



## Communitarianism, Sociology of

Henry Tam, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

© 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

This article is based on new materials, following on from the previous article by A. Etzioni, volume 4, pp. 2336–2339, © 2001, Elsevier Ltd.

### Abstract

'Communitarianism' is the name adopted by a group of American and British thinkers in late twentieth century to describe their shared sociological and philosophical concerns, and the ideas developed by them and their intellectual precursors in earlier times to address these concerns. One of its key themes is that society would be ultimately deficient and unstable, unless people learn to cultivate shared values and pursue them in cooperation with each other. Its significance is best understood as an evolving social philosophy that responds critically to threats to the development of inclusive community life.

### What Is Communitarianism?

In the 1840s, the term 'communitarian' came into usage to describe the approach to community building through cooperative education and organization, championed by the British reformist, Robert Owen, and his followers on both sides of the Atlantic. In the 1980s, the same term was used by academic commentators as a generic label for an otherwise diverse group of thinkers (Alasdair MacIntyre, Charles Taylor, Michael Sandel, and Michael Walzer) who had one thing in common – they all penned criticisms of John Rawls' liberal philosophy because it treated people as unencumbered selves without reference to their relationships to their communities.

It was in the 1990s that a group of social and political theorists in Britain and America formally adopted 'communitarian' as the name for their shared philosophical outlook. Through the writings and collaborations of these thinkers, who included Philip Selznick, Robert Bellah, Jonathan Boswell, Amitai Etzioni, and Henry Tam, a body of work emerged to elucidate what communitarianism is about, provide a framework for understanding its intellectual heritage dating back to fifth century BC, and point to future challenges in the twenty-first century, particularly in relation to the twin threats of local community life being fragmented and global social development failing to generate sufficient shared values and solidarity.

Aristotle's insightful correction of Plato's reduction of all human beings into narrow categories assigning them in a single monolithic state is arguably one of the earliest examples of communitarian criticism. By pointing out that people are irreducibly social beings who are attached to a range of communal associations, Aristotle rejected the Platonic assumption that morally or intellectually people can be coherently defined in abstract terms without due reference to the relationships they have or seek in actual communities.

The disagreement between the two Greek philosophers, however, pales in comparison with the disputes that erupted in China from fifth century down to third century BC. The fierce contest between the traditionalist Confucians, the communitarian Mohists, and other rival schools of thought brought into sharp relief the dividing lines between conflicting visions of how society should be organized. Against those who just wanted to preserve rigid traditional hierarchies, those who would prefer to ignore all hierarchies and ties, and those who

sought to impose new hierarchies at will, the communitarian followers of the philosopher, Mo Tze (c.479–399 BC), advocated the development of communities based on mutual values. They had to defend not only their doctrines but also their lives when their commitment to oppose aggressive wars put them repeatedly at odds with lords and princelings seeking to make territorial gains by force.

The Mohist and Owenite concerns with displacing oppressive social structures, not with any kind of free-for-all individualism, but with a deliberative and experimental reconstruction of community life based on the development of mutually respected values, point to philosophical continuities that ran through the late nineteenth/early twentieth century communitarian ideas of Émile Durkheim, L.T. Hobhouse, Jane Addams, and John Dewey, down to the contemporary advocates of communitarianism.

The key challenge facing communitarians in the twenty-first century is the resurgence of the 'self-centred' conception of human interactions. Academic relativism and popular culture converge on detaching the 'self' from any objective set of values with which it can be morally judged and socially restrained. The 'self' may be that of unaccountable political leader, a fundamentalist extremist, a corporate magnate, or simply an individual who cares nothing for the effects of his or her actions on others.

Communitarians reject both the relativist neutrality of supposing individual 'selves' should be left alone to act as they wish and authoritarian injunctions to impose the rigid order of hierarchical communities. Instead they put forward arguments and proposals to enable ordinary citizens and those in leadership positions to find ways to build and sustain a more inclusive form of community life, with the help of shared learning, deliberative dialogues, and participatory forms of collective decision making.

Although advocates for traditionalist hierarchical communities are sometimes labeled 'communitarians,' this is a term those advocates have never adopted, and their ideas have consistently been criticized by the writers who actually refer to themselves as communitarians. In this article, the term 'communitarian' is therefore applied only to the ideas that are philosophical antecedents of, intellectually complementary to, or directly expressed in, the works by thinkers who have used the term 'communitarian' to describe their own stance.

