

Insights and Innovations in Community Mental Health

The Erich Lindemann Memorial Lectures

**organized and edited by
The Erich Lindemann Memorial Lecture Committee**

hosted by William James College



**WILLIAM JAMES
COLLEGE**

Table of Contents

Foreward.....	3
Healthy Cities: From Wellesley to W.H.O.	4
Leonard J. Duhl, MD	5
A Personal Reflection.....	8
Community	11
From Community to Healthy Cities.....	16
Lisa Redfield Peattie, PhD	21
Introduction by David G. Satin, MD.....	21
Lisa Redfield Peattie, PhD	21
Betty Taymor, MA.....	25
Introduction by David G. Satin, MD.....	25
Betty Taymor, MA.....	25

Foreward

The Erich Lindemann Memorial Lecture is a forum in which to address issues of community mental health, public health, and social policy. It is also a place to give a hearing to those working in these fields, and to encourage students and workers to pursue this perspective, even in times that do not emphasize the social and humane perspective. It's important that social and community psychiatry continue to be presented and encouraged to an audience increasingly unfamiliar with its origins and with Dr. Lindemann as a person. The lecturers and discussants have presented a wide range of clinical, policy, and historical topics that continue to have much to teach.

Here we make available lectures that were presented since 1988. They are still live issues that have not been solved or become less important. This teaches us the historical lesson that societal needs and problems are an existential part of the ongoing life of people, communities, and society. We adapt ways of coping with them that are more effective and more appropriate to changed circumstances—values, technology, and populations. The insights and suggested approaches are still appropriate and inspiring.

Another value of the Lectures is the process of addressing problems that they exemplify: A group agrees on the importance of an issue, seeks out those with experience, enthusiasm, and creativity, and brings them together to share their approaches and open themselves to cross-fertilization. This results in new ideas, approaches, and collaborations. It might be argued that this approach, characteristic of social psychiatry and community mental health, is more important for societal benefit than are specific new techniques.

We hope that readers will become interested, excited, and broadly educated. For a listing of all the Erich Lindemann Memorial Lectures, please visit www.williamjames.edu/lindemann.

The Erich Lindemann Memorial Lecture Committee presents

THE ELEVENTH ANNUAL
ERICH LINDEMANN MEMORIAL LECTURE

Healthy Cities: From Wellesley to W.H.O.

Keynote Speaker

Leonard J. Duhl, MD, Professor of Public Health and Urban and Regional Planning, University of California, Berkeley; Clinical Professor of Psychiatry, University of California, San Francisco

Discussants

Lisa Peattie, PhD, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Betty Taymor, MA, Boston College

Moderator

David G. Satin, MD, DLFAPA, Assistant Clinical Professor of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School; Chairman, Erich Lindemann Memorial Lecture Committee

Friday, April 29, 1988, 2:00 – 5:00 pm

*Massachusetts School of Professional Psychology
221 Rivermoor Street, Boston, MA 02132*

Leonard J. Duhl, MD

Professor of Public Health and Urban and Regional Planning, University of California, Berkeley; Clinical Professor of Psychiatry, University of California, San Francisco.

I would like to take you in big strokes from the earliest days of my contact with Erich Lindemann to the present. It is an attempt to show how this elegant and special man, unappreciated by many during his tenure, managed to anticipate, and set the stage for many of the current developments in a wide variety of fields.

To do so, I will have to begin in the beginning, and tell an old story of creation.

In the beginning, there was everything and nothing. A void and blackness pervaded all that is, was, and will be. Suddenly there was a light. And as the light grew, the energy of the universe began to vibrate and fall into place. There were letters that appeared, the male, the female, and those that connect gradually forming a “pattern that connects”, a tree of life. When the whole alphabet was created, God, the universe, and all that exists appeared. God and human, appeared together.

In this Kabbalistic story of creation, some of the concepts of modern physics can be seen. It is, after all only a story, one handed down through the ages that has never been scientifically proved. It came, as all myths, from the mind of humans, out of continuous interactions with all the forces that surrounded them and effected their daily lives. Slowly, these myths have delivered their truths, as we “scientifically” studied each piece carefully. And still, they persevere, reminding us of how little we do know about the whole of things.

The story of creation, is about making of a whole. It is a balance of forces of different kinds. It is the fertilizing of the “cosmic egg”. It deals with specifics, and the linking connections. It is also the way perceptions and conceptualization are created, and the way we “understand” the totality that determines what we see, and do. The “God” that we create, helps us to unify, and to understand. And as we understand, go through the processes of existence, the pieces change, along with the links, and the conceptual models we use. Our understanding of God changes over our personal and social developmental time.

As we have moved from focusing upon the whole, to the parts, we have reduced our concern to understanding what can be measured. We become controlled by “the bean counters”, bent on analysis of what they understand to be life. We have accepted the view of the tailor who clothed the Emperor, and ignore the warnings of the “fool.”

We have given up our intuitive side, the female side of the tree, if you will, to the unyielding power of the male, analytic mind. We forget, that being whole, or healthy, or

even holy is the bringing together of both sides, connecting and linking them, drawing upon both powers.

The ancient Hebrews understood the need for the whole in defining the sabbath, as the time one did what one didn't do the rest of the week. It is the time of joining the male and female. We, who are academics are blessed with the sabbatical, not to go on teaching in another place, but to refresh ourselves by doing things differently. It is the time of giving up, letting go, and allowing new perceptions from deep inside our self, or outside to rise into out consciousness. It is the time of holiday, of holy days to refresh, renew, and recreate.

I remember a presentation by Semour Kety, when he asked what a book was. He pointed out that you could weigh its mass, measure its thickness, count its letters, analyze its chemistry, and still not know what is in the book. For that one had to learn a language, one had to read, and know meaning.

One could tell the same story about the man, who wanting to become a student of Louis Agassiz, was asked to study a fish. The more he studied, the more there was to know. Returning, first in a few days, and then finally after months, his hoped for teacher could only then say, "we can now begin to study the fish."

The work of the mathematicians and the physicists are foreign to me for I have neither studied them, nor learned intuitively their language. I was not brought up in their household, unlike my children who somehow know the world of psychology and mental health just by being my children.

