to be a values-driven charity delivering innovative person centred care in response to local needs. To be highly regarded, financially sustainable and well resourced with people who are motivated in their work and where anthroposophy remains a living inspiration.”³⁴

Action for Botton has been quite successful in garnering the support of the parents of its disabled residents and coworkers at other Camphills and has even received favorable coverage from the local media. It took legal action that resulted in binding mediation in July 2015 and an agreement that the two sides in the conflict would work together

³³ “The Botton Declaration,” http://www.actionforbotton.org/files/The_Botton_Declaration.pdf, posted 23 July 2014, accessed 22 September 2014.

³⁴ See <http://www.cvt.org.uk/our-vision-our-mission.html>, accessed 22 September 2014.

Camphill at Seventy-Five

41

to preserve shared living as an integral component of Camphill life.³⁵ Intriguingly, Action for Botton’s activist campaign has enabled it to build partnerships in the broader world of disability advocacy that run parallel to those established by Soltane and Blair Drummond. In the fall of 2015, they joined with the L’Arche movement—another network of intentional communities including persons with developmental disabilities—to offer a presentation before Parliament on the benefits of community living. The coworker group is also seeking to have their houses at Botton Village licensed by a non-anthroposophical charity under the rubric of “Shared Lives,” a model that ordinarily refers to family-based care for persons with special needs. “The Shared Lives Model when allied with intentional community and the principles of Camphill,” declares Action for Botton chair Neil Davidson, “is a potential world changer.”³⁶

It is far too soon to predict the long-term consequences of either Action for Botton’s activist campaign or the emerging agreement at Botton.

Perhaps CVT policies will tilt decisively back toward communalism; perhaps newly energized coworkers will leave CVT communities in order to create more traditionally communal Camphill places. Already the campaign has changed the Camphill movement as a whole, causing some Camphillers to see activist resistance to bureaucratic charity as part of the movement's mission. Should overt conflict between long-term coworkers and nonprofit boards spread to other Camphill places, one might imagine a developmental process similar to that of Mormonism in which "official" leaders abandon communalism while others create rival organizations to preserve it.

Resistance to the developmental trend has, however, taken a very different shape in some of the Scottish Camphill places that are about the same age as Botton. Two Scottish Camphills withdrew from Camphill Village Trust a few years ago, in part because they were not fully comfortable with the guiding vision of CVT's board. Yet the policies actually undertaken by these villages represent more of a middle path than a stark alternative to CVT. What's more, all of the Camphill places in Scotland participate in a loose umbrella organization called Camphill Scotland, which assists both with internal dynamics and with interaction with the social service authorities. Camphill Scotland seeks to serve all

³⁵ Action for Botton, "Mediation settlement agreement in High court case," 4 July 2015, <http://www.actionforbotton.org/mediation-settlement-agreement>, accessed 6 August 2015; Camphill Village Trust, "Mediation talks produce Settlement Agreement," 3 July 2015, <http://www.cvt.org.uk/news/84/62/Mediation-talks-produce-Settlement-Agreement.html>, accessed 6 August 2015.

³⁶ "Action for Botton Newsletter," October 2015, <http://www.actionforbotton.org/cms/tinymce/plugins/moxiemanager/data/files/AFB%20Newsletter%20October%202015%20FINAL.pdf>, accessed December 2015.

Camphill places on an equal basis, even though some of its constituent communities have no long-term coworkers and others have almost no employees. Indeed, two of the communities that are at opposite ends of the employee/coworker spectrum share a backyard. Just steps from the original Camphill estate, Simeon Community is a care home whose residents include elders with disabilities and retired Camphill coworkers. Given the high medical needs of its residents, it relies heavily on nurses and others working eight-hour shifts. Across the backyard is Cairnlee, the segment of Camphill Schools serving older teenagers making the transition into adulthood. All of the long-term coworkers there still practice income- and life-sharing, yet they have great respect for the different choices made at Simeon and work diligently to create festivals and artistic events in which Simeon employees and Cairnlee coworkers, as well as students and residents, can participate fully. The Scottish pattern, in other words, might be compared to early Christianity, in which practices of communal sharing were retained by a monastic minority who were, for the most part, admired and valued even by those who had made different choices.

It remains to be seen whether those seeking to preserve traditional forms of income- and life-sharing will be able to sustain these structures in the decades ahead and whether they will do so in cooperation or conflict with those Camphill places that make different choices. However

this story turns out, there is already abundant evidence that Camphill's development process cannot in any case be reduced to a conflict between "old" communal structures and "new" nonprofit ones. Many of the most rapidly changing Camphills are, in fact, creating entirely new social forms rather than merely reverting to the nonprofit model.