## The Emergence of Communitarian Thinking and Its Critics

The core themes of communitarian debates first emerged in ancient China, during the late 'Spring–Autumn' and early 'Warring States' periods (500–250 BC), when rival social philosophers contested how stable and prosperous community life could be engendered against a backdrop of growing social fragmentation and armed conflicts. Four distinct positions were articulated. Their interrelationships provide a better illustration of what are in dispute than the more commonly invoked communitarian-liberal polarization.

The first position was formulated by Confucius (551–479 BC) and staunchly defended by his followers. In essence, it maintains that society functions best when it has a firm hierarchical structure, and everyone accepts the traditional role that has been assigned to them without seeking to usurp someone else's position. Its favored tool of socialization is the inculcation of rites and customs, with which people are routinely reminded that they ought to do what is expected of them.

Against this position, the Taoists advocated a romantic form of anarchic individualism. The writings attributed to Lao Tze (c.550–450 BC) suggested that the ruler should do as little as possible, leaving people to live in small communities in accordance with their own wishes. Chuang Tze (c.369–286 BC) went even further in proposing that individuals should withdraw from conventional ties altogether and follow whatever mode of behavior that might take their fancy. The Taoists believe that such liberated individuals would have a much better life without the pressures exerted on them by rigid social structures.

The Mohists (named after the founder of their school of thought, Mo Tze, c.479–399 BC) challenged both the hierarchical traditionalist thinking of the Confucians, and the anarchic individualism of the Taoists. The communitarian alternative they put forward consisted of three key elements. First, members of communities are more likely to attain an improved quality of life if they are prepared to support others as they would like to be supported themselves. Second, what kind of mutual support would be most effective should not be determined by reference to customs or revered texts alone, but with the help of a combination of historical records, contemporary observation, and future experimentation. Third, communities must devise ways of acting together in order to advance the kind of mutual support backed by a critical review of the evidence.

While the Confucians attacked the communitarian Mohists for their refusal to respect the total sanctity of customs, the Taoists frowned upon their determination to organize for collective action, the Legalists (flourished c.third-century BC) attacked all their rivals on the basis that they assumed human beings could be expected to serve what those in the ruling position might deem to be the greater good without being made to do so by forceful commands. The fourth position rejects moral traditions, critical reasoning, and benign individualism as unrealistic drivers for social goals set by a ruling elite. Instead, it posits the need for strict laws backed by stringent sanctions to direct social behavior.

This four-way contest provides a framework for understanding the roots of communitarianism and for mapping its core disagreement with rival social theories on how communities should be organized. These divisions have resurfaced throughout

history in China and other parts of the world, and they represent underlying tensions in the diverse approaches for resolving disagreement within as well as between sovereign states.

## Cooperative Ethos and Communitarian Social Experiments

Although the Enlightenment is often characterized as a movement for individualism, it contains important strands of communitarian thinking. As Peter Gay (1973) pointed out, it was no accident that the most quoted moral philosopher amongst pro-Enlightenment writers in the eighteenth century was Cicero who advocated the pursuit of the common good through civic solidarity and informed deliberations. It was Robert Owen (1771–1858), who synthesized a range of Enlightenment ideas into a cogent social philosophy which set a new mission for education; inspired the cooperative movement, and promoted social experiments that came to be known by the mid-nineteenth century as 'communitarian' (the earliest recorded use of the term dates back to 1841).

What Owen set out in *A New View of Society*, essays on the principle of the formation of human character (1991, originally published 1813/14), was bold in its analysis and radical in its prescription. Owen maintained that people's lives could be substantially improved if they interacted with one another in mutually supportive communities, rather than carrying on with exploitative arrangements, which benefited a powerful few at the expense of the majority. He further argued that experimental alternatives could be developed to test out how social arrangements could be reformed irrespective of what traditional beliefs might be invoked to defend the status quo. Most importantly, he claimed that education held the key to giving people the skills, confidence, and will to bring about new social arrangements.

Owen helped set up cooperative enterprise where workers and their families were treated with respect, given educational support, and empowered to share in the profits generated. His example inspired the widespread development of cooperatives, which gave their members an equal say in the running of their workplace communities.