All this is meant to direct us to "meaning." What is a whole person, or community? Can one focus on the separate parts alone and really know, or understand? Can one look at and study the connecting links, or is there something more? To know, in biblical ways, is to know fully, almost carnally, where one knows in all ways that one can. How many other perceptions can we draw on to see the many sides of an issue, and the whole?

I would like to suggest that Erich Lindemann understood the whole. If not fully knowing it by that name, it was the purpose of his search and his existence, his true meaning. The more he studied physiology or psychology, the more he reached to psychoanalysis for a broader understanding of causality, as he faced the results of the Coconut Grove fire, and moved on to crisis theory, Wellesley Human Relations Service, the West End study, his visit to India, his search for peace, his work with the Friends, and so much else, the more he was yearning for an understanding, and being part of the whole.

It is no secret that Erich was always unsure of himself. Was he on the right track, or , as he often believed it was worthless searching, and that others were closer to the truth? That uncertainty came from many sources, but the most important was his ability to

leave the conceptualizations, or “ideas in good currency”, and search for new meanings and understanding.

It is no accident that I began with a spiritual story of creation, for Erich was a creative person. When he talked with me during the weeks before he died, he revealed a deep interest in German spiritual traditions. What I know of in that tradition, I associate with Rudolph Steiner, though he was not a teacher of Erich's.

The German preoccupation with the organismic whole led to such predecessors of Lindemann as Rudolph Virchow, a hero of public health. Among his many accomplishments, Virchow pointed to the connection of health to the politics of the larger society. He saw illness as an outgrowth and interaction of human and society, “politics is medicine writ large”.

It was concerns with such questions and more that effected Erich's life course. There were myths and mystical meanings. There was a concern with the way people chose to live. In Steiner's case there was a deep involvement in human development, as in the Waldorf Schools, in the quality of the environment, agriculture, food and a practice of medicine that dealt with the movement and energies of the body, as well as more specific treatments. That German view of the whole was felt in its art, music, medicine, and politics, though not always positively. It was and is a way of thinking, of finding meaning.

Erich, wrapped in such a view of the world could not help but try to tie together the psyche and soma, the human and the community, the professional and non-professional, the secular and religious, politics and science, and much more.

It is my hypothesis that Lindemann full of this view of the world, even at times only on an unconscious level, used it to deal both with his personal issues, such as the meaning of loss and death, and in his search and work in all the areas he was involved in. Erich was a spiritual man, in the tradition of the Bhoddisatva, where one can only achieve the highest development, as one brings all others along. Indeed, in Jon Rawls definition of justice, it is only when we aid others to achieve a level of development comparable, yet different from our own, that justice is served. Such was one meaning of Erich's life.

We only have a first peek into the life of this extraordinary man, in Betty Lindemann's biographical notes and in the all too few papers that Erich wrote. Where it really exists is in his students, as well as those effected unknowingly by his presence.

There are two very important developments now taking place, that among many others owe their current richness to Erich's existence. Two apparently unrelated activities, the “Healthy Cities” program of W.H.O., and the field of psycho-neuro-immunology, are deeply and all too often unconsciously connected to his work in Wellesley, the West End, the Coconut Grove fire, crisis theory, grief, and psychosomatic medicine.

A Personal Reflection

Why have I been concerned with “Healthy Cities”? There are many reasons. One was my involvement with Erich Lindemann in the West End study. My experience with him goes back many years. The relationship helped to form me, from the moment there was a question whether I work at the National Institute of Mental Health, or at the Human Relations Service in Wellesley. I’ve been told that Gerald Caplan and Richard Williams flipped a coin to see where I would go, and I went to Bethesda, and NIMH. It seems I had no control over my life, at that moment.

Going to the NIMH truly began the relationship that continued through the many years, including our many visits in the months prior to Erich’s death. It continues to the present. It is the story of that relationship, coupled with my own personal and intellectual and professional development, that is the subject of my comments today.

The questions facing psychiatry, psychoanalysis, mental health, health promotion, public health, community development, cities, planning and policy are all intimately interconnected. It has been in the spaces between health and urban planning that I now live my life.

It was as a physician, who wished to prevent illness via pediatrics, and working in a children’s camp that I came to psychiatry. Not wishing to join the army brought me to tuberculosis control, a local health department and the Public Health Service. It was that experience, working in Contra Costa County with Henrik Blum, and learning how a county worked that laid the groundwork for my future life, as it did for Matt Dumont.

It was the richness of that experience which drew me directly to Erich Lindemann, who was, to my mind, the only person in the 50s and 60s laying the groundwork for a truly preventive public health, and health promotion approaches to mental health issues. I had contact with Henry Schumacher at the Regional Office of NIMH and the Public Health Service, and Kent Zimmerman of the State Health Department and learned little more than that one should work with children, and that there were some specific conditions that one could prevent. Then there was the work of Paul Lemkau, Ben Pasimanick, and Ernest Gruenberg, who were also more preoccupied with preventing specific disorders and less with understanding how illness, and health was “learned” in the school of daily life.

I can remember vividly, my excitement with the study of the Coconut Grove fire victims, and my sudden awareness of the meaning of crisis and grief, in the interconnectedness of physical and mental illness. Crisis, stress, loss, and grief in all its forms became for me a way of understanding the processes of human development.

One is only later aware that the groundwork for me, and for Erich was in both the understanding of the basic biological mechanisms and in psychoanalysis. In my case, having become interested in pediatrics, both because you “got to them earlier”, and

because I could sit on the bed to cut out paper dolls and tell stories to the kids, I was drawn indirectly into psychoanalysis by the fact the whole Department of Pediatrics was both personally analyzed, and appreciative of the multi-faceted origin of disease.

My entrancement with psychoanalysis was to help me to explain the complexity of “learning” how we got the way we are. Later, though I had doubts about psychoanalysis as therapy, I came to believe that psychoanalysis was a beginning of an ecological systems approach toward human development and of illness. I was excited about the many interrelated factors that made up life, that included not only the basic biological and genetic, but the many factors of community and institutional living.

As much as the Coconut Grove study was important, the fact that the Wellesley Human Relations Service existed, permitted me to truly integrate what I had learned about in the Health Department in Contra Costa County, California, with human development, human needs and services, and the awareness that the people of the community were in fact the real helpers, the caretakers of people’s mental health.