At both Camphill School Aberdeen in Scotland and Camphill Special School in Pennsylvania, Camphillers have created a new social form by expanding their young coworker programs to include possibilities for young coworkers to earn college degrees while living at Camphill. Camphill School Aberdeen offers a bachelor of arts in social pedagogy in partnership with Robert Gordon University, while the Camphill Academy, based at Camphill Special School and serving students from several Camphill communities, works collaboratively with Excelsior College, Prescott College, and Empire State College. In these programs, students earn most of their college credits through Camphill-based experiences and courses; they draw on low-residency programs elsewhere to complete degree requirements. Such programs respond to one of the most obvious features of Camphill life today: even as the numbers of people willing to make a lifelong commitment to Camphill has declined, Camphill remains an extremely attractive destination for

Camphill at Seventy-Five

43



young people seeking a short-term service experience. Bachelor of arts programs have the benefit of encouraging young coworkers to stay for four years instead of just one, as well as providing long-term coworkers and persons from beyond Camphill with professional qualifications for their therapeutic work. They provide a place of dialogue and mutual learning between Camphillers, with their anthroposophical approach to curative education, and mainstream therapists and disability rights activists.

Perhaps most intriguingly, though, college programs allow Camphill to participate in the evolutionary processes that are currently transforming higher education as a whole. Camphill Academy's director explained to me that its mission is not only to form a new generation of Camphill leaders but also to change higher education by creating "a prototype for adult learning that is embedded in community that integrates study, contemplative practice, and artistic process; that allows people to come into a learning process as adults or young adults; and that is a little bit

more well rounded and deeper in a certain sense than what traditional academic education has become.”³⁷ Given the rising wave of dissatisfaction with conventional higher education—and the equally significant concerns that many people have raised about its for-profit and online rivals—it is possible that Camphill Academy could play an important role in revitalizing the core vision of liberal education.

³⁷ Interview with Jan Goeschel, spring 2014.

Camphill as Ecovillage

COMMUNAL SOCIETIES

Another exciting way in which Camphills are supporting an emerging social form is in their embrace of ecological practices. It is no accident that the editor of the most recent significant book on the Camphill movement, Jan Bang, is also the editor of one of the standard guides to the ecovillage movement.³⁸ Many, perhaps most, Camphills have begun to imagine themselves as ecovillages in the past decade or two, building on a long heritage of biodynamic farming and life close to the land. In Northern Ireland, for example, Camphill Clanabogan has earned a reputation as one of the area’s leading centers for environmental education and innovation. This is largely a result of the initiative of the community’s farmer, Martin Sturm, who in 1996 persuaded the other members of the community to install a woodchip boiler using a biomass technology that was already widespread in central Europe but virtually unknown in the British Isles. In conjunction with Clanabogan’s sustainable forestry practices, this system is carbon-neutral, and the fact that it serves most of the village—both houses that need heat at night and workshops that need heat during the day—allows it to be quite efficient.

Once Clanabogan was able to demonstrate an annual cost savings of £20,000–£40,000, it empowered Sturm to become an evangelist for renewable energy on a wider scale. Initially, he convinced the Austrian manufacturer of the furnace that Camphill was a cause worth supporting. Within a few years, he placed similar systems at the Jerpoint, Callan, and Kyle Camphill communities in the Republic of Ireland. Sturm then helped the manufacturer find an Irish agent and helped train that agent’s staff by overseeing the installation of the first ten or fifteen systems for private customers in Ireland. Some years later, Sturm gained the community’s blessing to launch his own biomass company with a partner from outside Camphill. “We initially concentrated on gaps in the supply chain of renewable energy equipment connected with biomass and wood chippers,” Sturm said, then turned their attention to “helping farmers become sustainable and build sustainable businesses” by creating local supplies of woodchip.³⁹ Sturm eventually became the Irish agent for the Austrian manufacturer. Though he devotes more expertise than time to the business and invests all its profits into its further development and growth, he is conscious of the irony of being both a full-time volunteer and the owner of a thriving business. “That’s difficult, certainly, for Camphillers to understand because very few people have a business

Camphill at Seventy-Five

45

head among Camphillers,” he said. Still, his initiative has allowed several Camphill places to install biomass plants at cost, and its impact on Ireland as a whole is astonishing. Coupled with his work as a lecturer and seminar speaker for Sustainable Energy Ireland, Sturm’s Camphill installations have been the catalyst for the installation of more than five thousand wood burners in Ireland over twenty years, a good proportion of them using woodchip technologies very similar to that found at Clanabogan.