Owenites in the United Kingdom and those who emigrated to the United States set up diverse communitarian experiments to enable people to take greater control of their lives, not as isolated individuals, but as fellow members of shared communities. What was sociologically significant about these experiments was that they opened the door to a new way to explore forms of human association. Instead of abstract models with their theoretical pros and cons, the Owenites pioneered the development and adaptation of community life through education and practical organization. As J.F.C. Harrison (2010) explained, while those early experiments produced a mix of successes and failures, they pointed later generations to the possibility of critical community development.

## The Relationship between Liberalism and Communitarianism

Although in the 1980s there was a common trend in focusing on the debates between John Rawls and his communitarian

critics (e.g., Charles Taylor, Michael Sandel, and Michael Walzer) as a contest between liberalism and communitarianism, a close reading of these critics would reveal that they rejected any suggestion that they were putting forward an alternative social philosophy in the form of 'communitarianism' to displace liberalism as such. What they were interested in was to pick out particular weaknesses in liberal thinking, and explained why a more robust understanding of human relationships, in the context of what would constitute healthy and coherent community life, was necessary to supplement those liberal insights that were in fact valid. As such they echoed the intellectual debates that began a century earlier and which characterized the reorientation of liberal ideas in late nineteenth/early twentieth century.

Individualist liberalism had by the 1890s leaned toward an increasingly laissez faire outlook that would have heartened the most radical Taoists, if not for the fact that instead of an overbearing state, there were now powerful factory owners, merchants and bankers who were imposing the social arrangements they favored on people who, on their own, had no chance of making any alterations to those often oppressive arrangements.

Against this transformation of liberalism into a doctrine that privileged the commercial elite, turn-of-the-century thinkers such as Émile Durkheim, L.T. Hobhouse, Jane Addams, and John Dewey led a counter-movement in rethinking what a society that is both liberal and communitarian should be like.

For these thinkers, liberal concerns with freeing people from arbitrary intervention were not to be rejected wholesale for a communitarian alternative form of life. On the contrary, they believed those concerns needed to be properly addressed by recognizing that individuals would only develop freely as social beings if they were able to learn to live with and support each other as members of shared communities. Drawing on communitarian experiments in education, cooperative enterprise, and democratic collective action, they began to reorientate liberal thinking toward a more proactive commitment to community development.

Important studies have shown that communitarian thought grew in the context of augmenting liberalism, not in seeking to undermine it. Anyone wanting to know more about the symbiotic relationship between communitarian and liberal ideas in these thinkers should consult the works on Durkheim by Mark S. Cladis (1992); on L.T. Hobhouse and what came to be known as *New Liberalism* by Stephan Collini (1979); and on Dewey by Alan Ryan (1995), especially the section 'The Communitarian Turn' in Chapter 9. Re-acquaintance with their arguments to bolster liberalism with communitarian insights should go some way to displacing the misleading dichotomy of 'liberalism versus communitarianism' that became fashionable for a time in late twentieth century.

### The Focus of Modern Communitarianism

In the 1990s, the long tradition of sociological insights and public advocacy relating to the critical development of community life outlined in the previous sections was further developed and applied to contemporary social problems when a group of American and British thinkers formally adopted the 'communitarian' name to describe this philosophy.

In the United States, Amitai Etzioni brought together a wide range of scholars and public figures, including William A. Galston, Philip Selznick, Robert Bellah, and Thomas Spragens Jr., under The Responsive Communitarian Platform: Rights and Responsibilities, a joint manifesto summarizing the core concerns of the group; produced the journal, *The Responsive Community*; and set up the Institute of Communitarian Policy Studies (<http://icps.gwu.edu/>).

In the United Kingdom, Henry Tam founded the Communitarian Forum with academics and civic leaders such as Tony Skillen, Chris Ormell, Lord Phillips of Sudbury (President, Citizenship Foundation), and Sheila Bloom (Chief Executive, Institute of Global Ethics, United Kingdom); devised a communitarian 'Working with Communities' program that was recognized with a national award by Prime Minister Tony Blair; and set up the Civil Renewal Unit for the UK Government in 2003 to run the 7-year nationwide 'Together We Can' campaign (<http://www.hbtam.blogspot.co.uk/2013/06/find-our-more-about-together-we-can.html>).

A good introduction to the core views of the modern communitarians can be found in the following key texts: Jonathan Boswell's (1990) *Community and the Economy*; Philip Selznick's (1992) *The Moral Commonwealth*; Amita Etzioni's (1993) *The Spirit of Community* and (1998) *The Essential Communitarian Reader* (edited collection); and Henry Tam's (1998) *Communitarianism*, and (2001a) *Progressive Politics in the Global Age* (edited collection).