It was in the West End study that Erich and I became partners. For it was here that we tested out the proposition that urban renewal, a social stress, could cause a crisis, and sense of loss that would manifest itself in symptoms that were medical, psychological and social. The team that was put together for the West End study has since carried these and other basic ideas into many areas.

It was Marc Fried’s “Grieving for a Lost Home” that gave impetus to a broader understanding of urban removal, stress, and disease. It was Herb Gans’ “Urban Villagers” that pointed to changes in the urban renewal policy of the federal government, and gave us an anthropological and sociological story of urban and people change. It was Chester Hartman who later created the Planner’s Network, and stimulated planning for the people who always are planned for. It was the beginning of advocacy planning and participatory planning, where people, in John Seeley’s terms, could “command the events that effect their life”. It was the beginning of the reforms of the 60s, and the rising power of the so called superfluous people.

For me the West End was the opportunity to learn things that would serve me for the rest of my life. When I coupled that with experience in the poverty stricken North Richmond, California that I worked with previously, there arose many of the ideas that became part of the OEO’s Community Action Program, the Model Cities Program, and most recently, WHO’s Healthy Cities program.

Another experience I shared with Erich and others was the “Space Cadets”. For eleven years, aided by John Calhoun, we created a group of widely different people, from law, to education, city planning, animal ecology, psychiatry, architecture, the press, sociology, community organization, philosophy and much more. Alec Meiklejohn, a member of the Space Cadets, former President of Amherst and developer of the

experimental college at Wisconsin, and key civil rights advocate, called it our private college.

Our focus was the relationship of man to the environment, with special concerns for human health. Each would present ideas, and the others commented. The diversity required understanding “new” languages, new ways of perception, and the alternative realities that this brought to the discussions.

Erich was an important member of the group, as we explored the complex interrelationships of psychological, social, political, administrative issues with the biological in various settings. Discussions of the West End, or the Lindemann’s trip to India were at times the focus. More often, he made piercing and perceptive comments that helped synthesize other people’s work. The fact that we not only talked, but ate, and played together was important in creating our community. We became a mutual support group, that in many ways, still exists.

I mentioned the “Space Cadets”, to point to our emerging understanding of ecosystems, and to how we learned more about the complexity of community. One outcome of the group was the publication of the “Urban Condition” in 1963, an attempt to deal with the complex issues of health and community from an ecological and systems perspective.

In the subsequent years, the West End study impacted upon national housing and urban renewal policy, at the same time as furthering our understanding of grief, crisis and stress. One can see the impact of the stress, grief, and crisis theories in the more recently emerging literature and activity around death and dying. I mention this to give credit to Erich, and to point to the fact that through the Donald Schon’s concept of the “transfer of metaphor”, ideas of Erich spread to widely diverse fields.

At the time of Erich’s death I had the good fortune of being able to meet with him weekly in the Lindemann home in Palo Alto. As Erich talked, and some of his personal history unfolded, it became very clear that in him, as with all of us, his early experience had a tremendous impact on later thought processes and intellectual preoccupations. As we know his concerns with grief had a connection to his mother’s illness and death.

His early life in Germany manifested itself in trying to piece together, not only the concepts of death and grief, but the multiple dimensions of human and social reality. His broad interests lead him to a complex understanding of human and social development.

As the “Space Cadets” spun out their ideas years before they became ideas in good currency, he, I, and others began to get an idea of community, and of cities that are more than had been defined for us, in “civics” classes in our earlier schooling. What is a community or city?

Community

Cities grew out of the attempt of people to get together for some common purpose. Often the concern was security, whether for feeding, shelter, or safety in the “hostile” environment. This gathering was held together, at first, not by a conscious set of rules, but rather by a set of processes that flowed together and interacted on the most “primitive”, yet even at that time complex levels.

Imagine the fetus in communication with the mother through the womb. There is no talk, but there is a multiplicity of communications via the biological organism, where sounds, and feelings, as well as numerous other experiences get communicated to and from the fetus. Such was the earliest experience of humans in their gatherings.

Slowly meaning is attached, understanding occurs. The understanding was obviously based on the level of “knowledge” that was available. What we call knowledge, the analytic comprehension of factors was probably less evident. What we call intuition, feeling, sensing, was probably more central to the “understanding” processes.

It is my hypothesis that what we now know as community has drifted more and more to a place run by cognitive and analytic rules, that tend to ignore, in large part the “unconscious” messages that go back and forth, that were familiar to our forebears. The move toward an analytic, cognitive modeling of behavior, and bean counting, as we try to understand the unknown, has deprived us of another form of knowledge.

Just as the “Space Cadets” were bonded not just by the discussions, but by the eating, drinking, and playing together of friends, larger communities are bonded by similar patterns. The current heterogeneity, and diversity of peoples in modern cities reflects, the differing realities, often on non-conscious levels of us all.

The West End showed us that the dominant reality that considered urban renewal as a boon to the tax base of Boston, ignored the quality of community life of this Italian Sicilian community. By ignoring this, to the authorities, a non-relevant reality, they tore apart the social fabric of the people, leading to crisis, and bio-psycho-social “illnesses” in medical and non-medical spheres. Grief, unresolved can therefore result from an oppression by dominant realities of people with differing experiences, past histories, and thus ways of seeing the world.

Any attempt to dominate, enforcing a reality leads to models of hierarchical control. Participation then becomes to mean, involving people so that they can be “brainwashed” into the acceptable viewpoint. The alternative view is that participation means interaction, on all levels, to optimize communication, and thus the ability to work out complex interrelationships of groups of diverse people. Since we are each unique, this diversity, is as much intracultural as cross-cultural.

Over the last years the development of family therapy has helped to create a way that diverse family members can each go their own way and yet be part of a whole. The

family, thus serves as a metaphor for the larger community, where there is acceptance of the city or community as a whole “organism”, but similarly accepts the diversity of individualized goals, desires, and activities. The real issue is not “family therapy” or understanding. It is rather an ability to comprehend in a systemic and holistic way the complexity of any organization of people and beings.