The biomass initiative also reverberates through the ecosystem of Clanabogan. Martin Sturm is constantly looking for new ways to enhance the environmental impact of his system. During my tour of the village, for example, he enthusiastically showed me a row of pollarded willow trees that have been bred to regenerate rapidly after pruning every five to ten years, so that each tree generates a steady supply of burnable wood even as it continues to absorb carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. These trees are also planted along the boundary separating a pasture from ditches and creek beds so they will function as living fence posts, to which electrical fencing can be attached. Sturm explained that “pollarded willows offer a habitat to many different species of insects, bats, and birds.” Even before installing the biomass system, Clanabogan also built a natural sewage treatment system. Perhaps most significantly, Clanabogan hosts an environmental education classroom for nearby South West College, which ensures that hundreds of young Irish students and environmentalists are not only learning about specific technologies but also discovering the multiplier effects that become possible when new technologies are introduced in the context of an interdependent community and biodynamic farm.

Two aspects of this story are especially noteworthy. The first is that the idea of “Camphill as ecovillage” depends on Camphill’s interaction with *another* communal movement. Indeed, Jan Bang has been an effective bridge-builder between Camphill and the ecovillage movement in part because he has deep ties to a much wider array of communal initiatives—kibbutzim and hippie communes as well as with ecovillages and Camphills—and he is closely tied to the permaculture movement as well. Bang is an especially good networker, but he illustrates the fact that when we think about the developmental processes that are possible for seventy-five-year-old communal movements today, it makes a huge difference that there are several other communal movements that are also seventy-five or fifty or twenty-five years old.

46

Shifts in Organizational Forms

COMMUNAL SOCIETIES

Another notable aspect of the Clanabogan story is that as it has become an ecovillage, it has allowed community members to shift some of their

functions from the traditional nonprofit structure to that of a for-profit social enterprise. This, I think, is an especially important development, because many of the movement's current struggles reflect tensions between a communal vision and the laws governing nonprofit corporations. In a conventional nonprofit, ultimate decision-making power is vested not in a community but in a self-perpetuating board of directors who in turn are accountable only to the organization's mission. Almost all Camphill places are incorporated as nonprofits, but in the early years Camphill boards did not really exercise their legal authority, instead allowing residential coworkers to shape the communities that were their homes as well as workplaces. When boards began exercising their authority—often in response to a financial crisis or to conflict among coworkers—the lack of fit between the nonprofit structure and communal cooperation became suddenly and painfully apparent. In response, some Camphillers are exploring the possibility that their communities might be reorganized as cohousing communities to protect the decision-making power of residents. And Camphill Gannicox in England, a freestanding community that was never part of CVT, established a Community Interest Company, a new legal form that combines elements of for-profit and non-profit incorporation, to avoid the dilemmas inherent in nonprofit incorporation.⁴⁰

Those dilemmas, however, are not unique to Camphill but are faced by many young idealists who aspire to change the world without being beholden to entrenched charitable bureaucracies. So yet another line of development for Camphill relies on budding partnerships between Camphill places and emerging social enterprises. In Hardwick, Vermont, for example, Hannah Schwartz and Jonathan Gilbert founded Heartbeet Lifesharing in 2000 at a time when food-oriented social entrepreneurs were flocking to the neglected farmland of Vermont's Northeast Kingdom. The ground had been prepared by back-to-the-land visionaries of the baby boom generation, but Schwartz and Gilbert grew especially close to entrepreneurs who were, like them, still in their twenties. Around 2005 Schwartz joined with her friend Tom Stearns, who was launching the High Mowing seed company nearby, to organize a business group for local food entrepreneurs. From a superficial perspective, Heartbeet was an odd fit in this group, whose other members ran a CSA farm, a restaurant, and an organic cheese business, but it was clear to Hannah that they were all asking similar questions, ranging from the basics of

⁴⁰ Philip Curwen, e-mail message to the author, 15 July 2015.

Camphill at Seventy-Five

47

business administration to the quest to preserve one's ideals in the face of challenges. "The business association," Schwartz explained, "provided that framework for being really interested in each other. Sitting on each other's boards and hearing each other's stories and being fed and nourished by the passion of another human being. . . . It was funny. I could speak about Camphill and people, and they could speak about vegetables, and I could find so many crossovers. We have a lot in common in what we are striving for."⁴¹ The relationships that were deepened in the business group are evident in many aspects of Heartbeet life today. While the disabled residents of many Camphills work exclusively in on-site workshops, those at Heartbeet also work at most of the other organizations represented in the business group, and they also sponsor a

local community luncheon that attracts farm interns eager to network as well as low-income neighbors in need of a free meal. These connections have helped Hardwick's network of sustainable enterprises thrive and grow, to the point that a recent publication has lifted the town up as a model for the emerging sustainable economy.⁴²

Camphill's current story, in short, has a place not only in the history of communalism, but also in the story of how humanity as a whole is moving toward a sustainable, post-carbon economy and toward a society in which person-to-person relationships take priority over bureaucratic structures. It is quite possible, of course, that humanity is not moving in this direction at all but towards a much bleaker future or perhaps even toward a positive future whose contours are beyond my imagining. Should current trends continue, however, it will become clear that intentional communities are not fated to develop in a single direction but can evolve creatively and consciously with each new generation.