These communitarian writers want to draw attention to five underlying problems engendered by the resurgence of a 'self-centred social and political outlook since the 1980s. The growing emphasis on the individual self as owing nothing to anyone but one's own 'self' was exacerbating the corrosive effects of relentless marketization and the deterioration of social bonds. For communitarians, these problems would continue to worsen unless a better understanding of what would make for healthy relationships in the multiple layers of community life was attained to inform attempts at finding long-term solutions.

Of the five problems, the first and foremost is the failure to give adequate attention to both rights and responsibilities. If we only defend individuals' rights to claim what they in isolation seek to claim as their entitlement, and neglect to press people to recognize and fulfill responsibilities they owe others, those rights may become hollow in any case. As societies become ever more socioeconomically polarized, the need to find a proper balance between rights and responsibilities becomes even more urgent when those who have the most insist on their rights to do what they want with their wealth, while those with the least are repeatedly told to take responsibility for their own plight with little help from others.

The second problem is the masking of indifference as the face of neutrality. The imposition of values, especially when it would in effect exploit some to gratify others, is dubious at best, and repugnant at worst. But the rejection of objectionable values does not entail the rejection of all values. Radical relativism gives succor to irresponsible individuals who would like to pretend that everything they do is morally neutral. By reconnecting people to the attitudinal and behavioral expectations they actually have on others, communitarians believe the fabric of common values can be weaved together again.

Third, there is the problem of the neglect of communities by both state and market. In the nineteenth century, liberal constraints on the state were widely called for and applied, but that led to businesses becoming so powerful that they could dictate terms to people as workers and consumers. In the first half of the twentieth century, the state expanded to deal with the problems caused or neglected by the market. But throughout, the capacity of ordinary people to get involved, have a say, or exert some real influence over their lives was diminished. Both government institutions and businesses need to face up to the urgent need to rethink how they are to enable communities to play their part in a more balanced and inclusive society.

The fourth problem concerns the unfortunate severance between a sense of universal respect and a commitment to more local, communal attachments. In a globalized world, people increasingly look to their families, neighborhoods, and national borders for a sense of belonging and security. But at the same time, they need to adapt more than ever to interactions beyond settled boundaries. In place of the dichotomy of either a bland universalism or a blinkered localism, communitarians seek to help build the solidarity for a worldwide community of diverse communities.

Finally, human beings in the modern world need to be reconceptualized as people whose potential for a fulfilling life is developed and realized as members of overlapping communities. The tendency to see them as nothing more than cogs in a corporate machine, utility-maximizing consumers, or free-floating atoms indifferent to their proximity to others must be challenged.

### The Key Communitarian Principles

In order to tackle the aforementioned problems, communitarians not only highlight the contradictions and distortions in the misguided conceptions of human relationship in contemporary society, they also put forward ideas for new models of interaction and power structure that would enable their participants to reach a more nuanced understanding to guide the future development of their social, economic, and political arrangements.

There are broadly three communitarian principles that are central to shaping appropriate models for human interaction. First, the principle of cooperative enquiry requires anyone making an assertion to be judged with reference to the extent to which informed participants deliberating under conditions of thoughtful and uncoerced exchanges would concur. Any provisional consensus reached by one group of individuals must in turn be open to possible revisions subject to examinations carried out with input from other groups. The ultimate strength of any truth claim rests with the likelihood of that claim surviving the critical deliberations of ever expanding circles of enquirers.

Second, the principle of mutual responsibility requires all members of any community to take responsibility for enabling each other to pursue those values which stand up to the test of reciprocity. What an individual may value cannot expect to command the respect from others if its pursuit is incompatible with the realization of goals valued by others. The range of mutual responsibilities may expand over time to cover, for

example, direct and indirect care for dependents, help to those who would otherwise be neglected, safeguards for verifiable evidence and coherent reasoning, and cultivation of personal abilities not inimical to those of others. Omission to support, as well as action to harm, would be deemed a breach of the responsibility owed to each other.

Third, the principle of citizen participation requires that all those affected by any given power structure are to be able to participate as equal citizens in determining how the power in question is to be exercised. All those subject to potentially binding commands should be entitled to learn about, review, and determine how to reform decision-making processes. This applies to not only government institutions, but also businesses, schools, and community organizations. It follows that power relations should not retain structural or cultural barriers which hold people back from accessing information, putting forward their suggestions, questioning proposals, or sharing in decision-making processes.