It is the balance of relationships of the whole and the parts that was part of the development of the Constitution of the United States. Neither hierarchical control, nor full decentralization would work. Rather, a Madisonian system of checks and balances, and acceptance of diversity, and an apparent willingness to permit the working out of issues as time unfolded that was the central point of the Constitutional process.

I am not a legal scholar, yet it is clear to me that any community, whether family or city requires a Constitution, or set of formal and informal rules by which they can work out the short and long range issues of living together. One might note, that the absence of informal, culturally and historically accepted ways of behavior throws more and more responsibility to legal structures.

Can we ask then, if the currently increasing, multiplicity of laws and lawyers reflect the breaking up of community? Thus, the grief observed in the West End, demanded legal and other institutional responses, because the Italian-Sicilian family and cultural structure was destroyed by urban removal.

Clearly, however, there is no such thing as a community in isolation. There is no place to hide, for every person, and every community is connected to every other one, into a world wide web of interconnectedness and interdependence. Thus the largest community on earth, is earth itself.

That which holds the pieces and parts together is both the formal and informal infrastructure. The formal or hard infrastructure is what is commonly meant by those words, the water and sewer lines, the roads and transport systems, the varied communication systems of TV, radio, and computer, and all the other connecting links, local and world wide. For me, what is more important is the “soft” infrastructure, the “constitution” or rules by which the connections are made. It is how we govern ourselves. It is not the legal structure, as much as the commonly accepted values and belief which are the glues that hold us together, yet unique.

What we know as culture, reflected either in tribal structure or the patterns that evolve in family institution or community, sets the basic tone of relationships and processes. These processes determine the values, attitudes, beliefs, and the “way one sees”, the perceptual mode of people.

The informal set of rules usually emerge over time in groups that live together, and reflects not only their history, but the character and history of the environment, both

physical and social. In groups that remain homogeneous, the rules are easily understood and obeyed. It is when groups mix and become heterogeneous that other patterns evolve.

Often as cultures attempt to defend their security they fail. Most often, the dominant culture forces a cultural pattern on the loser. Often too, the loser's culture gradually infiltrates, and changes the dominant group's values. An obvious example, are the oppressed blacks in the United States whose culture has invaded, at the least the musical, entertainment world and the language of the dominant culture.

Most recently, in the response of many to the Presidential campaign politics of Jesse Jackson, the blacks have shown how close they, through Jackson, touch the holistic needs of people. In Bridgeport, Connecticut, Jackson said, "I am the soul, over money and mechanics".

The loss of one's culture, and with it the rules, either broken up in urban renewal in the West End, lead to "Grieving For A Lost Home", Mark Fried's seminal piece in "The Urban Condition". Such crises, that arise out of dislocation, is based upon the breaking up of patterns of bonding, of networks of relationship which aid and abet life.

The work of Leonard Syme and Lisa Berkman, on networking and health has shown that disconnectedness causes both an increase in morbidity and mortality, and a lesser change of regaining the well state. It is not the de-networking alone that causes difficulty, but the loss of the ability to cope. Marc Pilusek, in reviewing the literature, confirms and extends their findings.

Connecting, networking, and relationships have also been shown to positively effect the immune system of the body. Coping, in our western culture, is a reflection of the individual's ego's ability to deal with issues. What we have lost is the recognition that it is the communal ego which provides support for many of the coping skills needed in life. Thus with the disenfranchisement of people, the mobility of populations and the break up of the old families and tribes, there is a loss of "skill" by the communal body.

One might ask whether our focus on the human body as the boundary marker of the organism is correct, or whether Theodore Sturgeon, the science fiction writer, is right that in the creation of "family" like groups, we find an organism that is "more than human".

We see, as these soft infrastructural bonds are broken, a strong need to maintain connections. What results, as creations of our analytic skill is the creation through technology of the roots of the more formal, and ever improving infrastructure.

But, we must ask, will this more technological infrastructure truly ever replace the softer side of connectedness? I believe not. With heterogeneity of culture, and human difference exists, there is a search for languages that are communally understood. At one time we searched for a world language. Esperanto was created and failed. In some ways, English has become the "lingua franca" of the world. Wherever you go, it is talked. Yet, if

you listen carefully, even though English is used, it is understood differently as one moves from population to population.

Another common language is that of numbers and mathematics, which are not bound by culture. Parenthetically, it is interesting that when foreign students come to American campuses, deficient in academic English they drift to math, computer, engineering, and similar sciences. As a corollary to this, the language of money, which we call economics, becomes a similar language of the lowest common denominator. How easy it has been for “money talk” to become the true “lingua franca” of the dominant world culture, leaving all who cannot use it, financially and otherwise, more oppressed and poverty stricken.

Our theories reflect our socio-cultural state of being. Though most people accept and use a hierarchical and oppressive model of organization, there is the potential for use of a communal connectedness of equals model. I suggest that equity means that as human beings we are equal, though we each are unique, different, and perhaps specialized in our knowledge or abilities.

The attempts through family and systems therapy to find equitable relationships of bonded people is one metaphor for a new pattern of inter-human relationships in institutions, communities and between political bodies.

Where we fail in the development of new processes, is not only in our push towards the analytic, but in the unconscious pull we have to be with those like ourselves. We feel that in this there is strength, security, and power. Paradoxically, the true strength may be in the heterogeneous mix, which if held together in a communal arrangement can work together in a pattern, that is “more than human”. We tend to forget the Russian pre-revolutionary work of Kropotkin, on mutual aid, as an important and viable way of human governance.

The political and administrative arrangements that we have lived with for generations are not only hierarchical, but they have become more and more segmented into fragmented “lines and blocks”. The vertical organizations of professions, business and special interests, and the turfs that we hold on to have disconnected us from others.

Connectedness has occurred world wide, with the new banking networks and money transfers that make us into a global stock market or bank, based on trust. However, such technological connections we have in fact further fragmented us, and ignore those issues which make us more human: love, caring, touching, belonging, community, and meaning. The economic model slowly invades, and takes over other areas of endeavor. “Modern medicine”, as was said by a lay leader in the medical field, “is no longer a service, it is a business”.

When this occurs the connectedness that was present in the healing world gets separated and one aspect of the healing process is lost. Technological or economic

connectedness is not a holistic connectedness. It does not include the multiplicity of connections that make up relations between people, and between people and their environment.