Concluding Thoughts

The Camphill story suggests that enduring intentional communities and communal movements can be as important as short-lived communities in infusing idealistic values into the larger society. To underscore this point, I conclude by placing the Camphill case study into dialogue with two contemporary contributions to developmental communalism. First, in his own recent work, Pitzer has hinted that in the "ultimate stage of developmental communalism," actual communes will become unnecessary. He does not say this in as many words, but he devotes a page and a half to the words of former communalist Omni

⁴¹ Interview with Hannah Schwartz, August 2014.

⁴² Ben Hewitt, *The Town that Food Saved: How One Community Found Vitality in Local Food* (Emmaus, PA: Rodale, 2010).



Mountainskyrainbow, who declares that "not only is there no longer a need to go off and separate from the mainstream society, indeed just the opposite is the case now! . . . All of the functions of the isolated alternative community are now being fulfilled in the greater global community."⁴³ Many Camphillers would respond to this with a rousing "Amen!" while many others would reply, "Heavens no!" This diversity of perspective has much to do with the age of the Camphill movement. While Mountainskyrainbow speaks out of the experience of a single generational cohort that passed through a period of youthful rebellion followed by mature reconnection with the larger society, communities whose lifespan exceeds that of a human individual are necessarily more

generationally diverse. This diversity, in turn, allows them to reach out to their neighbors at the very same time that they are digging deeper into their own ideals.

My conviction that no amount of development will render actual communities irrelevant is shared by Joshua Lockyer, who has proposed “transformational utopianism” as an updated version of developmental communalism. Lockyer’s change of terminology is intended merely to ward off misinterpretation of Pitzer, but along with it comes a more substantive corrective. Lockyer rightly notices that when we look at the developmental process of an individual community or movement, we typically see a progressive diminution of utopian idealism. But this obscures an equally important phenomenon, illustrated in the relationship between Celo Community (founded in 1937) and Earthaven Ecovillage (founded in 1994), which is that individuals associated with the older communities often mentor the founders of new communities with even more ambitious utopian visions. As one Earthaven member put it, “The ideals we brought into Earthaven did take it from where Celo left off and took the idealism a step farther.” For Lockyer, the network of relationships linking older and newer communities allows the newer communities to blend “lessons from the past” with “a renewed utopian urgency,”

⁴³Pitzer, “Developmental Communalism into the Twenty-First Century,” 33, 50.

Camphill at Seventy-Five

49

resulting in an ongoing utopianism with “enduring and renewable transformative potential.”⁴⁴

This blend is beautifully illustrated both in the practice of newer Camphill communities like Heartbeet and in the work of initiatives like Camphill Academy that are rooted in the older Camphill communities. The fact that such dynamics can exist *within* single communal movements and not only, as Lockyer seems to assume, *between* older and new movements suggests that he might be too quick to abandon the language of developmentalism. At least to my ear, *developmental* connotes an organic process in which the inner potential of an organism gradually unfolds, while *transformational* could imply a mechanistic or external process. Lockyer suggests that one drawback of the word *developmental* is its association with developmental disabilities, but from the perspective of Camphill, this is actually a strength.⁴⁵ Camphillers, arguably, have been closely attuned to the organic development of their movement because their work reminds them that people of very diverse mental and emotional abilities are all capable of profound growth.

The unique contribution of a multigenerational communal movement, in short, is its capacity to foster organic development, both within and beyond its boundaries. Such organic development has allowed Camphillers to make important contributions to sustainable energy, to alternative education, and to social entrepreneurship. It has led some Camphillers out of the communal milieu and others to insist, ever more emphatically, on life-sharing as the heart of Camphill’s vision. In this developmental diversity are many lessons for communal studies scholars and for the world.

⁴⁴Joshua Lockyer, “From Developmental Communalism to Transformative Utopianism:

An Imagined Conversation with Donald Pitzer," *Communal Societies* 29, no. 1 (2009): 1, 8, 9, 12.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 4.