The application of these principles to devising and evaluating modes of human interaction will help to show up barriers and identify specific improvements that should enable the people involved to relate to each other as members of communities with shared values. In practice, however, both established institutions and the mind-set of individuals will need to be changed if the communitarian principles are to be realized.

### Communitarianism and Social Change: Key Questions

Communitarians want to transform communities so that they move closer to what community life should be like. At the most basic level, a community is no more than a group of people who have something in common which brings them and keeps them together. What is in common could be a geographical location, a historical identity, the fear of a common enemy, a place of worship, a shared interest, a common employer, or a bond that has grown out of solidarity against similar prejudices and discrimination.

At any given time, however, there are already social and institutional arrangements in place. Where these are entrenched and yet ill-disposed to embrace the improvements sought, communitarians face the problem their critics routinely present to them: how can they bring about social change without disrupting, and possibly undermining, prevailing community structures?

There are at least four lines of criticism derived from this problem. First, there is the suggestion that communitarian aspiration for social change is hemmed in by the limits set by many hierarchical communities. This applies to modern corporations as much as to traditional communities. Instead of complacently leaving those in charge to reform from within, communitarians have put forward substantial social, economic, and political reforms to open up debates on what changes ought to be considered (see, e.g., the works of Boswell, Etzioni, Derber, and Tam). Communities that have become accustomed to neglecting some of their members may well be reluctant to change, and that is where strong advocacy, subtle persuasion, and vivid presentation have their role to play in altering mind-sets and building alliances for social transformation.

Second, communitarians are often accused of demanding homogeneity as a precondition for effective community life. It is claimed that they want to secure social cohesion at the expense of cultural pluralism because they believe that the rejection of a common set of values and practices would lead to instability and conflicts. But the emphasis on the importance of common values and practices is not inherently incompatible with individual autonomy.

The distinction Durkheim and Hobhouse drew between mechanical and organic solidarity helps to explain precisely that whereas the narrow values which underpin mechanical solidarity demand total homogeneity, organic solidarity offers the opportunity for individuals to develop themselves and attain a stronger sense of social cohesion at the same time. Values grow out of an expanding mutual understanding between people. The fear of 'foreign' or 'alien' is often most pronounced in those areas where people are most isolated from others with different lifestyles and cultures. The community bonds in cosmopolitan cities show that people can have a strong sense of shared belonging and at the same time have attachments to diverse interests and customs within the overarching framework of a set of inclusive common values.

The third type of criticism concerns the issues of power and dominance in established communities. Advocates for women, gays, disabled people, minority ethnic groups, are rightly troubled by the sense of righteous behavior carried out by the members of certain communities. In those communities, some people define their identity in a disturbingly large part in terms of the superiority they allow themselves to feel toward those who are traditionally discriminated against.

The sociological starting point adopted by communitarians would maintain that there are different forms of community life. To develop those which are most likely to promote the widest opportunities for individual growth without fragmenting communal links into a state of indifference or even conflicts, we need to break down barriers to equitable power distribution so that through open communications and co-operation we can identify appropriate reform strategies. It follows that existing communities of family, neighborhood, and nation should be evaluated critically in relation to the key communitarian principles. The more they contain oppressive relations and practices which demand the unquestioned obedience of those in subordinate positions, the more they need to be exposed as authoritarian and subject to radical transformation.

The fourth and final area of criticism concerns the exclusivity of communities. This objection concerns the compatibility between strong community identity and the inclusive ideal of a community of communities. Miller (1990) and others have claimed that the two are incompatible because communities must have a high degree of exclusivity if they are to provide their members with a real sense of belonging.

From a communitarian point of view, community identity does not rest on exclusive allegiance. We can, and many of us do, feel a real sense of belonging toward a multiplicity of communities, our neighborhoods, towns, counties, regions, nations, clubs, unions, professional bodies, work teams, interest-based societies, lobbying groups, etc. Many of these enable their members to be involved in major decisions which affect their lives. Furthermore, these communities do associate with each other both horizontally and vertically. For example,

the voluntary groups of a town coming together to form an umbrella group for the town; clubs across Europe forming a continental association; local businesses joining with regional businesses to set up a business support organization; and national and regional politicians working together on common interest issues. Some of these links are not strong, but others create their own communities where the sense of identity and belonging is as important as that within one of the constituent communities, and the nation state is only one of these communities.