What then is connectedness, or “commune-ity”? People are potentially connected in a wide variety of ways. Too often we see the links as physical, and biological. It is only in the last century that psychological connectedness occurs. Erich Lindemann, just before he died, talking of death, asked about the spiritual, philosophical and value connections of people to each other, and to the physical environment.

I am sure, that in our earliest communities where intuition and feeling play a more important role than analytic thinking, connectedness was on the most subtle of communications. Certainly we can now point to the electrical and chemical hormonal information systems involved. Yet, there obviously is more than we know at this time. The clues of psycho-neuro-immunology suggest that what we thought was the “quack” knowledge of Tibetan lamas, Indian gurus, Native American healers, and other spiritual leaders, can in part be understood by some of our newer technological tools.

Is it not strange that the tools of measurement deal primarily with the core community and human issues, material things are the most important. Who we are, how we relate to the universe, and the meanings of existence, which truly are the highest and most important issues we face, are unmeasurable? The current hierarchy of values put material, objective issues higher than the subjective, unmeasurable, and often intuitive ones.

Indeed, science will more and more find analytic answers. This does not mean we ignore the qualitative and intuitive ways of being. Our search for drugs in the 1960s, along with our looking to other cultures for other maps of the mind, have opened us up to more realities than we knew existed. Each of us has experienced some of these, and yet we continue to deny their existence as we attempt to find solutions to our problems.

A “community” is a place where a multiplicity of functions occurs, performed by diverse, unique people, institutions and organizations who work together on multiple levels through a wide variety of interconnections and communicative relationships. It is a commune, in that it is the whole body of the community that is as important as the pieces and parts. The lines and blocks are thus connected by the infrastructure of interrelationships that include feelings, emotions, and technology.

As we, the westernized, mostly white, world grieve for the lost parts of ourselves, we see in others, the minorities, blacks, Asians, and hispanics, that which we are missing. We project onto them the very disconnectedness that is in ourselves. Thus we see blacks as isolated, broken families, where “true health” does not exist.

For those of us who have allowed ourselves to meet, communicate, and “touch” this foreign world, we find a richness, and indeed a reservoir of all those qualities we have

lost. If we look hard enough we will find that the symptoms we claim of ill health, the so called black teenage pregnancy is lessening, while proportionately white teenage pregnancy is going up. We find that white adolescent violence is rising as black is falling. We find connectedness, and “families” of mutually supportive people present, in the black, and other formerly oppressed groups.

What does this projection mean? It is not our own grief and loss we are projecting on “them”, and calling them the problem. Why do we have the love-hate relation with minorities, where we are attracted and repelled, if not for our own loss of something tremendously important, our belonging in the non technological way to others.

We have given up the practice of “reciprocal maintenance”, taking care of those people and the environment that takes care of us. And yet if we look carefully, it is in the underground economies, where money has become less important than mutual support and “reciprocal maintenance”, that we find life in the cities and communities of the world. It is in the Northern Italian cities, whose communal politics, allows a place for the mentally ill and the old, and where barter and mutual support has lead to “rich” economies, that vitality exists.

Such underground worlds exist in Italy, Poland, Spain, Mexico, the United States, and elsewhere. Even in the world of the ghetto drug cultures are attempts to transfer funds from the “have” world to the “havenot”. It is our failure to recognize that the “havenot” world made up of what we feel are “superfluous people”, are part of our whole. We have ruled them out of our thinking. We accuse them of immorality and “illness”. We give them less and less, as we protect ourselves from the enemy, by building bigger and bigger barriers and offensive weapons.

The sign of life that exist in these “superfluous” is in their own natural organizations, their connectedness and their very human way of relating.

It is in this connection that my concern with “Healthy Cities” exist.

From Community to Healthy Cities

“Healthy Cities”, as a concept and activity is both new and very old. It is important to more fully trace the history of cities, in order to more fully understand the issues that we are faced with today, as we develop our activities.

One can go back to the earliest gathering of people to see how, like all organisms, they tend to cluster. In part this is a phenomena that goes way beyond the needs for food, shelter, or even protections. They cluster, as “like” tend to be with “like”. Whether hunter-gatherers or later in the early forms of agriculture people tended to be with each other. Familiarity can be said to be derived from instinctual processes.

As people are together they also develop means to exist together, whether it be through the modern languages or through a more instinctual set of reactions and responses. In these early forms of communities, people perhaps communicated the way a fetus is in touch with their mother: by chemical, sound, and other means, many of which we are beginning to get to know. It was not analytic or even verbal. Somehow the totality of existence was “felt” or experienced in some incomprehensible manner. It is as if the person and the environment was one, and interactive relationship of symbiotic proportions.

As humans began to conceptualize using language, words and concepts, a separation began to develop between person and environment, much in the way a child and mother separates, creating different and unique identities.

During this period of creating identities as humans, the gathering places began to assume a place of more formal communication. The rules that governed the interactions, be it spoken or not, were the cultural norms and emerging cosmology of the group of like minded people.

The key cosmologies of the world were originally religious, and thus centered around rites, temples, and spiritual structures. The “cosmologies in good currency” that developed, governed all behavior including the modifications and use of the environment itself. What emerged as a community was subjected to these belief systems, whether they be the so called primitive ones, or the later religious systems of more “sophisticated” cultures, like Greece, India, or China. Each created the pre-cities of the present, differing from each other as the cosmologies coupled with the geographic location with its climate and resources effecting it. Thus the Greek city-states having similar cosmologies, differed. Sparta and Athens created different rules and reasons for being.

Later the Jews, being rural people, and the Muslims created out of their religious beliefs rules about living together. Muslims turned these ultimately into Islamic “city planning”. The Jews, after being placed in the ghetto of Venice, modified their rurally created beliefs into what we might now see as “housing codes”. Culture after culture did the same.

What is important in the history of cities is that with the development of commerce and business as the most important endeavor in peoples’ lives, the communities and the cosmologies became modified to meet the new needs.

Indeed, the separation of beliefs that developed created multiple worlds, that in their fragmented way conflicted. Thus the emerging and changing cities, as we get closer to our time, began to have decisions made by rules that often made secondary other non-business needs of people.