People's attachment to a web of communities means that exclusivity is often an imagined desire rather than an actual barrier to a fulfilling community life. In reality, the task of developing healthy interactions within and between a multiplicity of communities is one becoming more urgent as the process of globalization takes out the option of communities existing in complete isolation from one another. As different communities impact more and more on each other, they will only be able to flourish if they learn to relate to each other by cultivating a set of common values and practices to which they will give their support. The alternative is a collusion course between rival communities, which will undermine the well-being of all.

### Communitarianism, Education, and Community-Based Learning

Communitarians rely on deliberative education and reasoned persuasion to win over hearts and minds in changing communities. Like the Mohists, while they recognize that traditions and customs may have a role to play in ordering society, they insist that these must be supplemented, and where appropriate corrected, by facts we learn from experience and ideas that can be tested out through social experimentation.

Education therefore has a central role in communitarian philosophy. There are three aspects that merit particular attention. First, the education of children raises the question of what and how they are to be taught. Since from a communitarian perspective, dogmas and prejudices cannot be defended as just another set of customary beliefs or group values, the contents of education can be contested and arguments put forward to support teaching that upholds the communitarian principles. Schools need to move forward in terms of their structures and teaching methodologies so that pupils, teachers, and parents can function as partners in raising understanding. Fielding and Moss (2010) provides an example of how a more democratic and communitarian ethos can be developed in schools. In England, the cooperative movement in the 2010s began to give systematic support to the development of cooperative schools, which formally integrate the communitarian values of the movement into the running of each school. Outside the school, there is the issue of how the socioeconomic status of parents may affect the access their children have to effective education. Where individuals and schools cannot overcome these problems, the state at the local or national level would need to help parents and children – from support to enable them to have enough to eat or travel to school, to the provision of advice to parents and facilities for after-school care where necessary.

Second, there is the educative influence beyond teaching institutions for young people. Work-based learning, adult education, and media output generally can shape people's understanding and attitudes to a large degree. Not only is it necessary for schools to prepare for what other sources of influence may be at work on their pupils' minds, society also needs to be aware what people are led to think and feel after they have left school. Just as what parents or schools teach their children cannot be ringfenced as their private business that has nothing to do with the wider society, the activities of media, trainers, lifelong learning providers, research institutions, advertising and public relations agencies, all have social impact which cannot be shielded from critical scrutiny. Liberal safeguards against arbitrary censorship are not to be seen in this context as insurmountable barrier to public intervention, but as providing a reliable framework to counter the promotion of falsehoods and prejudices. Furthermore, the common good is not to be enhanced necessarily just by negative constraints, and it is likely that public support in the form of investment and coordination can considerably strengthen the quality and dissemination of research and information.

Finally, there is the need to improve education in citizenship and democratic collaboration. Communitarians have written about how the disposition and skills toward interacting with others with a mix of shared values and conflicting views should be cultivated. One of the most comprehensive initiatives to develop such an educational approach across all social spheres – in schools, community groups, local government, businesses, public policies – was taken forward by the British Government when it set up the Civil Renewal Unit in 2003 with the communitarian, Henry Tam, as its head. The initiative, under the title of 'Together We Can,' enabled neighborhoods to learn in partnership with public and private bodies how to improve their common well-being. It supported Civic Pioneer local authorities to help local residents and groups as well as their own staff to deepen their understanding of how more effective democratic decision making can be achieved. It helped academic institutions, community activists, and public service providers to develop Take Part projects to facilitate active citizenship learning in a wide range of communities. It also funded regional Community Empowerment Partnerships in all parts of England to bring together diverse groups and organizations to share ideas on how best to spread learning on what came to be known as 'cooperative problem-solving.'

Tam's (2013) paper on 'Cooperative Problem-Solving and Education' and the web resource generated by the 'Together We Can' program demonstrate how communitarian ideas on social transformation can be taken forward by coordinated efforts to educate citizens and the diverse communities to which they belong in applying cooperation and conflict resolution approaches in cultivating shared values, so as to attain better forms of community life.

**See also:** Attitudes, Political and Civic Culture; Citizenship, Historical Development of; Communitarianism; Community, Social Context of: The US Case; Cooperative Learning in Schools; Deliberation and Democracy; Dewey, John (1859–1952); Durkheim, Emile (1858–1917); Individualism

versus Collectivism: Philosophical Aspects; Intergroup Relations; Power in Society; Republicanism: Philosophical Aspects; Social Enquiry and Action Research for Social Work; Social Identity in Social Psychology.

## Bibliography

- Annette, J., Mayo, M. (Eds.), 2010. *Take Part? Active Learning for Active Citizenship*. NIACE, Leicester.
- Bell, D., 1993. *Communitarianism and Its Critics*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Bellah, R., et al., 1986. *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- Boswell, J., 1990. *Community and the Economy: The Theory of Public Co-operation*. Routledge, London.
- Boswell, J., Tam, H., 2013. *Communitarianism Revisited*. <http://henry-tam.blogspot.co.uk/2013/02/communitarianism-revisited.html>.
- Brannan, T., et al., 2007. *Re-energizing Citizenship: Strategies for Civil Renewal*. Macmillan Palgrave, Basingstoke.
- Cladis, M.S., 1992. *A Communitarian Defense of Liberalism: Emile Durkheim and Contemporary Social Theory*. Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Collini, S., 1979. *Liberalism & Sociology: L. T. Hobhouse and Political Argument in England 1880–1914*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Derber, C., 2000. *Corporation Nation*. St Martin's Griffin, New York.
- Etzioni, A., 1993. *The Spirit of Community*. Touchstone, New York.
- Etzioni, A., 1996. *The New Golden Rule*. Basic Books, New York.
- Etzioni, A. (Ed.), 1998. *The Essential Communitarian Reader*. Roman & Littlefield, Lanham, MD.
- Etzioni, A., 2004. *The Common Good*. Polity Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Fielding, M., Moss, P., 2010. *Radical Education and the Common Good: A Democratic Alternative*. Routledge, London.
- Gay, P., 1973. *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation (The Rise of Modern Paganism)*. Wildwood House, London.
- Hale, S., 2006. *Blair's Community: Communitarian Thought and New Labour*. Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Harrison, J.F.C. 2010 edition of 1969 original. *Robert Owen and the Owenites in Britain and America: The Quest for the New Moral World*. Routledge, Abingdon.
- Lewis, M., Conaty, P., 2012. *The Resilience Imperative: Cooperative Transitions to a Steady State Economy*. New Society Publishers, Gabriola Island (Canada).
- McGreal, I.P. (Ed.), 1995. *Great Thinkers of the Eastern World*. Harper Collins, New York.
- Miller, D., 1990. *Market, State and Community*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Multhall, S., Swift, A., 1992. *Liberals and Communitarians*. Blackwell, Cambridge, MA.
- Owen, R. 1991 edition of 1813/14 original. *A New View of Society and Other Writings*. Penguin Classics, London.
- Ryan, A., 1995. *John Dewey and the High Tide of American Liberalism*. W.W. Norton & Co., New York.
- Sandel, M., 1996. *Democracy's Discontent*. Harvard University Press, Massachusetts.
- Selznick, P., 1992. *The Moral Commonwealth*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- Selznick, P., 2002. *The Communitarian Persuasion*. Woodrow Wilson Center Press, Washington.
- Sirianni, C., Friedland, L., 2001. *Civic Innovation in America: Community Empowerment, Public Policy and the Movement for Civic Renewal*. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Tam, H., 1998. *Communitarianism: A New Agenda for Politics and Citizenship*. Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Tam, H. (Ed.), 2001a. *Progressive Politics in the Global Age*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Tam, H., 2001b. *The community roots of citizenship*. In: Crick, B. (Ed.), *Citizens: Towards a Citizenship Culture*. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, pp. 123–131.
- Tam, H., 2005. *Civil renewal & diversity*. In: Lafleche, M. (Ed.), *Social Capital, Civil Renewal & Ethnic Diversity*. Runnymede Trust, London.
- Tam, H., 2011. *Rejuvenating democracy: lessons from a communitarian experiment*. *Forum for Promoting 3-19 Comprehensive Education* 53 (3), 407–420.
- Tam, H., 2013. *Cooperative problem-solving and education*. *Forum for Promoting 3-19 Comprehensive Education* 55 (2), 185–201.
- Tze, Mo, 1929. *Translated from the Original Chinese Text by Yi-Pao Mei. The Ethical and Political Works of Motse*. Arthur Probsthain, London.