The modern city, whether it be in the modern western world, or in the “developing” countries, thus has become a place where the multiple needs of people, especially diverse

groups who are not of the dominant culture, are not met adequately. All too often, in all societies of varied political or economic beliefs, this problem exists.

The modern temple or cathedral of the city is not a house of worship, but an economic institution, a bank, business, or hotel. Even in last decades' cathedral, the modern medical center, has become an economic institution.

The form that the difficulties take is related to the structures that have been created to deal with the problems faced. The modern world has created bureaucracies that are full of "lines and blocks". Recently, in China, I witnessed in the extreme, a phenomena where the vertically organized segments of organizations and the turfs or blocks, so immobilized action, that any ability to deal with the complex issues was extremely difficult. Small groups, dealing with a piece of the problem hold on to their perogatives so intensely that they can neither see the issues or take needed action.

We have no common cosmology that covers our heterogeneous populations, and mulit-dimensional societies, and thus we have troubles. Citities are said to be ungovernable, as are institutions and organizations. There is little ability of the individual to be both part of the whole and unique.

The arguments expressed here, in no way is meant to be quarrel with the need for cities, or for a return to the so called "natural" world of the past. Rather it is a plea for cities that meet people's varied needs.

The complexities that lead to the creation of a concern with systems, and with ecology, reflects a need for the pieces to find ways to work together. To create ecosystems without a common cosmology is difficult to do. We do this often. For example the Poverty and the Model Cities programs in the United States in the 1960s were attempts to pull the pieces together, and to redress grievances, but not without a commonly held belief system the programs often were mutually contradictory. Though systems oriented, they were a collection of activities that met every special interest group's needs, without working through a commonality of purpose.

A common perception of reality need not mean that all must behave alike. Often, in top-down, and centrally controlled societies, this has been the case. An impelling argument can be made for a commonalit of purpose, that is met by unique people and groups that fit together, but are different. At the least we must play on a common "gameboard", with some common rules, if we are to succeed.

The cities of the present, that are attempting to develop a "Healthy Cities" prgram as part of the World Health Organization's endeavors are attempts to deal not only with social and urban issues. They go much deeper, as attempts to find the common "gameboard" and ultimately a working formal and informal constitution, for their cities. The shift in the hierarchy of values that emerges puts human community needs on a higher level than materialistic gains. It puts the "lingua franca" of money to work for the

holistic need of a community, rather than for business needs alone. The goal is for a city to work for the people, in all their purposes.

Ultimately, we may have to face the question as to whether we can do everything, even the good things, or whether choices need to be made. The early gatherings had a clear set of reasons for existence. Those developed with communal religious beliefs, developed similarly. It is only when there was little agreement, and the cities became more diversified and heterogeneous that we could not solve issues, and the cities were called ungovernable.

Fortunately, there are cities, such as Toronto, those in Northern Italy, Minneapolis, and Saint Paul, among others, that work well. This tells us, “it can be done!”. The fact that all cities are different, and reflect differing interests, beliefs, and political systems, gives hope for a diversity of solutions.

Historically, the city, whether it be through “Healthy Cities” programs or by other means, needs to find solutions along these lines. Cities are, after all, the cradle of innovation and excitement. It is here that the “polis” of the Greek city-states, the politics of citizens can find, as they interact solutions to the problems of our time, and create those artifacts of business, education, health, music, art, literature, culture, and much more that make human life worthwhile.

Those who are involved with “Healthy Cities” are on the forefront of important advances in the city and its governance.

There are many issues that come up regularly in the planning of cities, in health promotion, and in our focus upon healthy public policy, have been taken by many as a matter of good faith. For example, “green grass is good”, open space is important to people’s mental health, that people need space in their housing, relaxation can change one’s sense of well being and so forth.

Though we “knew” this with an intuitive grasp, and people like Erich Lindemann had a sense of the tremendous importance of crises, the grieving process, and importance of giving priority to issues surrounding the development of health or illness, it is not until recently that we have “proof”. In our analytic world, we need the number crunching and the “bean counting” to demonstrate fact.

That social change, or a change in the psychological, or spiritual space of an individual can effect the chemistry of the brain, came out of the studies that began with the new psychoactive drugs. That such a change leads to depression or schizophrenia was but the first step. Now we can see changes, not only in brain chemistry, but in the hormonal and the immune system.

That the immune system can be effected by the state of mind, or by meanings, reinforces the “old” psychologies of the right brain, the teachings of the Buddhists, and even the aborigines of Australia. Living in the sabbath or in holy days (holidays), most of

their life, may indeed give lessons we can benefit from. Could it not be that their lives are more peaceful than the world we live in, less greedy, more concerned and loving.

Erich Lindemann, as he searched for the changes associated with grief, saw the outer, non-biological patterns, as significant responses. That “T” cells diminish in their ability to protect the organism against any foreign force, cancer, infection, or foreign body, when social, psychological, spiritual or other “superficial” change occurred, takes us away from a psychosomatic notion of the human, and forces us to see the human, in the context of environment, in holistic terms.

That was the genius of Erich Lindemann. By pushing on the boundaries of conventional wisdom, by living with self doubt that arose when others critical and not where he was, Erich showed us that “the fool” who saw the Emperor with no clothes, was indeed closer to God than all the true believers. It is “the fool”, that is our true leader in change.

It is for this reason, that “The Urban Condition-II; a twenty five year update”, is dedicated to the memory and friendship of Erich Lindemann. Though many of the original Space Cadets are no longer with us, many of those still active, joined by others of like values have produced this new volume.

It is no accident that the manner of writing reflects the values expressed in this paper. With each having a common acceptance of the values and orientation of the old “Urban Condition”, they were asked to write what they wished. It was only the editors what wove them together. They fit, easily, though some are concerned with narrow, and particular issues, they each play a part in the whole. Erich Lindemann would be delighted to see the outcome.

David Satin

Thank you, Len Duhl. I was thinking how different people would respond to that presentation's impassioned. It reminds me of the children's story of "The Emperor's New Clothes", which, in a larger sense, is a cautionary tale: In the storybook everybody is enlightened by the child and sees clearly the truth he points out. However, I sometimes wonder what would happen to that child in real life: people do not easily accept correction of their social or political values, and this challenging child might well end up in the mental health or juvenile justice system. Dr. Duhl might take heed in his bold challenge to perspectives health and values and the motivations and authority in policy.

Lisa Redfield Peattie, PhD

Professor Emerita and Senior Lecturer, Department of Urban Studies and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Introduction by David G. Satin, MD

The first discussant is Lisa Redfield Peattie. Professor Peattie has an undergraduate degree from Swarthmore College. She earned her master's and doctoral degrees in anthropology and social anthropology from the University of Chicago. She is now Professor Emerita and Senior Lecturer in the Department of Urban Studies and Planning of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and has been the Harvey S. Perloff Distinguished Professor at the University of California, Los Angeles. She was Visiting Professor at the Center for Urban Studies and Urban Planning at the University of Hong Kong; participant in the United Nations Expert Meeting on Upgrading Inner City Slums in Bangkok; consultant on design of a study of the "informal" housing sector in Egypt; and a lecturer on the developments in US planning in Beijing and Kunming at the invitation of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences; and collaborated with Morton Grodzins on a history of the decision making process in the War Relocation Authority. Her recent books include, Planning: Rethinking Ciudad Guanana, and Thinking About Development. I present Professor Lisa Peattie.

Lisa Redfield Peattie, PhD

Leonard Duhl brings out creative and provocative ideas. As always, they're not arguments, they're thematic. He brings forth important themes, and they demand not analysis and critiquing and nitpicking but response. So I thought what I'd do is respond to two of the themes in his talk.

The first theme is the sense of community or connectedness, that sense that's left the displaced West Enders grieving for a lost home. Second is the theme of provision, the commitment to individual well-being that made the Healthy Cities project look at the need for open space, as well as clean water and health services. Len Duhl has talked a little bit about some of the connections between those two themes. He's talked about the way in which the community provides services for itself more effectively, more efficiently, than services can be provided for it, and he has also talked about how the community is itself a service, by providing a sense of balance and rootedness which improves basic health. What I want to do here is talk about another connection between these two themes, community and services and provisions if you like. I thought about this connection a lot in the course of a night I spent recently in New York's Pennsylvania Station. There were quite a few of us there, spending the night, and some of the time

went in conversation between myself and three golden-aged women returning to Toronto from Florida; and a tattered intellectual who said he was on his way back from New Jersey, but seemed more interested in getting me to accompany him to what he described as a fantastic all-night bar full of Damon Runyon characters; and a cop whose job it was to keep us all from sleeping. Other people simply sat and dozed or, in some cases, groaned or muttered.

When not engaged in conversation, I thought about three books I had read recently which seemed not to have any relationship with each other until that moment. The first of these books, and the one which gave the basic plot, was Making the Second Ghettos, by Arnold Hirsch. The second was Jonathan Kozol's new book on homelessness, or rather on the life that homeless people lead in New York. The third was Hillberg's The Destruction of European Jewry. I'll take them in order, as in fact they arranged themselves in my mind in the course of the night.

I'd begun reading Hirsch's book because a central piece of it is an account of some events that played a part in my own life--the urban renewal project through which the University of Chicago tried to stabilize it's environment by creating an interracial community (but don't quote me). That's an interesting story in itself, especially since the outcome has been a defended territory in which no one goes out of doors, except by automobile after dark. But Hirsch's story cuts wider and deeper than that. The story begins with a problem: a substantial and increasing population of poor Blacks who nobody wants in their neighborhood. Ghettoized by prejudice, their conditions of life are isolating and stigmatizing, with racial hostility increasing. The pressure of population is such that they move out of the ghetto at it's edges, into any area too weak to defend itself. Where the White working class ethnic population is well-organized, they throw rocks and set fires. This behavior is widely disapproved of. Meanwhile the downtown business group, with Michael Reece Hospital and University of Chicago, perceive a more definite threat, they bend public powers to their purposes, and set in train programs of neighborhood improvement which has as their outcome the exclusion of poor people from the territory. White working class communities further south are duly enraged that the blacks appear at their doors, but they lack the capacity to retaliate in kind. But something has to give. Eventually what happens is this: the reform administrator of the Chicago Housing Authority is replaced by an independent developer and there is created an extraordinary high-rise federal facility.

The second book: Kozol's Rachel and the Children. This is a story of a pregnant woman who spends her days on the subway, following orders, travelling from shelter to office to shelter, which is forbidden by the health regulations. Here's life in a hotel which resembles a penal institution. Another woman says that when she came there, she learned that she'd lost the right to vote. Isn't it possible to publish a newsletter for the

1,800 residents of the institution? Speaking to reporters is penalized. Contacts with visitors is at the discretion of management. There's the picture of the visitor sitting stiffly in the lobby, a container of take-out food cooling on his lap, awaiting an eventual brief contact. Helping humans try to intervene at various points: Church dinners are provided. The Coalition for the Homeless sues to enable persons to register to vote.

The third book which enters my train of thought, Hillberg's The Destruction of European Jewry, is an open exercise in naming names: Who was in charge of transport and trains? Who designed the gas chambers? And an essay on changing power. The author tells us that the gas chambers did not come out of the blue or even out of the malign imagination of Adolph Hitler, but rather were made possible, were prepared, by a long series of efficient policies which had the effect of cutting social contact between Jews and gentiles, that restricted Jews to poorly provided ghettos whose inhabitants were bound to become healthy hazards. We learn from Gilbert's account, and the analogy is clearly in line, that if we separate and stigmatize a population on the basis of anything, anything at all, they will immediately become not like anyone else; they will have become not quite people. We learn from Hirsch's Chicago story that to achieve separation that stigmatizes it is not necessary to have official policies. It is quite enough to have a population which is generally seen undesirable to have around, and that no action can be taken to make it possible for them to blend in.

Sitting in Pennsylvania Station I learned that the action was presented by certain leaders. A school full of hotel children will need additional staff the system will not provide. The neighborhood which does not protest at city hall will find itself full of homeless. The policeman said that AMTRAK had received protests from its customers about homeless people sleeping in the station. I have to admit their response was not unusual.

Recently a public hearing was held in Westchester on a proposal to build a project to house now homeless people. As I remember it, the building was to be on a rather large plot of land and screened by trees. At the hearing not one person spoke in favor of the plan. One woman gave testimony about fire hazards in a shelter shouted, "Let them burn! Nobody wants them in their neighborhood, nobody wants them in their lobby." Train and bus stations have taken out lockers to reduce the number of homeless persons. The benches which remain are deliberately designed to be uncomfortable. The city of Atlanta has taken rest rooms out of the downtown area, which discourages the homeless from hanging around. It also ensures that homeless people will act crazy.

There is community at the neighborhood scale at the west end of the world, but there is also community at a wider scale. There are those who, under various banners, communities of patients, who have tried and are trying to build a community. The healthy city, I believe, is not only community at the neighborhood level but community

at a broader level than that. By stigmatizing and separating the homeless we are destroying our own civic homeland, our cities. The Coalition for the Homeless registered people to vote. In legal action, the system of provision must accept the support of the wider community, or else the local community will assert itself to stigmatize. It is not enough that there be some provision of open space. Provision must be made in such a way to build community. Chicago at last implemented a provision and it took the form of a high-rise ghetto. It could in the end house the homeless. It would be another occasion than this one to think how we would discuss how to address the housing problem to build the same for the homeless. I have some thoughts about it but no real solution. I want to appear only to make the general point that there are complicated elements of the healthy city. Those who are inadequately provided for, those who are isolated in the system of service provision, become separated from the rest of society.

Betty Taymor, MA

Boston College

Introduction by David G. Satin, MD

Our next discussant is Betty Taymor, the fifth graduate of Goucher College, and was the Elizabeth King Elicott Fellow in postgraduate study of Women in American Politics at Harvard University, and has a master's degree from Boston University. She is the designer, administrator and teacher of the Program for Women in Political and Governmental Careers at Boston College, and in the past, at Simmons College. She is founding member, coordinator of the Massachusetts Coalition for Women's Appointments, founding member and coordinator of the Boston Network for Women in Politics and Government, a member of the Democratic National Committee, and a member of the New England Board of Higher Education. We're listening here to somebody who has a keen eye and a practical application of ideas.

Betty Taymor, MA

When I was first asked if I would be on this program, I hesitated because I thought that this would be a talk about memorializing Dr. Lindemann and that I needed the cap of confessional public health person or a city plan, but I realized that I am very much a public person, a politician and a teacher of political science, and so I think that I have a different perspective today on what you said, although I looked up a lot of the words. I wouldn't talk today about what it would be like and what it would take to live in a nonsexist city. These ideas are not original with me, because a lot of people have been writing and thinking about housing policies in this way for some time, but I'm glad to have the opportunity to encourage this kind of dialogue.

Now, "a woman's place is in the home" has been an important principle of architectural design and urban planning in the United States. You may not have thought about it quite that way but it has been implicit and explicit as a principle of the organization of the contemporary American city. But women have rejected this dogma and have entered the labor force in unprecedented numbers, as you know, because dwellings, neighborhoods and suburbs and cities of all kinds have been designed for homebound women. The result has been to constrain women physically and socially and economically, and that does not work with a healthy society.

So I think what I'm going to tell you about and make you think about, although you probably know all of these things, is the health of people in our cities. The only remedy now is to develop a new model or a new paradigm of the home, of the neighborhood and

of the city that would support rather than restrict the activities of employed women and their families. So we need to begin to construct new public and private housing to meet the needs of the new and growing majority of Americans who are working women.

Today when I read the Boston Globe I noticed, I didn't have the time to read it because I think I knew what it said, but the baby boom generation can't find babysitters, which is part of what I'm talking about. Suburban sprawl, which has emerged in recent decades includes more than half the population. We know two thirds of Americans own their own homes. Most of these are White males with long mortgages. Now the reason that this has come about has become about consistent with the search for industrial order. Corporations sold the idea of a more passive male worker in the late 19th and early 20th century, responding to the urban tenement crowding conditions and the strikes that arose because of them. They thought that a happy worker was a more productive one, and that was good, and so therefore males, in their quest to own their own homes, had to work hard to support it. This led, of course, to a separation of the sexes by definition: a home for women and work for men. And I think all of us have remembered this and thought of this as if it never was any other way, but we know that women and men used to work side. Now this whole private place for men, a place where a man could go after his day of work, has to be supported and maintained by the unpaid work of women.

The corporations then began to push consumptive buying, and went to really new heights in the 1950s, and women became, we all remember, I'm sure, Betty Friedan's book about The Feminine Mystique, and really elaborating on the home life, as well as remembering that all of this was promoted by advertising. Society makes that the goal, everyone should reform to that goal, and also that would mean that we would need consumer products. As this increased, so did the bills for consumers products, and women had to enter the workforce to pay these bills, so that in 1975 39% of American families were dual worker families. Another 13% were single parent families usually headed by women.

Now a conventional home serves the employed women and her family very badly. Whether she's suburban, exurban or inner city really makes no difference, because what women really need is a fair space. Childcare and daycare-- Children are served by care and elders are served by what we call daycare. People, women also need transportation. Seventy percent of those people who use the public transport system are women. They also need laundry service, and they need food services, and they need clinics. A typical divorced or battered woman needs childcare, employment and counseling all at once.

While I'm on the topic of battered women, you hear a lot more about that. You hear a lot more of it on television, and its been reported that 17% of women in America are being battered. I find that hard to absorb. But I also know that most of this battering

takes place in the kitchen or bedroom, and it makes one wonder about the isolation of the way in which we live.

So we need to plan environments that unite housing, services and jobs. All our public policy, like public housing and so forth, attempt to support an ideal family which lives in an isolated house or apartment with a full-time homemaker, cooking meals and minding children many hours a day. The supports are not there. Even more affluent women have problems of no time and need for childcare. This has led to jobs that are by the hour, fast food, and the establishment of franchised daycare. These hide the failure of housing policies, and worst of all, they generate bad conditions for other working women because fast food franchises and commercial daycare are sources of non-union, low-paying jobs.

The problem is paradoxical because women cannot improve their status in the home unless their overall economic position is altered, and women cannot improve their status in the paid labor force unless their domestic responsibilities are altered.